

US Policy and Invoking the Fight Against Terrorism to Justify Aggressive War

السياسة الأمريكية والتدبر بمكافحة الإرهاب لتبرير الحرب العدوانية

Salama Abdelaziz Hassan Aly*, Egypt

lawyersalama@gmail.com

Received: 06/01/2023

Accepted: 12/04/2023

Published: 15/05/2023

Abstract:

After the incident of September 11, 2001, the United States of America adopted a new policy aimed at combating terrorism in the world, but the truth is that terrorism was a pretext for occupying Iraq and achieving American political interests. Therefore, the research aims to focus on the American policy to combat terrorism and the extent of its success in achieving its objectives. As for the importance of the research, it deals with the actual goals pursued by the United States, which is the search for a justification for launching an aggressive attack on many countries in order to impose hegemony on the world and overthrow governments hostile to Israel. The research problem is that it deals with the factors under the failure of the United States to make any progress in its war on terrorism.

KEY WORDS: Aggressive war, fight against terrorism.

Introduction: : After the attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States began to adopt a new policy, which is to intervene militarily and launch aggressive wars against many countries without the availability of a legitimate cover from the United Nations. Hence, the slogan of the United States of America, the war on terrorism, the protection of democracy, and the defense of human rights, has become a justification and a pretext by which it tries to legitimize its wars of aggression. Also, those unjustified wars sought to achieve other goals, including consolidating Israeli influence in the Middle East, dividing the Arab world, and tightening control over oil resources.

Research problem:

The research seeks to address the problem of the concept of aggressive war, the extent of the legitimacy of the war waged by the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan, and what are the real goals of those wars?, What is the legal cover for it?, Has the United States succeeded in eliminating terrorism?, Did Iraq possess weapons of mass destruction?.

Research Aims:

The research aims to shed light on the contemporary American policy adopted by the American administration in launching an aggressive attack on the legitimate regimes, violating the rules of international law, and infringing on the sovereignty of states.

It also aims to address the justifications on which the United States relies on waging unilateral wars without the availability of legal cover from the United Nations.

Research Importance:

The importance of the research lies in the fact that it focuses on studying the justifications behind waging the aggressive war and analyzes the evidence and arguments invoked by the aggressor country and the extent of its legitimacy. It also deals with the war on Iraq and Afghanistan as a model for the aggressive war, as well as the war launched by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear reactor.

* Corresponding Author

What increases the importance of the research is that it focuses on the real causes of the American wars in the Middle East, which seek to topple regimes hostile to the Israeli entity and seek to fragment the Arab world so that Israel becomes the major power in the region.

Research Methodology:

I will follow the descriptive analytical method by analyzing the causes of the American wars of aggression in the Middle East and analyzing the American justifications and allegations for waging unilateral wars without a legitimate cover, showing the falsity of those justifications.

I will shed light on analyzing the real causes of the American wars of aggression and analyzing the results that resulted from them and the attitude of the international community and the United Nations towards them.

Perhaps the war on Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor, are clear examples of those wars.

I.-American Politics and War of Aggression

After the events of September 11, 2001, the United States of America began pursuing a new policy to control the Arab world and impose its influence on the countries of the Middle East.

And after America relied on diplomacy and negotiation, it became dependent on military forces and directing preemptive strikes to other countries under the pretext of protecting US national security, and it seems that the United States was seeking to restructure the world in proportion to American interests. Hence, I will discuss in this section of the research the concept of aggressive war, the American pretexts for waging that war and the real reasons for it.

1- Concept of aggressive war:

The first to deal with the definition of aggression is the author Peter Maguire, who indicated that the origin of the concept of aggression was mentioned for the first time in Article (231) of the Versailles Treaty of 1919, which stipulated that "Germany and its allies bear responsibility for the damages suffered by the allied governments as a result of the war of aggression waged by Germany and its allies" (1).

