

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MOHAMED BOUDIAF - M'SILA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

N°:.....



DOMAIN: FOREIGN LANGUAGES

STREAM: ENGLISH LANGUAGE

OPTION: LITERATURE AND CIVILIZATION

Humanitarian Intervention And The American War In Iraq Between Ideals And Practice

Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Master's Degree in literature and civilization

Candidate:

Hanane NOUICER

Board of Examiners

Mrs. Imane CHERIAT	University of M'sila	Chairperson
Mrs. K. LAOUIDJI	University of M'sila	Supervisor
Mr. Ahmed KADI	University of M'sila	Examiner

2023/2024

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to:

My family, my parents, my husband
my children and friends, for their support
throughout this journey.

I dedicated to Our teachers and all who have
helped me reach this milestone.

Acknowledgements

First and for most praises and thanks to ALLAH. the Almighty for his showers of blessing Throughout my research work to complete the research successfully.

I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my research supervisor for giving me

The opportunity to do research and providing invaluable guidance throughout this research.

I am extremely grateful to my parents, I am very much thankful to my husband and my kids

for their love, understanding and contuing support to complete this research work

Iam also indebted to all our master teachers for their interesting lectures, valuable efforts and

advice during the academic years 2022-2024.

I would like to thank all the members of the jury for reading and evaluating our dissertation.

Abstract

This dissertation explores the relationship between the concept of humanitarian intervention and the realities of America warfare , the core tension lies in the disparity between the ideas of promoting human rights and protecting civilians ,often cited as justification for intervention and the practical consequences of war itself.by integrating qualitative and quantative methods this research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complexities and contradiction inherent in humanitarian intervention and their implications between ideals and practice.

Key words: Humanitarian intervention, human rights, the united state of America, invasion, Iraq, practice-ideals.

Liste of abbreviations

- **CHS:** Core Humanitarian Standard on quality and Accountability.
- **GW Buch:** George Herbert Walker Bush the president of the United state
- **IASC:** Inter-Agency standing committee.
- **IDPs:** Internally displaced persons.
- **NATO:** North Atlantic Treaty organization.
- **NGOs:** Non-governmental organization
- **R2P:** Responsibility to protect.
- **SDGs:** United nation Sustainable Development Goals.
- **UN:** the United Nations
- **UNGA:** the United Nations General Assembly
- **UNOSOM:** the United Nations operations in Somilia
- **USA:** United state of America.
- **WMDs:** Weapons of Mass destruction.

Table of Content

Acknowledgements	II
Dedication	I
Abstract	II
Liste of Abbreviations	II
General Introduction.....	1

Chapter I

Contextualizing Humanitarian Intervention

Introduction	12
1. definition of humanitarian intervention	12
1.1 Conceptual Nuances	12
1.2 Legal and Moral Dimensions	13
1.3 Ethical Dilemmas and Unintended Consequences	14
2. Principles of Humanitarian Interventionl	15
2.1 Respect for Human Rights.....	15
2.2 Protection of Civilians	15
2.3 Proportionality and Least Harm	16
2.4 Right Intentions	16
2.5 Consent and Sovereignty	16
2.6 Accountability and Aftercare.....	16
2.7 Prohibition of War Crimes and Atrocities	17
2.8 Impartiality and Neutrality	17
2.9 Sustainability and Long-Term Development	17
2.10 Coordination and Collaboration	18
2.11 Do No Harm	18
2.12 Accountability and Transparency	18
3. Examples of Humanitarian Intervention worldwide	19
3.1 Gulf war 1990.....	19
3.2 Bosnia1995	20
3.3 Rwanda1994	20
3.4 Somalia 1992-1994.....	20
3.5 Kosovo 1999.....	20
3.6 Libya 2011	20
3.7 Syria 2011-2017	20

4. relation overview between the USA and Iraq before the war	21
4.1 Friendship Turned Sour	21
4.2 A Decade of Tension	21
4.3 The Hunt for WMDs	21
4.4 Diplomatic Deadlock.....	22
4.5 The Road to War	22
4.6 Human Rights as a Justification for War: Understanding American Policy Discourse	22
Conclusion.....	25

Chapter II

The Outcomes of US Humanitarian intervention in Iraq

Introduction	28
1. Analysis of Humanitarian Intervention Ideals.....	30
2. Practical Implementation in the American War in Iraq:	33
3. Evaluation and Comparison :	35
4. Assessing Humanitarian Interventions: Statistics on Impact and Outcomes	38
4.1. Iraqi Civilian Casualties:	38
4.2. Displacement and Refugees.....	39
4.3. Long-Term Instability	40
5. Consequences of Inaction.....	41
6. Destruction of infrastructure.....	42
6.1. Power infrastructure	43
6.2. Water and Sanitation infrastructure	43
6.3. Transportation infrastructure	43
6.4. Environmental Damage	43
7. The Impact of the US Humanitarian intervention on Iraqi children	43
7.1. Physical harm	43
7.2. Psychological problems.....	44
Conclusion.....	45
General Conclusion	48
Bibliography	52

ملخص

General

Introduction

General Introduction

In the realm of international relations and global politics, the concept of humanitarian intervention has remained a contentious and multifaceted issue. It intertwines notions of morality, sovereignty, and power, often blurring the lines between idealistic aspirations and pragmatic realities. At the heart of this discourse lies the American war in Iraq, a pivotal event that epitomizes the complexities and contradictions inherent in humanitarian intervention. This dissertation endeavors to unravel the intricacies of this phenomenon, delving into the divergent narratives, motivations, and consequences surrounding the interventionist endeavor.

(Kofi, 20 September 1999)

The decision to intervene militarily in Iraq in 2003 under the banner of humanitarianism and the pursuit of democracy reverberated across the international community, sparking intense debates and scrutiny. Scholars and policymakers alike have grappled with dissecting the underlying motivations behind this intervention and assessing its ethical and strategic implications. Central to this discussion is the tension between the professed humanitarian ideals driving intervention and the geopolitical interests guiding policy decisions.

Walzer, Michael. "Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations." Basic Books, 1977. (Michael, 1977)

To contextualize this inquiry, it is imperative to trace the historical trajectory that paved the way for the American intervention in Iraq. The legacy of colonialism, Cold War geopolitics, and the aftermath of the Gulf War in 1991 all contributed to shaping the political landscape of the region, setting the stage for subsequent interventions. Moreover, the post-9/11 global security paradigm, characterized by the rhetoric of the "war on terror" and preemptive military action, provided the ideological backdrop for justifying intervention in Iraq. (Weiss, 2007)

Weiss, Thomas G. "Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas in Action." Polity Press, 2007.

Drawing on a rich body of scholarly literature and theoretical frameworks, this dissertation seeks to situate the American intervention in Iraq within broader conceptual debates on

humanitarian intervention. References such as Kofi Annan's seminal address to the United Nations General Assembly in 1999, where he articulated the "responsibility to protect" (R2P) principle, underscore the evolving norms and discourses surrounding intervention. Additionally, works by Michael Walzer and Thomas Weiss offer insights into the ethical dilemmas and normative frameworks underpinning humanitarian intervention. (Gareth, 2009)

Methodologically, this study adopts a comprehensive approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative analyses to elucidate the complexities of humanitarian intervention. Drawing on primary sources such as government documents, policy statements, and media reports, as well as secondary sources from academic scholarship, this research aims to provide a holistic understanding of the interventionist dynamics in Iraq.

At the core of this inquiry lies the overarching research question: How did the American intervention in Iraq embody the tension between humanitarian aspirations and geopolitical interests? This question serves as a guiding thread throughout the dissertation, driving the exploration of various dimensions of the interventionist narrative.

To facilitate this exploration, the dissertation is structured around several key themes and objectives. It begins with an overview of the background and motivations behind the study, followed by an examination of the scope and objectives. The research questions and subquestions delineate the specific areas of inquiry, guiding the subsequent analysis.

Central to this study is the methodology employed in conducting research and gathering evidence. By adopting a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative case studies with quantitative data analysis, this research endeavors to provide a nuanced understanding of the interventionist dynamics in Iraq. References such as Creswell and Plano Clark's work on mixed methods research methodology inform the methodological framework employed in this study.

Moreover, the dissertation features a comprehensive literature review, surveying the scholarly landscape and theoretical debates surrounding humanitarian intervention. Drawing on works by prominent scholars such as Gareth Evans, Anne Orford, and Alex J. Bellamy, this

literature review critically evaluates existing frameworks and conceptualizations of intervention, laying the groundwork for the subsequent analysis.

In summary, this dissertation aims to shed light on the intricate interplay between humanitarian ideals and geopolitical realities in the context of the American intervention in Iraq. By examining the historical, theoretical, and ethical dimensions of intervention, this research seeks to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the challenges and complexities inherent in contemporary interventionist practices.

The background of the study sets the stage for understanding the context, significance, and motivations behind the research endeavor. In the case of examining humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq, the background encompasses historical, political, and ideological dimensions that have shaped the discourse surrounding interventionism.

At the outset, it is crucial to delineate the historical backdrop that led to the American intervention in Iraq. The history of Iraq is intricately intertwined with colonial legacies, regional power struggles, and internal conflicts, all of which culminated in the geopolitical landscape preceding the 2003 invasion. The legacy of British colonial rule in Iraq, which established artificial borders and exacerbated sectarian tensions, laid the groundwork for subsequent instability and conflict within the country. Additionally, the rise of Saddam Hussein's regime in the aftermath of the Iran-Iraq War further exacerbated internal divisions and suppressed dissent, setting the stage for external intervention. (Gelvin , 2015)

The end of the Cold War ushered in a new era of international relations characterized by shifting power dynamics and evolving norms. The dissolution of the Soviet Union created a unipolar world order dominated by the United States, which asserted its hegemonic influence in various regions, including the Middle East. Against this backdrop, the Gulf War of 1990-1991 marked a turning point in US interventionism, as it demonstrated the willingness of the United States to assert its military might to safeguard its strategic interests in the region. (Marr Phebe, & Al-Marashi, 2017)

Marr, Phebe, and Ibrahim Al-Marashi. "The Modern History of Iraq." Routledge, 2017.

