

The 2003 Iraq War: Operations, Causes, and Consequences

Youssef Bassil

LACSC – Lebanese Association for Computational Sciences Registered under No. 957, 2011, Beirut, Lebanon

Abstract: *The Iraq war is the Third Gulf War that was initiated with the military invasion of Iraq on March 2003 by the United States of American and its allies to put an end to the Baath Party of Saddam Hussein, the fifth President of Iraq and a prominent leader of the Baath party in the Iraqi region. The chief cause of this war was the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) that George W. Bush declared in response to the attacks of September 11. The events of this war were both brutal and severe on both parties as it resulted in the defeat of the Iraqi army and the depose and execution of Saddam Hussein, in addition to thousands of causalities and billionsof dollars expenses. This paperdiscusses the overt as well as the covert reasons behind the Iraqi war, in addition to its different objectives. It alsodiscusses the course of the war and its aftermath. This would shed the light on the consequences of the war on the political, economic, social, and humanitarian levels. Finally, the true intentions of the war are speculated.*

Keywords –*Political Science, Warfare, Iraq War 2003, Global War on Terrorism*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Iraq war, sometimes known as the Third Gulf War, began on March 20, 2003 with the invasion of Iraq known as "Iraqi Freedom Operation" by the alliance led by the United States against the Baath Party of Saddam Hussein. President George W. Bush has officially declared its completion on March 20, 2003, under the banner Mission Accomplished. The invasion led to the rapid defeat of the Iraqi army and the capture and execution of Saddam Hussein. The United States occupied Iraq and attempted to establish a new government. However, violence against the alliance forces rapidly led to an asymmetrical war between the insurgents, the U.S. military, and the new Iraqi government [1].

In November 2011, Iraq Body Count, which bases its analysis on data published in the media, estimates that between 103,013 and 112,571 Iraqi civilians have died in the violence, consisting essentially of attacks [2], and at least 250,000 Iraqi civilians were wounded, with a further 4483 deaths and 32,219 wounded in the troops of the American army. The war yielded to the emigration of two million Iraqis fled abroad since 2003, mainly to Syria and Jordan as well as Europe and the United States. The organization National Priorities Project estimates that the war cost over 800 billion US dollars.

The Iraq war is the second after the war of Afghanistan which is characterized by the Bush doctrine of "preventive war" and about what some call the "new American empire". Moreover, this war is involved in the Global War On Terrorism (GWOT) that George W. Bush declared in response to the attacks of September 11, 2001 [3].

II. REASONS BEHIND THE WAR

The second Iraq war was conducted under the leadership of the United States. After launching an offensive in Afghanistan, where bin Laden took refuge, and suspecting links between Iraq and al Qaeda, George W. Bush charged Rumsfeld and Tommy Franks to establish a plan of attack against Iraq. This is the plan of operation 1003V, which is an evolution of the war plan of the first Gulf War. The official reasons were mainly the following [4, 5]:

First, the "fight against terrorism", Iraq is presented as a state supporting al-Qaida, responsible among other things, the attack against the warship USS Cole, attacks against several U.S. embassies in Africa, and the attacks of September 11, 2001. Those charges have since been shown to be unfounded, including the U.S. Senate, considering Saddam Hussein Islamic extremism as a threat to his regime.

Second, the elimination of weapons of mass destruction that was supposed to be held by Iraq. The possession of long range missiles and their proliferation is demonstrated since the 1990s but Iraq Survey Group which is charged by the U.S. government to find these weapons in September 2004, declared that there were no chemical weapons since 1991 or any current program in progress.

Third, the arrest of Saddam Hussein and the abolishment of his regime which would introduce democracy and peace to the region.

All the aforementioned causes are contested by many analysts, journalists, and politicians. The evidence adduced by the United States to support their claims about the presence in Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, or the production of such weapons or the existence of links between Iraq and terrorism do not cause

little more controversial, especially after the publication of the memorandum of Downing Street. In addition, some elements cause questions about the real motives of the intervention, such as: The links between the neo-conservatives in power in Washington and the oil companies, including Carlyle Group, Enron, Halliburton Energy Services, and Unocal; the links between the neo-conservatives in power in Washington and subcontractors of the army; and Iraq's decision not to argue against its oil currency in dollars but in euros. We can therefore distinguish two kinds of goals: the official statements and objectives in the speeches of representatives of the White House and reported in the press, and the opinion of the doctrine expressed using informal statements and objectives.

2.1 Official Statements & Objectives

2.1.1 Political Objectives

Establish as soon as possible a transition government that identifies the people in a democratic government as representative of all Iraqi communities including Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds, then capturing the Ba'ath Party members and judging their dictatorial regime set up by Saddam Hussein and his family [6].

2.1.2 Humanitarian Objectives

Liberate Iraq from its dictator Saddam Hussein, which will eventually render Iraq a united, stable, and free. Then, support the reconstruction and humanitarian aid, reduce damage to the country's organizations and infrastructure, prosecute Saddam Hussein for his crimes as violating human rights, punish Iraq for the sixteen UN resolutions and for the "Oil against food 2" program that it has not complied with. Finally, a last humanitarian objective is to promote democracy and human rights of women in the Muslim world [7].

2.1.3 Military Objectives

Remove a threat to the world, due to Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war; neutralize weapons of mass destruction including biological, chemical, nuclear, the long-range missiles, and other weapons; strike selected military targets; and recover Kuwait's properties, military equipment, and prisoners of war, which were seized by Saddam Hussein during the first Gulf War.

2.1.4 Anti-Terrorist Objectives

Destroy pockets of support for terrorism located in Iraq, eliminating an ally of Al Qaeda, which helps and protects terrorists, provides a refuge for various Palestinian terrorist groups, and create military bases to terrorist groups in Iran [8]. To justify their doubt of the existence of connections between Iraq and Al Qaeda, the U.S. secret intelligence evoke several meetings between bin Laden and Iraqi intelligence. Between 1994 and 1995, an Iraqi intelligence officer had met bin Laden in Khartoum. However there is no evidence that this meeting actually took place. In March 1998, Iraq had invited the Taliban on its territory after bin Laden expressed his fatwa against the United States. In July 1998, it was this time Iraqi officials who would have traveled to Afghanistan to meet with the Taliban and bin Laden. According to the intelligence services, other meetings took place, including one in which bin Laden was approached by Saddam Hussein to settle Iraq. Ultimately, the reports show a good agreement between Al-Qaeda and Iraq, but no sound leaves evidence of collaboration between them to address U.S. interests. According to one report from Czech intelligence passed to the CIA, the Egyptian Mohamed Atta, a pilot of an aircraft that have crashed into the twin towers, had met in April 9, 2001 an officer of the Iraqi intelligence services, identified as Samir al-Ani, a diplomat at the Iraqi embassy in Prague.

2.1.5 Economic Objectives

One of the main economic objectives is the Protection of oil wealth that will be useful for the reconstruction of the country and put an end to the large black market [9]. After all, the aim of occupying Iraq is to ensure a continued flow of oil from the Persian Gulf to all other countries especially Gulf countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and United Arab Emirates as they are a good source of petrol for the United States.

2.2 Informal Statements & Objectives

2.2.1 Political Objectives

One of the political objectives is to install a new democratic government in Iraq that will serve U.S. interests and eliminate the threat to several Islamic regimes neighboring Iraq. Following the terrorist threats, which were expressed with the attacks on the World Trade Center, and the outbreak of the war against terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has allowed the Bush administration to become a bulwark against terrorism in the eyes of millions of the Americans and an image of a patriot and defender of the nation.

The suppression of an anti-Israel is also a factor to consider. As Saddam Hussein's regime was considered anti-Israel that supports all attempts to the destruction of Israel, in addition to the support of the Palestinians against

their struggle with Israel and the boycotting of the state of Israel, stopping the persistence of Iraq was a must for stabilizing the neighboring political environment.

2.2.2 Military Objectives

Placing U.S. troops and bases permanently on Iraqi territories so as to have control over the Persian Gulf to show the world that the U.S. military is still the most powerful and it can act effectively and quickly to release U.S. prisoners captured during the war in Iraq.

2.2.3 Economic Objectives

This conflict would also allow many American companies close to the Bush administration to profit from Iraqi oil by taking control of oil wells in the fourth holder of reserves, as motivated by the analysts of geopolitics of oil. The defense sector would also have the opportunity to sell and buy stocks and to stimulate production by increasing needs. A lot of money could then be fed back into the U.S. economy, particularly in the field of weapons and oil, considered to be very close to U.S. Republicans.

III. UN DIPLOMATIC DISPUTE

The war followed the UN mission in Iraq who was in charge of Iraqi disarmament via the resolution 1441-2002, passed at the request of the Americans and the British on November 8, 2002. The Security Council of the United Nations could not agree between supporters, two axes were discussed then, one about peace while other about war.

Axis of Peace: This includes France, Germany, Russia, and China, for whom more time must be provided for the inspectors.

Axis of the war: This includes the United States, and the United Kingdom, for whom Iraq still holds weapons of mass destruction and is regarded as a country of international threat. In addition, the alliance countries felt that after 12 years of inspections and numerous resolutions, the UN had not succeeded in determining the potential threat of possible weapons of mass destruction. The expulsion of UN inspectors in November 1997 and non-cooperation of Iraq in 1998 showed in the eyes of American neo-conservatives an incapability of the international organization to enforce. More specifically, the U.S. arguments will be developed as follows [10]:

3.1 The Failure of the Disarmament Process after 1991

After the second Gulf War of 1991, the United Nations adopted Resolution 687 which, in Article 8, decided that Iraq shall unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless, under international supervision:

- All chemical, biological, and all stocks of agents, all sub-systems and components of all the facilities for research and development, support, and manufacturing facilities related to weapons of mass destruction must be stopped immediately.
- All ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, in addition to repair facilities and production must be stopped too.