Many European countries sought to sign two agreements to define aggression, the first was signed in 1933 and the second was signed in 1934. These countries have sought to reach a unified definition of aggression(2).

This agreement defines aggressive war as: a) Declaring war on another country. b) Invasion by the armed forces of one state, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory of another state. c) Attack by land, sea or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory of another country or on its ships or aircraft. d) Imposing a naval blockade on the coasts or ports of another country. e) Providing support to armed gangs formed in its territory and invading the territory of another country, or refusing to take all measures to deprive these gangs of all assistance or protection, despite the request of the invaded country to take such measures(3).

The League, under that agreement, did not use the League's powers to expel a League member found guilty of aggression, except once, against the Soviet government itself, on December 14, 1939, following the Soviet invasion of Finland.

From the foregoing, we can conclude that the aggression was not the result of contemporary thought, but was linked to the First and Second World Wars and the accompanying aggression launched by Germany and its allies against Britain and its allies.

This coincided with the efforts made by the European countries in 1933 and 1934 to conclude two conventions to define what is meant by aggression and limit it to specific actions that may not be committed. like Invasion by the armed forces of one state, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory of another state. or Attack by land, sea or air forces, with or without a declaration of war, on the territory of another country or on its ships or aircraft. or Imposing a naval blockade on the coasts or ports of another country.

2.- American aggression on Iraq:

On the nineteenth of March 2003, the United States of America launched an aggressive war against Iraq after it failed to obtain an international resolution from the Security Council in accordance with Chapters VI and VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

2.1- Justifications of the US for the war on Iraq and refutation:

2.1.1- The American administration claimed that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction that threaten world peace and that Saddam Hussein does not allow the inspection committees to disarm those weapons.

To refute this argument, I say: Iraq's nuclear weapons program suffered a serious setback in 1981 when Israel bombed the Tammuz reactor before it was operational, which could have produced weapons-grade nuclear material. David Albright and Mark Hibbs, writing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, also asserted that the unresolved technological challenges were too numerous and the Iraqi nuclear weapon was not developed.

Before launching the attack, the US administration demanded that international inspectors be sent back to Iraq. Indeed, a committee was formed headed by Hans Blix, Chairman of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission, and Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The inspectors began visiting sites suspected of producing weapons of mass destruction, but they did not find them. and they did not find evidence of such activities.

Hence, the claim that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction is not true, but it was a pretext for invading Iraq⁽⁴⁾.

This argument was a pretext for the US administration to describe Iraq as one of the countries of the axis of evil, in addition to Iran and North Korea, and threatened them with preemptive strikes⁽⁵⁾.

The United States was seeking by all means to justify launching an illegal attack on Iraq, as evidenced by the fact that the Iraqi Foreign Minister addressed the Secretary-General of the United Nations asking him to send international inspectors to Iraq again, but the United States refused because it was determined to launch an aggressive war.

Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, announced before the Council on March 27, 2003 that the agency's inspectors had not found any prohibited activities in Iraq, and he reaffirmed that on (30/1/2003) indicating that Iraq did not violate Resolution No. (1441) related to the disarmament of prohibited Iraqi weapons⁽⁶⁾.

2.1.2- The second justification on which the United States relied for the invasion of Iraq is its claim that the regime in Iraq is an authoritarian regime and that Iraq does not respect international law, human rights and democracy, and it claimed that it seeks to liberate the Iraqi people from the rule of Saddam Hussein.

To refute this argument, I say: The United States of America does not have the right to interfere in the affairs of Iraq to change its regime. Article (2), paragraph (7) of the Charter of the United Nations stipulates that "nothing in this Charter authorizes the United Nations to interfere in the internal affairs of another country".

And I note that the principle of inadmissibility of interference in the affairs of another state is not limited to the prohibition of the use of force only, but includes the prohibition of all kinds of pressures that threaten the state and affect it politically, economically and socially⁽⁷⁾.