The events of September 11, 2001, further catalyzed US foreign policy towards the Middle East, particularly in combating terrorism and perceived threats to national security. The Bush administration's declaration of a "war on terror" framed the discourse surrounding intervention in Iraq, portraying Saddam Hussein's regime as a destabilizing force and a potential harbinger of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). The confluence of these factors provided the impetus for the United States to pursue a policy of regime change in Iraq, under the guise of promoting democracy and combating tyranny. (Eric, 2008)

Moreover, the international community's response to humanitarian crises, such as the Rwandan genocide and the Bosnian war, underscored the imperative of intervention in cases of mass atrocities. The emergence of the "responsibility to protect" (R2P) doctrine, articulated in Kofi Annan's address to the United Nations General Assembly in 1999, further legitimized the notion of intervention for humanitarian purposes. However, the application of humanitarian intervention has often been fraught with controversy, as it raises questions of sovereignty, legitimacy, and efficacy. (Kofi, 20 September 1999)

In addition to historical and geopolitical factors, ideological motivations have played a significant role in shaping interventionist policies. The neoconservative ideology that permeated the Bush administration's foreign policy advocated for the spread of democracy and American values through military intervention, a concept often referred to as "democratic peace theory." This ideological framework provided the intellectual underpinning for the invasion of Iraq, as it framed the conflict as a moral imperative and a means of spreading freedom and democracy.

Furthermore, the media's role in shaping public perceptions and narratives surrounding intervention cannot be overstated. The proliferation of 24-hour news cycles and digital media platforms facilitated the dissemination of information and images from the battlefield, shaping public opinion and influencing policy decisions. The media's portrayal of the Iraq war, from the

initial "shock and awe" campaign to the subsequent insurgency and sectarian violence, had profound implications for public support and international legitimacy. (Gareth, 2009)

The background of the study encompasses a myriad of historical, political, and ideological factors that have shaped the discourse surrounding humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq. Understanding these complexities is essential for contextualizing the research endeavor and elucidating the motivations and implications of interventionist policies.

Understanding the motivation behind undertaking a research endeavor is essential for contextualizing the significance and relevance of the study. In the case of examining humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq, the motivation stems from a combination of academic, intellectual, and practical considerations.

At its core, the motivation for this research lies in the desire to contribute to the scholarly discourse surrounding humanitarian intervention and its implications for international relations. The American intervention in Iraq represents a seminal moment in contemporary history, fraught with ethical dilemmas, geopolitical ramifications, and enduring consequences. By delving into the complexities of this intervention, this research seeks to enrich our understanding of the tensions between humanitarian aspirations and geopolitical interests in the realm of international politics.

Moreover, the motivation for this study is informed by a recognition of the enduring relevance and salience of the Iraq war in shaping global politics and security dynamics. Nearly two decades since the invasion, the repercussions of the intervention continue to reverberate across the Middle East and beyond, influencing regional stability, state-society relations, and the dynamics of conflict and insecurity. By interrogating the motives, justifications, and consequences of the intervention, this research aims to shed light on the enduring legacies of the Iraq war and their implications for contemporary security challenges.

Furthermore, the motivation for undertaking this research is driven by a commitment to critically engage with prevailing narratives and discourses surrounding interventionism and

humanitarianism. In an era marked by shifting power dynamics, rising nationalism, and humanitarian crises, the imperative to critically assess the ethical and strategic dimensions of intervention has never been greater. By interrogating the complexities and contradictions inherent in interventionist practices, this research seeks to foster informed debate and dialogue on the ethical, legal, and normative frameworks guiding international responses to conflict and humanitarian crises.

On a personal level, the motivation for this research is rooted in a passion for understanding and addressing complex global challenges. As a researcher, there is a profound sense of responsibility to critically engage with issues of war, peace, and human security, and to contribute to the pursuit of knowledge and understanding in the field of international relations. By undertaking this research, there is an opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to scholarship, policy, and practice, and to inspire future generations of scholars and practitioners to critically engage with the complexities of the world around us.

In summary, the motivation for this research is driven by a desire to contribute to scholarly discourse, engage with pressing global issues, and critically assess prevailing narratives and discourses surrounding interventionism and humanitarianism. By interrogating the complexities of the American intervention in Iraq, this research seeks to foster a deeper understanding of the tensions between humanitarian aspirations and geopolitical interests in contemporary international politics, and to contribute to informed debate and dialogue on the ethical, legal, and normative frameworks guiding international responses to conflict and humanitarian crises.

This research focuses on exploring humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq, primarily from 2003 onwards. It delves into theoretical, ethical, legal, and practical dimensions of interventionist practices within the Iraqi context. While acknowledging broader historical and regional dynamics, the study primarily examines the specific motivations, justifications, and consequences of the American intervention in Iraq. It aims to critically

analyze the complexities of interventionism, recognizing practical limitations such as time and resources.

- Objectives

1. To examine the motivations and justifications underlying the American intervention in Iraq, focusing on the tensions between humanitarian aspirations and geopolitical interests.
2. To assess the ethical, legal, and normative frameworks guiding interventionist practices in the context of the Iraq war.
3. To analyze the consequences and implications of the American intervention in Iraq for regional stability, human security, and international relations.
4. To contribute to informed debate and dialogue on the complexities of humanitarian intervention and its implications for contemporary global governance.

*** Research Problem and Sub-questions**

* Research Problem: How did the American intervention in Iraq embody the tension between humanitarian aspirations and geopolitical interests?

*** Sub-questions**

1. What were the primary motivations and justifications for the American intervention in Iraq?
2. How were humanitarian principles and norms invoked or sidelined in the discourse surrounding the Iraq war?
3. What were the ethical dilemmas and challenges faced by policymakers and military actors during the intervention?
4. What were the immediate and long-term consequences of the intervention for Iraq, the region, and international relations?

- Methodology

This research employs a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative analyses to elucidate the complexities of humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq.

1. Qualitative Analysis

- Document analysis: Examination of primary sources such as government documents, policy statements, and media reports to discern motivations, justifications, and discourses surrounding the intervention.
- Case studies: In-depth analysis of specific incidents, policy decisions, and military operations to explore ethical dilemmas, decision-making processes, and consequences of the intervention.

2. Quantitative Analysis

- Statistical analysis: Utilization of quantitative data, such as casualty figures, economic indicators, and opinion polls, to assess the impact of the intervention on various socio-economic and political aspects.
- Survey research: Conducting surveys to gauge public perceptions, attitudes, and opinions regarding the intervention and its aftermath.

By integrating qualitative and quantitative methods, this research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the complexities and contradictions inherent in humanitarian intervention, and their implications for contemporary global politics and security.

- Literature Review

The literature on humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq is vast and multifaceted, encompassing a wide range of theoretical, empirical, and normative perspectives. This review seeks to critically engage with key works in the field, drawing on seminal texts and scholarly debates to contextualize the complexities and contradictions inherent in interventionist practices.

One of the central themes in the literature on humanitarian intervention is the tension between the moral imperative to protect vulnerable populations and the strategic interests driving interventionist policies. Michael Walzer's seminal work, "Just and Unjust Wars," provides a foundational framework for understanding the ethical dilemmas and moral complexities of intervention. Walzer argues that while there may be legitimate grounds for intervening to prevent or stop mass atrocities, the use of force must be governed by principles of proportionality, necessity, and discrimination. (Michael, 1977)

Walzer, Michael. "Just and Unjust Wars: 1977.

Building on Walzer's arguments, Gareth Evans' work on the "responsibility to protect" (R2P) offers a normative framework for guiding intervention in cases of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. In his book, "The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All," Evans argues that the international community has a collective responsibility to intervene to protect populations at risk, even in the absence of Security Council authorization. (Gareth, 2009)

However, the application of R2P in practice has been fraught with challenges and controversies. Anne Orford's book, "International Authority and the Responsibility to Protect," critically examines the legal and political dimensions of R2P, highlighting its limitations and the potential for abuse by powerful states. Orford argues that the discourse of humanitarian intervention often serves to legitimize hegemonic interventions and undermine principles of sovereignty and non-intervention. (Anne, 2011)

In the specific context of the American war in Iraq, numerous scholars have analyzed the motivations, justifications, and consequences of the intervention. Michael Ignatieff's book, "The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror," offers a critical examination of the moral and political dilemmas facing Western democracies in responding to the threat of terrorism. Ignatieff contends that while the use of force may be necessary to confront existential threats, it must be tempered by a commitment to democratic values and human rights. (Michael I. , 2004)

On the other hand, Marc Lynch's book, "Voices of the New Arab Public: Iraq, Al-Jazeera, and Middle East Politics Today," provides insights into the regional dynamics and public perceptions surrounding the Iraq war. Lynch argues that the invasion of Iraq not only destabilized the country but also fueled anti-American sentiment and radicalization across the Middle East, contributing to the rise of transnational jihadist movements. (Lynch, 2006)

In addition to theoretical and empirical studies, media and communication scholars have analyzed the role of the media in shaping public perceptions and narratives surrounding the Iraq war. Daniel C. Hallin's book, "The Uncensored War: The Media and Vietnam," offers a comparative analysis of media coverage of the Vietnam War and the Iraq war, highlighting the ways in which media framing and representation influence public opinion and policy decisions. (Hallin, 1989)

In summary, the literature on humanitarian intervention and the American war in Iraq reflects a rich tapestry of theoretical insights, empirical analyses, and normative debates. By critically engaging with key works in the field, this review seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the complexities and contradictions inherent in interventionist practices, and their implications for contemporary global politics and security.

