

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University Mohammed Boudiaf of M'sila

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English



**UK media coverage of the War on Iraq: A content analysis of the
Guardian newspaper**

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Master Degree in English Literature and Civilization

Submitted by:

Yassamine Rokbi

Supervised by:

Mr. Boutkhil Guemide

Members of the Jury

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Dr. Salima Maouche | Maitre des Conférences (A) | University Abd Al Rahmane Mira, Bejaia |
| Mr. Boutkhil Guemide | Maitre Assistant (B) | Unibersity Mohammed Boudiaf, Msila |
| Mr. Samir Amir | Maitre Assistant (A) | High School of Economics, Oran |

Academic year

2019- 2020

Dedications

To my beloved parents who are the reason for all the successes in my life;
Their unlimited love has been always my motivation. Without them, I might not be the person I am today.

To my grandmother for her prayers;

To my aunt Mrs. Rachida Benaissa for her motivation;

To my little brother lyad;

To my dear brother Fethi Houssam Eddine;

To my beloved sisters: Lina, Nada, and Maria for their encouragement;

To my best friends Karima Kabouya, my soul mate and Nesrine

Guesmia for their encouragement and support.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I thank almighty Allah for giving me the volition and strength to accomplish this work.

My special thanks and sincere gratitude go to my dear supervisor Mr. Boutkhil Guemide for his guidance, patience and constructive criticism. I really appreciate his tremendous efforts. My words cannot express my thanks to him.

I warmly thank my colleague Mr. El- Hosseyn Khirani who motivated me from the beginning until the end of this work and he was willing always to help me at any time.

My thanks and appreciations to the jury members for their precious time in reading and evaluating my work.

I would like to thank my teachers for their knowledgeable lectures and my classmates for the nice time that we spent together.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work, which I have created myself.

All the literature I used is properly quoted and is listed in the References. I declare that I worked on my final master's dissertation on my own using only cited literary sources, other information and sources in agreement with the disciplinary regulations for the Faculty of Letters and Languages at the University Mohammed Boudiaf of M'sila and with the regulations and laws of research of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in Algeria.

I agree with the storage of this work in the library of the Faculty of Letters and Languages at the University Mohammed Boudiaf of M'sila and making it accessible for study purposes.

Rokbi Yassamine

M'sila: 28/ 08/ 2020.

Abstract:

The most prominent event that characterized international relations in the beginning of the third millennium was the US war on Iraq in 2003. Relying on the Bush Doctrine, the US reacted unitarily against the global terror, which hit the US at home on September 11, 2001. Although there were uncovered reasons of the invasion, the US focused, primarily, on toppling the Baathist regime, led by the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. i. e. The US invasion of Iraq was labeled 'Operation Iraqi Freedom'. As a principal US ally, UK participated in the War on Iraq.

It is worth to mention that the War on Iraq attracted the media worldwide. All types of media got interested in news reporting about the events and the conduct of the war. In contrast to US media, which were in favor of the US invasion, some worldwide media; such as UK media, were either against, or neutral in their news coverage.

The present study explores UK's participation in the War on Iraq. It also aims to assess the media coverage of the US War on Iraq (2003), particularly UK media coverage. It takes into account the Guardian newspaper as a case study which is the leading point of this study as a valuable evidence in this study. Using qualitative analytical and descriptive research methods, the study concludes with the Guardian coverage impacts in the War on Iraq.

Key Words: The War on Iraq, US, UK, Saddam Hussein, Tony Blair, Media Coverage, the Guardian.

List of contents

Dedications I

Acknowledgments II

Declaration III

Abstract IV

List of contents V

Contents VI

List of abbreviations.....XI

Contents

General introduction:.....1

1. Background of the study 1

2. Statement of the problem:2

3. The literature review3

4. Research questions and hypotheses 6

5. The significance of the study 6

6. The purpose of the study 7

7. Research methodology8

8. The structure of the dissertation:..... 8

Chapter One: The origins of the US War on Iraq (2003):
..... 10

Introduction: 10

1.1. The causes of the US invasion of Iraq: 11

1.1.1. The impacts of 9/11:..... 12

1.1.2. Destroying Iraqi WMD program:..... 13

1.1.2.1. US reports on Iraqi WMD capabilities 14

1.1.2.1.1. CIA’s report: 15

1.1.2.1.2. Colin Powell’s report: 17

1.1.3. Saddam Hussein’s ties with Al Qaeda: 18

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.2. The US invasion of Iraq (March- April, 2003): Operation Iraqi Freedom: | 19 |
| 1.2.1. War planning: | 20 |
| 1.2.1.1. Strategic Objectives | 21 |
| 1.2.1.2. Military Objectives: | 22 |
| 1.2.1.3. Major Combat Operations: | 23 |
| 1.2.1.3.1. Early Infiltration: | 24 |
| 1.2.1.3.2. The launch: | 25 |
| 1.2.1.3.3. The ground Campaign: | 25 |
| 1.2.1.4. The disposition of the Iraqi army | 26 |
| 1.2.1.5. The fall of the Iraqi regime: | 28 |
| 1.2.1.6. The end of the invasion and the US occupation of Iraq: | 29 |
| Conclusion: | 30 |

Chapter two: The Guardian coverage of the US War on Iraq:

| | |
|---|----|
| | 31 |
| Introduction: | 31 |
| 2.1. Media, propaganda, and war: | 31 |
| 2.1.1. The role of media in war and conflicts: | 33 |
| 2.1.2. The newspapers and the critical incidents: | 35 |
| 2.2. The Guardian Coverage of the US War on Iraq and UK's foreign policy towards the War: | 36 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.2.1. UK and the War on Iraq (2003):..... | 39 |
| 2.2.1.1. The UK reasons to invade Iraq (2003): | 41 |
| 2.2.1.1.1. The War on Terror:..... | 43 |
| 2.2.1.1.2. Economic benefits:..... | 44 |
| 2.2.1.1.2.1. Taking control of Iraqi oil reserves: | 44 |
| 2.2.1.1.2.2. Assuring state building deals in Iraq | 46 |
| 2.2.1.2. Blair’s 2002 decision to invade Iraq: ‘I will be with you, Whatever’: | 48 |
| 2.2.1.2.1. A true US ally:..... | 49 |
| 2.2.1.2.2. Providing political and military support to the US:..... | 50 |
| Conclusion: | 51 |

Chapter three: The Guardian Coverage of the military operations of the War on Iraq

| | |
|--|-----------|
| (2003): A content analysis: | 52 |
|--|-----------|

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Introduction: | 52 |
|---------------------|----|

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.1. The Guardian Coverage of pre- war events:..... | 52 |
|---|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.2. The Guardian Coverage of the British military operations in the War: | 54 |
|--|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.2.1. Fighting the battles of the War on Iraq:..... | 54 |
|--|----|

| | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| 3.2.1.1. Mosul raid (2003) | 54 |
|----------------------------------|----|

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.2.1.2. Battle of Baghdad (2003) | 56 |
|---|----|

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| 3.2.1.3. Battle of Basra (2003)..... | 57 |
|--------------------------------------|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.2.1.4. First Battle of Fallujah..... | 58 |
|--|----|

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3.2.1.5. Second Battle of Fallujah | 59 |
| 3.3. Story analysis form: | 60 |
| 3.3.1. Article genre: | 60 |
| 3.3.2. Article structure and unity | 61 |
| 3.3.2.1. Headlines: | 61 |
| 3.3.2.2. Leads: | 62 |
| 3.3.2.3. Body of the articles:..... | 63 |
| 3.3.2.4. Conclusions:..... | 64 |
| 3.3.2.5. Language, vocabulary, and style: | 65 |
| 3.4. Content analysis..... | 66 |
| 3.4.1. Identification and data collection | 66 |
| 3.4.2. Units and categories of analysis | 67 |
| 3.4.2.1. The units of meaning..... | 67 |
| 3.4.2.2. The set of categories..... | 69 |
| 3.4.3. Coding the Content: | 69 |
| 3.4.4. Presentation and analysis of the results | 70 |
| 3.5. The impacts of the Iraqi war in relation to the Guardian's coverage: | 72 |
| Conclusion: | 72 |
| General conclusion..... | 73 |
| The limitation of the study | 75 |

References: 76

Resumé:116

المخلص

118

List of abbreviations

| | |
|----------------|---|
| US | United States |
| WMD | Weapons of Mass Destruction |
| USS | United States Ship |
| UK | United Kingdom |
| UN | United Nations |
| IAEA | International Atomic Energy Agency |
| CIA | Central Intelligence Agency |
| CENTCOM | United States Central Command |
| CFLCC | Coalition Forces Land Component Command |
| SECDEF | Secretary of Defense |
| UNSCOM | United Nations Special Commission |
| ISIS | Islamic State of Iraq and Syria |
| PM | Prime Minister |
| TV | Television |
| MPs | Members of Parliament |
| UNSC | United Nations Security Council |
| DNA | Deoxyribonucleic Acid |
| CNN | Cable News Network |
| EU | European Union |
| IIP | Iraqi Islamic Party |

General introduction:

Background Information:

The invasion of Iraq constituted a major phase of the War on Terror, which was declared by George W. Bush, the US president. Encapsulated in the *Bush Doctrine*, the US administration fought countries which possess weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, Iraq constituted the next country, after Afghanistan, in the Bush menu for his War on Terror because of its WMD programs, nuclear and chemical weapons, and its ties with Al- Qaeda, a Jihadist organization.

The prospect of the War on Iraq created some dilemmas for British newspapers in matters of reporting. Editorial support for the invasion of Iraq could; in fact, be interpreted as support for UK's the foreign policy. The British press alluded that there were numerous European and Muslim countries; such as, France, Germany, Belgium, China, Russia, Turkey, Ireland, Italy, Australia, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iran that opposed the War on Iraq. German chancellor Gerhard Schroder openly criticized the US foreign policy in Iraq. Moreover, British newspapers highlighted oppositional statements by outstanding political and religious personalities in opposition to the war; such as, Clare Short, ex- British Secretary of State for International Development and the Javier Solana, ex- Spanish minister of foreign affairs and High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union.

The British press mentioned subsequent themes in their editorials; such as, the implications of the war on Iraq, criticism the US policies regarding the invasion of Iraq, US violation of UN resolutions, deteriorating security scenario, and the US extension of War on Terror to other countries. The Guardian argued that before invading Iraq, the US should not have extended its opposing terrorist act campaign to Iraq. It stated that without the permission of an international organization, the UNO in particular, the US policy against Iraq would be illogical.

