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Abstract

In the opinion of White House politicians, Iraq played a critical role in the United States’ Middle East policy after overthrowing Saddam Hussein. In a way, George Bush Jr.’s strategy, being expressed by conservatives with a focus on the Middle East and was called War against Terrorism, reflected imperialistic views on Persian Gulf’s oil revenues and a neoconservative look to empower Israel who prescribed removing Saddam and the power of Iraq as a threat. Condoleezza Rice, National security Advisor of the U.S proposed the link between a military invasion to Iraq and the Great Middle East Plan. She believed that a democratic Iraq could transform into a key element for a totally different Middle East. Bush’s Administration believed that freeing Iraq would not only bring democracy to this country, but also it would foster democracy in other countries of the Middle East. therefore, the author in this study seeks to investigate Iraq as a case study to implement the Great Middle East plan.
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Introduction

In the U.S’s Middle East plan, the main policy of the West has always been to expand their values throughout the world. Western liberal democracy is among these values which the West considers it in line with its security based on the belief coming from Kant that democratic countries do not enter a war with each other. It seems that the United States seeks to develop democracy in the less developed world especially after the collapse of the USSR. The Clinton's doctrine titled enlargement of democracy and a forward strategy of freedom presend by Bush J.r is conceivable in this respect. September 11 terrorist attacks of 2001 led to a change in the dominant paradigm of the U.S foreign policy particularly in the Middle East and for the first time America put up the slogan of a serious change in the Middle East and developing democracy. The Great Middle East plan provided by Bush J.R is one such change. The former deputy of Defence Minister of the U.S six month before military invasion and occupation of Iraq. We have seen the procedure of democratization after collapse of the USSR in many countries, especially Eastern Europe, Latin America and Africa. Middle East seems to be an exception. Some theorists of Middle Eastern studies have investigated that by claiming that this region has remained immune from many international procedures including localization, globalization and democratization (Aartz, 1999, P.5) However, this belief has been developed in democratization especially after the collapse of the USSR that the signs of democracy can be seen in the Middle East (Korany, 1998, PP.267-278). Some experts and scholars of regional studies by comparative studies of Arab countries have concluded that: the discourse of democracy has spread throughout the region ( Arab countries), while most part of politics in the Arab world is still non – democratic(Korany, 1998,PP271-2). Paul Smirnov, one of the authors of that group, regards the source of democratization in the Third World as being based on the following factors (Smirnov, 2003, 49-4).

• Leaders such as Gorbachov, Mandella or Gandhi initiated ideas, rules and actions that were democratic.
• Democratization develops through indirect effects of factors such as foreign aids and investment, cultural ties, constructive criticisms, etc.
• The state class or institutions create an institutional- legal framework for a peaceful and comparative politics.
• All businesses, expert workers and farmers force the government to reform.
• Revolitional changes
The American neoconservatives believed that the problem of democratization in the Middle East would only solve through foreign intervention and there is no hope in local interactions. These people severely criticize the American policies during Clinton. In their opinion America had an "inconsistent leadership" which did not want to express power. They believed that a consistent leadership could be observed in Reagan’s administration during which America was ready to confront present and future challenges, American foreign policy was designed according to the countries principles abroad and the leadership took its global responsibilities (Hajyusefi, 2004). Their main aim is to create an American Empire (Iowis, 2002, 133). This viewpoint dominated Bush's thoughts too, and he talked of it not only in his report of the American national security strategy published in September 2002, but also in most of his lectures. The most important innovation in this document compared to the previous ones is that it considers terrorists the same as dictators. According to this document America's most important objective has to be fostering democracy throughout the world. To this aim the task of defending peace through fighting terrorists and dictators, keeping peace through establishing warm relationships among big powers and expanding peace through encouraging open societies in the world has been pinpointed in the country's foreign policy.