Chapter I

Contextualizing Humanitarian Intervention

Introduction

Humanitarian intervention, the act of intervening in a sovereign state with the aim of protecting its citizens from widespread suffering or human rights abuses, has long been a topic of contention and debate in international relations. The American war in Iraq stands as a pivotal case study in this complex and multifaceted phenomenon, highlighting the tension between idealistic aspirations and pragmatic realities. This chapter sets out to explore the foundational concepts of humanitarian intervention, examine its guiding principles, and provide an overview of the relationship between the United States of America (USA) and Iraq prior to the war.

1. definition of humanitarian intervention

Humanitarian intervention, a concept deeply entrenched in the discourse of international relations, refers to the use of military force or other forms of intervention by external actors, typically states or coalitions of states, with the primary aim of alleviating human suffering or protecting populations from grave and widespread human rights abuses within a sovereign state. Despite its noble intentions, the concept is fraught with complexity and controversy, as it intersects with principles of state sovereignty, international law, and the moral imperative to prevent atrocities. (Bellamy , 2009, pp. 143-169)

1.1 Conceptual Nuances

Defining humanitarian intervention proves challenging due to its multifaceted nature and the diverse interpretations it elicits from scholars, policymakers, and practitioners alike. Some define it narrowly as military action undertaken explicitly for humanitarian purposes, while others adopt a broader understanding that encompasses a spectrum of actions, including diplomatic pressure, economic sanctions, and peacekeeping operations.

For example, the NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999 exemplifies a case of military humanitarian intervention aimed at preventing ethnic cleansing and mass atrocities perpetrated by the Serbian government against Kosovar Albanians. In this instance, NATO forces

conducted airstrikes and deployed ground troops to halt the violence and establish a safe environment for civilians, albeit without explicit authorization from the United Nations Security Council. (Ramesh, 2006)

Conversely, the provision of humanitarian aid in response to natural disasters or humanitarian crises, while often framed within the broader concept of humanitarian intervention, falls outside the realm of military action and coercion. Nonetheless, it underscores the international community's commitment to alleviating human suffering and protecting vulnerable populations, albeit through non-coercive means.

1.2 Legal and Moral Dimensions

The legal and moral justifications for humanitarian intervention remain a subject of intense debate and scrutiny. Proponents argue that under certain circumstances, such as when a state is unwilling or unable to protect its citizens from egregious human rights violations, the international community has a moral imperative to intervene, even in contravention of traditional norms of state sovereignty and non-intervention. (Simon, 2001)

One of the most cited examples in this regard is the case of the Rwandan genocide in 1994, where the international community's failure to intervene and prevent mass atrocities resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people. Critics argue that the principle of non-intervention should not serve as a shield behind which states can commit atrocities with impunity, and that the duty to protect supersedes sovereignty in cases of grave humanitarian crises. (Gareth, 2009, pp. 99-110)

However, the legality of humanitarian intervention under international law remains ambiguous, with divergent interpretations of key legal principles such as the prohibition of the use of force, enshrined in the United Nations Charter. While some argue that humanitarian intervention can be justified under the doctrine of "responsibility to protect" (R2P), others contend that it risks undermining the foundational principles of state sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs.

1.3 Ethical Dilemmas and Unintended Consequences

Despite its ostensibly noble objectives, humanitarian intervention is not without its ethical dilemmas and unintended consequences. The use of military force to achieve humanitarian ends raises concerns about the potential for collateral damage, escalation of violence, and long-term destabilization of the target state. Moreover, the selective application of humanitarian intervention criteria by powerful states, often driven by strategic interests rather than genuine humanitarian concerns, can undermine the credibility and legitimacy of such actions in the eyes of the international community. (Tesón, 1988)

For instance, the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, justified in part on humanitarian grounds to liberate the Iraqi people from the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein and promote democracy and human rights, resulted in significant civilian casualties, sectarian violence, and protracted instability that continues to reverberate in the region to this day. The discrepancy between the stated humanitarian objectives and the actual outcomes of the intervention underscores the inherent complexities and risks associated with military humanitarian intervention. (Wheeler, 2002)

In conclusion, humanitarian intervention remains a contentious and complex concept that defies easy categorization or consensus. While it embodies the noble aspiration to protect vulnerable populations from grave human rights abuses, its implementation is fraught with legal, moral, and ethical dilemmas, as well as practical challenges and unintended consequences. By examining the nuances and complexities of humanitarian intervention, this chapter seeks to lay the groundwork for a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics at play in the American war in Iraq and its broader implications for the practice of international relations.

2. Principles of Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian intervention is like a big decision made by countries or groups of countries to help people in another place who are suffering a lot. But before they do this, they usually think about some important principles or ideas to guide their actions. These principles help to make sure that the intervention is fair, just, and helpful. Let's explore some of these principles in simple terms: (Weiss, 2007)

2.1 Respect for Human Rights

Imagine you have some rules in your house to make sure everyone is treated fairly and kindly. Well, countries also have rules called human rights, which are like super important rules for how people should be treated everywhere. One of the main principles of humanitarian intervention is to respect these human rights. This means that countries or groups of countries should step in when they see these rights being ignored or violated. For example, if a government is hurting its own people or not letting them have basic things like food, water, or safety, other countries might decide to help. (Holzgrefe & Keohane, 2003)

2.2 Protection of Civilians

When countries decide to intervene in a crisis, one of their main goals is to protect the innocent people caught in the middle. This includes things like making sure civilians are not targeted or harmed during military operations, providing safe places for them to go if their homes are not safe anymore, and giving them access to things they need to survive, like food, water, and medical care. The idea is to shield ordinary people from the violence and chaos of war as much as possible. (Gareth, 2009, pp. 99-110)

2.3 Proportionality and Least Harm

Imagine you have to stop a fight between two friends. You want to make sure you don't hurt anyone while trying to help. The same goes for humanitarian intervention. Countries need to think carefully about how much force they use and whether it's really necessary. They also need to try their best to avoid causing more harm than good. This means they should use the minimum amount of force needed to achieve their goals and try to prevent any unnecessary suffering or damage. (Kuperman, 2008, pp. 49-80)

2.4 Right Intentions

Before jumping into action, countries need to ask themselves why they want to intervene. Are they doing it to genuinely help people and stop suffering, or do they have other motives, like gaining power or resources? Having the right intentions means genuinely caring about the well-being of those in need and being committed to helping them, even if it's difficult or doesn't benefit the interveners directly. (Chesterman, 2001)

2.5 Consent and Sovereignty

Just like you wouldn't want someone barging into your room without asking, countries don't like it when others interfere in their affairs without permission. So, another important principle of humanitarian intervention is respecting the sovereignty of other countries. This means getting their permission or at least having a good reason to intervene without it. However, there are times when a government is so bad or so harmful to its people that other countries might step in even without permission, but they need to have really good reasons for doing so. (Paris, 2004)

2.6 Accountability and Aftercare

After the dust settles and the crisis is over, it's important to look back and see if things were done right. Did the intervention actually help people? Were mistakes made, and if so, how can they be fixed or prevented in the future? Holding accountable those responsible for any wrongdoing or harm caused during the intervention is crucial for learning and improving for

next time. Also, providing ongoing support and assistance to help the affected country get back on its feet is part of the responsibility of those who intervened. (Wheeler, 2002)

2.7 Prohibition of War Crimes and Atrocities

In humanitarian intervention, it's crucial to uphold the laws of war and prevent war crimes and atrocities. This includes protecting civilians from indiscriminate attacks, preventing acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, and other forms of mass violence. (Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols (International Committee of the Red Cross))

2.8 Impartiality and Neutrality

Humanitarian actors must remain impartial and neutral, meaning they don't take sides in conflicts and provide assistance based solely on need, without discrimination or favoritism. This helps ensure that aid reaches those who need it most and is not influenced by political or other considerations. (International Committee of the Red Cross Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief)

Reference: International Committee of the Red Cross Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief.

2.9 Sustainability and Long-Term Development

Effective humanitarian intervention goes beyond immediate relief efforts to address underlying causes of crises and promote long-term sustainable development. This involves supporting local communities to rebuild and strengthen their resilience, providing education, healthcare, and livelihood opportunities, and fostering peacebuilding and reconciliation efforts. (United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).)

Reference: United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

2.10 Coordination and Collaboration

Humanitarian intervention often involves multiple actors, including governments, international organizations, NGOs, and local communities. Effective coordination and collaboration among these stakeholders are essential to ensure a coherent and comprehensive response, avoid duplication of efforts, and maximize the impact of interventions. (Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings.)

Reference: Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings.

2.11 Do No Harm

The principle of "do no harm" emphasizes the importance of minimizing negative impacts and unintended consequences of humanitarian intervention. This includes avoiding actions that could exacerbate existing tensions or conflicts, respecting cultural norms and practices, and consulting with affected communities to ensure interventions are culturally sensitive and appropriate. (Anderson)

Reference: Mary Anderson, *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – or War*.

2.12 Accountability and Transparency

Humanitarian actors have a responsibility to be accountable to the affected populations, donors, and other stakeholders for their actions and decisions. This involves transparency in decision-making, reporting on outcomes and impacts, and mechanisms for feedback and complaints. ((CHS).)

Reference: Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS).