There were number of publications noted from the Guardian featured popular disagreement, open dissent both inside and outside UK, and oppositional statements by the leading social, political, and religious personalities of the world. The Guardian criticized the use of cluster bombs and heavy bombardment in Iraq: It asserted that the usage of cluster bombs became against international law as it had dreadful effects on Iraqi civilians.

During the war, the *Guardian* frequently published articles on increasing casualties, destruction and worsening security scenario in Iraq. It criticized the US conduct of the War in Iraq. Moreover, it stressed on searching missing WMD in Iraq, since they were the primary reason to invade Iraq.

1. Statement of the problem:

Media coverage of the War on Iraq was largely framed within the perspective of pro-war ideas by UK media. The US administration has paid a close attention to how media report the events of the war. It was much concerned about the coverage of the Invasion of Iraq because war pictures play

necessary role in shaping beliefs and public opinions. For this reason, it was propagated by the US administration and the US media that the invasion of Iraq was for: (1) searching of WMD, (2) restraining Saddam Hussein's activities who had connections with Al- Qaeda, (3) chasing Baathist leaders, and (4) establishing new democratic government in Iraq.

It is worth to mention that most of the media coverage, whether inside or outside the US, was wholly biased, except for some British media which was unbiased. Within this perspective, it is important to analyze and study how the British media proceeded with media coverage of the War on Iraq. Taking the British newspaper the Guardian as a case study in the present research paper, the researcher intends to focus on reporting the War on Iraq from western point of view. Therefore, the present study seeks to analyze whether the *Guardian* media coverage of the War on Iraq was according to its media policies, or for humanitarian reasons.

2. The literature review:

During the 21st century, the invasion of Iraq, which took place in 2003, was the most contentious issue and serious foreign policy decision that took place in the Middle East. Led by the US and supported by its UK ally, the campaign aimed at overthrowing of Iraq's President, Saddam Hussein. The US, under the administration of George W. Bush, argued that Saddam Hussein (1) possessed chemical and biological weapons, (2) was a threat to global peace, (3) a vicious tyrant, and (4) a sponsor of international terrorism.

There appeared to be an especially radical cleavage between the justifications for war advocated by its proponents: Destruction of Iraqi WMD programs, and the real causes and motives. However, the media also played an important role in the coverage of the war timeline events, from the beginning of military operations until the fall of Baghdad in April 2003.

Since the common reason in this military invasion was the toppling of the Iraqi regime, scholars and researchers were encouraged by the fact of examining the media strategies and coverage of the said conflict in order to explore the policies, techniques, and methods used in the circumstances of the US military invasion in Iraq in relation to communication policies, as well as media coverage.

Griffin (2004) analyzed photo coverage of the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq in the same three news magazines. He concluded that the predictable depiction as told from an ethnocentric perspective outweighed more complex and independent narratives. About half the photographs from the weeks just before and during the Iraq invasion reinforced the prevailing theme of US political and military might. Images that contributed “new, independent, or complex visual information,” such as the Iraqi perspective, the human toll, or global economics, were rare.

Bennett (2003) also found that the U.S. media tended to frame the Gulf War in a patriotic, American- centered way, ignoring opposition from the world community.

Lester and King (2005) observed that The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, and Chicago Tribune published twice as many war photos during the Iraq War as during the Gulf War. Even so, the number of combat images and close-ups rose only slightly, as did coverage of protesters and the home front. US and British newspapers did not show much combat activity either, even though embedded photojournalists were close to the fighting (Fahmy & Johnson, 2005).

In their article entitled *Picturing the Iraq War: Constructing the Image of War in the British and US press*, Fahmy and Kim (2006) made a comparative study between the US newspaper of the *New York Times* and the British one, the *Guardian*, taking into account the visual images of the War in Iraq. Although about 20% of the war visuals in the *New York Times* and the *Guardian* newspaper depicted Iraqi civilian casualties, most images followed a narrow, allied-centered perspective that spotlighted allied troops, US and British political leaders, and jubilant encounters between the troops and Iraqi civilians.

Mosdell and Threadgold (2006) pointed out the British media supported the official stand of the British government by highlighting the immorality of Saddam's regime, and welcomed the rise of a new Iraqi government. Within the same context, Murray, Parry, Robinson and Goddard (2009) identified British media's conformity to the official viewpoint by relying on government sources and notion of patriotism. Finally, Robert Jensen believed that if the first two weeks of the coverage were any indication, this war would be a real case study of the failure of US journalism.

As seen above, the literature review dealt much with the military intervention and the media coverage strategies in relation to the War in Iraq. The common issue that was relevant to these researches and studies was how the timeline events of the war was portrayed and presented to viewers to keep updated with the war events.

3. Research questions and hypotheses:

The present study seeks to analyze the following research questions:

- Did *The Guardian* oppose UK's foreign policy in relation to the War on Iraq?
- How did *The Guardian* cover the military operations during the war?
- Would *The Guardian* coverage of the war be in relation to the war's aftermath?

In the light of these questions, it is hypothesized that:

- The Guardian was one of British media that showed its disagreement to Tony Blair' involvement with the US War on Iraq. It opposed UK's policies towards the war on Iraq and criticized Tony Blair regarding this involvement.

4. The significance of the study:

The main point that makes the present paper significant is that the war on Iraq is a sensitive subject; it is one of the most important events in recent history. The legality of the conflict has been a main subject of discussion in both the US

and UK. Moreover, the war on Iraq became the most controversial issue after Second World War. The study has approached this research from an interpretive stance based on the data available and it is going to explore media strategies during the Iraq war.

The present study is designed to elucidate the significant and influential role of UK media in shaping public opinion. It will mainly tackle the issue of representation through a content analysis of *The Guardian* newspaper. The study focuses primarily on what, how and why UK media covered the Iraq war.

5. The purpose of the study:

The present research is entitled *UK media coverage of the War on Iraq: A content analysis of the Guardian newspaper*. The current research focuses on the role of media that was played during the US Invasion of Iraq and the *Guardian* in particular. In addition, it demonstrates the procedures that showed Blair's involvement, and focuses on representing the role of his policies in the War on Iraq war.

This study attempts to fill the gap in the research field by showing how the *Guardian* covered the conflict in Iraq, and analyzing publications which depicted this war.

The present research has been conducted in order to achieve the following objectives:

- To investigate how the *Guardian* framed and covered the War on Iraq, and to reveal how the *Guardian* managed to cover the initial stage of the war,
- To analyze the *Guardian's* reports so as to show how its coverage of Iraq war was discussed differently,

6. Research design and Methodology:

An analytical and descriptive route is pursued to achieve the objective of the study. The present research analyzes the content of *the Guardian* newspaper reports, words, and information so as to identify what and how were the text of newspaper editorials. The analysis of the War on Iraq was drawn from a broader study analyzing media coverage, in particularly UK media coverage during this conflict.

Moreover, a quantitative approach is used in the present research to measure the frequent uses of words and phrases in the news reports and articles of the *Guardian*. This is; in fact, an important part in the presentation and analysis of data to find out the status of the *Guardian* coverage of the US War on Iraq (2003).

7. The structure of the dissertation:

The present research entitled *UK media coverage of the War on Iraq: A content analysis of the Guardian newspaper*. It is divided into three chapters.

The first chapter reviews the origins of the US War on Iraq. It analyzes the causes of the US invasion of Iraq. Also, it describes the US invasion of Iraq, aka *Operation Iraqi Freedom*, and the end of the invasion and the US occupation of Iraq.

The second chapter analyzes the Guardian's Coverage of the US War on Iraq and UK's foreign policy toward the War. It focuses mainly on UK's reasons for participating in the War on Iraq, and how UK provided political and military support to the US.

The third chapter analyzes the Guardian's coverage of the military operations of the War on Iraq. It focuses on media analysis of the events which preceded the US invasion, the military operations conducted during and after the US- UK led invasion of Iraq. Furthermore, it analyses the contents of the Guardian newspaper in relation to the events of the war to find out whether the newspaper was biased, or unbiased in its news coverage and analysis.

Chapter One: The origins of the US War on Iraq (2003):

Introduction:

Since 9/11 attacks, the War on Terror became a staple of the US foreign policy. The Bush Doctrine, which was initiated shortly after 9/11, emphasized on fighting countries supporting terrorism and countries which develop WMD programs. As a major step in Bush menu of the war on Terror, the US invasion of Iraq, which started on March 20, 2003, targeted Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein and the Baathist regime. It was aka 'Operation Iraqi Freedom' and intended to build a new nation with western and democratic values. The US invasion resulted in the Iraqi army's defeat and Saddam Hussein's capture and execution. Although the US invasion of Iraq ended officially in May, 2006, the country became destabilized and entered chaotic era. Moreover, violence and insurgency led to asymmetrical war between the insurgents, the U.S. military, and the new Iraqi government.

The present chapter highlights an overview of the US invasion of Iraq and its causes, taking into consideration 9/11 attacks and WMD program. It also deals with the US invasion of Iraq, aka Operation Iraqi Freedom, which led to the US occupation of Iraq.

1.1. The causes of the US Invasion on Iraq:

Amongst the primary reasons which led the US to invade Afghanistan after 9/11 attacks was the search of Osama Bin Laden (1957- 2011), the leader of Al-Qaeda, who sought refuge in the aforementioned country. Also, he got support of the Taliban. Within the context of global War on Terror, the US administration accused Saddam Hussein of having links with Al-Qaeda in order to attack the US. Therefore, the US administration, together with the US military, started planning for the invasion of Iraq (Bassil, 2012, p. 29).

Having being built on his Doctrine, George W. Bush's strategy of the invasion of Iraq was to achieve many goals. In this context, Bassil (2012) stated that the official reasons that George W. Bush gave to the Congress were as follows:

- First, The US invasion of Iraq was to eliminate terrorism and Saddam Hussein's regime, for Saddam Hussein represents a major threat to the US. The US presented Iraq as a country that supports Al-Qaeda. Therefore, it is responsible for 9/11 attacks and the offensive against USS Cole,
- Second, The US major aim was to eliminate the Iraqi WMD program. Since the 1990s, Iraq was able to develop WMD, in addition to chemical and biological weapons. In September, 2004, although the US charged inspection teams to find those weapons, but they were not found,
- Third, the US wanted to overthrow Saddam's dictatorship and instill a new democratic government (p. 29).