Following this, the UN inspectors and the International Agency for Atomic Energy (IAEA) conducted inspections of Iraqi sites until December 1998.

In late November 2001, Washington warned Baghdad against the production of weapons of mass destruction (WMD): George W. Bush demands the renewal of United Nations inspections to disarm Iraq. Little by little the United States put pressure on Iraq by trying to convince Saddam Hussein to let inspectors return to the United Nations.

On November 8, 2002, 15 members of the Security Council of the United Nations voted for resolution 1441 which states that if Saddam Hussein fails to meet its obligations on disarmament, it will result in serious consequences [11].

On 27 November, Iraq agreed that the new UN resolution is enforced. The CIA hoped to increase the chances of finding weapons of mass destruction before implementing the UN resolution.

3.2 CIA in Search for Weapons of Mass Destruction

The CIA, in its October 2002 report entitled "Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs" is very clear on the subject: since the end of inspections in 1998 and in violation of resolutions of the United Nations, Iraq has maintained its chemical weapons project, has continued development and production of missiles and has invested more in biological weapons. Most specialists consider that Iraq had re-formed its nuclear weapons program. The Iraqi which has tried to obtain uranium tubes from Niger in the 1990s, resumed production of chemical agents, conservation, and development of missiles [12].

However, this is not the opinion of everyone. Joseph Wilson, a former diplomat working on the issue of Iraq, was given by the CIA in February 2002, the investigation into the Niger uranium that Saddam could have used in its nuclear program. His report was clear: he found nothing [13]. However, in September 24, 2002, Niger's uranium was mentioned in a British report, this report indicates that Iraq is attempting to provide uranium in African countries. Moreover, in January 2003, George W. Bush used the British report to prove to the United Nations that Iraq recovered its nuclear program [14]. Although the CIA did not find weapons of mass destruction, they remain convinced that Iraq has. They compare the documents provided by Iraq to the United Nations with what they recognized after the Gulf War in 1991.

3.3 Justification to the United Nations

On February 5, 2003, Colin Powell goes before the Security Council of the United Nations to reveal evidence of illegal activities of the Baathist regime. He showed several pictures of vehicles used as mobile biological research laboratories, satellite photos of military plants, chemical weapons bunkers, and a recording of a conversation between the officers of the Iraqi Republican Guard who speak about weapons of mass destruction. Based on that, Russia, China, and France who threatened to use their veto to prevent approval of a UN military action against Iraq, refused to follow the U.S. and the UK. As a result, the U.S. decided to attack Iraq without the approval of the Security Council.

3.4 Controversy over Weapons of Mass Destruction

Richard Butler who is an Australian diplomat and head of the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM), and in charge of research on the subject of weapon of mass destruction after the Gulf War, held the communication with the Pentagon regarding the military situation in Iraq. He had then detailed plans within industrial facilities inspected in Iraq by the weapons inspectors of UNSCOM, which allowed the programming of GPS guided bombs for the destruction of these facilities in 1998 and 2003. All these information and inspections report what the inspectors found in 1998, that Iraq was producing VX gas. Iraq had denied, and then admitted to having produced only 200 liters and 3900 liters, but without being able to use them as weapons. In 2002, UN inspectors have summarized what they found in Iraq, in a written report by the analyst Kenneth Katzman. Between 1991 and 1994, inspectors discovered forty secret nuclear research laboratories and three clandestine programs to enrich uranium. Hans Blix, whose morality was never questioned by anyone, on January 27, 2003, said in its report that the UN inspectors had discovered in late 2002 that Saddam Hussein's Iraq was producing gas VX and a nearby gas mustard, thiodiglycol, as well as tactical ballistic missiles. One category of these missiles are missiles Al Samuda derived from the missile "air defense" Soviet SA-2 Guideline, which were designed, developed, and manufactured by the Iraqis. The UNSCOM inspectors believed in 1998 that these missiles real significance was 149 km, in accordance with UN Resolution 687 which established 150 km maximum range of missiles that could hold, develop or manufacture in Iraq, but the structures seem to have been eased after 1998, which would have given the production models a range of up to 160 km or 190 km depending on the version. A dozen were destroyed a few weeks before the invasion and a dozen were captured in July 21, 2003 by U.S. forces.

Another version of missiles namely the Ababil-100/Al Fatah, with a maximum range declared by Iraq 161 km, was built between 2001 and 2003. They were used during the invasion against Kuwait, without loss, and against the Headquarters of the 2nd Brigade of the 3rd Infantry Division of the United States in April 7, 2003, killing three soldiers and two journalists, wounding 14 other soldiers, and destroying 22 vehicles [15, 16].

IV. OPPOSITION TO THE WAR

Several events were held worldwide against the war in Iraq. In many countries, large demonstrations were attended by people wanting to show their rejection to the US-British intervention. The movement was particularly strong in Europe, where, according to polls, between 70% and 90% of the population was opposed to this war. In London, the important events have demonstrated the split between the decisions of both governments, who supported the war, and the willingness of citizens, who were overwhelmingly against it. Likewise, the Bush administration has been very sensitive to criticism from U.S. citizens to the point of asking the CIA investigations and illegal phone tapping in order to publicly denigrate critics of the war [17].

V. OPPOSITION OF THE VATICAN

If the United States is interested primarily in oil, the Pope and the Vatican are concerned with the fate of people and the respect of their dignity as persons created in the image of God. In early 2003, when U.S. troops began massing on the outskirts of Iraq, the Pope and other Vatican dignitaries multiplying diplomatic efforts to avoid war, and until the last minute, have hoped for a peaceful conclusion to this crisis. Pope John Paul II called on all Christians to pray the rosary for peace, and had even sent two of his cardinals to meet personally with Saddam Hussein and President Bush.

The Pope knows that Iraqis have suffered greatly from an embargo of 12 years, which resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people, mostly of whom were children, lack of medicines and other essentials, and that this new war could result in the death of thousands more innocent victims. The war has a real ugly face: no water, no electricity, no medicine, no essential goods, and no public services. In short, it is a humanitarian disaster that affects millions of people. But what the Pope and the Vatican feared the most is the reaction that in turn creates military intervention in the Arab world, a shock that leads to more terrorist acts against the United States and other Western countries. Worse than that, the U.S. attacks could create such resentment against the West that this anger could turn into a general war of Muslims against Christians. In fact, Muslims do not accept the presence of Americans on the Arab territories as they are Christians, and are believed to be infidels as simply they are not Muslims. For example, it is the permanent presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia since the Gulf War of 1991 had led to the creation of the terrorist group Al Qaeda of Osama bin Laden. So what can we expect now, since it seems that the American soldiers and their allies will have to remain for months if not years, in Iraq. That is why the Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak said, on March 31: "When completed, if it ends, this war will have terrible consequences. Instead of having one Osama Bin Laden, we will have hundreds of new Bin Laden".

The Secretary of State Cardinal Angelo Sodano, the Vatican number two after the Pope gave the background of his thoughts to reporters on January 29: "Some people think that the church officials are idealists. We are, but we are also realistic. Is the danger of irritating a billion Muslims in worth? That's the question I ask my American friends: do what you want? Would you like to bring decades of hostility from the Muslim world? If the Western military presence in the Arabian Peninsula produced Bin Laden, Al Qaeda, and the attack of September 11, 2001, what reaction infernal occupation of Iraq does happen?"

On March 29, 2003, Pope John Paul II said that the Catholic bishops of Indonesia - countries with the largest Muslim population - fearing that the conflict in Iraq could lead to a wider confrontation between Christianity and Islam: "We must never allow the war to divide world religions. Do not allow a human tragedy also to become a religious catastrophe."

In his speech to the Diplomatic Corps, January 13, the Pontiff said: "No to war! It is never inevitable. It is always a defeat for humanity. International law, honest dialogue, solidarity between States, the noble exercise of diplomacy: these are methods worthy of individuals and nations to resolve their differences. I say this thinking of those who still place their confidence in nuclear weapons and too many conflicts that continue to hold hostage the brothers in humanity. I will simply add today, faced with the constant aggravation of the Middle Eastern crisis, that its solution can never be imposed by recourse to terrorism or armed conflict, believing that military victories could be the answer."

Pope's words at the Angelus on February 23, 2003: "For months the international community living in great fear, because of the danger of a war that could destabilize the entire Middle East region and aggravate tensions, that will exist unfortunately at the beginning of the third millennium. It is the duty of believers, regardless of the religion to which they belong, to proclaim that we will never be happy against fighting each other, never in the future of humanity, never, ever, cannot be ensured by terrorism and the logic of war."

Angelus of March 2, 2003: "Peace is a gift from God to be invoked with humble and insistent trust. Without giving up the face of difficulties, we must then seek out and engage in each channel could avoid war, which always carries with it grief and grave consequences for all."

On the morning of March 20, the Pope was informed that the U.S. had started their military intervention in Iraq. He retired to his private chapel to pray. A few hours later, the Vatican spokesman, Joaquin Navarro-Valls, the reaction expressed by the Holy See in these words: "Whoever decides that all peaceful means of international law are exhausted assumes a grave responsibility before God, before his own conscience, and before history." In the days following, the Pope expressed his "sorrow and pain" that the search for a peaceful solution was abandoned. March 22, he said: "When war, as in recent days in Iraq, threatens the fate of humanity, it is even more urgent to proclaim in a loud voice and determined that peace is the only voice to build a more just and inclusive world where violence and weapons could not solve the problems of men."

During the Angelus on April 6, 2003, John Paul II added: "My thoughts go in particular to Iraq and all those affected by the war raging there. I think particularly of the defenseless civilian populations that are submitted in various cities of hardship. God grant that this conflict ends soon to make way for a new era of forgiveness, love, and peace." [18, 19, 20, 21, 22].