Although Clinton sought peace, Bush followed defending and keeping peace. So, this objective cannot be obtained with deterrence and containment policy since the nature of threat is different from what it was in the past and the source of it remains unknown. Bush believes: America has unchallengeable power and will preserve it. Regarding the national security document presented by Bush the new strategy in the Middle East could be considered as part of reassessment of American policy after September 11 events through which the country attempted to re-identify its challenges. Some believer that the Great Middle East plan developed not only because of September 11 events, but also it was as a result of America's challenges and crises in Iraq. The Iraq crisis led to America's intensifying its decisiveness to implement an idea presented in the framework of the Great Middle East Plan. The Pawel’s Plan called America-Middle East involvement initiative being put forward in December 12th 2002 is regarded as an evidence for this claim. Based on this Plan, America has to seek the following in the Middle East:

1. Expanding entrepreneurship in Arab countries.
2. Encouraging free trade in the Middle East.
3. Financially support education of Moslem women.
4. Support those citizens who want their voices to be heard. The Bush administration pursued these aims in the Great Middle East Plan.

1. The Great Middle East Plan and occupation of Iraq in the Bush Administration Policy marker's view, Iraq played a major role as a support for America's Middle East Policy. This viewpoint first was set forward by G.Garner, Military Governer of Iraq after over throwing Saddam. He considered Iraq as similar to the Philippines in the Far East after WWI. Those familiar with contemporary history remember that America turned the Philippines into its military operation base in the East Asia and expanded its Sovereignty in the region (Ataei, 1999, 231). The recorded strategy proposed by Bush J.R. was a complex set of drafts that were collected during Bush S.R. administration by neoconservatives with a focus on the Middle East. The strategy of war against terror reflects an Imperialistic outlook on the Persian Gulf’s oil resources and a neoconservative view on enhancing the security of Israel which prescribe removing Saddam and regarded Iraq's power as a threat (Brzezinski, 2002, 235). Looking at declared and non-declared objectives of invasion to Iraq, one can figure out the link between this war and the Great Middle East Plan. Condoleeza Rice, the then National Security Advisor of the U.S, discussed the issue by an essay and then during a lecture in her opinion, a democratic Iraq could transform into a key element for a totally different Middle East. Even before this, she stated in an interview with Financial Times dated September 23, 2002 that America not only seeks to "establish democratization or move toward freedom in the Moslem world". During a lecture in November 2003 in Washington, Bush said: "the failure of democracy in Iraq will lead to empowering terrorists throughout the world, hazards for the U.S and disappointing millions of people in the region". Democracy will succeed in Iraq and this carries the message for the region-from Demascus to Tehran- that any nation can reach freedom in the future. Establishing a free Iraq at the heart of Middle East is a turning point in global democratic revolution. The Bush's Administration believed that "freeing Iraq
will not only bring democracy to this country but also it would bring democracy to other Middle East countries (Jervis, 2003, 118).