The US invaded Iraq because the huge reserves of oil, and George W. Bush was convinced that a military presence in Iraq would serve as the best way to get access to oil supplies and be able to control oil prices in the world market (Bennis, 2003, para. 4).

1.1.1. The impacts of 9/11:

On September 11, 2001, 19 terrorists used four airplanes to carry out suicide attacks on particular targets in the US. Two of the planes targeted the World Trade Center in New York. The third one was smashed into Pentagon, and the fourth plane did not reach the target and crashed in Pennsylvania. The attacks resulted in 2,973 people killed. Because of their serious aftermaths, 9/ 11 attacks are considered the most horrible incidents in US history (Bysyuk, 2010, p. 10).

Although Iraq did not participate in 9/11 attacks, it was subjected to the US invasion. It was subjected to the US invasion. Therefore, it is essential to understand the liaison between 9/11 attacks, which took place in the US, and the war on Iraq. These attacks exposed a direct threat to US, the Middle East, and Muslim world. Neo- conservative members in the Bush administration, who had strongly advocated the invasion of Iraq, administered directly the US foreign policy following 9/ 11 attacks, believed that it was necessary for the US to redraw the Middle East according to the US agenda (Hinnebusch, 2007, pp. 10 - 11).

The 9/11 attacks proved that the United States was at risk; A large-scale attack could be launched by a non-state terrorist organization. In addition, they showed that Jihadist organizations, such as Al-Qaeda, are capable of destroying the US, causing several human casualties. Moreover, these terrorists will be able to possess WMD (Heinrich, 2015, p. 3).

Shortly after the attacks, more than three thousand people were murdered in the US. In its final report, the congressional commission reported that the U.S. could not save its citizens from these threats because it did not estimate the threat posed by Al- Qaeda, which accomplished the mortal assault on US. The reports blamed directly Al-Qaeda as the main perpetrator of the attacks (El-Shibiny, 2016, p. 1).

The 9/11 attacks affected the Muslim community in the US and around the world. In fact, the Arab Muslims condemned the attacks, describing them tragic, inhumane, non- Islamic, barbaric, and against humanity and ethical values and universal principles.

1.1.2. Destroying Iraqi WMD program:

Iraq is one of the countries that suffered from frequent conventional strikes to destroy its WMD program. It is worth to mention that Israel conducted an airstrike in June 1980 which targeted Osiraq -experimental nuclear reactor situated in southeast of Baghdad. In addition, Operation Desert Fox which was launched in December 1998 by the US and its UK ally targeted Iraq in an attempt to destroy its WMD capabilities (Russell, 2002, p. 3).

On April 3, 1991, the UN Security Council issued Resolution 687 ordering Iraq to destroy its weapons of mass destruction, or render them under the supervision of UN or IAEA inspectors. UN Security Council Resolution required Iraq to stop developing, or obtaining WMD in the future (Central Intelligence Agency, 2002, p. 3).

In 1996, UN inspectors demolished the major biological weapons facilities in Iraq, which had been transformed to civilian use in 1991. The objective of Resolution 687 had been accomplished and, Iraq possessed no more WMD manufacturing facilities (Sanders, 2016, para. 9).

1.1.2.1. US report on Iraqi WMD capabilities:

The Bush Doctrine defines the threat stand on ‘radicalism and technology’ and he linked this threat with the proliferation of WMD ‘The gravest danger to freedom lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons ...’ he said. In addition, he believes that even the developed countries can be struck by small groups if they possessed these weapons ‘when that occurs, even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations.’ Moreover, the Bush Doctrine determines three threat factors: (1) terrorist organizations with universal extent, (2) Weak states that support these organizations, and (3) rogue states. The Bush doctrine defined rogue states as “ ‘display no regard for international law, threaten their neighbors, and callously violate international

treaties to which they are party; are determined to acquire weapons of mass destruction ...' (Record, 2003, p .4- 5).

According to the Bush Administration, Iraq was the major threat to US for its continuous development of WMD that it may be transmitted to Al- Qaeda as well as terrorist organizations and groups and that could cause sudden great damage to the US. Thus, The US administration took WMD as the basic proof to overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime and after the fall of the regime, the US intelligences searched Iraq in order to confirm the US administration' claim about Iraq' possession of WMD (Katzman, 2008, p. 1).

On November 8, 2002 the UNSC released Resolution 1441, providing Iraq a "final opportunity" to "comply with its disarmament obligations" or facing "serious consequences" if Iraq break the Resolution 1441 ('Iraq War: Background and Issues Overview', 2003, p. 2).

1.1.2.1.1. CIA's report:

Before the US invasion which was launched in 2003, the CIA had only one intelligence officer; he was reincarnated as diplomat to espionage the sources from inside Baghdad. The intelligence officer did not improve any sources about WMD. Through the Iraqi National Accord also known as Wifaq (a famous opposition group led by Ayad Allawi that got finance from the US before the removal of the Hussein regime), the agency had improved Iraqi military sources, but none of those military officers had any exact information about WMD in Iraq (Risen, 2006, p. 89).

In October 2002, The CIA released a document which contained related information concerning chemical and biological weapon programs of Iraq. This document was handed out to members of the Congress. The information has been used to hold up the Bush administration's matter that WMD program is an impending threat, which became probably the major reason for the US war on Iraq (Rosen, 2015, para. 2).

The CIA report entitled *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs* showed an evident picture on the subject matter; since the departure of UNSCOM inspectors in 1998, Iraq has carried on the development and manufacturing WMD programs and missiles, has preserved its chemical and biological weapons project (Bassil, 2012, p. 31).

Charles Duelfer, the CIA's special adviser to the Iraq Survey Group, said that they went far in their searching of WMD but they found nothing. In this context, he stated, 'As matters now stand, the WMD investigation has gone as far as feasible.' In addition, he noted that the forbidden weapons had been destroyed before Gulf war of 1991 (Harris, 2006, p. 27).

Duelfer proclaimed that Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi leader, believed that during the Iraqi- Iran War (1980- 8) Iraqi chemical weapons protected Iraq from the defeat, and chemical and biological weapons capabilities prevent US from toppling Iraq. The report shed light on the cooperation of Iraq with UN inspectors. According to the report, the aim of Saddam Hussein from this cooperation was to reconstitute its nuclear program and lift sanctions (Kerr, n. d, para. 10).

The CIA report pushed George W. Bush to confess that a lot of the US intelligence practiced to give reasons for War on Iraq was incorrect. However, the Bush administration believed that Saddam Hussein still had the intention to improve WMD so they rejected the arguments that it was wrong to invade Iraq (Sevastopulo, 2005, para. 4).

Before 2002, the US intelligence expressed its anxiety that Iraq might obtain materials which helped to restart its nuclear weapon program. In October 2002, the CIA's report showed that Iraq got back its nuclear weapon program. The assessment of the CIA National Intelligence concluded with high conviction that Iraq kept expanding its WMD programs and missiles. Furthermore, the assessment judged Iraq to possess nuclear weapons (Cirincione, Mathews, Perkovich & Orton, 2004, p. 22).

1.1.2.1.2. Colin Powell's report:

On February 05, 2003, Colin Powell, US Secretary of State made a speech entitled *Iraq's Failure to Disarm* to the UN Security Council about Saddam Hussein's WMD possession and his program to develop. Powell, in his speech presented a series of accusations that dealt with Iraq's concealing of information about its WMD and establishing ties with terrorist organizations decades ago, including Al Qaeda. He accused Iraq of hiding weapons and supported his evidence by audio recordings and pictures taken via satellite 'my colleagues, every statement I make today is backed up by sources, solid sources' Powell said. Moreover, Powell noted that Iraq has failed to comply the Security Council

Resolution 1441 which calls Iraq to disarm chemical, nuclear and biological weapons and it did not; it has no chance to do it (Neilan, 2003, para. 1, 2 & 3).

After the war, Powell has admitted that the evidence he provided to the UN to justify the war in Iraq may be wrong (Schwarz, 2018, para. 1). In fact, Powell's intelligence relied with the intelligence provided by the Pentagon. Some analysts believe that Powell was opposed to the idea of war on Iraq. Therefore, perhaps the CIA had deceived him by providing him with misleading information. Powell blamed some CIA employees of knowing that the sources of the information are not reliable (Norton- Taylor, 2003, para. 1- 5).

On May, 2012, Powell published a book blamed himself on the speech which he gave to the United Nations concerning the war on Iraq; he included allegations of WMD in the regime of Saddam Hussein, which later turned out - after the war - to be misleading information. Furthermore, Powell mentioned that he will never forget that day, and he asserted that even after his death, the newspapers will highlight this event 'A failure will always be attached to me and my U.N. presentation,' he said ('Powell Blames Himself,' 2012, para. 1- 4).

1.1.3. Saddam Hussein's ties with Al Qaeda:

After 9/11 attacks, Bush Administration made many statements about the relation between Al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. On September 2002, the US president George W. Bush asserted that there is no difference between Al-Qaeda, Saddam Hussein and the War on Terror (Alterman, 2004, para. 1). On September 27, 2002, US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld confirmed that

the CIA provided with “bulletproof” evidence of Saddam Hussein’s link to Al-Qaeda (Rosenberg, 2006).

The Bush Administration had always used the links between Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaeda as one of the reasons which led US to wage the War on Iraq. They strongly believed that Iraq government helped Al- Qaeda to spread chemical weapons. Moreover, Dick Cheney, the Vice President and his advocates assumed that Iraq had link with Al-Qaeda in implementing 9/11 attacks while other Administration officials, including George W. Bush rejected this view (Katzman, 2008, p. 2).

In early 2002, intelligence analysts ruled out the accusation of Bush Administration that Saddam Hussein helped Al- Qaeda to produce and proliferate chemical weapons. On March 2008, five years after the US invasion of Iraq, the Pentagon reviewed 600.000 documents in order to make sure whether the relationship between Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaeda is true or not. The Pentagon’s results found no direct ties between them (Schor, 2008, para. 2).