VI. EVANGELICAL PROTESTANTS

The military response made by the Bush administration after the attacks of September 11 convinced the evangelical community. Evangelical Protestants have also supported the massive war in Iraq. In March 2003, 77% of them supported the war against only 36% of African-American Protestants and 44% of Americans atheists, agnostics or without religious preference.

To justify these positions spiritually bellicose, Protestants Evangelicals are based on the theory of "just war", which finds its Christian roots in Chapter 5 of the Book of Judges in the Old Testament and the writings of Saint Augustine. The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the SBC (Southern Baptist Convention) has even published the criteria deemed necessary to ensure that they conduct a just war: "a just cause, competent authority, comparative justice, intentions fair, the last resort, the probability of success, proportionality of desired results, just a state of mind" and "proportionality in the use of force, discrimination between combatants and noncombatants, not use of immoral means, good faith". With these criteria, the SBC has not hesitated to declare war in Iraq "just war" and to support it as such. But the SBC was the only evangelical denomination to take a formal position in favor of the war in Iraq, demonstrating once again that the American evangelical community is neither homogeneous nor unified. Some evangelical leaders have rejected the idea that the war in Iraq has the attributes of a "just war", just like Jim Wallis, head of the evangelical community Progressive Sojourners. Jim Wallis Justice politically "illegal, immoral and unreasonable" and contrary to biblical writings religiously: "A nation shall not lift up sword against another" (Isa. 2:4). In addition, the evangelical community remains divided on the cases of Iran and North Korea, between military intervention and diplomatic action, and it is likely that the rest as the U.S. Administration itself maintains the ambiguity [23, 24].

VII. THE ALLIES

Commitment of armed forces for the initial attacking: U.S., UK, and Australia. Countries with an active and meaningful role in supporting logistical, political and armed processes are: Australia, Bulgaria, South Korea, Denmark, Spain until March 2004 (withdrawal of troops after the parliamentary elections), the United States, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, the Philippines, until July 2004 (withdrawal following the execution of a hostage Filipino), Poland (end of commitment 10/4/2008 the official), Portugal, Romania, the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Turkey, Ukraine.

In March 2003, 48 allies countries cited by the White House are: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Colombia, South Korea, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Spain, Estonia, the United States, Ethiopia, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Iceland, Japan, Kuwait, Lithuania, The Republic of Macedonia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Palau, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, the United Kingdom, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine. Costa Rica, initially included, is removed after the decision of the Constitutional Court invalidating the support of President Pacheco [25].

The Spanish case: while the Spanish Prime Minister José María Aznar was initially engaged in the conflict in Spain, the Spanish general elections of 2004 caused him to lose the majority in favor of Jose Luis Zapatero, who took the decision in accordance with its program, to withdraw Spanish troops from Iraq. A few days before the election, an attack attributed to Al Qaeda had struck Madrid. Jose Maria Aznar had then accused the Basque organization ETA of being behind the attacks, which proved untrue. This error has lost all credibility the Prime Minister which would have some say led to the victory of Jose Luis Zapatero.

The Australian case: during the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, Australia led by the conservative John Howard launched Operation Bastille, sending about 2,000 men, three warships and fifteen had of hunting. During the election campaign in the fall of 2004, the Labor opposition had promised to bring the Australian troops in the country. Victory Party of John Howard, an ally of George W. Bush, in the legislative elections of October 2004 has extended support to the American operation in Iraq by having about 850 Australians on site in 2004 until the end of the military mission July 28, 2009.

Besides the UK, more than 14,000 soldiers for diverse nations were in Iraq and they are: South Korea, Australia, Poland, Romania, Denmark, El Salvador, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Latvia, Albania, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Mongolia, Lithuania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Estonia, Macedonia, Kazakhstan, and Moldova. Nations such as Japan withdrew at that time their ground forces but contribute to the logistics of the operation.

VIII. COURSE OF THE WAR

On March 20, 2003, U.S. President George W. Bush officially stated war on Iraq. On March 19, 2003, a few hours after the end of the 48-hour ultimatum calling on the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his sons Uday and Qusay to leave Iraq, the United States launched missiles at Baghdad. Iraq responded by sending in Kuwait, from a Soviet-made speedboat hidden in the coastline, many HY-2 anti-ship missile, flying tidal waves, which reached uninhabited areas without intercepted, one fell to 7h 18 UTC near a headquarters of the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force U.S. [26], a total of twenty airborne missiles were also thrown by the Iraqi army from Kuwait in the direction of the allies forces, the majority being interrupted by the MIM-104 Patriot missiles or falling off camera but on April 3, one of them hit the command center of a U.S. unit.

The allies' strategy has been, first, to bombard the Iraqi capital and other major cities, to terrorize Iraqis and see mass desertions in Iraqi army or an uprising of the Iraqi people, and destroying the country's defense

systems. The buildings were the most bombed in the presidential palace and the structures of the Baath Party and the quarters that the Iraqi armed forces had emptied several weeks ago. The allies' forces went to the ground offensive from 18h 30 UTC few hours after the aerial bombardment in contrast to what happened during Operation Desert Storm [27].

Parallel to the aerial bombardment, three divisions of the Army, the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force American of the Marine Corps and the 1st British Armored Division of the British Army, with 100,000 troops and thousands of tanks under the command of the United States Central Command stationed in Kuwait, entered the country mainly through the southern border and clashed with three of the seventeen divisions of the Regular Army Iraqi, each of which is a military force equivalent to a troop of the allies, and the other eleven in Kurdistan who did not have the logistics to move more than a few tens of kilometers from their barracks, and four of the six Republican Guard divisions each division equivalent to a military force equivalent to a brigade of allies. Other various militias, such as the Fedayeen Saddam, largely responsible for the custody of static sensitive areas, have little or no opportunity to fight [28].

Various battles were fought for several days in the cities of Umm Qasr and Nasiriyah, for nearly two weeks in Basra, the Iraqi resistance, fighting exclusively in urban or semi urban areas, being higher than the staff of the allies had expected. In particular, Iraqi commandos also known as Iraqi special forces held a neighborhood of Umm Qasr for almost a week, and the forces of the Iraqi army in Basra consists of the 6th Armored Division in Iraq and the Iraqimechanized division of the allies. Iraqi forces in Basra were only supported by artillery of the total volume of a Battalion and had no air support. The 1st British Armored Division clashed on his right by the three Commando Brigade Royal Marines. With air support of the allies on the borders of the city throughout the movement of U.S. forces to Baghdad, prevented the British armored division to participate in the attack on Baghdad alongside with the U.S. forces, as was most likely originally intended once their mission accomplished. In actual fact, Iraqi forces in Basra melted away, whereas they certainly had the opportunity to take even longer. Similarly, a strength of the Iraqi regular army of Nasiriyah, consisting of the Iraqi 11th Infantry Division, supported by a small number of mortars, with no armored opposed successfully, for nearly three days, crossing at this location of the Euphrates by a brigade of the Marine Corps, however, have much higher means in terms of quality.

The U.S. mechanized infantry, heavily armored tanks with heavy combat Abrams, Bradley's VCI, together with powerful heavy artillery and with an air total supremacy, then bypassed the cities in their march to Baghdad. The aim was to reach as quickly as possible the focus of the plan, hoping that a fall in the capital would result in the surrender of the centers of resistance elsewhere.

In parallel, in the Kurdistan region, the allies had originally planned a Mechanized Infantry Division of the Army coming from the province of Mardin in Turkey, division fairly small but the most modern of all the U.S. The mission of this division was to threaten Baghdad assuming that the Iraqi army located in Kurdistan would stand until the fall of Baghdad. This division is ultimately not allowed to land in Turkey, but to join the Kuwait boat after the ending of the fight.

Faced with this threat, the Iraqis had massed west of Baghdad eleven divisions of the regular army divisions and two Iraqi Republican Guard [29]: the front line, facing the border with Turkey, Iraqi forces were equivalent to two motorized infantry brigades of the allies, which must be added guerrilla groups in Kirkuk, the second line, forces equivalent to three brigades of the allies were on the three roads leading from Baghdad to Kurdistan. The forces involved were relatively balanced or slightly in favor of the Iraqi defenders, although the air supremacy of the allies certainly gave him the advantage in reality. Finally, less than a month before the invasion, Turkey does not allow U.S. ground forces to operate from its territory, however, given the weakness of the Iraqi logistics, most of the Kurdistan Iraqi army were forced to remain on site, with the exception of a few Republican Guard units that were sent to reinforce the Guard units that provided the defense of Baghdad. In place of the Mechanized Infantry Division, the U.S. military sent an Airborne Brigade in Kurdistan, mainly designed to prevent a Turkish military intervention in the region and control the activities of Kurdish forces of the KDP and PUK. The Brigade was ready to support if necessary Kurdish forces, such as securing bridges, Kurdish forces who now aims at taken the cities of Mosul and Kirkuk [30].

The forces of the Iraqi regular army showed no resistance to Kurdish forces, who have probably been instructed not fighting the forces, the Kurds then being considered by Iraq as Iraqi, and the cities of Mosul and Kirkuk were taken almost without a fight, after the regular army forces to Iraq were vanished.

In the months that preceded the invasion, the allies forces had spread the rumor of a possible large airborne operation from Fallujah, in fact, this operation requiring very important ways, particularly in terms of logistics, and very risky if the Iraqis decided to set up troops on the airfield that should have been in this case be used by allies forces, seems never to have actually been planned, and Iraqis do not seem to have really believed in it. However, they placed some troops in Fallujah, a city that could in any way be threatened by troops of the Army. In fact, the allies have sent in this desert region some special forces to the defended area near the Iraqi

border guards. Another U.S. special forces were content to move north to control the border with Iraq-Syria and thus prevent a possible leak of Iraqi leaders toward Syria, if they had decided to make such an attempt.