Article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States affirms the principle of non-interference, stating that "no country or group of countries has the right to interfere, directly or indirectly, whether in the internal or external affairs of other countries. This principle prohibits resorting to armed force, as well as all forms of intervention, and tendencies aimed at violating the personality of states, or their political, economic, and cultural elements." Article (16) of the Charter stipulates that "no state has the right to use or encourage the use of Measures of coercion

of an economic and political nature to impose the will of states on the sovereignty of other states, or to obtain some advantages from them.

The United States of America was one of the countries that interfered most in the affairs of other countries because of its influence, and with the end of the Cold War, America became the only country that interfered in the affairs of other countries. And it was asking the international community to legitimize its intervention, and this is what happened with regard to interference in Libyan affairs, such as severing diplomatic relations and economic blockade, and considering it one of the countries of the axis of evil. And accusing Libya of sponsoring international terrorism, until the result was the American bombing of it in 1986, then accusing it of bombing an American plane over Lockerbie, as well as its military intervention in Iraq and waging war against it with the countries allied with it⁽⁸⁾.

The interference of a country in the internal affairs of another country for the purpose of imposing a certain policy on it is a diminution of that country's sovereignty⁽⁹⁾.

Hence, the evidence presented by the United States of America to justify the invasion of Iraq is not supported by international law, which granted the Iraqi people on their own the right to choose or change the regime.

The International Court of Justice has previously affirmed the impermissibility of using force to interfere in the affairs of another country on the pretext that it embraces a certain ideology or a certain political system because this matter is due to the internal jurisdiction of each country, so the state is free to choose the system of government that suits it, and this is confirmed by the Court in its ruling In the Case of Military and Quasi-Military Activities in Nicaragua 1986⁽¹⁰⁾.

The United States and its allies have violated United Nations General Assembly Resolution No. 3314 in its articles 4 and 5, which consider Gaza to be a state's territory or the blockade of its shores as aggression not protected by law.

2.1.3- The USA claimed that the Iraqi regime was supplying al-Qaeda with weapons of mass destruction and that it had set up camps to train terrorists in Somalia and other al-Qaeda camps near Baghdad, but this allegation has nothing to do with reality and there is no evidence of a relationship between them due to the different ideologies because the Baath Party has a secular orientation hostile to religious extremism and movements. The radical Islamist organization from which al-Qaeda emanates⁽¹¹⁾.

The US administration accused Saddam Hussein of being involved in the September 11 events. These accusations were based on allegations that 6 of the perpetrators of the events of September 11, including Muhammad Atta, had met several times with members of the Iraqi intelligence in a European country, and that there was an al-Qaeda camp in the Salman Pak area, south of the capital, Baghdad. It is believed that the CIA based these allegations on Sayings of Iraqis who migrated to the West and were affiliated with the opposition Iraqi National Congress Party led by Ahmed Chalabi. On July 29, 2004, a report was issued by a committee formed by the Senate to investigate the truth of the matter, in which it stated that after strenuous efforts by the committee, no tangible evidence of Saddam Hussein's association with al-Qaeda was reached. In September 2005, Colin Powell denied the existence of any relationship between the two parties ⁽¹²⁾.

2.1.4- The United States of America claims that launching an attack on Iraq was inevitable to protect the American national security, and that the United States of America felt a grave danger threatening its national security, which is Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction.

The early theories in the principles of Roman law stipulated two conditions for the right of legal defense to arise, namely:

First: the presence of aggression and real imminent danger. Second: That force be the only means to respond to this danger And that the time is not enough to use legal methods to ward off the danger .

According to international law, the right to legitimate defense is restricted by restrictions, whether for the attacked state, which alone has the right to self-defense, Self-defense is also linked to a specific period of time, as this right ends once the Security Council is resorted to, which in turn takes appropriate measures against the aggressor country.