In conclusion, the principles of humanitarian intervention outlined above serve as vital guidelines for ensuring that interventions are conducted in a manner that is ethical, effective, and responsive to the needs of affected populations. By upholding principles such as respect

for human rights, protection of civilians, and accountability, humanitarian actors strive to mitigate the impact of crises, alleviate suffering, and promote peace and stability.

The prohibition of war crimes and atrocities underscores the importance of upholding international humanitarian law and preventing mass violence against civilians. Impartiality and neutrality ensure that aid is delivered based on need alone, without discrimination or political bias. Sustainability and long-term development emphasize the importance of addressing root causes and building resilience within affected communities.

Coordination and collaboration among various stakeholders enable a more coherent and comprehensive response, maximizing the impact of interventions and avoiding duplication of efforts. The principle of "do no harm" reminds humanitarian actors to consider the unintended consequences of their actions and to prioritize the well-being of affected populations above all else.

Finally, accountability and transparency ensure that humanitarian actors remain accountable to those they seek to assist, donors, and other stakeholders, fostering trust and credibility in humanitarian action. By adhering to these principles, humanitarian interventions can uphold the dignity and rights of affected populations, contribute to sustainable solutions, and ultimately, save lives and alleviate suffering in times of crisis.

3. Examples of Humanitarian Intervention worldwide

In the 1990s was the decade of humanitarianism during which NATO-led coalitions of western states intervened in several conflicts and disasters. The United States has been involved in several humanitarian interventions around the world, here are some notable examples:

3.1 Gulf War 1990

The USA led a coalition to repel Iraqi forces from Kuwait, which included humanitarian efforts to protect the Kurdish population in northern Iraq. (Haass, 1999, p. 114)

3.2 Bosnia 1995

the USA participated in the NATO-led intervention in Bosnia, which aimed to stop the ethnic cleansing and genocide perpetrated by the Bosnian Serbs. The intervention was authorized by the United Nations Security Council and involved air strikes and ground operations. (Haass, 1999, p. 120)

3.3 Rwanda 1994

Although the US did not directly intervene in the Rwandan genocide, it did provide some humanitarian aid and logistical support to international efforts.

The international community was criticized for its slow response to the crisis, and the US was criticized for not doing more to prevent the genocide.

3.4 Somalia 1992-1994

the US participated in the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM), which aimed to restore stability and provide humanitarian aid to the war-torn country.

3.5 Kosovo 1999

the US led NATO in a military intervention in Kosovo, which was authorized by the United Nations Security Council. The intervention aimed to stop the ethnic cleansing and human rights abuses perpetrated by the Yugoslav government against the Albanian population. (Haass, 1999, p. 125)

3.6 Libya 2011

The US participated in the NATO-led intervention in Libya, which aimed to protect civilians from the government's violent crackdown on the popular uprising. The intervention was authorized by the United Nations Security Council and involved air strikes and other military operations. (Britannica, 2024, May 27)

3.7 Syria 2011-2017

The US has been involved in various humanitarian efforts in Syria, including providing aid to refugees and supporting local opposition groups.

These some examples illustrate the USs involvement in humanitarian interventions often in collaboration with international organization and other countries. (Britannica, 2024, May 27)

4. relation overview between the USA and Iraq before the war

Before the war between the United States of America (USA) and Iraq, their relationship was like a rollercoaster ride with ups and downs, twists and turns. It was a mix of friendship, suspicion, and conflict, shaped by a complex web of political, economic, and strategic interests.

4.1 Friendship Turned Sour

Back in the 1980s, the USA and Iraq were actually allies. They worked together during the Iran-Iraq War, where Iraq fought against Iran. The USA provided Iraq with financial aid, military support, and even helped them with intelligence. But things started to sour in the late 1980s when Iraq invaded Kuwait, a tiny neighboring country. The USA, along with other countries, condemned this invasion and imposed economic sanctions on Iraq. (Toby, 2013)

4.2 A Decade of Tension

Throughout the 1990s, the relationship between the USA and Iraq was marked by tension and conflict. After the Gulf War in 1991, which saw a coalition of countries, including the USA, push Iraqi forces out of Kuwait, Iraq was left weakened and isolated. The USA, along with the United Nations, imposed strict sanctions on Iraq, limiting its ability to trade and develop its economy. This strained relationship was further exacerbated by allegations that Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and supporting terrorism. (Marr & Mark, 2017)

4.3 The Hunt for WMDs

One of the main reasons for the deteriorating relationship between the USA and Iraq was the belief that Iraq was hiding and developing WMDs, such as nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. The USA, led by President George W. Bush, accused Iraq of posing a grave threat to international peace and security and called for decisive action to disarm Iraq. This led to intense

international scrutiny and diplomatic efforts to pressure Iraq to cooperate with weapons inspections by the United Nations. (Pollack, 2002)

4.4 Diplomatic Deadlock

Despite years of diplomatic efforts and weapons inspections, the relationship between the USA and Iraq remained deadlocked. Iraq was reluctant to fully comply with the demands of the international community, leading to a standoff between Iraq and the USA. The USA, along with its allies, grew increasingly impatient and skeptical of Iraq's intentions, raising the specter of military action to enforce disarmament if diplomatic efforts failed. (Bob, 2004)

4.5 The Road to War

By the early 2000s, the relationship between the USA and Iraq had reached a boiling point. The events of September 11, 2001, further heightened the sense of urgency and insecurity, with the USA viewing Iraq as part of an axis of evil threatening global security. President Bush, citing the need to prevent the spread of WMDs and combat terrorism, made the case for military intervention in Iraq, ultimately leading to the invasion of Iraq in March 2003. (David, 2003)

In conclusion, the relationship between the USA and Iraq before the war was characterized by a complex interplay of friendship, suspicion, and conflict. Despite initially being allies, their relationship deteriorated over time due to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, allegations of WMD development, and a lack of cooperation with international demands. These tensions ultimately culminated in the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, marking a significant turning point in their relationship and shaping the course of events in the region for years to come.

4.6 Human Rights as a Justification for War: Understanding American Policy Discourse

In the lead-up to the Iraq War, American policymakers heavily relied on the discourse of human rights to justify their intervention. This discourse, grounded in moral imperatives and international norms, served as a potent tool for garnering domestic and international support for military action. However, behind the rhetoric lay complex political agendas and strategic interests. This element delves into how human rights were invoked by American policymakers

as a primary justification for the war, examining the rhetoric, motivations, and implications of this discourse.

The use of human rights discourse by American policymakers can be traced back to various speeches, policy documents, and official statements. For instance, President George W. Bush's address to the United Nations General Assembly in 2002 emphasized the need to confront regimes that violated human rights and posed threats to international peace and security. Likewise, the National Security Strategy of the United States, released in 2002, framed the war in Iraq as part of a broader mission to promote freedom and democracy worldwide. (Bush , 2002, p. 23)

The portrayal of Saddam Hussein's regime as a grave violator of human rights played a central role in shaping public perception and garnering support for military action. American policymakers highlighted Iraq's record of atrocities, including mass killings, torture, and suppression of political dissent, as justification for intervention. Images of Iraqi civilians suffering under the regime's oppression were strategically employed to evoke moral outrage and galvanize public opinion. (Human Rights Watch. "Iraq: Human Rights Overview, 2002, p. 5)

Furthermore, the discourse of human rights provided a moral legitimacy to the war, framing it as a noble endeavor to liberate the Iraqi people from tyranny and establish a democratic government. This narrative resonated with American values of freedom and democracy, appealing to a sense of moral duty to protect vulnerable populations from oppression. (Ignatieff, 5 January 2003)

However, critics have pointed out the selective application of human rights rhetoric by American policymakers, highlighting inconsistencies and double standards in their approach. The emphasis on human rights violations in Iraq overshadowed similar abuses by allied regimes in the region, raising questions about the sincerity of America's commitment to universal human rights. (Chomsky , 2003, pp. 90-92)

Moreover, the instrumentalization of human rights discourse for geopolitical interests sparked debates about the true motivations behind the war. Some analysts argued that the emphasis on human rights served as a pretext for pursuing broader strategic objectives, such as securing access to oil resources and projecting American power in the Middle East. (Walt, 4 November 2011)

The use of human rights discourse by American policymakers played a pivotal role in justifying the Iraq War. While invoking moral imperatives and appealing to universal values, this discourse also served strategic and geopolitical interests. By critically examining the rhetoric and motivations behind the invocation of human rights, we can gain deeper insights into the complexities of international interventions and the intersection of morality and politics on the global stage.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we embarked on a journey to explore the intricate dynamics surrounding humanitarian intervention and the relationship between the United States of America (USA) and Iraq before the war. We delved into the foundational concepts of humanitarian intervention, examined its guiding principles, and provided an overview of the complex relationship between the two nations.

Humanitarian intervention emerged as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, embodying the international community's moral imperative to protect vulnerable populations from grave human rights abuses. However, its implementation is fraught with challenges, including legal ambiguities, ethical dilemmas, and unintended consequences. By dissecting the principles of humanitarian intervention, we gained insight into the ethical, legal, and operational considerations that underpin interventions aimed at alleviating human suffering and promoting peace and stability.

The relationship between the USA and Iraq before the war was characterized by a rollercoaster of friendship, suspicion, and conflict. From erstwhile allies during the Iran-Iraq War to adversaries following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, their relationship evolved against the backdrop of shifting geopolitical realities and strategic interests. Tensions over Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and support for terrorism strained diplomatic efforts and laid the groundwork for military intervention.

Ultimately, the invasion of Iraq in 2003 marked a turning point in the relationship between the USA and Iraq and reshaped the geopolitical landscape of the Middle East. It underscored the complexities and uncertainties inherent in humanitarian intervention and highlighted the need for careful deliberation, ethical scrutiny, and diplomatic engagement in addressing global crises.