After only 19 days of travel and the price of a few fights, the U.S. military pushed easily to the south and east of Baghdad units of the Republican Guard, composed entirely of professional soldiers, mostly, or almost exclusively Sunni, mainly equipped with medium tanks, few troop transport vehicles, few wheeled combat vehicles of infantry that never exceeded a volume equivalent to a squadron of armored forces of the allies. These Iraqi units were fighting in total isolation and apparently poorly controlled at the command of the Republican Guard, in particular those who were fighting in such areas as of Baghdad, Tikrit, Baquba, and Kut. The U.S. military then entered Baghdad, executing attacks against buildings representing the Iraqi government, while leading the Pentagon had planned to reach 80 km from the capital after 47 days. The U.S. military took control of the capital with a series of reinforced attacks to totally annihilate the Republican Guard responsible for protecting presidential palaces and various terrorist groups. Notwithstanding, there was shooting of Iraqi ballistic missiles that in most cases were opposed by the Patriot anti-aircraft missile batteries or who fell out of area, but one of them achieved to hit the headquarters of a U.S. brigade [31].

The regime of Saddam Hussein fell in the following days. The last compartments of armed resistance were so quick to fall in. The allies' troops then sought senior Iraqi government officials. While some have been arrested quickly, an important part of Iraqi officials several months will not be found, especially the two Saddam Hussein's son, Uday and Qusai who were later killed in July 22, 2003. In February 2005, fifty-five of the highest VIPs of the Saddam's regime were either captured or murdered, leaving only eleven that were not located by the US troops. Saddam Hussein has been arrested in a basement by U.S. soldiers in Tikrit on 14 December 2003, with the support of the Kurds. He was then condemned by the Iraqi Special Tribunal and hanged the next day on December 30, 2006 with several of his henchmen.

IX. ASSESSMENTS OF THE WAR ON THE ALLIES

9.1 Casualties

The outcome of the war, March 20, 2003 to November 7, 2011 is the following [32, 33]: 4801 of the allies died including deaths in Kuwait and the Persian Gulf, of which 4483 American soldiers and 3531 killed in action, 179 British soldiers and 139 soldiers from other Allied countries were killed. More than 36,000 wounded of which 32,219 were U.S. American soldiers [33]. The number of victims exceeded 10,000 people who died and almost 130,000 injured according to the NY Times in mid-2007.

The annual review for the allies is as follows:

- in 2003: 580 dead;
in 2004: 906 dead;
in 2005: 897 dead;
- in 2006: 872 dead;
in 2007: 963 dead;
in 2008: 322 dead;
in 2009: 150 dead;
in 2010: 60 dead

2011: 53 died on November 7

The symbolic 1000 GI's killed was crossing the 08/09/04;

The symbolic 2000 GI's killed was reached on 26/10/05;

The symbolic 3000 GI's killed was reached on 08/01/07;

The symbolic 4000 GI's killed was reached on 24/03/08;

9.2 Material Losses

According to several reviews, there were in the armed forces of the United States the following [34]: 2300 dead and 18,469 injured, 9,137 seriously injured enough with permanent disabilities, for a total of about 20,000 soldiers out of action, about 12% of the committed; 1300 helicopters lost, including 140 CH-47 Chinook and 27 AH-64 Apache costing over \$15 million each, and 1180 helicopters damaged; about 30,000 land vehicles, nearly 14,000 were destroyed, including 490 M-1 Abrams tanks (1420 damage) and 4500 light vehicles Hummer (4300 damage). It is projected that the maintenance of the helicopters has represented since operations began in Afghanistan in 2001, \$20.6 billion, and global support for 2006 is estimated at 200 million hours of work [35].

9.3 Psychological Impacts

A review on January 2008 [36], addresses the emotional and psychological consequences of the Iraq war on the soldiers. This is a study of the American soldiers involved in the Iraq conflict between 2005 and 2006. It was published by "The Journal of the American Medical Association" and covers 88,235 soldiers, half

of reservists."The purpose of this study was to compare their mental state prior to departure, with the one they show six months after their return. For 20% of professionals and 42% of reservists needed psychological counseling".The study of more general reservists is twice as likely to exhibit problems post-traumatic stress in their household or business activity.

X. ASSESSMENTS OF THE WAR ON THE IRAQIS

10.1 Casualties

There is no accurate count of civilian deaths; only estimates are available, prepared by different statistical methods. In 2005, U.S. President George Bush said the death toll was 30,000; whereas, the Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group, based on a sample larger than the Iraq Body Count Project, said the death toll around 150,000 between March 2003 and June 2006 [37]. In October 2006, the medical journal -The Lancet- estimated Iraqi deaths due to war to 655,000. Comparing mortality rates in the homes of 1982 people in 2006 to official figures from 2003, the study shows that mortality has doubled during the war, from 5.5 to 13.3 per thousand, this study is nevertheless toughly criticized by many worldwide associations, including the Iraq Body Count [38]. The British pollster Opinion Research Business estimated over 1 million Iraqi casualties between March 2003 and August 2007. The Iraq Body Count Project has only civilian deaths officially recorded. In September 2008, there are between 87,665 and 95,687 deaths. According to Iraq Body Count, the number of civilians killed has dropped significantly in 2008, from 76 deaths per day in 2006 to 25 deaths per day in 2008 [38].

The Iraqi army and security forces in March 2007 had 20,000 soldiers and police killed. 2065 police officers were killed in 2007 against 928 in 2008. 225 military personnel were killed in 2009 and 429 in 2010. In January 2011, Iraqi ministries have reported 120 civilians killed in October 2010, 105 civilians killed in November, 91 civilians, 40 cops and 22 soldiers in December 2010, 160 civilians, 55 cops and 45 soldiers killed in January 2011 according to the Ministries of Interior and Defense [39].

10.2 Wounded

In early 2008, some believe that the number of casualties and wounded among the Iraqi civilian population were at least 250,000 injuries, commonly among the Sunni population, which has around 5 million people.

10.3 Refugees

According to estimates by the UN in April 2006, almost 2.5 million Iraqis have fled their country because of violence. 1 million have taken refuge in Syria, 75,000 in Jordan and 150,000 in Egypt and 500 in the United States. In addition, according to UNHCR, 1.8 million Iraqis were displaced inside the country. Nearly a quarter of Iraqis have been forced to flee their homes since the beginning of the war. Since September 2007, we see a return of tens of thousands of refugees [40].

XI. FINANCIAL COSTS OF THE WAR

The financial cost of the war in Iraq may be partly derived from budgetary measures passed by the Congress of the United States in addition to operating budgets. The Department of Defense is authorized to use the operating budget to finance the war. Many American associations, mostly hostile to the war, following closely the development of additional costs associated with the war. Their estimates are around \$500 billion and include the indirect costs of allowances, food, and accommodations. In his speech on October 28, 2006 before the House of Representatives of the United States, Honorary Senator of Massachusetts, James P. McGovern, estimates the cost of the war to 246 million per day (\$ 2847 per second). He recalled that the direct costs which do not represent the total costs amounted to [41]:

- 2004: \$ 77.3 billion
- 2005: \$ 87.3 billion
- 2006: \$ 100.4 billion

It identifies two future scenarios: An instant resolution to withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan would cost \$371 billion dollars. The four extension years of operations would cost of 1,000 billion. Two researchers from Harvard and Columbia, have an updated study on the costs of the conflict around 2267 \$ billions. The fiscal costs in dollars that they identify are as follows [42]:

- 336 billion already spent.
- 389 billion in operating costs for future operations.
- 127 billion for compensation and veterans' pensions.
- 160 billion for the demobilization and repositioning of the defense.

- 355 billion losses to the economy associated with death, disability, cost differentials purchases related to the war.
- 300 billion related to the oil price in the form of transfers to the producer countries.
- 150 billion related to lower economic performance related to the same high prices.
- 450 billion resulting from the allocation of budgets for war rather than productive spending or deficit reduction.

In 2008, the total cost of operations was about \$3000 billion which has already surpassed that of twelve years of the Vietnam War, and twice the cost of the Korean War. Furthermore, the war against terrorism costs the United States around 502 billion dollars.

Total costs of the Iraq war between 2003 and 2005. [43].

- United States: \$255 billion
- Allies outside the United States: \$40 billion
- Iraq: \$134 billion
- Total: \$429 billion
- For the UK, the financial cost of the military operation is 847 million pounds (1 billion dollars and 176 million euros) since 2003.

Expected costs for the period 2005-2015. This is only a projection of long-term if the commitment was maintained in 2005:

- United States: \$349 billion
- Allies outside the United States: \$55 billion
- Iraq: \$173 billion
- Total: \$577

Costs avoided by the intervention which represents the cost which must be subtracted from the savings generated by these operations such as stopping the implementation of UN resolutions, recovery of international trade, etc. [44].

- United States: \$32 billion
- Allies outside the United States: \$85 billion
- Total: \$117 billion.

XII. CONSEQUENCES OF THE WAR

At large, the main consequences and results of the invasion of Iraq are [45]:

- Disappearance of Saddam Hussein.
- An increase in the general insecurity in Iraq including terrorist attacks, theft, assault, murder, hostage taking, etc.
- The creation of an Iraqi transitional government.
- An unstoppable humanitarian crisis in Iraq.
- An increase in terrorist attacks outside of Iraq.
- A Setback or progress of law including in international law, and in human rights.
- The organization of the first free elections in Iraq for over 50 years.