According to the most correct in international legal jurisprudence, Article (51) stipulates that a real armed attack takes place in order for the state to have the right to resort to the use of the right of legitimate defense. The article included the phrase "if a force is attacked"⁽¹³⁾.

Others believe that the article used the term armed attack to justify self-defense, and therefore any aggression without the use of armed attack is not sufficient for self-defense⁽¹⁴⁾.

2.1.5-The United States of America claimed that it launched a war on Iraq with the aim of establishing a democratic regime that respects the law and human rights, and this regime will be an alternative to the repressive regime of President Saddam Hussein.

The US administration has succeeded in promoting and creating a general feeling among Western peoples that Saddam Hussein's regime is brutal, repressive, and supportive of terrorism, although sources familiar with US intelligence say that there is no evidence that Saddam is related to the September 11 attacks, nor that he was or is currently doing With the help of the base. . It seems that the White House was encouraging this false impression, seeking to maintain American support for a possible war against Iraq and to show the seriousness of purpose in Saddam's regime.

The United States of America, with its innovative democracy in the Middle East, is seeking to impose conditions and friendly and allied governments that are completely subservient to it and to Israel⁽¹⁵⁾.

2.2- The real reasons for the US aggressive war on Iraq:

In its war of aggression against Iraq, the US administration relied on many false reasons and allegations. Therefore, in this section, I will address the actual reasons for the war of aggression against Iraq.

2.2.1- Domination of Iraqi oil and ensuring control of oil stocks in the Middle East , The US administration has been influenced by the modern theory which believes that whoever controls oil controls the economy and whoever controls the economy controls the world.

The United States fought the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in order to find a foothold in oil-rich regions such as Iraq, which alone possesses four times the US reserves, including Alaska, or controls the paths of pipelines, such as Afghanistan.

So, oil is the important determinant behind the American war on Iraq, as it is not aimed at satisfying the immediate American need for it, as much as it is a tool for global domination and domination over one of the most important energy sources in the world, in order to complete the elements of the American empire that is to be built according to the (New American Century) project.

The war against Iraq was mainly oil, because according to the American strategy, plans and goals were set in advance to control Iraq's oil, and among those goals: ⁽¹⁶⁾

A) Canceling the nationalization of Iraqi oil, which Saddam Hussein accomplished in the early 1970s, by seeking to privatize it within 24 months, while giving absolute preference to American companies.

B) Seeking to remove the cartel status of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and change the global oil market by using Iraq as a tool in this policy.

C) Flooding the market with quantities that exceed the limits of OPEC, and to levels that push the price of a barrel to less than twenty dollars in the first period, and push Iraq to pump more quantities without restrictions, and Dick Cheney indicated that Iraqi production will rise to three million barrels per day in six Months.

Donald Kagan, an important member of the neoconservative group, wrote: "Most likely, we will need an extensive military presence in the Middle East for a long time, and any interruption in the flow of oil will lead to dire economic consequences, and the presence of our forces in Iraq is sufficient to prevent any interruption of oil supplies"⁽¹⁷⁾. . Therefore, the Middle East project may be a word of truth intended to be false. Yes, the region needs this project, and it needs comprehensive democratization. At the same time, this project needs clear seriousness and high credibility on the part of the United States. The American argument for a permanent military presence in the Middle East is something that was decided before 9/11.

2.2.2- Destruction of the largest anti-Israel force:

The United States of America was planning to occupy Iraq because it is the largest country hostile to Israel and must be destroyed, and because the division of Iraq is part of the Bernald Lewis project.

Israel and the Zionist lobby played a vital role in inciting the United States of America to invade Iraq, and this was evident in various political, military and intelligence fields, especially since the Bush administration was dominated by the pro-Israel conservative current, which pushes and incites the American administration to launch aggression Iraq, its occupation and destruction. As former Prime Minister Ehud Barak wrote in The New York Times: "Warning that the greatest danger lies in inaction," while Benjamin Netanyahu wrote in an article published in the Wall Street Journal, saying: "In These days there is nothing less important than the overthrow of the Iraqi regime"⁽¹⁸⁾.