1.2. The US invasion of Iraq (Mar.- Apr., 2003): Operation Iraqi Freedom:

In October 2002, the US Congress gave President George W. Bush an authorization to use force against Iraq to defend US national security from the ongoing threat posed by Iraq, and to implement all relevant UN Security Council resolutions, which were passed on the Iraqi issue (U.S.G.P.O, 2002, p. 3).

On March 20, 2003, Operation Iraqi Freedom was launched. As the Bush administration claimed, the immediate goal was to eliminate Iraqi Baathist regime and to search for WMD, so that they would not fall into the hands of terrorists. In addition, the long-term objective of the operation included assisting Iraqis construct a new developed and free Iraq, as George W. Bush stated 'we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free' (Dale, 2008, p. 1).

Operation Iraqi Freedom shifted from dismantling the Iraqi regime to the more open-ended task of building a new government, improve security, create a governance system, and promote economic development. The nature of the war developed from major combat operations to various counter rebellion and reconstruction efforts (Dale, 2008, p. 1).

1.2.1. War planning:

A military operation plan, or war plan, is a formal plan for military armed forces, their military organizations and units to conduct operations, as drawn up by commanders within the combat operations process in achieving objectives before or during a conflict. Military plans are generally produced in accordance with the military doctrine of the troops involved ('Joint Operation Planning', Dec. 2006).

On November 2002, *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* reported that US President George W. Bush had come up with a military plan for the invasion. Few days later, other newspapers published more details about George W. Bush plan. They reported that US forces would attack the Iraqi

territory with mainly ground forces and air forces as well as Special Forces. The leaked plan by newspapers stated that the target of the ground attack is just the initial stage to take control inside Iraq (Pollack, 2002, para. 1- 2).

Anthony H. Cordesman in his book (2003) wrote that before the war, the US prepared its major ground forces, which numbered 115.000 troops and were stationed in Kuwait, which were under the command of Gen. David D. McKiernan. Moreover, the V Corps comprised 1500 troops was commanded by Gen. William Wallace. Also, the 3rd Infantry Division *Rock of the Marne* which numbered between 18.000 and 20.000 troops were commanded by Gen. Beford C. Blount III. The 2nd Brigade Combat also known as *Falcon Brigade* were paratroops that numbered 4000 troops were commanded by Col. Arnold Neil Gordon- Bray. Furthermore, the 101st Airborne Division was under the command of Gen. David Petraeus, which numbered 20.000 troops. Finally, Gen. James Conway led the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force and the 1st Marine Division. Both divisions numbered 60.000 troops (pp. 37- 8).

On March 19, 2003, almost 175,000 troops took part in the invasion of Iraq. These troops joined the war from the allied countries of US: United Kingdom of Great Britain, Australia, and Poland. The US comprised the core troops with 130.000 (Haddad, 2016, para. 1).

1.2.1.1. Strategic objectives:

According to Catherine Dale (2008), a Specialist in International Security, the short- term goal of the administration for Operation Iraqi Freedom was to

abolish Saddam's dictatorship. In his address to the Nation on March 17, 2003, US President George W. Bush stated that 'It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power.... We will tear down the apparatus of terror... the tyrant will soon be gone' (p. 9).

Within the same context, President George W. Bush announced the US would aid Iraqis to construct 'a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.' in the future. It would be an Iraq, as he described it, which would not harm its own people. The CENTCOM Operation Iraqi Freedom campaign plan depicted the strategic objective as follows 'A stable Iraq, with its territorial integrity intact and a broad-based government that renounces WMD development and use and no longer supports terrorism or threatens its neighbors' (Dale, 2009, p. 31).

1.2.1.2. Military objectives:

According to Gen. Franks, there were eight objectives of the invasion:

First, ending the regime of Saddam Hussein. Second, to identify, isolate, and eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Third, to search for, to capture, and to drive out terrorists from that country. Fourth, to collect such intelligence as we can relate to terrorist networks. Fifth, to collect such intelligence as we can relate to the global network of illicit weapons of mass destruction. Sixth, to end sanctions and to immediately deliver humanitarian support to the displaced and to many needy Iraqi citizens. Seventh, to secure Iraq's oil fields and resources, which belong

to the Iraqi people. And last, to help the Iraqi people create conditions for a transition to a representative self- government.

(Sale and and Javid, 2003, para. 4).

Within this context, Catherine Dale (2009), in her report, stated that the US *CENTCOM* defined the military objectives of Operation Iraqi Freedom as follows:

- End the Baathist regime,
- Devastate Iraqi WMD capabilities and infrastructure,
- Destabilize, separate, and topple the Iraqi government and support a new, broad- based government,
- Protecting allies and supporters from Iraqi threats and attacks,
- Dismantling Iraqi terrorist networks,
- Gathering intelligence on global terrorism,
- Detaining terrorists and war criminals and liberating unjustly detained individuals under Iraqi rule,
- Promoting diplomatic efforts to establish conditions for long- term peace in Iraq (p. 32).

1.2.1.3. Major combat operations:

Major combat operations in Iraq started on March, 20, 2003 with air strikes followed by a ground offensive into Iraq via Kuwait.(Dale, 2009, p40). Steve Bowman (2007), a specialist in National Defense, mentioned that the invasion

of Iraq was predicated to begin with a 72- 96 hours air attack to weak the Iraqi leadership structure and frustrate Iraqi resistance. Intelligence reported that striking Saddam Hussein might accelerate the operational plan and lead to start offensive air and ground operations. During 25 days of the offensive operations, the coalition forces took control of most of the cities of Iraq; such as, Baghdad, Al Basra, Mosul, Kirkuk, and Tikrit (p. 3).

Stephen A. Carney (2011) wrote that all armed forces which participated in the invasion of Iraq from different countries were under the command of Gen. Tommy Franks. These combined- forces included ground, air, the Navy, and special operations force (p. 6).

As military operations proceeded in Iraq, much debate has been undertaken about the war plan against Iraq. The Department of Defense released only official information concerning the war preparations before the implementation of the offensive procedures. However, there were considerable and continual news reports which provided details about the war plan (Costel, 2008, p. 110).

1.2.1.3.1. Early infiltration:

In 2003, the US Army started to penetrate into Iraq. Before the real launch of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the CIA infiltrated early to Iraq in order to gather information and to prepare the groundwork for early infiltration of Special Operations Forces. Then, Special Operation forces entered Iraq before the official launch and putted its bases in Al Anbar – Territory situated in western Iraq-, Moreover, it secured suspicious WMD websites (Dale, 2009, p. 40).

1.2.1.3.2. The launch:

On March, 20, 2003, US launched the war on Iraq; UK and several coalition allies were both joined to overthrow Saddam Hussein's government and to eliminate his stock of weapons of mass destruction.

Andrew Glass (2017) showed that preventive attack from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction turned into an occupation. This occupation led to the capture of Saddam Hussein and he was hanged to death. Glass also mentioned in his report that the Iraqi Survey Group investigated about nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and they found that since 1991, Iraq had no weapons. However, Saddam Hussein had the intention to continue the production if US sanctions were lifted (para. 3- 4).

In early 2003, plans were supposed to begin with a short air-campaign, then the ground invasion. However, last-minute evidence has increasingly raised fears that the Iraqi regime willfully destroys its southern oil wells, so that the timing of the launch of the ground forces has been advanced, before the planned launch of the air-campaign (Dale, 2009, p. 41).

1.2.1.3.3. The ground campaign:

Before the invasion of Iraq which was implemented under the Coalition Forces Land Component Command (CFLCC), a dispute occurred between General Tommy Franks and Lieutenant General Paul T. Mikolashek who was CFLCC commander. Therefore, Franks removed him although he was supervising and arranging for the ground campaign on Iraq. After Gen.

Mikolashek was removed, Gen. Franks substituted him with Lt- Gen. David D. McKiernan. Then, David D. McKiernan became the commander of ground troops which headed towards Iraq. The SECDEF's Office suggested dividing the missions force for Afghanistan and Iraq, so the CFLCC concentrate only on Iraq (Rayburn et al., 2019, pp. 55- 6).

The Army Commander David D. McKiernan led all US land forces into Iraq. His major aim and focus was to disarm WMD from the hand of Saddam Hussein as well as remove the Baath Party from power (Martin, 2016, para. 5).

On March 21, 2003, it has been determined for the CFLCC ground forces to pass through the Iraqi-Kuwaiti borders at 9 p.m. However, there were intelligence information that led the US president George W. Bush and the SECDEF Donald Rumsfeld to start the ground campaign before the agreed time (Rayburn et al., 2019, p. 84).

1.2.1.4. The disposition of the Iraqi army:

Saddam Hussein was preparing just weeks before the real US offensive of Iraq. The week before the launch of the invasion, the Iraqi Army was not fully prepared because they thought that the US would not actually invade Iraq. Saddam Hussein believed that the offensive would enter Iraq from the west. Thus, his major Republican Guard was recruited toward Jordan. Also, he recruited his conventional army forces in the east in order to counter any expedient attack from Iran. Moreover, the I Army Corps was in Kirkuk -238

kilometers north of Baghdad- as well as the V Army Corps was in Mosul - approximately 400 km north of Baghdad-(Rayburn et al., 2019, p. 83).

Anthony H. Cordesman (2003) stated that the Iraqi Army was divided into 5 main corps, and its main bases were stationed in Baghdad, Basra, Kirkuk and Mosul. The First Army Corps and the Fifth Army Corps were in the north to protect the Iraqi-Turkish borders as they were deployed on the Iraqi-Kurdish borders and the oil fields. Cordesman (2003) stated that the main five corps organized as follows:

- The I Corps contained the 2nd Infantry Division, the 5th Mechanized Division, the 8th Infantry Division and 38th Infantry Division,
- The II Corps was spread in the east of Baghdad to respond any attack from Iran; it contained the 3rd Armored Division, the 15th Infantry Division and the 34th Infantry Division,
- The III Corps headquartered near the Kuwaiti borders; it contained the 6th Armored Division, the 11th Infantry Division and 51 Mechanized Division,
- The IV Corps was ready to protect the Iranian borders; it contained 10th Armored Division, 14th Infantry Division and the 18th Infantry Division,
- The V Corps contained the 1st Mechanized Division, the 4th Infantry Division, the 7th Infantry Division and the 16th Infantry Division (pp. 45- 6)

Also, Cordesman (2003) mentioned that Iraq Army generally used tanks for combat operations more than its other armored vehicles (p .49).