2. The function of Great Middle East Plan in the new Iraq September 11 is considered as a turning point in international relations' contemporary history. This event restored old geo politic rules and brought the new power-based rules into the arena of international relations. America's invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, obvious support of Israel’s invasion to Lebanon (victory of 33-days Hezbollah resistance), Tel Aviv’s genocide in Gaza (victory of Hamas and people of Gaza) and setting up missile defense in the middle east and the Persian Gulf are among part of September 11 consequences, the truth of the event itself still remain doubtful. The occupied Iraq entered into two security discourses of "backlash states" and "axis of evil", is regarded as one such consequences. (Moshirzade, 2004,46). Occupation of Kuwait by Saddam’s regime in 1991. Created a new regional and international crisis; continuation of this crisis led to the invasion of Iraq by the United states and Britain in 2001. The invasion of Iraq was done without respect to united nation's and humanitarian international groups' views and with America’s unilateral decision (accompanied by Britain). This crisis is unique in it’s own right in terms of dimensions, depth and extent after collapse of the USSR, since it first involved the UN security council and then all international political, legal and social organization as well as states of the region, Europe and global community and finally the neoconservatives of the white house entered into an unpredictable and difficult war. Applying power has always existed during the cold war era but activating the strategy of "pre-emptive strike" is considered as a symbol of "moving power" to defy potential threats. The pre-emptive war doctrine appeared after September 11 was formulated based on the new American national security discourses. This indicates that such an approach goes beyond militarizing and strategic behavior. George Bush managed to organize the pre-emptive war strategy to realize interventionism, unilateralism and ideologic conflict with new security forces (Moshirzade, 2004,176). America and Britain attempted to obtain the necessary authorization and legitimacy from the UN security council, but they failed and began the military invasion of Iraq in march 21,2002. By occupation of Iraq and the quick fall of Baghdad, George w. bush declared the end of military operation in Iraq, called it a liberalization operation, celebrated his victory and talked of the beginning of "democratization" in the region of the Middle East and expansion of the pattern of new Iraq. He regarded three features of: government creation, establishing security and stability and rebuilding Iraq as his priority. The American officials expected that the majority of Iraqies welcome their saviors and Iraq become transformed under American army’s hard power. But, due to the white houses' lack of plan the troops under command of border security forces returned back home. The security guard in charge of protecting state and industrial facsilities left their posts or did not fulfill their tasks while the looter attacked and the people of Iraq received occupants coldly and did not accompany them though they were consent for Saddam’s fall (Amir Abdollahian, 2007, 49). The issue of Iraq is pivotal to the American foreign policy and affects the United States' viewpoint in the region and the world. The new Iraq’s developments not only has affected its international relations and security and political status of the country, but also has had a great effect on the countries of the region, international system and reducing Americas’ hegemonic role. Months before occupying Iraq, the military officials claimed that they have careful plans to enter Iraq and micro plans, from the process of government creation to collecting garbage in Baghdad. But, in practice the occupiers were surprisingly confused. Some military commanders tried to justify that Loy regarding early victory in Iraq as the cause of this confusion. This chapter investigates different aims and dimension of Baghdad-Washington security deal by reviewing Americas' behavior in the new Iraq. The occupiers turned to the Geneva conventions about armed conflicts to legitimize their presence in Iraq. As a result, American government declared in September 11, 2003 that the coalition provisional authority (CPA) has fulfilled its duties in Iraq (Elain-halchlin, 2004). The members of coalition officially admitted that they are occupiers and responsible for providing Iraqi peoples’ security and welfare although the U.S and Britain could not keep themselves secure let alone fulfilling their responsibilities for the Iraqies’. Consequently, the people of Iraq suffered great losses. However, thought the security council’s 1483 Resolution later acknowledged the CPA, Americas' occupying behavior continued in Iraq. According to the American group of studying Iraq (consisted of two republican and democrat parties) called baker- Hamilton, the issue of Iraq is in the center of American’s foreign policy and has effects on its viewpoint in the region and all over the world.
The United States experiences one of the toughest and most crucial of its challenges in the region in the recent decade (Baker- Hamilton, 2006). Now, America’s hard and soft war is in process hinding upon six political, military, security, economic, social and cultural axes. This war, seemingly being in progress in Iraq and Afghanistan, is practically a long, unpredictable war. New America’s decision to focus on fighting with Al Qaeda and terrorism in Afghanistan, increasing NATO forces in Afghanistan to confront new Taliban threats, American and multi-national force’s presence accounting to more than one hundred and forty thousand military troops in Iraq, monthly military cost accounting to twenty billion dollars, and thousands of people being injured or killed are considered as part of this war’s consequences. Assessing the American policy in Iraq, Anthony kurdsmen, an official in the American center of strategic studies states:” we were not appropriately prepared to liberalize Iraq. It was like using bulls to free a porcelain shop. Its consequences were destroying in all respects. Iraq has certainly not transformed into an example of change in the Middle East, and ultimately we might have a better Iraq than Saddam’s era at best not an example country for the region. We have tried various ideas instead of handing over the responsibilities to Iraqi’s and non of them suits. Their real conditions”. Different viewpoint have been proposed about Americas’ intentions of invading Iraq including : destroying mass destruction weapons, fighting terrorism, the necessity of a pre-emptive war, gaining access to Iraq’s great oil resources, democracy based on western values, Iraq’s connections with Al Qaeda groups, Iraq as an immediate threat, Saddam’s dictator ship and cruel acts and regime change. Fighting terrorism, supporting Israel as America’s ally in the region, need to provide energy in the Middle East, dominating Iraq’s great oil resources in which case America would become a non-official member of OPEC (Askarkhâni, 2004.16) and expanding the NATO to the Middle East are among America’s objectives in insisting on signing a security deal.