Israel continued its pressure on the United States of America through the Jewish lobbies present in Washington in order to carry out military action to invade Iraq according to the new American vision for the region and the Greater Middle East project, which was heralded by US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to achieve many goals, including control of oil sources. And protecting Israel in a way that secures the establishment of its great state from the Nile to the Euphrates. In addition to reshaping and drawing the map of the regional region to serve Israeli interests within the framework of a comprehensive plan to prepare the Arab reality to find a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, and turn it into an Arab-Persian conflict. to a regional earthquake, which creates new conditions and redistributes power in the region.

When the United States occupied Iraq in 2003, the first thing it did was to abolish its amended provisional constitution of 1970, which for the first time in Iraq's history recognized the principle of self-government as the basis for the form of Iraq. In 2004, Paul Bremer announced the Interim State Administration Law as an alternative to the constitution, and appointed the Transitional Governing Council consisting of 25 Iraqi personalities who were chosen on the basis of race and sectarianism, and the American administration declared that this law is the constitution of Iraq. Which means that one of the main goals of the invasion of Iraq is its sectarian and ethnic fragmentation.

2.2.3-

The occupation of Iraq was part of a plan to restructure the Middle East according to Israel's interests. The United States of America, during its successive administrations, adopted a policy of supporting and ensuring Israel's material and moral security, by deliberately achieving Israel's military superiority over the Arab countries combined, and enabling it to continue to possess nuclear weapons in the region. In addition to the commitment of the United States to support Israel in international forums and to prevent the issuance of a resolution against it by the Security Council for its continuous violation of international law, which made the United States lose its credibility in the Arab region, especially its position on the Arab-Israeli conflict⁽¹⁹⁾.

Hence, the war on Iraq was not aimed at ridding Iraq of a dictatorial regime, nor was the war on terrorism, but rather the goal was to achieve American strategic interests related to ensuring America's hegemony over this oil region, establishing the Middle East project, and dividing the

region to ensure the security of Israel, the only democratic ally. in the region of the United States of America⁽²⁰⁾.

On the Zionist side, the concept of the Middle East was associated with the name of Shimon Peres in the name of the new Middle East, in which he called for forgetting the past and wars, and putting an end to the Arab-Zionist conflict in order to build a new, homogeneous Middle East. Peres revealed his intention and goals in a press interview published by the "Middle East Quarterly" newspaper. In March 1995, when he answered a question about his previous statement that Israel's next goal should be joining the Arab League, he said: "I think their Arab League should be called the Middle East League, and then Israel can join it, and we will not become Arabs, but The university should become Middle Eastern.

2.2.4- Supporting repressive dictatorial regimes loyal to Israel . What the United States claims that it seeks to achieve democracy in the Middle East in light of its intellectual, political and military support for Israel confirms the falsity of what it claims, and this American support for Israel would expose the logic of alleged democracy, especially since Israel is committing crimes against humanity that contradict democracy and with American support.

II- The Failure of the United States in its War of Aggression

The United States of America was seeking from the occupation of Iraq to many goals, including the establishment of democratic rule in Iraq, the elimination of terrorism and extremism, and the disarmament of weapons of mass destruction. In this section, I will address the extent to which the United States of America succeeded in achieving its goals.

1.- Establishing a democratic system of government in Iraq :

After the overthrow of the Iraqi regime and the occupation of the eastern gate to the Middle East, American policy tended to adopt glamorous slogans, including the establishment of a democratic system of government in Iraq, the elimination of dictatorship, support for human rights, the spread of justice and equality, and the opportunity for women to hold positions to be equal to men.