1.2.1.5. The fall of the Iraqi regime

From April 2 to 3, 2003 the 1st Marine Division passed through Tigris River and demolished some of Baghdad Republican Guard Division and directed towards the north in order to devastate Al Nida Division. On April 3, the 3rd Infantry Division moved to protect Baghdad, the capital city. On Apr. 5, the 3rd Infantry Division which was commanded by Lt- Gen. David D. McKiernan led the attack on Saddam International Airport, in Baghdad, the largest airport in Iraq. Furthermore, the 2nd Brigade which was under the command of Col. David G. Perkins was ready to carry out armored incursion into Baghdad (Rayburn et al., 2019, p. 95- 8).

On Apr. 7, the US forces seized the main presidential palace in Baghdad. Hence, Col. David Perkins said “Saddam Hussein says he owns Baghdad,” adding “Wrong. We own Baghdad” (Mohan, Daniszewski & Perry, 2003, para. 1 & 2). On Apr. 9, 2003 Saddam Hussein’s statue fell down in Al Firdos Square. The toppling of Saddam Hussein’s statue symbolized the overthrow of Saddam Hussein as well as his brutal and dictatorial regime (Zucchino & Martin, 2008, para. 1).

1.2.1.6. The end of the invasion and the US occupation of Iraq:

The US invasion of Iraq ended with the fall of the Iraqi capital, Baghdad on April 9, 2003 under the control of the US. On April 17, 2003, the US President George W. Bush announced the success of US in its mission. On May 01, 2003 the US president George W. Bush declared the end of major combat operations under the banner "Mission Accomplished" (Haddad, 2019, para. 5).

As soon as it became apparent that the old regime was no longer exercising control, widespread looting took place in Baghdad and elsewhere. Targets included government buildings, and the former houses of regime leaders, but also some private businesses and cultural institutions. Leaders of the Iraqi National Museum in Baghdad reported, for example, that "looters had taken or destroyed 170,000 items of antiquity dating back thousands of years" (Burns, 2003, para. 6). Looters and vandals also targeted unguarded weapons stockpiles largely abandoned by former Iraqi security forces.

On May 1, 2003, President Bush, standing aboard the USS Abraham Lincoln, declared an end to major combat operations in Iraq. He stated, 'In the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed' ('President Bush Announces Major Combat Operations in Iraq Have Ended', 2003, para. 1).

At that point, the old Iraqi regime, though not completely dismantled, was no longer able to exercise control over Iraq's territory, resources, or population. Saddam Hussein was captured later, on December 13, 2003, by units of 4ID, outside his hometown Tikrit.

Conclusion:

The US occupation of Iraq which started in 2003 was ground, air and marine military control led by US with its allied countries. The justifications for Iraq's possession of WMD and the support of Saddam to Al-Qaeda were among the most prominent and important justifications that the US administration gave to the United Nations. Some of the US administration officials have come to use this justification to the extent that Saddam Hussein was accused of his participation in the attacks of 9/11. The War on Iraq is considered one of the fastest wars ever after the defeat of the Iraqi army, which led to the quick fall of Baghdad. It ended with the arrest and execution of Saddam Hussein in December 2006.

Chapter two: The Guardian coverage of the US War on Iraq:

Introduction:

The War on Iraq, which was led by the US in 2003, was amongst the most devastating armed conflicts during the 21st century. It resulted in serious consequences, as hundreds of thousands civilians and soldiers lost their lives. In relation the war timeline, the media coverage of the War on Iraq played a key role in shaping public opinions and views. It shed light on the evolution of political and military relationships of UK and the US.

The present chapter shed light on the Guardian's Coverage of the US War on Iraq and UK's foreign policy towards the War. It focuses mainly on highlighting UK's reasons for participating in the War on Iraq, and how UK provided political and military support to the US.

2.1. Media, propaganda, and war:

Propaganda is the fuel that feeds the machinery of war. It appears when there is an important topic or subject with mysterious and unconfirmed information, i.e. correct information are not available. It emerges and spreads when people could not understand and keep up with the events that are happening. In war case, propaganda and war are closely associated (Kelley, 2004, pp. 3- 4). When a war starts, there will be distortions, fabrications, and manipulations of information. Propaganda; however, is directed to enemies in

order to mislead them with fake and wrong information and dark out facts to disorganize and perturb their forces.

In 2003, the War on Iraq witnessed extensive, daily media events coverage, since it was the major war event at that time. In this context, Kellner (2004) stated that 'the 2003 Iraq war was a major global media event constructed very differently by varying broadcasting networks in different parts of the world' (p. 1). Therefore, the War on Iraq was a global issue with which different broadcasting networks dealt in the world. In other sense, media spectacles show to readers different subjects in positive or negative images concerning the events. However, for the press, the issue of war is complicated and difficult to control, because it is an issue, which depends on different interpretations.

The public always try to recognize and see how media behaved in reporting the war and conflict, how it covered the issues; because sometimes, media report the events of the war to people without giving real details, so there will be gaps in understanding the fact and public opinion finds it difficult to handle, or assimilate the issue. Within this context, Steuter and Wills (2008) noted that 'Propaganda is not concerned with disseminating information, but with rallying emotion. Information is a distraction from propaganda's fundamental work: it is not intended to enlarge our understanding of complex issues but to narrow it' (p. 18). In contrast, in a more open society; such as, the US, Nancy Snow (2003) noticed that 'the hidden and integrated nature of the propaganda best convinces people that they are not being manipulated' (p. 22). Moreover, she believed that US propaganda is the sugar that reduces bitterness of the reality (p. 23).

2.1.1. The role of media in war and conflicts:

Wars and conflicts are important issues that are covered by a variety of media. Most journalists try to shed light on the war events in order to attract the public opinion to evaluate the reality behind what happened in these wars. Therefore, it has great and powerful responsibilities in influencing public thoughts. Moreover, it has powerful function in shaping opinions, change the way the people perceive and understand the world and getting the truth.

Media is the most powerful tool of communication; it plays a vital role in society, and it participates in shaping people's opinions. It provides a true side to the audience about what is right or wrong. Although media is related to spreading news like fire, but on the other hand, it also tells about the real world (Maheshwari, n. d., p. 136).

According to A. Puddephatt (2006), media's role generally takes two different forms, 'either the media takes an active part in the conflict and has responsibility for increased violence, or stays independent and out of the conflict, thereby contributing to the resolution of conflict and alleviation of violence' (p. 4). In other words, media role is either minimizing the problems and trying to find resolutions, or exaggerating the conflict as agitator.

One of the principals for media coverage of the war is neutrality. However, media, sometimes, becomes part of breaking wars, not part of resolving them. Therefore, media should avoid manipulation in covering the events for the goal of influencing public views to take support of the government. At this light, Chomsky stated that 'there was a need for the media to propose peaceful

choices and highlight the implications of war rather than just the more binary propagandistic approach' (as cited in Hutchinson, 2008, p. 35).

Media occupies an important part between the public and policymakers. Policymakers always follow up what media reports about public opinion. On the other hand, public opinion see that media is the primary source to know what policymakers do (Soroka, 2003, p. 28). Therefore, media is considered an essential element in transmitting images of both public opinion and policymakers.

The role of media in society is to give the public with right facts related to social, political, and economic issues, and it is the mission of the journalist to offer and detect these truths. In wartime, 'the media has a responsibility to inform the public in a way that allows them to make a rational judgment about government actions. However, most of the rhetoric at these times tends to be propagandistic and combative in nature' (Hutchinson, 2008, p. 35). This means that media role in wartime is to give the truth in order to allow public give their views in appropriate way and evaluate war in all sides.

According to Armin Wolf (2010), 'most scholars name the mass media as the most important source of political information and the central platform of political discourse'. In this sense, according to political scientist Ralph Nergine (1996, 107) the mass media act as:

- An important link between the public, and the opinion of the public and the decision-making processes of government,

- A key player in the construction or creation of “the public” and of public opinion,
- A means by which the public can come to play a direct and indirect part in the democratic process (Wolf, 2010, p. 15).

Media, public opinion, and government are related to each other since mass media transmit the sound of government and, at the same time, shape public opinion. Generally, they rely on political context; it shows the strategy of the government about specific issues and passes the predominating public opinion about them. This always happens in the time of a country's military conflict (Hyklová, 2010, pp. 6- 7).

As final point, the most important role of media in covering wars' news and events is to draw the real dimensions of the war which give sufficient insights to public in order to attract their attention.

2.1.1. The newspapers and the critical incidents:

In 2003, the news about the US invasion of Iraq spread largely in the world. Numerous incidents occurred to misunderstandings and ambiguities due to the rules that journalists were asked to adhere to. They could not attach each incident with details because of the prescribed rules of military unit during a conflict (Tumber & Palmer, 2004, p. 27). Consequently, the post- 9/ 11 era changed the way of media's coverage to the war; it made the reporters highly nervous to write negative reports that were anti- government.

In its editorial *War in the ruins of diplomacy* (March 18, 2003), *The New York Times* extremely criticized George W. Bush decision to invade Iraq. It said that Bush waged the war “without the compulsion of necessity”. Also, in *The Guardian*’s pages and *The Times*, London, the war dominated wide coverage of Bush’s speech, reports of the military plans as well as they depict and describe the situation in Iraq. Moreover, *The Guardian* in its editorial *Losing Robin Cook, Can Clare Short be far behind* (March 18, 2003), was strongly opposed to the war; it attacked the war without any support from government or the other countries and encouraged MPs to vote against Iraq. Furthermore, *The Dawn* in its editorial *On to war* illustrated that Israel is the the real beneficiary from the war and it would be able to seize the occupied areas. Besides, *The Times of India* also criticized the plan of the invasion and mentioned that there were no reasonable grounds which led to the war (Ravi, 2004, pp. 18, 19, 20, 21 & 22).

2.2. The Guardian coverage of the US War on Iraq and UK’s foreign policy towards the war:

UK foreign policy towards the war on Iraq had many dimensions to achieve. Tony Blair, the British PM, believed that it was necessary to stand with his ally George W. Bush, US President, in the Iraqi issue to confront the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, who constituted a danger to humanity and the entire world. He was; in fact, determined that removing Saddam Hussein from power was an ethical and legal action, since he posed a threat to US national security and the

world. Therefore, he insisted to remove him from power and called his people to support them to do so. In addition, Blair justified this action through many arguments; such as, banning and stopping the future threat; defending for the rights of weak people because Blair viewed that Saddam Hussein is a dictator; and he interfered with the aim to aid citizens who are under attack (Lee, 2012, p. 4).