12.1 Islamist Terrorist Activity

As predicted by many analysts, the disappearance of Saddam Hussein and the occupation by the US-British forces leads to a significant increase in terrorist activity of Islamic origin. But it is important to mention that the increase of terrorist attacks is not necessarily due entirely to the occupation of Iraq. They have increased since the pyramid structure of al-Qaeda network was destroyed during the invasion of Afghanistan. The terrorist cells are now more independent and await the orders of senior al-Qaeda. Thus, a humanitarian crisis due to lack of food, clean water, medicines, and other essential items appeared. In addition, the collateral damage caused to the civilian infrastructure, particularly hospitals, roads, and power plants, prevent the proper functioning of the economy and public services. Finally, rebellion, sabotage, and terrorism became the rule rather than the exception. For these reasons, the United States announced May 31, 2003 that they would stay longer than originally planned in Iraq.

12.2 The Revolt of Fallujah

March 31, 2004, images of angry mobs in Fallujah were broadcasted by Western media. They showed the crowd hitting, dragging through the city and over a bridge the bodies of four American employees of private military company Blackwater, killed by grenades. These images recalled those of 1993, in Mogadishu, Somalia. The revolt of Fallujah has strongly influenced American public opinion, so far generally favorable to the intervention in Iraq, raising awareness of the violence of this conflict.

12.3 Attacks in the West

The invasion and occupation of Iraq have played a significant role in the wave of attacks on July 7, 2005 in London. It not only led by the emergence of a new generation of volunteers to Islamist terrorism, but it also appears that the explosives used in the London bombings came from Iraq.

12.4 International Law

The decision by the United States to invade Iraq without the approval of the Security Council of the United Nations is, according to European diplomacy, a decline of international law. According to representatives of some European countries like France, Germany or Russia, the invasion of Iraq without any mandate from the UN is an act of aggression, pure and simple, not release or an act of self-defense. In addition, according to these same countries, the United States set a bad example by invading a country without multilateral management that prevailed in the 1990s [46].

12.5 Declines in Human Rights in Iraq

Many newspapers and NGOs deplore a decline in human rights at the time of the Iraq war. The situation caused by the invasion of Iraq prevents the exercise of freedom of the press in Iraq again; the Iraqi government even came to expel some journalists, and to exclude others from coming to Iraq [47].

12.6 Period of Disorder

At the end of the period of conventional war, Iraq has experienced a short period of total chaos. The occupation forces didn't prevent the destruction of memories of the regime of Saddam Hussein, or prevent the looting of the wealth of the country banks, and museums.

Following several clashes and acts of terrorism after 2003, the disorder peaked during the 2006-2007 in the form of sectarian violence. But the attacks continue daily in 2011, particularly in Baghdad, Diyala, and parts of the North, played between the central government and the autonomous region of Kurdistan.

12.7 Consequences for the Iraqi Army

There was a total re-creation of the army and security forces (New Iraqi Army, National Guard, police, vigilantes ...) formed and reconstituted by the U.S. military. The new army has rehired many soldiers to the rank of junior officer, the former Iraqi army. Soldiers have more freedom vis-à-vis their officers at the beginning of the war, the soldiers were completely dependent on their officers as they were in possession of identity documents of their soldiers, which forced them to fight. In fact, the behavior of the Iraqi regular army, whose career officers were mostly Sunnis and the rank which were mostly conscripts Shiite army that fought with courage and determination at Umm Qasr, Basra and Nasiriyah, against an enemy far superior in ability, seems to completely contradict the last statement, the soldiers seem to have fought, not for Saddam Hussein, but for their country and their honor [48, 49].

12.8 Political Consequences in Iraq

- End of the policies of Saddam Hussein and his family.
- End of the Baath Party.
- Closure of Iraqi embassies around the world according to the orders from Washington.
- Installation of a provisional Iraqi government selected by the allies that aims to revamp Iraq policy and introduce a democratic government that includes members of various ethnic groups in Iraq including Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds.
- Passage of a constitution which is accepted at 75% mainly by Kurds and Shiites. First "free elections" for over 50 years.
- Formation of a de facto independent state in Kurdistan because since a long time, the Iraqi Kurds, like those of Turkey, Syria and Iran, want to create a unified and independent Kurdish state, and engaged in armed struggle to achieve it, struggles were especially harshly repressed by Turkey and by the regime of Saddam Hussein.

12.9 Economic Consequences in Iraq

- Dramatic increase gross national product due to the cessation of economic sanctions and investment for the reconstruction (18.4 billion USD in 2002, 47 billion in 2006).
- The number of private businesses in Iraq increased from 8,000 in 2003 to 35,000 in 2006 following the liberalization of the economy.
- Investments in oil by foreign companies, preventing Iraq to fully benefit from the resource investments which Iraqis cannot refuse because oil refineries are under the control of Special Forces and American and British armies.
- Sabotage of factories and refineries in the war that lead to lower oil exports worldwide and a shortage of gasoline, even in areas most oil from Iraq.
- Shortage of production and imports of basic necessities, food, medicines, etc.
- Water pollution from the burning of several oil refineries and by the fighting, which prevents farmers from producing enough.
- Introduction of a new Iraqi currency replacing the old Iraqi dinars bearing the image of Saddam and the "Swiss dinar" that runs into the north.
- Loss of tourism (already virtually non-existent under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein) because of the state of war and continuing insecurity.

12.10 Social Consequences in Iraq

- The war has claimed thousands of casualties on the Iraqi side and many refugees have lost everything while fleeing their country to Syria, Turkey and Iran (about 200,000 Iraqi refugees).
- Back to the land of political refugees (opposed to the power of Saddam Hussein), exiled in neighboring countries or elsewhere, in the case of Ahmed Chalabi, who was exiled to America.
- There has been much made hostage by Islamic radical groups, either to finance their operations, destabilize the coalition countries, or to free some of their militia detained by the coalition.
- Reorganization of the various public services and return to school the youth of Iraq despite the destruction of infrastructure, insecurity in the country, and the deaths of many teachers and students.
- For the first time women have access to positions in government, as well as men, although in much lower numbers, in the case of Narmin Othman (Minister of Environment), Fouad Maasoum Jouan (Minister of communication) Abed Jaafar Souheila (Minister of migrants and displaced persons), one third of members are women, a record in the region.
- Damage to civilian infrastructure: health services were looted from their beds, ambulances, equipment, electrical installations by the population, hospitals are overloaded while doctors desperately needed. Roads, power plants and communication centers are destroyed.
- Increase in the general insecurity (looting, arson and hostage-taking), following the complete disorganization (almost) the various public services such as police, who are being trained by instructors from the army American.
- End of UN sanctions, end of the restriction against oil and food program.
- Arrivals of NGOs like the Red Cross, Red Crescent.
- Release of prisoners held occasionally for epochs, and having no identity in the Centre of operations of Iraqi military intelligence.
- Intense growth in the number of families reaching the edge of poverty because of unemployment, burgling, and forced movement [50].

12.11 Humanitarian Consequences in Iraq

- Opening of American aid center in Kuwait.
- End of the embargo in place at the end of the first Gulf War (Kuwait, 1991).
- Significant risk of cholera and respiratory diseases due to poor access to safe drinking water and food.
- Neighboring border closures (notably that of Syria) except for the passage of humanitarian convoys.
- Coming of many NGOs: the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Aid Civil (Orah) led by Jay Garner, the World Food Program (which sends tons of wheat flour), UNICEF (sending convoys of water and drugs), the United Nations, the Disaster Assistance Teams (DART), the Humanitarian Operations Center (HOC), the World Health

12.12 Consequences on Iraqi Higher-Education

Already under Saddam Hussein higher education in Iraq suffered: The salary of a teacher was at most 200 dollars, far too little to live. Many competent teachers were removed from the universities to become official. Now wages have increased but remain inadequate. Depressions are accentuated by mental stress caused

by fear of persecution. Often teachers in Iraq do not dare say in public opinion. Since the war in 2003, more than 200 teachers were killed, and a lot of libraries were destroyed. For instance, the library of the Faculty of Philosophy History of the University of Baghdad was completely burned. According to UNESCO, 84% of the infrastructure of educational institutions were damaged by war, this with 50 000 new students, boys and girls, including the universities each year. The admittance of students is done without considering their qualifications, yielding to an overload of universities, particularly in Baghdad. The 21 Iraqi universities serve approximately 250,000 students. It is estimated that 60 000 missing computers, science labs, and numerous books and school materials. Since 1990, 40% of teachers among the best trained left their countries which turned the universities and research centers in Iraq as isolated from the international scientific community. Only 7% of all teachers are teachers. Teachers are required to have a second source of income. Their skills are often limited to a level graduates, while a master or a PhD is more than the norm. The quality is also missing at the academic level. The work of such degrees in history is often limited to a listing of historical events. No criticism or influence appears, much needed programs. Congresses, conferences, and forums are almost non-existent, let alone a "student life". There is little contact to the outside. Many scientists and students lack the language skills for international exchange. Officially there are no more restrictions on the curriculum, despite a lack of strategic planning.

12.13 Political & Economic Consequences Outside of Iraq

- Rising oil prices (secondary cause, Iraq is due to the low productive economic sanctions before the war).
- Disruption of the status quo related to the geopolitics of oil.
- Increase in the number of terrorist attacks worldwide to Osama bin Laden's incentive to invite Muslims to rise up against Muslim regimes (Bahrain, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Pakistan ...) because of their support for the war in Iraq.
- Improved security in Kuwait.
- The Iraq war has divided Europe, creating discord between the countries involved or committed in Iraq (United Kingdom, Poland, Spain, etc.) and those who were against military intervention (Germany, Belgium, France, etc.).
- The launch of a real devaluation policy of France to the United States known as the French Bashing. It is particularly evident in some restaurants where fried, usually called "French Fries" are renamed "Liberty Fries". This practice is, with the evolution of American opinion on the conflict, out of date.
- Strengthening the political power of Shiite Islam in Iran and therefore the region.
- Massive debt following U.S. military spending and loss of their status as military and political superpower in the eyes of many nations by the failure of political and military control of Iraq.
- Strengthening the anti-American sentiment in all countries of Muslim culture which enhances the risk of terrorism and the power of Islamist terrorist organizations.