**Americans action in Iraq**

The strategy of occupation

Following the failure of the UN security council’s political negotiations and insisting the pro-war front (the U.S, Britain, and Spain) and anti-war front (France, Russia, Germany, China, Syria and most temporary members of the security council) On their policies and stance, Bush finally declared war against Iraq in March 21, 2002 and called it a war not against Iraqi nation but to free them from Saddam’s dictator’s ship. The quick fall of Saddam’s regime and development of a power America’s. Power vacuum. Created security problems and action in new Iraq were done during decision making stage I military invasion, murder and looting and government creating which will be thoroughly described in what follows.

**Military Stage**

Month before beginning of the military invasion, the then deputy of American Defence Minister stated that democracy will being from Iraq in the region (jervis,2003,3). Following that, the then U.N Defence Minister, Collin Powel’s doctrine was proposed. The main characteristics of this doctrine were nation creation, elit creation and culture creation in the new Middle East. Applying force by the U.S in Iraq (and before that Afghanistan) indicated that the discourse of promoting freedom and democracy in the Middle East does not involve a cultural and social dimension. Moreover, it depends on the strategy of security, information and economy which was called the greater Middle East plan and more light was shed on its dimension. The Americas’ unilateral invasion to Iraq (accompanied by Britain) took place using high tech and an operational pattern called (c4); it included simultaneous and coordinated employment of four factors of command, computer, control and communications. The American and British invasion began in the evening of March 20, 2002, and Iraq was occupied by American and British military forces due to the domination of a totalitarian Ba’esi regime in Iraq, the results of twelve-year international sanctions against it, Saddam’s crimes against his own nation (besides imposing two wars to the region), people’s lack of faith to Saddam’s dictator regime, etc. Without any major resistance. Before beginning the invasion, the U.S officials claimed they have entered Iraq with careful planning and are fully prepared to administer macro plans (the process of government creation) to micro plans (collecting garbage in Baghdad). But practically, American militants faced confusion in such a way that some military commanders reported the early victory in Iraq as a cause of this confusion. The Iraqi people in this stage and the new militaristic atmosphere did
not welcome American’s warmly, though they were pleased for Saddam and Báes party’s over throw, since they could not tolerate the occupation of their country. A retired American Army General, ”G. Garner” entered Iraq in april 21,2002. The pressure of public opinion, enlightening positions of religious authorities (especially Grand Ayatollah Sistani) and the national Iraqi leader’s attempts forced the White House to alter the mere military approach in Iraq. The efficient and prominent role of Shia religious authorities and Shia groups in occupied Iraq is among the crucial factors in Iraq. Finally, after three weeks and failure of Garner and his team to stabilize the insecure and complex situation in Iraq and the increase in looting public places, the White House sent Paul Burmer (a terrorism specialist in Foreign Ministry) to Iraq instead of Garner. As the ”coalition provisional authority”, Burmer took new measures accompanied by main Iraqi political leaders including: dissolution of security institutes, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of information, the parliament, the Army, the security courts, the National Olympic committee, the Báes Party and sacking officials of various ranks in the Party.