Therefore, Colin Powell, the US Secretary of State, announced from the Heritage Foundation in Washington on December 12, 2002 AD, his initiative for the Middle East, as it "aims to encourage popular participation in the process, assist educational institutions throughout the Middle East, combat illiteracy, support women's rights, support the private and public sectors in the Arab world, and achieve Economic and investment reforms, as well as advancing understanding and partnership between the people of the United States and the Arab peoples"⁽²¹⁾. In order to achieve that democracy, the United States of America found no escape from supporting Islamic groups that adopt liberal ideas, and sought to encourage thinkers, intellectuals, Islamists, and those who support the stream of political Islam, which does not see a contradiction between the principles of Islam and the values of liberalism and democracy. This in turn helped the growth of political Islam movements and building Charitable institutions supporting Islamic political action.

This American policy resulted in the rise of political Islam in many Arab regimes, for example the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Tunisia. This leads us to a question? Did democracy bring a system of government supportive and supportive of the United States of America?, The United States has realized that the rise of democratic regimes will not bring governments loyal to them, but will bring governments that only care about the interests of the people.

Reality has proven that the United States, which overthrew Iraqi President Saddam Hussein by claiming to replace the Baath Party with a democratic system, failed in its alleged goal, and its allegations were proven false.

2.-Eliminate Terrorist Groups :

The United States claimed that it launched an attack on Iraq with the aim of eradicating the Islamic Group and other extremist groups. And the question now! Did you succeed in achieving this goal?.

On June 29, 2014, the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant announced the establishment of the Islamic caliphate and changed its name to the "Islamic State" and appointed Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi as the caliph of the Muslims after it took control of many cities in Iraq and Syria, including Mosul, Raqqa, Tikrit, Nineveh, Ramadi, Deir ez-Zor, Homs, Hama, Hasakah and Tal Abyad, followed by the arrival of extremist fighters from many other countries, armed groups announcing allegiance to Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi and trying to control cities and villages with financial and military support from the organization, and the United States announcing the formation of an international coalition to eliminate the organization.

The United States of America has failed to achieve its false goal of eliminating terrorist groups, whether the Islamic Group or Al-Qaeda, Rather, contrary to what the United States claimed, sectarian parties spread in Iraq after the invasion, the influence of Al-Qaeda increased, and many Awakening Councils appeared in Iraq, and the United States was unable to confront the Islamic groups⁽²²⁾.

Hence, the war launched by the United States against Iraq with the aim of eliminating terrorism and the Islamic State organization was based on fabricated American intelligence information, as it was later proven that the Iraqi regime had no connection with Islamic groups, and the results of that war contributed to an increase in the rate of terrorism and killing in Iraq after it. The sectarian division increased and Iraq transformed from a safe country into a country that exported terrorism.

3.-Disarmament of weapons of mass destruction :

The United States claimed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, as the George W. Bush and Tony Blair administrations confirmed that Saddam Hussein's weapons programs were still actively building weapons, and confirmed the existence of large caches of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. UN inspections to resolve the resumed disarmament issue began between November 2002 and March 2003, pursuant to UN Security Council Resolution 1441, which required Hussein to provide "immediate, unconditional and active cooperation" with UN inspectors and the IAEA, shortly before his country was attacked. The United States asserted that Hussein's repeated failure to cooperate constituted a breach of Resolution 1441, but failed to persuade the UN Security Council to pass a new resolution authorizing the use of force for lack of evidence.

The Security Council has issued several resolutions to confront this occupation, the most important of which is Resolution No. (687) dated (3/4/1991), which obligated Iraq to remove and destroy its weapons of mass destruction⁽²³⁾.

On September 17, 2002, the Iraqi Foreign Minister addressed the Secretary-General of the United Nations with Iraq's approval of the return of international inspectors without restriction or condition, but the United States refused that and insisted on issuing a new Security Council resolution that strengthens the powers of the inspection committees, and aimed to find a legitimate and legal justification for launching aggressive war on Iraq.