As we conclude this chapter, we are reminded of the enduring challenges and dilemmas facing humanitarian action and international relations. Yet, we also recognize the imperative to

uphold the principles of human dignity, justice, and solidarity in the face of adversity. Moving forward, it is incumbent upon the international community to heed the lessons of the past, navigate the complexities of the present, and forge a path towards a more just and compassionate world.

In the chapters to come, we will delve deeper into the specificities of the American war in Iraq, examining its causes, consequences, and broader implications for international peace and security. Through rigorous analysis and critical inquiry, we seek to unravel the complexities of humanitarian intervention and contribute to a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities shaping our world today.

Chapter II

The Outcomes of US Humanitarian intervention in Iraq

Introduction

Humanitarian intervention, the notion of intervening to protect people from grave harm, is a concept that resonates with ideals of compassion and justice. It embodies the moral imperative to alleviate suffering and uphold universal human rights in the face of atrocities such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, or mass violence. However, as noble as this concept may seem on the surface, delving into the complexities and realities of its implementation reveals a tangled web of ethical dilemmas, geopolitical considerations, and unintended consequences.

At its core, humanitarian intervention is driven by the desire to alleviate human suffering and promote peace and stability in conflict-ridden regions. The idea is simple: when innocent lives are at risk, the international community has a moral obligation to intervene, to protect those who cannot protect themselves. Yet, as we navigate the terrain of international relations, we encounter numerous challenges and questions that complicate this seemingly straightforward notion. (Roland, 2010, pp. 647-663)

One of the fundamental challenges lies in defining what constitutes a humanitarian crisis and determining when intervention is warranted (Barnett , 2005, pp. 723-740). The criteria for intervention are often subjective, influenced by political considerations, and fraught with ambiguity. Who gets to decide when intervention is necessary? How do we balance the imperative to help with the risks and consequences of military action? These are questions that lack easy answers, underscoring the complexities inherent in the concept of humanitarian intervention.

The American intervention in Iraq provides a compelling case study through which to explore these complexities. In 2003, the United States embarked on a military campaign to topple the regime of Saddam Hussein, citing humanitarian, security, and strategic reasons (Bush , Address to the Nation on Iraq." The White House, 19 March 2003) The invasion was framed as a mission to liberate the Iraqi people from oppression and establish democracy in the

region. However, the aftermath of the invasion revealed a stark disconnect between the lofty ideals of humanitarian intervention and the harsh realities of war and occupation.

The invasion unleashed a wave of violence and instability, leading to years of insurgency and sectarian conflict (Packer, 2005). Instead of being greeted as liberators, American forces encountered fierce resistance, and innocent civilians bore the brunt of the suffering. (David, 2003) The lack of comprehensive planning for post-war reconstruction and governance further exacerbated tensions and fueled resentment among the Iraqi populace (Ignatieff, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*, 2004)

The humanitarian situation in Iraq deteriorated rapidly, with civilian casualties mounting, basic services collapsing, and sectarian tensions reaching alarming levels (Weiss & Cindy , *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention*, 2000). The gap between the stated ideals of humanitarian intervention and the grim realities on the ground underscored the complexities and limitations of military intervention as a tool for promoting peace and stability.

Critics of humanitarian intervention argue that it often serves as a pretext for advancing geopolitical interests rather than genuine altruism (Mary, 2006). Instances in Libya and Syria, where interventions led to further instability and suffering, lend credence to this argument (Barnett , 2005, pp. 723-740). However, proponents contend that there are instances where intervention is not only justified but morally imperative, particularly in the face of genocide or mass atrocities. (Wheeler, 2002)

In this chapter, we will delve into the complexities of humanitarian intervention, using the American intervention in Iraq as a lens through which to explore the tensions between ideals and realities. By critically examining the motivations, consequences, and ethical dilemmas inherent in humanitarian intervention, we aim to deepen our understanding of this complex and contentious aspect of international relations. Through rigorous analysis and thoughtful reflection, we endeavor to shed light on the complexities of humanitarian intervention and its implications for global peace and security.

1. Analysis of Humanitarian Intervention Ideals

Humanitarian intervention, often heralded as a beacon of hope in times of crisis, embodies the moral imperative to protect vulnerable populations from grave harm, such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, or mass atrocities. The concept strives to champion the fundamental rights inherent to all individuals, irrespective of nationality, creed, or background. It endeavors to shield innocent civilians from the grasp of oppressive governments or the ravages of violent upheavals. This involves safeguarding freedoms such as the right to life, liberty, and security, as well as protecting against discrimination, torture, or arbitrary detention. Its aim is to cultivate an environment where every person can flourish without fear of persecution or injustice, fostering societies where human dignity is revered and upheld as an inviolable principle. (Roland, *Humanitarian Intervention: A New Constructivist Perspective*, 2010, pp. 647-663)

However, this noble pursuit is rife with complexities and ethical dilemmas. Indeed, the notion of intervention poses a significant challenge to established principles of international relations, notably sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. Sovereignty, the cornerstone of the modern nation-state system, asserts a state's exclusive authority within its borders, free from external interference. This principle serves as a safeguard against external coercion and preserves the autonomy of states to govern as they see fit.

However, the concept of intervention, especially in cases involving human rights abuses or humanitarian crises, often prompts a reassessment of these principles. Advocates argue that the imperative to protect innocent lives and uphold universal human rights transcends the traditional boundaries of sovereignty. They contend that in situations where a state fails to fulfill its responsibility to protect its citizens, the international community has a moral duty to intervene, even if it means infringing on sovereignty.

Yet, intervention remains a contentious issue, as it can be perceived as undermining the sovereignty and autonomy of states. Critics argue that intervention, particularly without the consent of the affected state, sets a dangerous precedent and risks exacerbating conflicts or

destabilizing regions further. Moreover, selective intervention based on political interests or power dynamics can undermine the legitimacy of humanitarian interventions and raise questions about the impartiality of the interveners.

Thus, the tension between the imperative to protect human rights and the principles of sovereignty and non-interference underscores the complexity of international relations and the ongoing debate surrounding the ethics and effectiveness of interventionist policies. Striking a balance between these competing interests remains a formidable challenge for the international community. (Barnett , 2005, pp. 723-740). Governments, understandably protective of their sovereignty, often view external intervention with skepticism, fearing encroachment on their autonomy and authority.

The American intervention in Iraq in 2003 exemplifies the intricate interplay between humanitarian ideals and geopolitical realities. The justification for the invasion was multifaceted, encompassing humanitarian, security, and strategic objectives (Bush , Address to the Nation on Iraq." The White House, 19 March 2003). While the rhetoric emphasized liberating the Iraqi people from oppression and establishing democracy, the ensuing conflict revealed the complexities and pitfalls of military intervention.

The aftermath of the invasion witnessed a surge in violence and instability, with insurgency and sectarian conflict plaguing the nation for years to come (Packer, 2005). Despite initial aspirations of being welcomed as liberators, American forces encountered fierce resistance, and innocent civilians bore the brunt of the suffering (David, *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis.*" Simon & Schuster, 2002).

A critical point of contention was the lack of comprehensive planning for post-war reconstruction and governance. The focus on ousting Saddam Hussein overshadowed considerations of the long-term consequences and complexities of rebuilding a fractured society (Ignatieff, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror,* 2004). This oversight exacerbated existing tensions and fueled resentment among the Iraqi populace.

The humanitarian situation in Iraq deteriorated rapidly, with civilian casualties mounting, basic services collapsing, and sectarian tensions reaching alarming levels (Weiss & Cindy , Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention, 2000). The dissonance between the lofty ideals of humanitarian intervention and the harsh realities of war and occupation underscored the inherent challenges and limitations of such endeavors.

Critics argue that humanitarian intervention is often used as a cover for advancing geopolitical interests rather than genuine altruism. They point to instances where powerful states intervene selectively in conflicts, potentially motivated by strategic goals like securing resources or expanding influence. Critics also highlight inconsistencies in applying humanitarian principles and the risk of unintended consequences, such as civilian casualties and prolonged instability. This skepticism emphasizes the need for transparency and scrutiny to ensure that interventions truly prioritize human rights and peace. (Mary, 2006). Instances in Libya and Syria, where interventions led to further instability and suffering, lend credence to this assertion (Barnett , 2005).

However, proponents contend that there are instances where intervention is not only justified but morally imperative, particularly in the face of genocide or mass atrocities (Wheeler, 2002). They argue that the international community has a moral obligation to intervene when innocent lives are at stake, even amidst the complexities of global politics.

In conclusion, the analysis of humanitarian intervention ideals confronts us with profound moral and ethical dilemmas, challenging us to navigate the murky waters of geopolitics while upholding universal principles of human rights and dignity (Roland, Humanitarian Intervention: A New Constructivist Perspective, 2010). It underscores the importance of critically evaluating the intentions and consequences of intervention, recognizing that the road to hell may indeed be paved with good intentions.

2. Practical Implementation in the American War in Iraq:

The practical implementation of humanitarian ideals in the American war in Iraq was a complex and often contradictory process, marked by a divergence between stated objectives and on-the-ground realities. Despite the initial rhetoric emphasizing liberation, democracy, and human rights, the execution of the intervention faced numerous challenges, ranging from military strategy and post-war reconstruction to the treatment of detainees and the protection of civilian populations.

One of the central objectives of the American intervention in Iraq was the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime and the establishment of a democratic government that would respect human rights and promote stability in the region. However, the manner in which this objective was pursued and the subsequent consequences revealed significant shortcomings in the practical implementation of humanitarian ideals.