Although the political arguments and justification which were given by Tony Blair about the invasion of Iraq, the truth of the war cannot be reached without going back over old facts and examining Blair's role in explaining the reasons which led to this conflict. From this perspective, Lee (2012) affirmed that 'I am confident that a close look at the moral grounds for invasion will broaden our understanding of what took place, Blair's role in it, and the immediate and long-term consequences for the UK and Western interventionist policies' (p. 8).

On April 7, 2002, in George W. Bush's Presidential Library, Tony Blair spoke about the criminal regime of the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein Al Takriti. Believing that the Baathist regime must be changed, PM Tony Blair linked his intervention in Iraq with the regime change that he had made earlier in Kosovo, Sierra Leone, and Afghanistan. Furthermore, he convinced his audience listeners that both super powers of the US and UK are under the threat of global terrorism and WMD programs and; thus, they have the right to retaliate against it.

In this context, he strongly emphasized his belief that:

We must be prepared to act where terrorism or Weapons of Mass Destruction threaten us. The fight against international terrorism is ... necessary the action should be military and again, if necessary and justified, it should involve regime change. (Lee, 2012, p. 96).

This latter related the terrorism and the danger of WMD that can make and he underlined the advantages of the regime change to save the victims from the cruel and oppressive leader.

Numerous British writers present a high level of suspicion in their writing, as they presume that US governments lie and tend to make people wondering about the information validity. In contrast, American writers “frequently bow to power even as they seek to hold it accountable” (Carr, 2013, para. 11). That is why US newspapers be inclined to government as it sparkle a positive reports on it.

In wartime, many newspapers covered the war from various countries. One of the famous newspapers is the British newspaper *The Guardian* which is among the most respected newspapers in the world. It had a great role in covering the political events like the issues of the war on Iraq. Its focus and interested point were to show and clarify the right pictures of the war to public. Moreover, *The Guardian* news took great and remarkable attention of public on its coverage about actions that happened. In addition, it criticizes the leaders

around the world, especially those from the United States. It reaches 30.4 million readers from different countries (Daly, 2016, para. 3).

Kristin M. Daly (2016) stated that when US declared War on Iraq, *The Guardian* extremely stood against this conflict. On the other hand, some US newspapers, in their editorials, concentrated only on inviting citizens to be united with the US government, while other US newspapers interpreted President George W. Bush's speeches in order to convince public and readers that the war is legal and it is justified (para. 3). Moreover, *The Guardian* journalists expressed their opposition of the war on Iraq. Thus, several editorials of *The Guardian* newspaper wrote that America had no right to enter and Iraq. Moreover, some journalists advised the British PM Tony Blair to avoid the use of force in countering terrorism, considering that supporting the US war is a big mistake for UK (para. 4). The Guardian's outlook about the war has affected both US and British people (para. 6).

The Guardian newspaper totally opposed about the war on Iraq before it launched but this objection started to decrease when the war began. Within the context, Narsimhan Ravi (2004) believed that 'The Guardian which was vociferous in its opposition to the war before it began toned down its opposition once the war started' (p. 27).

2.2.1. UK and the War on Iraq (2003):

Tony Blair stated that Saddam Hussein was developing WMD and his regime was intolerable. Therefore, they would not allow him to do it because it is a threat

to Saddam Hussein's people, to his region also. On April 10, 2002, Tony Blair made a speech in the House of Commons in which he stated that:

Saddam Hussein's regime is despicable, he is developing weapons of mass destruction, and we cannot leave him doing so unchecked. He is a threat to his own people and to the region and, if allowed to develop these weapons, and a threat to the US. (Rangwala & Plesch, 2004, pp. 8- 9)

On March 18, 2003, 412 members of the House of Commons voted in favor of the US invasion of Iraq, in contrast to 149 who voted against. Therefore, Tony Blair, UK's PM, gave considerable supports to US president George W. Bush to invade Iraq; since George W. Bush was unready to go alone to Iraq and he may not gone to invade Iraq without the assistance and support of UK. On the evening of 18 March 2003, after voting for the US the invasion of Iraq, Tony Blair gained support of UK's forces to join the US troops in the invasion of Iraq (Marshall, 2018, para. 1 & 2).

According to Tony Blair and US President George W. Bush, they decided to invade Iraq in for the sake of liberating Iraqi people from dictatorship tyrannical rule of the Baathist regime. The overall operation was called *Operation Iraq Freedom*.

In this context, Tony Blair stated in the House of Commons that:

We went into conflict because we believed- in my view, rightly- that Saddam Hussein was a threat to his region and to the wider world, and we are proud of the fact that people in Iraq today, for the first time in decades, have got the chance of stability, prosperity and democracy. What everyone should realize is that if people like the Hon— our able Gentleman had had their way, Saddam Hussein, his sons and his henchmen would still be terrorizing people in Iraq. I find it quite extraordinary that he thinks that that would be a preferable state of affairs. (Lewis, 2004, p. 299)

Tony Blair believed that Saddam Hussein should be fought on the basis that he constituted a great danger to the world. Moreover, he strongly believed that their decision would ensure the stability of the people of Iraq as well as their freedom.

2.1.1.1. The UK reasons to invade Iraq (2003):

Like any country which has military power and intends to engage in a war in the reason to gain what serves its own interests in all sides: economic, social, military interests, UK invaded Iraq for many goals. Therefore, Tony Blair strongly supported the war on Iraq and participates with US and took the decision to start the war on Iraq (War on Terror). This war makes a climate of controversial and it get the attention of public.

On September 24, 2004 Tony Blair gave the dossier to British parliament stating that Saddam Hussein possessed chemical and biological weapons, and he has existing and active military plans for the use of chemical weapons and it would be activate in 45 minutes. In order to gain the support for a war, Iraq was depicted as an evil state and its leader is brutal and savage. Since 2003, it has become transparent that there was fundamental relation between oil of Iraq with both US and UK decision that led to this war (Hamourtziadou and Gokay, 2016, para. 2- 3).

UK designed its warpath to Iraq with US to achieve many goals. The first reason which is emphatically clear is to remove Saddam Hussein from power and eliminate his dictatorship, so that democracy and freedom could appear and flourish in Iraq. The second reason is that UK wanted to dominate oil stock; UK and US administration succeeded to overthrow of Saddam Hussein (Gould, 2010, para. 2- 3).

Tony Blair aimed also to control the world like the US administration and gain a good position to UK in Europe, from that perspective Parisa Abbasian (2017) noted 'the prime minister pursued two wishes about Iraq: first, he wished to have share in global management beside the United States. In another level he wished that Blair wanted to the United Kingdom being in the heart of Europe.' (p. 2).

On July, 06 2016, John Chilcot, a British Inquiry Chairman made public statement "The Iraq Inquiry", its goal was to find the reasons that UK needed from the invasion of Iraq and if it had the right to do so. The inquiry examined

events from 2001 to 2009 and it examined how the conflict was organized. Moreover, he investigated the arguments in the run-up to the invasion by hearing evidence from those who involved the decision to go to war including Tony Blair who was prime minister at that time. The report made details about the illegitimate reasons of the war and outlined the mistakes which were made. (McCredie, 2016, para. 1). Tony Blair then apologized for his mistake of intelligence assessment, “I express more sorrow, regret and apology than you may ever know or can believe” Blair said (Mason, Asthana and Stewart, 2016, para. 6).

2.1.1.1.1. The War on Terror:

In 2003 war, The UK was the US key ally in preparing the plan to stop the serious threat to global peace. The UK and US used numerous military strategies to destroy this threat under the name of “War on Terror”. This latter became an equivalent word to “Iraq”.

In March and April, 2003, the British forces which numbered 46,000 troops, were the second largest forces after US forces to wage the war on Iraq (‘British troops start Iraq withdrawal’, 2009, para. 7). The British forces who were recruited to enter war with Iraq knew the US plan of expanding the War on Terror. However, Blair was uncertain well to send the UK troops without parliamentary support. This contributed in the delaying of British army's fully preparation (‘Iraq War: The invasion’, n. d).

Both the US and UK were using advanced weapons in the war on Iraq, some of these weapons were illegal according to international law. Moreover, It has been proven that the US and British army used widespread and indiscriminate weapons as well as every day they bombarded the Iraqi cities ('War Crimes Committed by the United States', 2006, pp. 20- 21).

Ali Fathollah- Nejad (2015) wrote that Chris Patten, a British politician and a member of the European Commission, stated in his article in The Irish Times that many countries in Europe tried to stop those crimes against humanity and finish the war, but they failed to do so (p. 19).

2.1.1.1.2. Economic benefits:

Since debates about wars are dominated by moral, ethical, political, legal, and military- strategic issues, economists are not usually associated with debates about wars. However, economists can make an important contribution by stressing the costs of wars and conflict.

Although wars can be costly- as they require scarce resources, superpowers can engage in conducting wars for their own benefits. They always have economic benefits and advantages to gain from. This is the case of the War on Iraq (2003) which was led primarily by the US, UK, and coalition forces.

2.1.1.1.2.1. Taking control of Iraqi oil reserves:

When the war started, both the US and UK were under doubt about their goal from invading Iraq. The UNSCOM confirmed that the reason of Iraq war was

about oil. Moreover, several members of US and UK administration asserted that the Iraqi oil resources were always the main interests of British oil companies and US. Thus, the Iraqi oil was essential part that led US and UK to invade Iraq in 2003 (Gökay, n.d, para. 2, 3 & 5).

According to Terry Macalister, Energy editor, Chilcot's papers explored that both US and UK fought in a forceful way to take control of Iraqi oil. Therefore, Tony Blair was worried if the war on Iraq being seen as "war for oil" and it would be very harmful if critics see the US and UK aimed to snatch Iraq's oil. On March 31, 2003, Tony Blair at a meeting with George W. Bush told him that they need to draw an obvious picture to "dispel the myth that [they] were out to grab Iraq's oil" (2016, para. 1 & 7).