Second stage: state creation

Burmer, the American civil governor took power in a situation which Iraqi leaders took important measures including formation of a governing council with 25 major political, religious and national leaders aiming at holding the reins of power. the next step in the political procedure of Iraq was to form the Governing council based on the Resolution 1834 of the security council through which the Shia’s become majority in the body of the government. The members of this council consisted 13 Shit’s, 5 sunnis, 1 Torkman, and 1 christain. The initiation of this council could be traced back to the previous meetings of dissidents in Salahiddin in which Shiit representatives also took active part. The White House of course initially wanted to assign elements near itself to this council and they did not tend to delegate much authority to this council. The council, too appointed the ministers of the Governing council by observing the same combination and population percentage. The first country to officially recognize the Governing council and which sent a special political delegate as the first official delegate after the fall of Saddam to Iraq was Islamic Republic of Iran(Garner,2005). In this stage while the U.S sought to strengthen its position in Iraq and the region and dealt with the great Middle East plan, Ayatollah Sistani asked people to be present in the political arena, required the U.N to inter Iraq and running parliament election as well as forming the National government. The UN security council’s Resolution 1546 was issued through political pressure of Iraq’s neighboring countries and the global community with the aim of running election in Iraq and forming a national government. The result of two parliamentary election proved that Iraqi people wanted Islamic laws to rule their country. After these stages the ”power transfer document” to Iraqi leaders was signed by burmer and Acting President of Iraq(Jalal Talibani in 2003). Burmer declared establishment of the provisional government of Iraq in 2004. Gazi Al.yavar the president (sunnin and two deputies (Dr.Ibrahim jafari,Shia; Dr.Roj Shavis,Kurd), Ayad Alavi the prime minister (Shia) and a deputy (Barham Salleh,kurd) as well as 31 technocrate minister were the majore elements of the provisional government. The Governing council and the coalition were dissolved and Burmer left Iraqi the same day. Following that, Bush wanted to establish diplomatic relation with Iraq through a letter to allavi, the prime minister. John Negroponte, the former U.S ambassador to the UN offered his credentials to the Iraqi prime minister. In general, the occupiers forced to set back step by step from their unilateral invasive policies due to the complex situation in Iraq. They did so to provide grounds to form Iraqi provisional government, entering the UN and ending of occupation. The U.S has embraced to creat insecurity and attempted to manage insecurity toward its interests. Noam Chomsky believes that the U.S would continue to make weighty use of violence to reach goals political in nature. This act is technicanaly considered terrorism (Chomsky, 2004,13). The tired stage: end of political process and formation of the first national government. With the Iraqi national parliament’s election being run in February 2005 and the formation of the first elected national government in the country, the process of political transform went through the last stage. Duing this period, three groups dissatisfied with the results of the election took big actions aimed at not realizing formation government and returning peace to Iraq. American and British intelligent services as well as some foreigners who found themselves unsuccessful in this move acted out the scenario of killing Shiits by Sunni fundamentalists in such a way that nearly one hundred bodies were found in rural areas and especially the capital on a daily
basis. Parallel to these security measures Khalilzad, the U.S embassadore to Iraq initiated attempts that led to an agreement between him and some extremists, participating some destructive groups in the national parliament and the committee to draft the constitution, lobbying to returned Básis and the Bás Army commanders, obvious intervention in determining the interior and security ministers of Iraq, lobbying against winning groups in the election, attempting to disarm major political groups and attempting to propose the idea of developing the national salvation government in order to fight the legal and national government of Iraq. Military, the U.S was also constructing twelve bases in Iraq. This issue was revealed as a basic challenge in the U.S policy of exiting Iraq during electoral discussions between Bush and John Kerry (the Democrat candidate). Regarding the failure of several security and political plans in Iraq and increase in tolls and insecurities, the U.S adopted a new strategy. In a lecture in March 10,2006 Bush stated: *our failure in Iraq is a catastrophe for the U.S. we have to succeed in order to ensure the security of American people the U.S previous attempts to make Iraq secure failed due to two reasons : one, lack of sufficient forces to be established in cleared areas and the second, many restriction that we had created for our forces. I will send twenty thousand new military troops to Iraq the Iraqi government has to assume responsibility of Iraq security by November 2008. We have to take measures to improve people’s lives as well as doing military operations. Defending territorial integrity, stabilizing the region, containing the Islamic Republic and Syria and helping Iraq and Turkey to settle border disputes are included in the new American strategy. Although bush personally admitted America’s responsibility in Iraq, no change in objectives, principles and even the approaches were not being observed. Declaring this strategy came along the Democrats victory the U.S Parliamentary election. While the U.S had to admit defeat in Iraq, the Baker-Hamilton plan was a help for neoconservatives. James A.Baker and lee.H.Hamilton, the joint heads of the study group of Democrat and Republican parties write in the report called Iraq study group: "there is no magic way to solve Iraq problems. Many American are not satisfied with the situation in Iraq and our current discussion about Iraq. Our political leaders have to adopt a two party policy to reach a reasonable conclusion about what turned Iraq war to a rusty battle, no one could guarantee that the current actions in Iraq can put an end to ethnic conflicts, increasing violence and the country’s move toward chaos. If this view continue to exit, the possible consequences would be dangerous. The situation in Iraq is dangerous. There is no way that guarantees success. But the outlook could improve. "our most important suggestion is to take new and advanced political and diplomatic action in Iraq and the region as well as change in the priority of American military forces in Iraq in order to enable the U.S to take its forces out of Iraq. The challenges in Iraq are complex. The extent of this violence is expanding with regard to Iran and syria’s ability to affect developments in Iraq and their interests in avoiding chaos in Iraq, the U.S has to try to make them interact constructively. In an attempt to impact both country behaviors, the U.S could make use of incentives or prevents at hand”. "Iran must make use of its influence on shii groups and improve national reconciliation in them. At the same time that the U.S expands its approach toward Iraq and the Middle East, additional political, economic and military supports should be provided for Afghanistan. This includes resources which would be available by military forces exiting Iraq. Obviously, Iraq needs to American aids, particularly security aids. However, America has to make it clear for Iraqi government that Washington is able to realize its plans including changing the arrangement of the forces even if the Baghdad government could not implement the pre-determined changes. The U.S should not provide endless commitment for Iraqis and should keep many of its forces in Iraq”. "many Iraqis turn to ethnic identities. Insecurity has overcome economic developments. Most countries in the region do not play a constructive role in supporting Iraqi government and some of them are the cause are instability. Iraq is crucially important for regional and even global stability. Iraq owns the second biggest oil resources in the world”.