XIII. CHANGES IN THE GEOPOLITICAL SITUATIONS IN THE MIDDLE-EAST

13.1 Iran

The invasion of Iraq and threats of the United States vis-à-vis Iran, which seeks to acquire nuclear weapons, have partly caused the defeat of the reformists in the presidential election of 2005 in Iran. This, however, for other reasons: The failure of economic reforms, leaving many Iranians in misery; the failure of reforms to liberalize society and the functioning of institutions, due to a constitution making it impossible for such reforms without the agreement of religious slow mobilization of the electorate reformer of mainly two reasons above.

The Nobel Peace laureate Shirin Ebadi, also denounced the crusade fundamentalist George Bush, which aggravates the situation of reformists and women in her country, Iran, and the rest of the Muslim world [51].

13.2 Israel-Palestine

Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon evacuated completely the settlers and military in the Gaza Strip in the summer of 2005, thus giving a real basis for a territorial future Palestinian state. However, this is only a small decline, in an area cramped and overcrowded, with no water crucial given the Middle East, and with a low risk to the government because there were only 8,000 Israeli settlers in Gaza and in addition, it allows Israel to build in the West Bank, more water-rich and less populated.

13.3 Syria

The threatening attitude of the United States have accelerated a strengthening of the Syrian regime, accused of supporting Hamas and a having a blind eye on the infiltration of terrorists in Iraq, especially after the death of Hafez el-Assad. Syria, however, was forced to evacuate Lebanon after the assassination of Rafik Hariri, Lebanese leader and former prime minister. In a disorder context, the latter trying to get rid of Syria may have

been murdered by the government of the latter. During November 2005, the Syrian president made a public address broadcast on various channels throughout the world, including European channel, the Euro-news private. He reminded the colonial history of Syria, from the division by the French and British settlers in Syria and Lebanon to the French, and Iraq and Kuwait by the British. And the constant pressure they exerted on this country since he was able to secure its independence, advocating a more equitable international relations and a greater respect in the Arab world [52].

XIV. THE AFTERMATH

After their victory, the allies' troops have sought to stabilize the situation in Iraq by deploying a temporary military government, the Coalition Provisional Authority. However, the population is devastatingly hostile to allies' forces and conflicts arise. In addition, most regions are in a difficult situation: looting, fighting, and settling of scores. In April 2003, the former head of U.S. Central Command, General Tommy Franks decides to suspend the death penalty in Iraq.

On May 22, 2003, Resolution 1483 passed by the Security Council United Nations request the occupying powers to work in the formation of an interim administration "until an internationally recognized, representative government can be established by the Iraqi people".

On May 23, 2003, the U.S. administrator in Iraq, Paul Bremer, announced the ending of the Iraqi army and other security organizations of Saddam Hussein, what will be considered later as one of the biggest mistakes of it.

May 31, 2003, the U.S. military announced that they would occupy Iraq longer than had been previously announced [53].

During the month of June 2003, the U.S. military, which suffered many attacks from the Iraqi civil rebellion and terrorist groups, launched an operation named "Desert Scorpion", trying to take control of the country. The United States calls for civilians to hand over some 5 million weapons that would have been assigned by the regime of Saddam Hussein and the risk of captivity in the case of a refusal. Only a few thousands of weapons were delivered.

On June 17, 2003, a previously unknown group, the Iraqi Resistance Brigades, claimed the attacks against the American occupation army. The group declared itself independent of former President Saddam Hussein, not Islamic, and claims to be a "group of young Iraqis and Arabs who believe in unity, freedom and Arabism of Iraq." Subsequently, many groups of rebels appear. They are believed to recruit many supporters among members of the former military and paramilitary forces of the Baathist regime, the United States have been slow to consider recruiting them to maintain order.

In July 2003, the United States and several countries are asking the UN to assist in control of the country by transporting armed soldiers troops, but they refused, not wanting to endorse the invasion ruled illegal the Iraq.

On July 23, 2003, one hundred days after the end of the war was declared by the occupier, an article was published stating that human rights are still not respected by the U.S. military in Iraq as torture, murder, detention in poor conditions for prisoners are still present [54].

On 25 July 2003, Moqtada al-Sadr, Shiite cleric considered influential demand in Najaf, for the withdrawal of the U.S. occupation forces, before a crowd of one hundred thousand faithful.

On August 19, 2003, a truck bomb destroyed the UN headquarters in Baghdad killing 22 people including the Special Representative of the Secretary General of the UN in Iraq, Brazilian Sergio Vieira de Mello. Attributed to Ansar al-Islam and Al-Qaida in Iraq, the attack marked the beginning of a cycle of violence that raged the country [54].

On December 14, 2003, Saddam Hussein was arrested by the U.S. military. He was then transferred to an undisclosed location for questioning. But his arrest, although a success for the forces of the United States, does not deter the armed rebellion.

End of January 2004 in Iraq, almost daily attacks continue to strike the military occupation and civilians working for them.

During January and February 2004, attacks to booby traps points to recruit police and Iraqi army is growing. Some analysts believe that the rebels want and prevent any assistance to foreign occupation forces from their fellow citizens.

On February 15, 2004, a group of countries neighboring Iraq including Syria, Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt and Turkey, after a meeting in Kuwait, seriously asked, the drawing of the allies occupation forces.

In March 2004, the first battle of Fallujah, 2000 Marines and two battalions of the new Iraqi army conquered two-thirds of the city and killed 184 insurgents and 616 civilians, and 27 soldiers from the U.S. military.

On June 8, 2004, after bitter debate, a resolution of the Security Council of the UN passed the conditions of transfer of sovereignty to Iraq, scheduled June 30. The interim government is to prepare the elections, scheduled for early 2005. The resolution states that it may request the departure of the allies, but it can always intervene whenever it deems it necessary.

On June 28, 2004, Paul Bremer, administrator of occupation, the sovereignty passes to the interim Iraqi government two days ahead of schedule to avoid the attacks. The interim government obtained economic control of oil, but not that of eighteen billion dollars of U.S. aid.

From November 6 to November 29, 2004, the second Battle of Fallujah started: 10 to 15,000 men of the third body in six American battalions and 2000 men of the new Iraqi army were involved. The battle began with aerial bombardments and artillery, with the use of white phosphorus, after a closure of the city by the allies. Arms caches, bunkers and networks of tunnels were discovered. This time, Iraqi units are on the second level, they help capture critical points such as mosques, and especially to occupy the conquered territories. Despite this withdrawal, the behavior of Iraqi soldiers would not be improved very slowly, and the judgments made by the Marines on their allies in Fallujah in November were very severe. At November 15, there were a few hundred well-equipped insurgents. Most of them fighting and resisting the U.S. army. At December 15, the U.S. military is still struggling to reduce the last pockets of resistance, which it believes its number was about 200 troops. They would still have been 45 deaths between 11 and 14 December. Much of the insurgents finally managed to escape and disperse in western Iraq. Others would back a few weeks after the end of the battle. Official figures show 470 killed and 1200 injured, including 243 women and 200 children, but more than 1,350 dead, and 106 dead on the side of the allies, to December 23, 2004 [55].

May 25, 2006, George W. Bush and Tony Blair acknowledged mistakes in Iraq. The U.S. president particularly said that his comments had "sent the wrong signals", that "things did not go as we had hoped" and that "the biggest mistake, at least with regard to the involvement of our country is Abu Ghraib". In September 2006, and in the area of Al Anbar, in the west of Iraq, part of the Sunni tribal rose as the Council of salvation Anbar, led by Abdul Sattar Abu Risha, who died a year later and replaced by his elder brother Ahmed Abu Risha, also known as the Movement of the alarm. These Sunnis allied to the government of al-Maliki (a Shiite majority after the massive abstention of Sunnis in the elections of December 2005) and the Americans against al Qaeda in Mesopotamia. They achieved to make the area of Al Anbar, a source of Islamist insurgency.

On December 30, 2006, Saddam Hussein was condemned by the Iraqi Special Tribunal and hanged the next day with several of his henchmen.

On August 14, 2007, the greatest lethal terrorist attack since the beginning of the war occurred producing 580 deaths and 1600 injuries. Soon after, Bush acknowledges, September 15, 2007, that political commitment, economic, and military of the US in Iraq will remain even after the end his presidency. In early 2007, reinforcements were sent and implementation of a program against an insurgency symbolized by the appointment of David Petraeus as commander of the operations supported by the Iraqi army and militia helps to lower the level of violence.

In late July 2008, President Bush proclaimed the retreat of U.S. troops from Iraqi cities and by end June 2009 and December 31, 2011 for the evacuation of U.S. combat troops.

In November 2008, Iraqi and U.S. governments signed a bilateral pact, the Status of Forces Agreement, which sets the end of 2011 the term military presence in the US.

From mid-2009, U.S. forces do not patrol in the streets. This act, which includes thirty articles, was adopted Thursday, November 27, 2008 by the Iraqi parliament represented by 149 deputies out of 198 present, 35 voted against and 14 deputies abstained. The only foreign troops allowed to remain in Iraq after the UN mandate 31 December 2008 are those of the U.S., UK, Australia, El Salvador, Estonia and Romania. The bulk of the 4000 British military contingent was repatriated in June 2009. It remains, to January 25, 2010, forty-led NATO instructors for the training of Iraqi officers and a contingent of one hundred men to protect offshore oil sites and train Iraqi Navy [56].