As a matter of fact, the US was motivated by oil to invade Iraq. According to Paul Wolfowitz, ex- US Deputy Secretary of Defense, 'If we should decide to go to war with Iraq, it will not be a war against Saddam Hussein, weapons of mass destruction, or terrorism ... it will be about oil' ('Paul Wolfowitz and the reasons for invading Iraq', 2003, para. 1). He made it clear that oil was the main reason for going to war in Iraq. Accordingly, "The ... difference between North Korea and Iraq is that we had virtually no economic options with Iraq because the country floats on a sea of oil" ('Wolfowitz: Oil Motivated U.S. Attack On Iraq', 2003, para. 3). The sense was clearly that the US had no economic options by means of which to achieve its objectives, not that the economic value of the oil motivated the war. Therefore, the US engaged in the War on Iraq (2003) to take

control of the Iraqi oil reserves that exist in abundance in that country. Likewise, UK had the same option as the US.

Since the US- British led invasion of Iraq aimed at controlling the Iraqi oil resources, it was estimated that the Iraqi storage of oil existed in billions of barrels. The US Energy Institute published a report on natural resources in the world, showing the top ten richest countries in the world in terms of natural resources. The wealth was calculated on the basis of the presence of oil, gas, coal, forests, "wood", gold, silver, copper, uranium, iron ore and phosphates. Iraq came in ninth place out of 193 countries (Djamarani, 2000, pp. 21- 2).

2.1.1.1.2.2. Assuring state building deals in Iraq:

After the US- British led invasion of Iraq and the devastation caused by the war, UK intended to support Iraq in its reconstruction in various fields, as announced by the British ambassador to Iraq John Willex to Iraqi PM Haider Al-Abadi in 2013. Wilkes renewed his country's support for Iraq in various fields after achieving a great victory over ISIS. In addition, there was a great desire of British companies to contribute to the reconstruction efforts. It is worth to mention that Kuwait hosted the donor countries conference to support the reconstruction of Iraq, which included the Iraqi government's report on the extent of destruction and the amounts required to complete the reconstruction projects (Fagan and Watts, 2003, para. 1- 2).

In hope to achieve a central role in state building in the post- war Iraq, British companies expect to work on the reconstruction mainly as sub-contractors to

American firms. This could be achieved only after the conflict ended. UK businesses were involved in patching up Iraqi infrastructure following intervention with the US government by Patricia Hewitt. The latter contacted the US Agency for International Aid and Development, which co-ordinated an £800m to £900m rebuilding programme for Iraq (Fagan and Watts, 2003, para. 4).

The companies were also concerned that any future British government aid for Iraq would be channeled through international agencies, including the EU, and that Iraqi work generated by the funds would be open to bidding by foreign firms (Fagan & Watts, 2003, para. 6).

In fact, the reconstruction process embraces for Western powers all the backgrounds they bear related to oil resources which exist in the cities targeted for reconstruction, in addition to what they constitute in terms of access to new markets. When it comes to oil-producing countries, whenever conflicts break out, or end, Western countries quickly announce their willingness to participate in a reconstruction in which failed strategies are often applied.

As a matter of fact, the US and other European countries; such as UK, France, and Germany, faced one of the worst economic crises they had, and they strove to locate themselves on the international map, and obtain their share of reconstruction deals. The battle is raging between the Western powers to secure their share of the process of rebuilding the destroyed Iraqi cities, given its strategic location within an area that is considered a rich reservoir of oil and other mineral resources, is the focus of Western powers' attention. The decline

in the reserves of the Western powers of raw materials, in addition to the decline in their economic indicators because of their vulnerability to the repercussions of the global financial crisis (2008) and the impact of terrorism, prompted Western countries, especially the US and UK, to search for alternative markets in countries that are totally or partially devastated by setting up pro-governments to ensure that they get the biggest shares of rebuilding deals.

2.1.1.1. Blair's 2002 decision to invade Iraq: 'I will be with you, whatever':

Tony Blair considered the decision to invade Iraq as the most difficult decision he took along his career 'The decision to go to war in Iraq ... was the hardest, most momentous, most agonizing decision I took in my 10 years as British Prime Minister' (Johnson & Ashmore, 2016, para. 6). However Blair believed the world is better and safer as a result of toppling Saddam Hussein and decided to be "shoulder to shoulder" with the US president, he stated in his speech on September 12, 2001 'We therefore here in Britain stand shoulder to shoulder with our American friends', then he added '... we, like them, will not rest until this evil is driven from our world' ('Full transcript of Tony Blair's statement', 2001, para. 12).

On July 28, 2002, eight months before the invasion of Iraq, Tony Blair wrote a secret letter to the US president George W. Bush that he will be with him in all cases. 'I will be with you, whatever', Blair said (Booth, 2016, para. 1). The Chilcot's report shed light on many things; one of them is the private

correspondence between George W. Bush and Tony Blair. Tony Blair made a secret deal with George W. Bush to support him in ousting Saddam Hussein no matter what. Moreover, Blair strongly believed that the US president had the full right to invade Iraq and he did not want to let US administration go alone to the war, so he took the decision to be with George W. Bush and he never regretted to do so. From this angle, Blair said 'I believe we made the right decision and the world is better and safer,' (Harding, 2016, para. 5).

2.1.1.1.1. A true US ally:

The UK's relationship with the US is special and it is strong enough over time. They have a close connection with each other, because not only they share the same language or same history, but also they have cultural, political, military and economic ties. Many of these ties existed and still exist today.

Since 1940s, the UK is often observed as the voice of making US foreign policy. Scientists confirmed that UK's position as close ally to US has presented in order to promote its global power and status. On the other hand, UK support of US helped in enhancing the reputation and credibility of US policies. The close relationship between the aforementioned countries made common benefits to both of them (Mix, 2018, p. 12).

The 9/11 events changed the way of US foreign policy and gathered George W. Bush and Tony Blair. Therefore, these events became true allies and they had special relationship, 'America has no true friend than Great Britain' George W. Bush said. The special relationship was stable feature their time in power

together. There were some variation between the two but as the relationship has been flourished, it was clear that both of them had the same desire to advance in foreign affairs. The major objective of the two countries from the special relationship was to set their national interests aside in the aim of achieving their foreign goals. Tony Blair had his own visions and perspectives for foreign policy while George W. Bush was strongly reliant with his advisors (Laidlaw, 2016, p. 6).

In his report *The Iraq Inquiry*, John Chilcot uncovered the reality on the personal relationship between Tony Blair and George W. Bush that made Great Britain participate in the War on Iraq. Therefore, this relationship between both leaders was a 'determining factor' which drive them to invade Iraq (Milmo, 2016, para. 1).

2.1.1.1.2. Providing political and military support to the US:

The UK was the power point for the US in the war of Iraq. Blair was convinced that US with the support of UK could put an end to Saddam Hussein's regime as he was ready to do what George W. Bush did and promised that he will be with him "whatever". Thus, Blair was ready to aid George W. Bush in both political and military sides.

In 2003, Britain sent almost 46.000 troops to Iraq in order to assist US troops. The British troops were named "Operation Telic", the codename given to the British military operations which were conducted in the Iraq war in 2003. In January 2003, Britain started to move its troops and equipment to Kuwait. When

British forces arrived, they constructed vast tented in Kuwait. However, they had some difficulties in training and planning for war due to dust storms. Robert Brims, Major General led the 1st Armored Division. The division contained 16 Air Assault Brigade, 7th Armored Brigade equipped with Challenger tanks and Warrior armored fighting vehicles, and 102 Logistics Brigade. Furthermore, Special Forces of UK were deployed to locate WMD ('Iraq War: The invasion', n. d).

Tony Blair confirmed that the main purpose from the support of US to start the war is 'to spread [their] values of freedom, democracy, tolerance and the rule of law' (Hosenball, 2016, para. 19).

Conclusion:

Iraq war 2003 was the major incident that attracted interests and intentions of media to talk and write about it. Hence, many newspapers started to report and criticize the incidents as well as the events that happened. Each newspaper had its own aspects and point of views about the conflict which are different from the other newspapers. In addition to that, the military and political operations of this conflict play a key role in the world of media and made great storms of news particularly in newspapers and TV. Finally, The US invasion of Iraq was the pivotal event in the eye of the media in 2003.

Chapter three: The Guardian Coverage of the military operations of the War on Iraq (2003): A content analysis:

Introduction:

Before, during, after the Iraq war 2003, the Guardian newspaper was among the most reliable newspaper in the entire world, particularly in UK for its significant and trusted coverage of the US invasion of Iraq 2003. The Guardian coverage had great influence and impact in public opinion due to its accurate and honest coverage of events.

The present chapter shows how the Guardian newspaper dealt with its coverage, taking into consideration five battles that took place in Iraq 2003, which opened the road to analyze the content. In addition, the target of this chapter is to examine, evaluate and analyze the content of the Guardian in a detailed way and from different angles.

3.1. The Guardian coverage of pre- war events:

The Guardian newspaper was amongst the most trusted sources in reporting news about the US invasion of Iraq 2003, since it provided the public with descriptive and informative coverage.

Before the war began, and while both the US and UK were still searching about intelligence and information about Iraqi WMD program to proceed with invasion of Iraq, *The Guardian* began to report the events leading to the war in order to cover more details about the war plan to invade Iraq. Within this

framework, Kamal Ahmed (2002), in his article entitled *Blair and Bush to plot war on Iraq*, wrote about the plan of George W. Bush and Tony Blair. He stated that Tony Blair extremely supported the plan of Bush to engage in the war on Iraq if Saddam Hussein did not accept to devestate his WMD. Furthermore, he indicated that Europe attacked George W. Bush because of his desire to topple Saddam Hussein. Besides, George W. Bush described Iraq, Iran, and North Korea as *International Pariah States* in his famous speech *Axis of Evil* of January 29, 2002. However, US President George W. Bush received critics of the French Prime Minister, Lionel Jospin, and Chris Patten, the EU Commissioner for external affairs.

In March 21, 2002, *The Guardian* published *Opposition grows to Iraq war*. The article was based on poll to take British opinions about UK support to US in the war, and most British voters were against it. The poll gave 51% who opposed the war, while 35% backed it. Additionally, Clare Short, a British politician and the first Cabinet Minister expressed her disagreement concerning Britain to engage in the war with Iraq and she described this action as "a blind military attack" (Guardian Reporters, 2002, para. 2 & 4).