And after the United States of America occupied Iraq, we wonder: Where are the weapons of mass destruction that it claimed that Iraq is stockpiling?!!!, Did the United States really aim from its war on Iraq to disarm weapons of mass destruction? Or did it come to break up Iraq, control its oil reserves, and eliminate the largest force hostile to the Israeli entity?

III.- Conclusion: (Results and Recommendations)

1-The United States and Britain declared that military intervention in Iraq is necessary to change the ruling Iraqi dictatorial regime and replace it with another democratic system based on the

" US Policy and Invoking the Fight Against Terrorism to Justify Aggressive War"

principle of respect for human rights and to be a model for the countries of the Middle East. This justification is illegal because: The United States of America has no right to interfere in Iraq's affairs to change its regime. Because according to paragraph (7) of Article (2) of the United Nations Charter, "Nothing in this Charter authorizes the United Nations to interfere in the internal affairs of another country".

2- The US administration claimed that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction that threaten world peace and that Saddam Hussein does not allow the inspection committees to disarm those weapons. This argument is bogus because Iraq's nuclear weapons program suffered a serious setback in 1981 when Israel bombed the Tammuz reactor before it was operational, which could have produced weapons-grade nuclear material. David Albright and Mark Hibbs, writing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, also asserted that the unresolved technological challenges were too numerous and the Iraqi nuclear weapon was not developed.

3- What America claims that the Iraqi regime was supplying al-Qaeda with weapons of mass destruction and that it set up terrorist training camps in Somalia and other al-Qaeda camps near Baghdad is incorrect and there is no evidence of a relationship between them.

4- The occupation of Iraq was planned by the American administration long ago because it seeks to divide Iraq into ethnic sects that kill each other because Iraq is part of the Greater Middle East project.

5- The goal of Israel's occupation has nothing to do with terrorism or the Islamic State, but the United States was seeking to control Iraq's oil to ensure the continued flow of oil supplies to American factories.

6- Iraq has become the major anti-Israel power in the Middle East, and therefore it was necessary to eliminate it in order not to threaten the Zionist entity.

7- The war waged by the United States on Iraq lacks legitimacy, and it can be said that it is an aggressive war that is covered up with false justifications. The United States was unable to provide legal cover for it after the Security Council refused to issue a resolution on it. Changing the head of state in Iraq concerns the Iraqi people alone, and no other country has the right to dismiss the Iraqi president.

The establishment of a democratic state in Iraq is an Iraqi internal matter, and the United States should not seek it.

8- I conclude from the foregoing that the United States of America has failed to achieve any of its alleged goals. The rate of terrorism has increased in Iraq, it has failed to establish a democratic regime in Iraq, it has failed to convince the world that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction, and it has failed to eliminate the Islamic State organization.

9- I recommend the need for Arab countries to come together to confront the American-Zionist plans that seek to colonize and occupy the Arab world and plunder its wealth and oil under the slogan of the so-called New Middle East.

10- I recommended the conclusion of a joint defense agreement between the Arab countries, similar to NATO, whose mission would be to confront the American ambitions that seek to fragment the Arab world.

11- I recommend exchanging experiences between Arab countries, focusing investments within the Arab world, expanding the scope of trade exchange between Middle Eastern countries, stopping dealing in dollars and dealing in national currencies.

III V.- References :

¹) Stephen C. Neff (2005), War and the Law of Nations: A General History, Cambridge UP, p. 289, ISBN 9781139445238.

²) P. Zadeikis, 1944 "An Aspect of the Lithuanian Record of Independence", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 50. , <https://econpapers.repec.org/article/saeannname/default233.htm>.