XV. THE OCCUPATION OF IRAQ FROM THE ARAB PERSPECTIVE

When analyzing in the Arab countries, reactions to the invasion and occupation of North America to Iraq, we must distinguish between governments and public opinion. The divergence of views between government and governed comes from very different experiences, and even antagonistic. Since the Gulf War of 1991, Arab countries have lived for a profound transformation of a new hegemony of the United States that promoted the access of the wealth of the region, allowed them to expand their military presence in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf countries, and gradually forged a growing dependence on Arab regimes to the United States. These plans, most of nature clan and heritage and, therefore, showing a growing lack of legitimacy to their societies, understood that the new order established by the United States guaranteed their support, provided they take on their strategic military project. In exchange, they received political support, economic aid (Benefiting

from the influence of Washington with the International Monetary Fund) and a free hand to manage their societies with repressive methods they deem necessary to apply to remain in power. This has established a regional system "State-client" of the United States as a capacity for joint action by the Arab countries to protect their regional interests or be a source of stability in the region. Thus, although a U.S. military invasion against Iraq should place all the Arab governments in a difficult internal situation, the latter showed completely unable to maintain a position contrary to U.S. interests. This complicated situation came as a result of another Arab country accentuating their de-legitimization policy and probably placed a face a violent reaction, as their reluctance to a preemptive strike and the application of principle of "regime change". Indeed, in the future, nothing can ensure that this does not turn against one of them. Hence, the proposed early Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah bin AbdelAziz, a Charter to Reform the Arab world, in February 2003, seeking to forestall statements inconsistent of North Americans about redevelopment of the region.

Despite all this, at the summit of the Arab League, 1 March 2003, convened to decide faced with an imminent U.S. invasion, Arab governments were limited to a rhetorical exercise in which they hardly dared say they did not feel that Iraq was a threat and that therefore they did not want a war, and they rejected the proposal of Syria to adopt a statement against any support of military action. How Gulf countries would they approve this resolution so they are military protectorate of the United States? How Egypt would she risk losing aid amounting to 2000 million annual it receives from the United States? How Jordan would risk getting hurt again the punishment destroyer which she had suffered for not having supported the war of 1991? How Algeria, would sacrifice the North American support which contributes in large part of the military junta to win the war against democracy and civil society? How was Gaddafi going to jeopardize his reconciliation with the progressive Western world?... But in the same way, how Syria could not make this proposal knowing that the North American speech of redevelopment of the Middle East would, one way or another, given by Damascus after the domination of Iraq. However, they showed the inability of Arabs to control their own political future and showed their people, already very dissident, that they were unable to act together to influence the international community and defend the Arab causes, more particularly the Palestinian cause and now, the Iraq, which has a devastating effect to their legitimacy as rulers.

Later, accepting, September 9, the Iraqi Governing Council, appointed by the occupying force, fill the vacancy of Iraq within the Arab League, received with great enthusiasm by the spokesman of the White House, has deepened the disagreement. Just analyze the results of opinion poll completed in late 2003 by the prestigious American institution, The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press in seven Arab countries plus Turkey and Israel, for the views of the United States and their policy after the invasion of Iraq. We observe on this, the gap between the Arab citizens of the position of their governments. In all these countries, apart from Israel, citizens occur overwhelmingly opposed the U.S. States and in some cases, as in Jordan and Palestine, this anti-American position is expressed, respectively, 99 and 98% of interviewees. The study also points out that the support for the United States has dramatically decreased compared to surveys in 2000-2002. So today only 15% Turks surveyed express positive feelings to the United States and most even refute limited support their government had offered North Americans during the invasion of Iraq. Faced with the almost unanimous opposition, the most Israelis (79%) express a position favorable to the United States and their policies. It is important to note that most people respondents see the United States in a powerful military threat to their own countries and consider that U.S. policy endangers the stability of the region. Compared to the situation in 2002, the fight against terrorism conducted by Washington has lost its credibility in countries: less than a quarter of respondents give them their support today. Is that the "war against terrorism", as that formulate and implement the United States, has no social support in much of the world, precisely where this war must be carried out successfully.

Increasing the disgrace suffered by the United Nations with its citizens is also of particular concern. This feeling is probably no stranger to disappointment growing experienced by these populations when unable to find this organization to impose Israel's compliance with its resolutions, the fact the embargo, for twelve years, struck the Iraqi society and caused a humanitarian catastrophe, was imposed by the UN, nor the fact that there is currently an ambiguous position between the UN and the U.S. occupation of Iraq following the 1511 resolution.

15.1 Resolutions of the Arab League on Iraq

Resolution British-American Aggression on Iraq and its impact on the safety of neighboring Arab states and the security of Arab nations (24-03-03). Ministerial Council League of Arab States, the 119th regular session:

Condemns the aggression against Iraq; Calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all forces armies of the United States and Great Britain for the entire Iraqi territory, and accountable morally and materially.

This act of aggression: Reaffirms the commitment of all Arab states to abstain from any military action that would violate the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of an Arab state, and decides to transmit

instructions to the group of Arab United Nations to request an urgent meeting of the Security Council and, for non-adoption of a resolution, it requires a session urgency of the General Assembly.

Resolution 6257 on the developments of the Iraqi issue: Council of the Arab League meeting in session to examine the extraordinary developments of the Iraq crisis and its consequences for the Arab world.

Reaffirms the resolutions adopted by the Council of the Arab League, in particular Resolution 227, adopted at the Beirut Summit of 28-03-2002 and Resolution 6216 adopted by the Ministerial Council the Arab League on 05-09-2002.

Approve Resolution 1441 of the Security Council, one authority competent to evaluate the reports of the inspectors. The Resolution does not constitute a basis for the use of force against Iraq.

Accepts the agreement by Iraq to let the international inspectors return and calls for cooperation between the UN and Iraq as prelude to lifting the sanctions and embargo. Invite the inspectors to complete their task in a neutral and objective call for the integration of Arab experts in these teams. Then, reaffirm the commitment of Arab States to preserve the territorial integrity, security and sovereignty in Iraq.

Requests the Security Council that will ensure Israel's compliance with international law and that it accelerates the implementation of Resolution 687 (1991) Security Council for the dismantling of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, particularly in the case of Israel. Then invite the Secretary General of the League of Arab States to stay in contact with the Iraqi government and doing the right negotiation with the UN [57].

15.2 Resolutions of the Security Council of the UN on Iraq

S/RES/1441 Resolution 1441 (08-11-02): The Security Council sum Baghdad to destroy all its programs of weapons of mass to the possibility of using force.

S/RES/1443 Resolution 1443 (05-11-02): The Security Council Decides to extend until December 4, 2002 provisions sale or supply of goods to Iraq, contained in resolution 1409 (2002).

S/RES/1447 Resolution 1447 (04-12-02): Extension Program "Oil against food 'for 6 months.

S/RES/1454 Resolution 1454 (30-12-02): Hardening of sanctions against Baghdad. The Security Council expands the list of prohibited imports to Iraq.

S/RES/1472 Resolution 1472 (28-03-03): Go to a period 45 days of the "Oil against food 'in Iraq suspended on March 17 to the impending military action. Furthermore, the resolution recalls the parties of their obligation in international humanitarian law and urges the community international lending immediate humanitarian assistance to the population Iraqi.

S/RES/1476 Resolution 1476 (24-04-03): To extend the program for a few weeks and leaves open the possibility of its future renovation.

S/RES/1483 Resolution 1483 (22-05-03): immediate lifting of all international sanctions imposed on Iraq since 1990, except those related to armaments, the definition of terms UN mandate in the country and establishment of an administration preliminary run by Iraqis [58].

XVI. CONCLUSIONS

The Bush regime has implicated the USA into a long war in Iraq with no end in sight. The cost of these wars of aggression is dreadful. 4,538 U.S. soldiers were dead; while, 29,780 U.S. soldiers were wounded. Experts have argued that these figures are understated. However, to some they are only the tip of the iceberg.

On April 17, 2008, AP News reported that a new study by the RAND Corporation showed that some 300,000 U.S. troops are suffering from major depression or post-traumatic stress after serving in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and 320,000 were victims of brain damage.

On April 21, 2008, Op-Ed-News reported that internal e-mail from General Michael J. Kussman, Minister for Health to the Department of Veterans Affairs (MAC), addressed to Ira Katz, head of mental health in the MAC, confirming a report in the McClatchy Newspaper, that 126 veterans commit suicide every week. To the extent that these suicides are due to the war, more than 500 people each month should be added to the losses in the fighting.

If one turns to the Iraqi losses, expert studies support a figure of up to 1.2 million dead Iraqis, almost all of civilians. Two million Iraqis have fled their country and two million have been displaced within Iraq. Iraq had civilian losses and damage to homes, infrastructure, and environment excessive. It was also affected by depleted uranium and sewer ruptured.

Then there is the economic cost to the United States. Nobel laureate economist Joseph Stiglitz estimates that the total cost of this invasion and attempted occupation of Iraq is between 3 and 5 trillion dollars. The price of oil and gasoline in dollars has tripled, and the dollar value against other currencies, declined dramatically. Before Bush launched his wars of aggression, a dollar was worth 45 baht. Today the dollar is only worth 30 baht.

The United States cannot afford such costs. Before his resignation, the President of Court of Accounts of the United States, David Walker, reported that debts not covered by the Government of the United States amounted a total of 53 trillion dollars. The U.S. government is unable to cover these debts. The Bush Regime even had to borrow money abroad to pay for his wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. There is no surer way to bankrupt the country and dethrone the dollar as world reserve currency [59].