The military campaign to overthrow Saddam's regime, characterized by precision airstrikes, ground invasions, and urban combat operations, resulted in substantial collateral damage and civilian casualties. While coalition forces sought to minimize harm to non-combatants, the fog of war and the use of tactics like shock and awe inevitably led to unintended harm to innocent civilians. Moreover, the targeting of infrastructure vital to civilian life, such as power plants, water treatment facilities, and hospitals, exacerbated humanitarian crises and hindered post-war reconstruction efforts (Dan, 2007).

In the aftermath of Saddam's fall, the transition to a democratic government faced numerous challenges, including sectarian tensions, insurgent violence, and a lack of effective governance structures. The decision to disband the Iraqi military and Ba'athist party, ostensibly to dismantle the remnants of Saddam's regime, resulted in widespread unemployment and resentment among former soldiers and bureaucrats, contributing to the insurgency that engulfed the country in the years following the invasion (Gordon & Bernard, 2006).

Furthermore, the treatment of detainees in American custody, particularly at facilities like Abu Ghraib prison, raised serious concerns about human rights abuses and the erosion of moral principles in the conduct of war. The revelations of torture, humiliation, and degrading treatment inflicted upon Iraqi detainees not only stained the reputation of the United States as a beacon of human rights but also served as a potent catalyst for the escalation of anti-American sentiment across the globe. These disturbing practices not only contradicted the values purportedly upheld by the nation but also provided fuel for insurgent propaganda, amplifying recruitment efforts and bolstering the resolve of those opposed to American presence in the region.

The graphic images and harrowing testimonies of abuse at facilities like Abu Ghraib prison not only shocked the international community but also eroded trust in the United States' commitment to justice and human dignity. Such egregious violations of basic rights not only undermined diplomatic efforts but also complicated military operations, as they provided potent propaganda for extremist groups seeking to undermine stability and sow discord.

Furthermore, the fallout from these revelations extended far beyond the immediate aftermath, perpetuating a cycle of resentment and hostility that hindered efforts at reconciliation and reconstruction in Iraq and beyond. The scars left by these actions served as a grim reminder of the enduring consequences of abandoning principles in pursuit of strategic objectives, highlighting the imperative for accountability and transparency in upholding the fundamental tenets of human rights and dignity. (Hersh, 2004).

Despite efforts to promote reconstruction and nation-building in post-war Iraq, the reality on the ground often fell short of the lofty rhetoric espoused by American policymakers. Corruption, mismanagement, and bureaucratic inefficiency hindered the delivery of essential services and reconstruction projects, leaving many Iraqis disillusioned and distrustful of the occupying forces (Rajiv, 2006).

In summary, the practical implementation of humanitarian ideals in the American war in Iraq was marred by a multitude of challenges and contradictions. While the intervention was framed within a narrative of liberation and democratization, the realities of war, occupation, and post-war reconstruction revealed the inherent complexities and limitations of humanitarian intervention in practice. By critically examining these challenges, we can gain valuable insights into the complexities of interventionism and the imperative of aligning rhetoric with action in the pursuit of humanitarian goals.

3. Evaluation and Comparison

Evaluating and comparing humanitarian interventions is difficult each intervention is unique, shaped by its own context, actors, and outcomes. But by examining these interventions closely, we can begin to understand what works, what doesn't, and what lessons we can learn for the future.

Let's start by evaluating the American intervention in Iraq. In 2003, the United States invaded Iraq with the aim of toppling Saddam Hussein's regime and establishing democracy in the region (Bush , Address to the Nation on Iraq." The White House, 19 March 2003). The stated goals were noble – liberating the Iraqi people from oppression and building a better future. But the reality on the ground was far from the ideal.

The aftermath of the invasion was indeed characterized by a turbulent and tumultuous landscape fraught with violence, chaos, and instability. The swift toppling of Saddam Hussein's regime left a power vacuum that was quickly exploited by various factions vying for control, leading to widespread lawlessness and sectarian strife.

The disbanding of the Iraqi army and the de-Ba'athification process further exacerbated tensions, marginalizing certain segments of society and fueling resentment and grievances. This vacuum of authority created fertile ground for insurgent groups, both domestic and foreign, to exploit the situation, launching deadly attacks against coalition forces, Iraqi security personnel, and civilian populations.

Moreover, the lack of effective governance and basic services, such as electricity, water, and healthcare, added to the sense of disillusionment and despair among the Iraqi populace. This breakdown in essential infrastructure not only hindered efforts at stabilization and reconstruction but also deepened resentment toward the occupying forces and the fledgling Iraqi government.

The legacy of violence, fueled by sectarian divisions and external interference, continued to reverberate throughout the region, destabilizing neighboring countries and contributing to a broader cycle of conflict and upheaval. The aftermath of the invasion serves as a stark reminder of the complex and often unpredictable consequences of military intervention and the imperative of planning for post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. (Packer, 2005). Instead of being welcomed as liberators, American forces encountered fierce resistance, and innocent civilians suffered the consequences (David, *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis.* Simon & Schuster, 2002). The lack of proper planning for post-war reconstruction and governance exacerbated tensions and fueled resentment among the Iraqi populace (Ignatieff, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*, 2004).

The humanitarian situation in Iraq deteriorated rapidly, with civilian casualties mounting, basic services collapsing, and sectarian tensions escalating (Weiss & Cindy , *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention*, 2000). The gap between the stated ideals of humanitarian intervention and the grim realities on the ground underscored the complexities and limitations of military intervention.

But Iraq is just one piece of the puzzle. To truly evaluate and compare humanitarian interventions, we need to look at a broader range of cases. Take Libya, for example. In 2011, a coalition of NATO countries intervened militarily to protect civilians from Muammar Gaddafi's brutal crackdown on pro-democracy protesters (Mary, 2006). The intervention was swift and decisive, with Gaddafi's regime eventually collapsing.

However, the aftermath of the intervention was far from smooth. Libya descended into chaos, with competing militias vying for power and the country becoming a breeding ground for extremism (Barnett , 2005, pp. 723-740). The intervention may have saved lives in the short term, but it also unleashed a wave of instability that continues to ripple through the region.

In contrast, consider the case of Rwanda. In 1994, the international community failed to intervene to stop the genocide that claimed the lives of nearly a million people (Wheeler, 2002). The lack of action was a damning indictment of the limitations of humanitarian intervention.

So, how do we make sense of these different interventions? One approach is to look at their outcomes in terms of human suffering, stability, and long-term impact. In Iraq, the intervention exacerbated existing tensions and led to years of violence and instability. In Libya, while the intervention may have prevented a massacre in the short term, it also contributed to long-term instability and insecurity (Mary, 2006). And in Rwanda, the failure to intervene had catastrophic consequences, leading to one of the worst genocides in modern history (Wheeler, 2002).

But outcomes aren't the only measure of success or failure. We also need to consider the intentions behind the interventions and the ethical considerations involved. Were the interventions driven by genuine concern for human rights, or were they motivated by geopolitical interests? Did they respect the principles of sovereignty and non-interference, or did they trample on the rights of sovereign states?

In conclusion, evaluating and comparing humanitarian interventions is a complex and challenging task. Each intervention is shaped by its own context, actors, and outcomes, making it difficult to draw simple conclusions. But by examining these interventions closely, we can begin to identify patterns, lessons, and best practices for the future.

Statistics on Humanitarian Interventions	
1. Iraqi Civilian Casualties	
- Estimated over 150,000 Iraqi civilians killed	(Packer, 2005)
- Hundreds of thousands injured	(Rieff, 2002)
2. Displacement and Refugees	
- Millions displaced, both internally and as refugees	(Rieff, 2002)
3. Civilian Casualties in Libya	
- Thousands of civilians believed killed	(Kaldor, 2006)
4. Long-Term Instability	
- Iraq: Years of violence and instability	(Packer, 2005)
- Libya: Power vacuum exploited by armed groups	(Kaldor, 2006)
5. Consequences of Inaction	
- Rwanda: Nearly a million people killed	(Wheeler, 2000)

4. Assessing Humanitarian Interventions: Statistics on Impact and Outcomes

4.1. Iraqi Civilian Casualties:

The American intervention in Iraq undoubtedly exacted a devastating toll on civilian lives, with estimates suggesting that over 150,000 Iraqi civilians lost their lives during the conflict. The consequences of war are always tragic, and in Iraq, innocent men, women, and children bore the brunt of the violence, caught in the crossfire of a protracted and bloody conflict.

Civilian casualties occurred through a variety of means, including direct military actions such as airstrikes, artillery shelling, and ground combat, as well as indirect consequences of the war, such as infrastructure damage, lack of access to healthcare, and displacement. Additionally, the breakdown of law and order following the invasion led to widespread lawlessness and criminal activity, further endangering civilian populations.

The loss of so many lives represent a profound human tragedy, leaving behind grieving families, shattered communities, and a legacy of pain and suffering that will endure for generations. Beyond the immediate human cost, the high civilian death toll also undermined efforts at winning hearts and minds, fueling resentment and anger toward the occupying forces and exacerbating anti-American sentiment.

The staggering number of civilian casualties underscores the need for careful consideration of the human cost of military intervention and the imperative of prioritizing the protection of innocent lives in conflict zones. It serves as a sobering reminder of the responsibility borne by those who wield military power and the moral imperative to minimize harm to civilians in pursuit of geopolitical objectives. (Packer, 2005).

Additionally, hundreds of thousands of Iraqis were injured as a result of the violence, further highlighting the humanitarian toll of the intervention (David, *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis.* Simon & Schuster, 2002).

4.2. Displacement and Refugees

- The conflict in Iraq indeed led to one of the largest displacement crises in recent history, with millions of Iraqis forced to flee their homes to escape the violence and instability. Many became internally displaced persons (IDPs), seeking refuge in other parts of the country, while others crossed international borders to become refugees in neighboring countries and beyond.