The Baker-Hamilton report has also focused on negotiations with the Islamic Republic and writes: entering into negotiations with Iran especially with regard to its relations with the U.S is problematic. However, the U.S and Iran cooperated in the issue of Afghanistan and the two countries should see whether this model is applicable for Iraq. Although Iran prefers to see America’s captivity in Iraq, it does not want the failure of American policy to occur in a way that leads to chaos and decomposition of Iraq. Iran could make use of its influence especially among Shii groups to support national unity in this country. It could also help
reconstruct Iraq’s economy (Amir, Abdollahian, 2007, 76). The Iraqis officials feel several problems facing their occupied country including continuation of insecurities, death and injury of more than one million Iraqis, remaining 2.5 new displaced and immigrants, lack of healthy water and medical equipments, severe lack of fuel and power, increasing unemployment, the failure of political security plans of the U.S, the slow procedure of instructing the army and the police and many other cases. Under these condition by considering the problems facing Iraqi elected government and the people of the country and sustaining the policy of helping Iraqi government and people, the issue of Tehran-Washington negotiations was presented and realized for the following reasons: the Baker-Hamilton report and the trilateral negotiations between Tehran-Baghdad and Washington in Iraq provide the opportunity for enumerating and reviewing the Americas’ mistakes in Iraq America’s committed several strategic mistakes In Iraq which included the image of a warm welcome for the troops (due to peoples weariness of Saddam’s tyranny), not recognizing the influence of religious authorities, appointing General Garner as a military governor, the scam of torture in Abu-Gharaib prison and various failing security political, etc plans. 2.strategy of exit through signing a security deal the unsuccessful experience of the U.S and its allies during the period of occupying Iraq in different areas of government creation security , democracy making, reconstruction, etc. led to an obvious defeat for conservatives and neocons and made the U.S to redefine the strategy of honorable exit. The security deal was signed with the aim of sustaining America’s soft presence in Iraq and exit of American militans. Though at first America tried to sign the deal without complying with the exit schedule, by Iraqi political, religious leaders insisting it was made to admit the schedule. Thomas Barent considers the America’s national security strategy as lacking a comprehensive design and an ”exit strategy” besides approving the American Middle East policy in Iraq’s regime change and occupation (Barnet, 2003, 32). George Bush , the president of the U.S and Nuri-Al-Maleki, Iraqi president signed the long-term cooperation agreement between the two countries called strategic framework in November 2007, in which the security deal was predicted to be signed between Washington and Baghdad . The national parliament of Iraq signed the security deal after long discussion and improvement of the text with 144 positive votes of total 198 representatives and 35 negative votes in November, 27, 2008. The Iraqi officials had no other options but to accept the deal due to Americas' threats and pressure and the realities they included a date for a referendum in the in the deal which was not accepted by the U.S at first. The white House which was in the last days of Bush’s presidency contended to the status quo and signing the deal hoping to conservatives re-election and presenting a successful picture of Iraq’s case, and postponed further steps to the future. The U.S is now following the policy of changing the form in Iraq to set the ground for its presence by bringing figures close to itself. A source in Iraq’s Ministry of defence through an interview with the news website ”Nahrain net” in april, 2009 revealed that a dangerous plan to fire shii officers out of the Ministry of Defence in Iraq and returning Baesis by American advisors is in progress and by now 186 shia officers have been fired, retired or depose from their positions for various excuses and some discarded Baesi forces have been replaced.