- ³) Leon Romaniecki, 1974, "The Soviet Union and International Terrorism", Soviet Studies, published online , Volume 26, 1974 - Issue 3, on 6, Nov , 2007 , p. 417 , <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668137408410962>.
- ⁴) Jaafar Daa Jaafar,2004, Weapons of Mass Destruction, Accusations and Facts, Al-Mustaqbal, Al-Arabi Magazine, Issue (306), Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, Lebanon, p. 43 and beyond.
- ⁵) Reda Saeed Muhammad Al-Ganzouri, 2007, Pre-emptive War in the Rules of Contemporary International Law, Master Thesis, Faculty of Law, Cairo University, p. 128.
- ⁶) Dr. Khalaf Ramadan Muhammad al-Jubouri, 2009, International legitimacy and the position on the occupation of Iraq, Al-Rafidain Journal of Law, Volume (11), Issue (40), College of Law, University of Mosul, p. 304.
- ⁷) Lakrini, Idris. 2010-11-30. Interference in international practices: between legal prohibition and the changing international reality. Globalization and the New International Order, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, Lebanon, p. 57-78.
<https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-711443>.
- ⁸) Dr.. Hussein Hanafi, 2004, Interfering in the affairs of states under the pretext of protecting human rights, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 1st edition, p. 18.
- ⁹) Musab Abdel-Majid Al-Haris, 2016, Mechanisms for implementing international humanitarian law and their impact on state sovereignty, PhD thesis, National Ribat University in Khartoum, p. 151
- ¹⁰) Summary of judgments, fatwas, and orders issued by the International Court of Justice (1948-1991), United Nations, New York, 1992, p. 221.
- ¹¹) : Sanaa Kazem Kata'a, 2005, The declared American justifications for the war on Iraq, an intellectual vision through the event, Iraqi Future Magazine, Issue (5), Sunna (2), Iraq Research Center, p. 95.
- ¹²) Dana Priest, Al Qaeda-Iraq Link Recanted, Aug, 1, 2004, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A30909-2004Jul31.html>.
- ¹³) Dr. Sami Jad Abdel-Rahman Wasel, 2003, State terrorism in the context of public international law, Manshaat Al-Maarif, Alexandria, 2003, p. 206.
- ¹⁴) Dr. Abu Al-Khair Ahmed Attia Omar,2005, The Theory of Preemptive Military Strikes (Preventive Defense) in Light of the Rules of Contemporary International Law, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, p. 38.
- ¹⁵) Labib, Fakhry, 2005, The New World Order and American Initiatives for the Middle East, Intellectual Issues for Rooting Rationality, Democracy and Creativity, Intellectual Issues Book Series, Madbouly Library for Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 2005, p. 307.
- ¹⁶) Dr. Abd Ali Al-Mamouri and Dr. Malik Daham Al-Jumaili, 2011, Oil and Occupation in Iraq, Hammurabi Center for Research and Strategic Studies, first edition, p.63
- ¹⁷) Al-Tanir, Samir, 2010, America from within, wars for oil, Publications Company, Beirut, 1st edition, p. 128.
- ¹⁸) An Iraqi Minister... Iraqi Jews Have the Right to Reclaim Their Property, Kuwait News Agency (KUNA): 3/31/2004: <https://www.kuna.net.kw/ArticleDetails.aspx?language=ar&id=1422999>
- ¹⁹) Abu Rashid, Abdullah Ahmed, 1999, Globalization in the Global System and the Middle East, Dar Al-Hiwar, 1st Edition, p.64
- ²⁰) Al-Tanir, Samir, 2010, America from within, wars for oil, Publications Company, Beirut, 1st edition, p. 127.
- ²¹)) Labib, Fakhry, the same reference P.306.
- ²²) Hisham Daoud, 2006, Iraqi Tribes in the Land of Jihad, Imran for Social and Human Sciences, Qatar, p. 98
- ²³) Dr. Ahmed Al-Rashidi, 2003, Iraq and International Legitimacy: A Reading in the Connotations and Context of Resolution 1441, International Politics Magazine, Volume (38), Issue (151), Year (39), Al-Ahram Foundation, Cairo, p. 116.