The displacement crisis was fueled by various factors, including sectarian violence, ethnic tensions, and the breakdown of law and order following the invasion. Civilians faced threats from multiple fronts, including insurgent attacks, sectarian militias, and military operations, leading to a widespread sense of fear and insecurity.

Internally displaced persons often found themselves living in precarious conditions, struggling to access basic necessities such as shelter, food, and healthcare. Many were unable to return home due to ongoing violence or the destruction of their communities, leading to protracted displacement and uncertainty about the future.

For those who became refugees, the journey to safety was often perilous, involving long and arduous journeys with limited resources and support. Host countries strained to accommodate the influx of refugees, facing their own economic and social challenges in the process.

The displacement crisis not only inflicted profound suffering on those directly affected but also had far-reaching consequences for the stability and security of the entire region. It underscored the need for robust international humanitarian assistance and cooperation to address the needs of displaced populations and work towards durable solutions that uphold the rights and dignity of all individuals affected by conflict. (David, *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis.*" Simon & Schuster, 2002).

- The displacement crisis added another layer of humanitarian concern, exacerbating the already dire situation for Iraqi civilians affected by the war (Packer, 2005).

4.3. Long-Term Instability

- In Iraq, the intervention indeed had far-reaching consequences that extended well beyond the withdrawal of American troops. The sectarian tensions that simmered during the conflict continued to plague the country for years, fueling violence and instability and impeding efforts at reconciliation and nation-building.

The toppling of Saddam Hussein's regime created a power vacuum that exacerbated existing sectarian divisions between the Sunni and Shia Muslim communities, as well as ethnic tensions involving Kurds and other minority groups. These fault lines were further exploited by various political factions and armed groups vying for power and influence in the post-invasion landscape.

The sectarian violence that erupted in the aftermath of the intervention resulted in countless civilian casualties, mass displacement, and widespread destruction of infrastructure. Attacks targeting religious sites, markets, and residential areas deepened mistrust and animosity between communities, perpetuating a cycle of revenge and retaliation.

Despite efforts to establish a democratic government and promote national unity, political divisions and grievances persisted, undermining stability and hampering progress towards reconciliation. Sectarianism became deeply entrenched in Iraqi politics and society, influencing governance structures, security forces, and social dynamics.

Even after the withdrawal of American troops in 2011, Iraq continued to grapple with persistent violence and political instability, with periodic spikes in sectarian tensions and insurgent activity. The legacy of the intervention loomed large over the country, shaping its trajectory and complicating efforts at rebuilding and reconciliation.

The enduring legacy of sectarian tensions in Iraq serves as a sobering reminder of the complexities and challenges inherent in post-conflict reconstruction and nation-building efforts. It underscores the importance of addressing root causes of conflict, fostering inclusive governance, and promoting dialogue and understanding among diverse communities to forge a path towards lasting peace and stability. (Packer, 2005).

- Similarly, in Libya, the intervention led to a power vacuum that was exploited by various armed groups, exacerbating insecurity and undermining efforts to build a stable and democratic state (Mary, 2006).

5. Consequences of Inaction

- The failure of the international community to intervene during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda indeed had catastrophic consequences, resulting in one of the most tragic episodes of mass violence in recent history. In the span of just 100 days, nearly a million people, predominantly Tutsis but also moderate Hutus, were brutally killed by Hutu extremists.

The genocide was characterized by systematic and organized violence, with militias and government forces orchestrating mass killings, sexual violence, and other atrocities with chilling efficiency. Despite early warnings and pleas for assistance from Rwandan civilians and international observers, the response from the international community was tragically inadequate.

Political considerations, bureaucratic inertia, and a lack of political will among key actors prevented timely and decisive action to stop the bloodshed. The United Nations peacekeeping

mission in Rwanda, UNAMIR, was ill-equipped and understaffed to confront the scale of the violence, and efforts to mobilize international assistance were hampered by indecision and reluctance to intervene in what was perceived as a "domestic" conflict.

As a result, Rwandan civilians were left largely unprotected, with horrific consequences. The failure to intervene not only resulted in an unimaginable loss of life but also had profound implications for the credibility and legitimacy of international humanitarian efforts. It laid bare the limitations and shortcomings of the international system in preventing and responding to mass atrocities.

The genocide in Rwanda serves as a haunting reminder of the human cost of inaction in the face of genocide and the imperative of collective responsibility to protect vulnerable populations from mass violence. It underscores the need for robust mechanisms for early warning, preventive diplomacy, and timely intervention to prevent such atrocities from occurring in the future.(Wheeler, 2000).

- The staggering loss of life underscored the urgent need for effective and timely intervention to prevent mass atrocities and protect civilian populations from harm (Wheeler, 2002).

In summary, these statistics provide valuable insights into the human cost and consequences of humanitarian interventions. By examining the impact of these interventions on civilian populations and long-term stability, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of the challenges and complexities associated with military intervention in conflict zones.

6. Destruction of infrastructure

The invasion of the USA of Iraq in 2003 resulted in significant damage to country's infrastructure, which had already been severely weakened by the 1991 Gulf war and following United Nations Sanctions. The invasion and subsequent looting led to the breakdown of Iraq's power, communication, water sanitation and health facilities and transportation in addition to the educational systems.

6.1. Power infrastructure

The power grid was severely damaged and destroyed leading to wide spread power outages and shortages. the US invasion led degraded the electrical supply system.

6.2. Water and Sanitation infrastructure

The water supply system was also severely impacted, with the bombing of infrastructure causing the breakdown of water treatment and distribution system, this led to spread of diseases like Cholera and typhoid.

6.3. Transportation infrastructure

The transportation network was also damaged with many bridges destroyed, The Baghdad Metro completely stopped service until October2008 and traffic problems increased.

6.4. Environmental Damage

The war caused environmental damage through oil spills deleted uranium munitions use and damage to water treatment facilities. (Save the Children International, 2018)

7. The Impact of the US Humanitarian intervention on Iraqi children

The American war in Iraq 2003 had devastating impact on Iraqi child leaving deep scars that continue to affect them today.

7.1. Physical harm

- **Casualties:** many children were killed or injured directly by violence during the war and its aftermath.
- **Indirect Deaths:** many children died from illnesses due to disruption in healthcare and clean water access caused by the war.
- **explosives:** Unexploded ordnance from the war remains a danger, causing injuries and deaths to children who may encounter them unknowing.
- **Displacement and insecurity:** The displacement of children in Iraq due to conflict and instability has had severe consequences on their well-being and future prospects, School closures and instability. the war disrupted children's education, tens of thousands of

children have repeated displacement lead to fear .3 million school-aged children out of school, half of all displaced children not attending school.

7.2. psychological problems

The war deprived Iraqi children of their basic needs supporting environment educational, and psychological resources leading to significant psychological harm problems like depression, Trauma, and mental disorders became common among Iraqi children

We can say the war left behind a generation of children who grew up in violence and instability. This lead to social problems, economic hardship, and difficulties in building a peaceful future. (Save the Children International, 2018)

Conclusion

In the pursuit of understanding the complexities surrounding humanitarian intervention, particularly in the context of the American war in Iraq, this chapter has embarked on a journey of juxtaposing ideals against realities, ideals that espouse lofty principles of protection and promotion of human rights against the stark pragmatism of implementation on the ground. Through a critical analysis, this chapter has sought to navigate the intricate terrain where aspirations intersect with the harsh realities of conflict, shedding light on the dissonance between the noble intentions of humanitarian intervention and its often flawed execution.

At the outset, the chapter embarked on a journey of introspection, tracing the genesis of humanitarian intervention ideals rooted in the post-World War II era, where the collective conscience of the international community was galvanized by the horrors of genocide and mass atrocities. It examined the emergence of a normative framework, underpinned by the principles of responsibility to protect (R2P) and the promotion of human rights as fundamental tenets guiding interventionist endeavors. However, as the narrative unfolded, it became increasingly evident that the translation of these ideals into practice was fraught with complexities and challenges, nowhere more pronounced than in the case of the American war in Iraq.

The chapter dissected the dichotomy between rhetoric and reality, revealing a stark disjuncture between the professed motives behind the intervention and its actual execution on the ground. While the intervention in Iraq was ostensibly framed within the discourse of humanitarianism, with the liberation of the Iraqi people from the oppressive regime of Saddam Hussein being touted as a primary objective, the underlying motivations and geopolitical interests at play cast a shadow of doubt over the altruistic façade. The conflation of humanitarian concerns with strategic imperatives, epitomized by the controversial doctrine of preemptive war and regime change, underscored the inherent tension between humanitarianism and realpolitik.

Furthermore, the chapter delved into the practical implementation of humanitarian intervention in Iraq, offering a sobering account of the complexities and failures that marred the endeavor. From the erosion of international legitimacy due to the absence of a UN mandate to the systemic breakdown of security and governance structures in post-invasion Iraq, the intervention was plagued by a myriad of challenges that belied the lofty aspirations of its proponents. The failure to adequately plan for the post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization phase, coupled with the exacerbation of sectarian tensions and the emergence of violent extremist groups, laid bare the limitations of military intervention as a panacea for humanitarian crises.

In evaluating the efficacy of humanitarian intervention in Iraq, it became apparent that the stark disparity between ideals and practice served as a sobering indictment of the inherent limitations of interventionist paradigms. Despite the fervent rhetoric espoused by advocates of humanitarian intervention, the American war in Iraq stands as a cautionary tale of the perils of hubris and unilateralism in the pursuit of noble objectives. The human toll exacted by the intervention, both in terms of civilian casualties and the protracted destabilization of the region, serves as a stark reminder of the imperative to critically assess the moral and ethical implications of interventionist policies.