Conclusion
Most American realists such as ”Robert Art” opposed invasion to Iraq. They regarded the benefits of establishing democracy in the Middle East as unimportant at best, since they believed that a government which truly represents Iraqies feelings would behave friendly toward the U.S More than three scientists many of which are among prominent realisties, in order to prove the wrong actions of America in Iraq wrote in a letter in September 26, 2002:
- No One Has Presented Evidence That Shows Cooperation Between Iraq And Al-Qaeda.
- Saddam Hossein Could Not Apply His Nuclear Warhead Even If He Owned Any, Without.
- Attempt To Conquer Iraq Could Lead To Expanding Instability In The Middle East And Endangering The U.S Interests.
- Attempt To Conquer Iraq Could Lead To Expanding Instability In The Middle East And Endangering The U.S Interests.
Even If The U.S Wins, It Would Not Have An Acceptable Strategy To Exit Iraq, Because American Society Suffers From A Deep Fraction.

America Has No Other Options But To Occupy And Manage Iraq For Several Years To Create A Successful Government In That Country.

Al-Qaeda Is A Greater Threat Than Iraq For The U.S And A War Against Iraq Would Decrease Americas' Ability To Fight With A-Qaeda Due To Escalated Anti-American Sentiments And Diverted Resources. The Iraqi government with Maleki as the prime Minister has attempted to end occupation of Iraq with less costs and no trace of a colonial agreement remains between the two countries. But, the plan of Iraqi-American security deal in line with the imperialistic American policy in the Middle East not only puts Iraq under Americas' direct influence, but also overlaps other objectives of America. America’s behavior indicates that its forces want to stay in Iraq for a long time. Fukuyama says: the historical experience shows that wherever in the world in which government creation have been efficient like Germany, Japan and South Korea, the American army troops remained there at least for two generations. On the contrary, in countries where the U.S military forces stayed less than 5 years, America’s intervention has not been positive at all and it has been damaging. Haeiti is an example. Adams Erly, the American Embassay spokesman in Baghdad emphasized that the U.S will stay for a thousand years in Iraq.
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