The final question remains: Could all these dead, all these wounded, and all these economic costs to the United States be due entirely to the lies of the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, National Security Advisor, and the U.S. media, in favor of a hidden agenda whose goals are to acquire the oil of the Iraq, set an American colony in the Middle East, and expand the Israeli territories in the Arab region? A question to be answered by the yet unwritten history.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was funded by the Lebanese Association for Computational Sciences (LACSC), Beirut, Lebanon, registered under Decree No. 957, 2011, Beirut, Lebanon.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rodney P. Carlisle, *Iraq War, Facts on File*, 2004, 176 pp, *Facts on File*, 2007, pp. 208
- [2] National Counterterrorism Center: Annex of Statistical Information, *Country Reports on Terrorism*, April 30, 2007.
- [3] Christopher Cerf and Micah L. Sifry, eds., *The Iraq War Reader: History, Documents, Opinions*, Touchstone, 2003. pp 736.
- [4] U.S. silence on new Iraq spying allegations, *BBC News*, 1999-01-07. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/250808.stm.
- [5] Joseph J. Collins, *Choosing War: The Decision to Invade Iraq and Its Aftermath*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 2008, 43 pp.
- [6] David M. Walker, *Iraqi Benchmarks: An Objective Assessment*, Hearing, September 5, 2007, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Serial No. 110-108, iii, 67 pp.
- [7] *The Iraq Oil-For-Food Program: starving for accountability*, Hearing before the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations of the Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives, April 21, 2004, 285 pp.
- [8] K. Katzman, "Iraq and Al-Qaeda: allies or not?", *CRS Reports for Congress*, p. 6
- [9] Stephen Pelletière, *Iraq and the International Oil System: Why America Went to War in the Gulf*. Greenwood, 2001, 239 pp, *Maisonneuve Press*, 2004, 250 pp.
- [10] Resolution 1441 of the Security Council, 8 November 2002, www.un.org, 2002, p.5.
- [11] Art. 8 of the Resolution 687 of the Security Council, 3 April 1991, www.un.org, 1991, p.13.
- [12] *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs*, CIA Report, October 2002, pp. 1-3.
- [13] J. Wilson, "What I didn't find in Africa", 6 July 2003, *New York Times*, 2003, p. 9
- [14] *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction the Assessment of the British Government*, <http://www.fco.gov.uk>
- [15] A Committee of Privy Counsellors, Chairman, Lord Butler of Brockwell, *Review of Evidence on Weapons of Mass Destruction*. London: The Stationery Office, 2004. xii, 196 pp.
- [16] M. Gozlan, "The real story of Iraqi war", 31 October 2008, *Marianne*, p. 71
- [17] *The Bush administration and critics of the Iraq war*, article du quotidien *Le Monde*, 17 juin 2007.
- [18] Scott P. Richert, *The War in Iraq - A Roman Catholic View*, http://catholicism.about.com/od/thechurchintheworld/f/popes_on_iraq.htm
- [19] Pope John Paul II calls War a Defeat for Humanity: Neoconservative Iraq Just War Theories Rejected, *Houston Catholic Worker*. July–August 2003, <http://www.cjd.org/paper/jp2war.html>, Retrieved November 15, 2008.
- [20] "Vatican Strongly Opposes Iraq War". *Fox News*. March 12, 2003. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,80875,00.html>
- [21] "Pope warns against Iraq war". *BBC News*. December 25, 2002. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2605367.stm>, Retrieved November 15, 2008.
- [22] John L. Allen Jr., "Vatican opposition to Iraq war justified", *National Catholic Reporter*, June 8, 2003
- [23] "American Hearing About Iraq From the Pulpit, But Religious Faith Not Defining Opinions", *Pew Research Center for The People & The Press*, *Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life*, 2003, 15p.
- [24] "Just War Principles", 2005, <http://www.baptistpress.org/pdf/justwarprinciples.pdf>
- [25] Connie Veillette, "CRS Report for Congress", 10 February 2005.
- [26] Mike Tucker and Charles Faddis, *Operation Hotel California, the Clandestine War inside Iraq*, 2008.
- [27] C. J. Chivers, *Nation at War: Second Front*, March 24, 2003.
- [28] Sheila Enslev Johnston, *The Iraqi Conflict*. Canada: Altitude Publishing, 2008. 192 pp.
- [29] Louis A. DiMarco, *Traditions, Changes, and Challenges: Military Operations and the Middle Eastern City*, *Global War on Terrorism Occasional Paper*, *Combat Studies Institute Press*, 2004. vi, 71 pp.
- [30] Williamson Murray and Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr., *The Iraq War: A Military History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003. 368 pp.
- [31] "U.S. Military Operations in Iraq: Planning, Combat, and Occupation". Conference sponsored by Johns Hopkins' SAIS and the U.S. Army's Strategic Studies Institute, November 2, 2005.
- [32] Christopher Gelpi, Peter D. Feaver, and Jason Reifler, *Paying the human costs of war: American public opinion and casualties in military conflicts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009. xiv, 289 pp.
- [33] Conetta, C., "The Wages of War: Iraqi Combatant and Noncombatant Fatalities in the 2003 Conflict," *Research Monograph no. 8 Project on Defense Alternatives*, October 20, 2003.
- [34] Brownstein CA, Brownstein JS, *Estimating excess mortality in post-invasion Iraq*, 2008, 358:445-447
- [35] Jean-Dominique Merchet, "The expensive price paid by the American Materials", *Liberation*, 2006.
- [36] Margaret Griffis , "Casualties in Iraq", *The Human Cost of Occupation*, 2011
- [37] *Study estimates 655,000 excess Iraqi deaths since start of war*, *The Lancet*, 13 October 2006
- [38] *Iraq Body Count Press Release 14, Iraq Body Count*, 16 October 2006
- [39] *Iraq Family Health Survey Study Group*, "Violence-related mortality in Iraq from 2002 to 2006" , 2008, 358:484-493

- [40] Iraqi volunteers, Iraqi refugees: What is America's obligation?, March 26, 2007, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 67 pp. Serial No.110-46.
- [41] War at Any Cost? The Total Economic Costs of the War Beyond the Federal Budget. Hearing, Joint Economic Committee, February 28, 2008. iii, 280 pp. S.Hrg. 110-703.
- [42] C.Gelpi, "The Cost of War: How Many Casualties Will Americans Tolerate", *Foreign Affairs*, 85:1 (2006), pp. 139-144.
- [43] "The Three Trillion Dollar War": The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict.
- [44] Scott Wallsten, Katrina Kosec, "Iraqi War Costs", the AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Studies, 2008.
- [45] James DeFronzo, "The Iraq War: Origins and Consequences", Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press (Perseus), 2010. xi, 323 pp.
- [46] Michael N. Schmitt, "The Legality of Operation Iraqi Freedom under International Law." *Journal of Military Ethics*, 3:2 , 2004, pp. 82-104.
- [47] Peter C. Danchin, "International law, human rights and the transformative occupation of Iraq", pp. 64-89)
- [48] David H. Marlowe, *Psychological and Psychosocial Consequences of Combat and Deployment with Special Emphasis on the Gulf War*. MR-1018/11-OSD. Santa Monica: Rand, 2000. xxi, 181 pp.
- [49] Rick Fawn and Raymond A. Hinnebusch, "The Iraq War: Causes and Consequences", Lynne Rienner, 2006. 357 pp.
- [50] Ronnie Lankford, "The Iraq War", Greenhaven Press, 2010, In the series "Social Issues Firsthand," for young adult readers.
- [51] Frederick M. Wehrey, Dalia Dassa Kaye, Jessica Watkins, Jeffrey Martini, and Robert A. Guffey, *The Iraq Effect: The Middle East After the Iraq war*. Santa Monica: Rand, 2010. 216 pp.
- [52] Frederick M. Wehrey, Dalia Dassa Kaye, Jessica Watkins, Jeffrey Martini, and Robert A. Guffey, *The Iraq Effect: The Middle East After the Iraq war*. Santa Monica: Rand, 2010, 216 pp.
- [53] Toby Dodge, *Iraq's Future: The Aftermath of Regime Change*. London and New York: Routledge, for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2005. 72 pp.
- [54] Brian Katulis, Marc Lynch, and Peter Juul, "Iraq's Political Transition after the Surge", Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress, September 2008, 30 pp.
- [55] Nora Bensahel, Olga Oliker, Keith Crane, Rochard P. Brennan, Jr., Heather S. Gregg, Thomas Sullivan, and Andrew Rathmell, "After Saddam: Prewar Planning and the Occupation of Iraq", MG-642-A, Santa Monica: Rand, 2008, xxxvii, 273 pp.
- [56] Anne Garrels, *Naked in Baghdad: The Iraq War and the Aftermath as Seen by NPR's Correspondent*. New York: Picador, 2004. x, 246 pp.
- [57] Resolution of the League of Arab States Concerning Iraq, Resolutions of the Arab League, 2003, <http://www.arableagueonline.org>
- [58] Resolutions of the United Nations Security Council concerning Iraq, 2003, Documents: <http://www.un.org/documents/scres.htm>
- [59] John Chapman, "The real reasons Bush went to war", *The Guardian*, Wednesday 28 July 2004.

There were many consequences for Iraq which came out of the Gulf War. This time at the end of the war Iraq ended up worse collections of libraries, museums, and laboratories were transported to Iraq. Since the war, Kuwait has been largely rebuilt. However, many oil smoke, and other environmental damage. However, by 2003, the US, UK and Spain introduced the "second resolution" arguing that Iraq failed to take the final opportunity provided by the UN Security Council to disarm. The second resolution meant the authorisation of immediate force to disarm Saddam's Iraq. [8] However, France's president Jack Chiroc argued that they would veto the resolution. Crisis talks were held with the leaders of the US, UK and Spain resulting in the withdrawal of the resolution. The Iraq War was a protracted armed conflict that began in 2003 with the invasion of Iraq by a United States-led coalition that overthrew the government of Saddam Hussein. The conflict continued for much of the next decade as an insurgency emerged to oppose the occupying forces and the post-invasion Iraqi government. An estimated 151,000 to 600,000 or more Iraqis were killed in the first three to four years of conflict. In 2009, official US troops were withdrawn, but American soldiers continued to