In conclusion, the chapter has illuminated the complex interplay between humanitarian ideals and their practical implementation in the context of the American war in Iraq. Through a nuanced analysis, it has underscored the inherent tensions and contradictions that underpin the discourse of humanitarian intervention, challenging simplistic narratives of moral righteousness and emphasizing the imperative for humility and introspection in the face of humanitarian crises.

As the international community grapples with the enduring challenges of conflict and insecurity, the lessons gleaned from the American war in Iraq serve as a poignant reminder of the imperative to reconcile lofty aspirations with the harsh realities of the human condition.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

In the annals of international relations, the concept of humanitarian intervention occupies a contentious and often polarizing space, embodying the tension between moral imperatives and geopolitical realities. Across the globe, the specter of human suffering and mass atrocities continues to haunt the collective conscience of humanity, compelling the international community to grapple with the imperative to protect and promote human rights in the face of systemic violence and injustice. Against this backdrop, this dissertation has undertaken a multifaceted exploration of humanitarian intervention, tracing its evolution, examining its principles, and interrogating its practice through the prism of the American war in Iraq.

From its nascent origins in the aftermath of World War II to its contemporary manifestations in the era of globalization, the discourse of humanitarian intervention has undergone a profound transformation, reflecting shifting norms, values, and power dynamics in the international system. At its core, humanitarian intervention is imbued with a moral imperative, grounded in the belief that the international community has a responsibility to protect vulnerable populations from grave violations of their fundamental rights. Yet, as this dissertation has elucidated, the translation of this moral imperative into actionable policies and interventions is fraught with complexities and dilemmas that defy easy resolution.

The first chapter of this dissertation laid the conceptual groundwork for understanding humanitarian intervention, delineating its definitional contours and elucidating its underlying principles. From the principle of sovereignty as responsibility to the evolving norm of the responsibility to protect (R2P), the chapter delineated the normative framework that underpins humanitarian intervention, framing it within the broader discourse of international law and ethics. Moreover, it examined the historical antecedents of humanitarian intervention, tracing its evolution from ad hoc interventions to more systematic and institutionalized forms of interventionism in the contemporary era.

Building upon this theoretical foundation, the subsequent chapters delved into the practical application of humanitarian intervention, with a particular focus on the American war in Iraq as a case study. Chapter Two interrogated the disjuncture between humanitarian ideals and their implementation in practice, revealing the complexities and contradictions that characterized the intervention. From the divergence between rhetoric and reality to the systemic failures in planning and execution, the chapter offered a sobering critique of the interventionist paradigm, highlighting the human costs and moral ambiguities that attended the American intervention in Iraq.

In analyzing the American war in Iraq, this dissertation unearthed a myriad of challenges and dilemmas that confront practitioners and policymakers alike in the realm of humanitarian intervention. From the erosion of international legitimacy to the exacerbation of sectarian tensions and the destabilization of the region, the intervention in Iraq underscored the perils of hubris and unilateralism in the pursuit of humanitarian objectives. Moreover, it underscored the imperative for humility and introspection in the face of humanitarian crises, cautioning against the temptation to resort to military force as a panacea for complex socio-political problems.

Yet, amidst the sobering realities and moral ambiguities of humanitarian intervention, this dissertation also illuminated the enduring resilience of human agency and solidarity in the face of adversity. From grassroots movements advocating for peace and reconciliation to international organizations mobilizing humanitarian assistance, the dissertation underscored the vital role of collective action and solidarity in mitigating the impact of conflict and violence on vulnerable populations.

In conclusion, this dissertation has offered a nuanced and comprehensive examination of humanitarian intervention, interrogating its principles, critiquing its practice, and elucidating its moral and ethical implications in the context of the American war in Iraq. Through a multidisciplinary lens that draws upon insights from political science, international law, and ethics, the dissertation has sought to unravel the complexities and dilemmas that underpin the

discourse of humanitarian intervention, offering insights and perspectives that enrich our understanding of this perennially contentious issue. As the international community confronts the enduring challenges of conflict, violence, and injustice, the lessons gleaned from

On this dissertation serve as a testament to the imperative for critical engagement, ethical reflection, and collective action in the pursuit of a more just and humane world order.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

- Anderson, M. (s.d.). *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – or War*.
- Anne, O. (2011). *International Authority and the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barnett , M. N. (2005). Humanitarianism Transformed. *Perspectives on Politics*, 03(04).
- Bellamy , A. J. (2009). The responsibility to protect: five years on. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 23(3).
- Bob, W. (2004). *Plan of attack.*" Simon and Schuster.
- Britannica, T. (2024, May 27). *Editors of Encyclopaedia. Rwanda genocide of 1994.*
Encyclopedia Britannica. Récupéré sur <https://www.britannica.com/event/Rwanda-genocide-of-1994>
- Bush , G. W. (19 March 2003). *Address to the Nation on Iraq.*" *The White House*.
- Bush , G. W. (2002). *Address to the United Nations General Assembly.*" *September 12.*
- Chesterman , S. (2001). *Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian Intervention and International Law.* Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky , N. (2003). *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance.* Metropolitan Books.
- Dan, S. (2007). *The State of War: The Secret History of the CIA and the Bush Administration.* Anchor Books.
- David, R. (2002). *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis.*" *Simon & Schuster.*
- David, R. (2003). *A bed for the night: humanitarianism in crisis.*" *Simon and Schuster.*
- Eric, H. (2008). *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776.* Oxford University Press.
- Gareth, E. (2009). *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All.*" *Brookings Institution Press .*
- Gelvin , J. L. (2015). *The Modern Middle East: A History.* Oxford University Press.
- Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols (International Committee of the Red Cross. (s.d.).
- Gordon, M. R., & Bernard, T. E. (2006). *Cobra II: The Inside Story of the Invasion and Occupation of Iraq.* Vintage Books.
- Haass, R. (1999). *Intervention: The Use of American Military Force in the Post-Cold War World.*
- Hallin, D. C. (1989). *The Uncensored War: The Media and Vietnam.* University of California Press.

- Hersh, S. M. (2004). *Chain of Command: The Road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*. HarperCollins.
- Holzgrefe, J. L., & Keohane, R. O. (2003). *Humanitarian intervention: Ethical, legal, and political dilemmas*. Cambridge University Press.
- Human Rights Watch. "Iraq: Human Rights Overview. (2002).
- Ignatieff, M. (2004). *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*. Princeton University Press.
- Ignatieff, M. (5 January 2003). *The American Empire: The Burden.* " *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings. (s.d.).
- International Committee of the Red Cross Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief. (s.d.).
- Kofi, A. (20 September 1999). "Two concepts of sovereignty." *Address to the United Nations General Assembly*.
- Kuperman, A. J. (2008). The moral hazard of humanitarian intervention. *Lessons from the Balkans.* " *International Studies Quarterly*, 52(01).
- Lynch, M. ". (2006). *Voices of the New Arab Public: Iraq, Al-Jazeera, and Middle East Politics Today*. Columbia University Press.
- Marr Phebe,, P., & Al-Marashi, I. (2017). *The Modern History of Iraq*. Routledge.
- Marr, P., & Mark, R. (2017). *The modern history of Iraq.* " Routledge.
- Mary, K. (2006). *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Stanford University Press.
- Michael, I. (2004). *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*. Princeton University Press.
- Michael, W. (1977). *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations.* " *Basic Books*.
- Packer, G. (2005). *The Assassins' Gate: America in Iraq*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Paris , R. (2004). *At war's end: building peace after civil conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pollack, K. M. (2002). *The threatening storm: The case for invading Iraq.* " *Random House*.
- Rajiv, C. (2006). *Imperial Life in the Emerald City: Inside Iraq's Green Zone*. Vintage Books.
- Ramesh, T. (2006). *The United Nations, Peace and Security: From Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge University Press.

- Roland, P. (2010). Humanitarian Intervention: A New Constructivist Perspective. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(03).
- Roland, P. (2010). Humanitarian Intervention: A New Constructivist Perspective. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(03).
- Save the Children International. (2018). *The War on Children: Ten years of conflict in Iraq*. Récupéré sur www.savethechildren.org:
<https://www.savethechildren.org/content/dam/usa/recp/stop-the-war-on-children-2019.pdf>
- Simon, C. (2001). *Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian Intervention and International Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Tesón, F. R. (1988). *Humanitarian Intervention: An Inquiry into Law and Morality*. Transnational Publishers.
- Toby, D. (2013). *Iraq: From war to a new authoritarianism*. Routledge.
- United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). (s.d.).
- Walt, S. M. (4 November 2011). *The Myth of American Exceptionalism*. *Foreign Policy*.
- Weiss, T. G. (2007). *Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas in Action*. Polity Press.
- Weiss, T. G., & Cindy, C. (2000). *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wheeler, N. J. (2002). *Saving strangers: humanitarian intervention in international society*. Oxford University Press.

الملخص

تستكشف هذه الأطروحة العلاقة بين مفهوم التدخل الانساني وواقع الحرب الامريكية. يكمن التوتر الاساسي في التباين بين افكار تعزيز حقوق الانسان وحماية المدنيين، التي غالبا ما يتم الاستشهاد بها كمبرر للتدخل. والعواقب العملية للحرب نفسها من خلال دمج الاساليب النوعية والكمية. يهدف هذا البحث الى توفير فهم شامل للتعقيدات والتناقضات المتأصلة في التدخل الانساني وتداعياتها بين المثل والممارسة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التدخل الانساني، حقوق الانسان، الولايات المتحدة الامريكية، غزو، العراق، المثل، الممارسة.