Months later, *The Guardian* started to write its articles by referring to other newspapers. From this perspective, Julia Day in her article *War on Iraq; what the papers say* published on September 25, 2002, compared between mainly the British newspapers of *the Daily Mirror* and *the Sun*. She showed that the *Daily Mirror* was against the War on Iraq when she stated that 'the Daily Mirror has refused to succumb to Downing Street pressure to back a war against Iraq'.

However, the *Sun* newspaper was not against the war since it was justified. Moreover, she stated that ‘the Sun publishes gruesome and disturbingly graphic pictures of children killed by chemical weapons during Iraq's war with Iran 14 years ago as "irrefutable evidence" that war is justified’. Additionally, she asserted that ‘The Sun, which has consistently supported an attack on Iraq, is unequivocal’ (para. 1, 2 & 7).

3.2. The Guardian coverage of the British military operations in the War:

The conflict between US and Iraq in 2003 was the focus of world media, especially newspapers; and *The Guardian* was amongst the world newspapers which covered the events of the war before, during, and after the US occupation of Iraq.

The Guardian coverage of the war and military operations was ‘descriptive’ more than ‘analytical’. In addition, *The Guardian* had a considerable influence on international politics, as it was covering a conflict that had considerable and serious consequences in the Middle East and the entire Arab region.

3.2.1. Fighting the battles of the War on Iraq:

3.2.1.1. The Mosul raid (2003):

In their article *Dead: the sons of Saddam* which was published on Jul. 23, 2003, Julian Borger and Gary Younge described the aforesaid which erupted in Mosul as gun battle in northern Iraq between the US and Iraq; Saddam

Hussein's sons Uday and Qusay were; unfortunately, killed in this battle. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, Commander of ground forces in Iraq, led the raid attack in the city of Mosul and confirmed that Saddam Hussein's sons were killed. He indicated that 'We are certain that Uday and Qusay were killed today. We have used multiple sources to identify the individuals.' In addition, Gen. Ricardo Sanchez clarified 'They died in a fierce gun battle. They resisted the detention and the efforts of the coalition forces to apprehend them. They were killed in the ensuing gunfight.' Moreover, the US forces assured and pledged that they will provide incisive evidence of deaths, may be by showing photographs. Borger and Younge stated that 'the deaths of Saddam's sons will come as an immense relief to the US and British governments' (para. 2, 5, 6 & 9).

In the same day of Hussein's sons death, US Army investigators used DNA test in the aim of assuring that Uday and Qusay were killed in the raid of Mosul, and they wanted to confirm that because there were four persons who were killed (Borger & Younge, 2003, Para 13). Furthermore, Scott McClellan, the White House Spokesman informed journalists that he had information about the reports, but 'not in a position to confirm anything'. Furthermore, an official in Washington D. C. said the four dead bodies were deformed, but two of them had "a strong resemblance" to Uday and Qusay, the third one was a body of an adolescent (Qusay's son 14 years old) and the fourth one was probably of bodyguard ('US forces may have killed Saddam's sons,' 2003, Para. 4, 11 & 12).

In this context, Jamie Wilson, in her article *Tribe gathers to bury Saddam's sons* published on Aug. 3, 2003, stated that Qusay and Uday were buried in the graveyard in the region where their father was born as well as Qusay's son (Mustapha). He was buried beside his father and uncle. According to Thawrah Abed Bakr, the director of the Red Crescent in Tikrit, Iraq, they were buried in the family cemetery and everything was done before 12H 30 pm (para. 3 & 8).

3.2.1.2. The Battle of Baghdad (2003):

In the north of Karbala, 50 miles away from the south of Baghdad, the V Corps from the US army arranged military line with huge number of tanks as well as land forces. They moved swiftly from Kuwait to join the conflict (McCarthy, Borger and Millar, 2003, para. 1). In the night of April 01, 2003 the US 3rd Infantry Division and the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force were ready to go towards to the north of Baghdad and they were well prepared to enter the battle as Reuters correspondent with American forces, Sean Maguire claimed "we've swung from passivity to activity quite quickly". In addition to that, in Diwaniya, south-east of Baghdad a gunfire broke out for eight hours when US marines were fired by Iraqi armies (McCarthy, Borger and MacAskill, 2003, para. 8, 9 & 10).

On the road to Baghdad, US troops discovered that Iraqi forces rapidly left "defensive positions and fled, leaving behind trenches littered with everything from mortars and small arms to teapots and bedspreads" ('US troops 'within six miles' of Baghdad,' 2003, para. 6). Captain Frank Thorp, a spokesman for

central command in Qatar, Kuwait told CNN that US Special Forces could enter various Iraqi sites and a palace approximate to Baghdad and it was proof that Saddam Hussein's leadership began to break down ('US troops 'within six miles' of Baghdad,' 2003, para. 9 & 10).

Fox News quoted some information by an officer from the 3rd Infantry Division who declared that they took Baghdad, its palaces as well as its town center "Saddam Hussein says he owns Baghdad. We own Baghdad. We own his palaces, we own downtown," he said (Whitaker, 2003, para. 1). Military sources said that their purpose was not to dominate Baghdad, but rather to show the power of the US army to prove that nothing could prevent them from entering Baghdad. In the morning of April 07, 2003, the US troops entered for the first time the city center with not less than 70 tanks and 60 armored vehicles (Whitaker, 2003, para. 2 & 3).

3.2.1.3. The Battle of Basra (2003):

In their article, entitled *Basra hit by bombardment* published on March 21, 2003, Mohammed Amini and Dan De Luce showed that a continued aerial bombardment implemented in southern city of Basra. Furthermore, from Iranian border there were at least 20 bombs or missiles attacks on the city of Al Basra in 30 minutes. Local residents told the Guardian reporters that more than two bombs fell from the Iranian borders: One of them struck a petrochemical plant complex at about 10H00 pm and the damage to the plant was not clear. The other one fell down behind a hospital in Abadan, four miles from the Iraqi-Iranian

border. There were some reports informed that both British and US forces could soon take control of the city (para. 1, 3 & 4).

According to Paul Harris, who wrote his article entitled *Hit-and-run attack on Basra*, published on March 29, 2003, the British forces with their tanks directed towards central Basra. The tanks demolished 'the *Fedayeen militias* Headquarters, a TV mast, and a statue of Saddam Hussein' then they withdrew without causing casualties (para. 1).

Tim Butcher, an English author and journalist, in his article *Commandos launch battle for Basra*, stated that in the battle of Basra there were 'unknown number of injuries' of British forces, some of them were in a grave situation. However, British troops could ruin the Iraqi tanks and armored soldiers carriers. The Iraqi troops arranged a brave counter- attack, they threw rocket- propelled grenade and set fire to the British ship, one Royal Marine was killed and three of them were injured. Then, the British troops struck one of the Iraqi vessels with two Milan anti-tank missiles and sunk (2003, para. 2 & 3).

3.2.1.4. The First Battle of Fallujah:

In his article entitled *Uneasy truce in the city of ghosts*, Rory McCarthy (2004) stated that in the battle of Fallujah (April 4–May 1, 2004), the US 1st Marine Expeditionary Force were almost 2000 armed forces. They implemented the most violent battle since the beginning of the war on Iraq 2003. This latter have resulted a horrible number of deaths and casualties. The doctors who were in Fallujah said 600 persons died. Moreover, the US military sources declared that

many of its troops were killed and deaths of US troops in the month of April 2004 were more than the deaths of the war which launched in Iraq in 2003 against the Iraqi president Saddam Hussein (para. 10 & 11).

After five days from the start of the battle, the US forces decided to stop ceasefire and made negotiation with politicians from the Iraqi Islamic party (IIP). A senior member in of the IIP, Hajim Al- Hassani said that when US troops used its power, the Iraqi troops used the same power and that what led people enter in a conflict "Using force in the way they used it in Fallujah made people fight," he said (McCarthy, 2004, Para. 36 & 38).

3.2.1.5. The Second Battle of Fallujah:

The second battle of Fallujah, also called "Operation Phantom Fury" and "Operation al-Fajr" (Nov. 7– Dec. 23, 2004) is an urban battle between the Iraqi guerrillas and the US armed forces. The US sent 6000 troops and marines to enter this battle and Iraqi troops were about 2000 armed troops. The US leaders recruited almost three times as many soldiers that were recruited in the first battle for Fallujah to avoid their defeat, as happened in April 2004. The US forces were supported by advanced weapons: attack helicopters, AC-130 gunships, jets, tanks and artillery (Reid, 2004, para. 01 & 02).

Ros Taylor (2004), in his article, *Operation Phantom Fury* wrote that according to Herald Tribune, an English newspaper, the second battle of Fallujah might be the most interesting battle since the war which launched in 2003 by US against Iraq. Furthermore, the Telegraph, a British newspaper

described the battle scene by showing that the big quantity of explosions illuminated the city "Orange explosions lit up palm trees, minarets and rooftops ...". In addition to that, some commanders considered the battle of Fallujah as the great "urban operation" after the war in Vietnam (para. 1 & 2).

Ever after the two battles of Fallujah in 2004, the residents of the aforementioned city suffered from the great increase in rates of cancers, birth defect and infant mortality. Dr. Chris Busby, a British scientist who made two studies on the Fallujah health crisis, described the damage of Fallujah as the most genetic damage studied in history (Caputi, 2012, para. 02).

3.3. Story analysis form:

3.3.1. Article genre:

Data selected to analyze are newspaper articles and reports of the *Guardian* newspaper. The articles were selected in the aim of assessing and evaluating the manner of journalistic writers in the use of their words to convey to readers the events of the US and UK invasion of Iraq war 2003 before, during and after the war. Moreover, the articles and reports which were chosen focused mainly how *The Guardian* reporters structured their articles in covering the war on Iraq 2003 as well as how they used their words in describing and transferring the events and news to readers.

3.3.2. Article structure and unity:

The structure of the *Guardian* articles is divided into three parts: introduction, the body, and the conclusion. Firstly, reporters in their introduction shed light on the main idea of the topic discussed and tried to attract readers to continue reading the rest of the article by starting with the most interesting event and giving not enough details in order to suspense readers to read more. Secondly, the body of the articles divided into many short paragraphs which dealt with multiple ideas which may made the topic more understandable to readers. Finally, the conclusions were not concluding the idea of the whole article but they had independent information.

The unity in the *Guardian* articles was not achieved because the whole article was not derived from the controlling idea and the paragraphs were not related to each other.

3.3.2.1. Headlines:

The headlines in the *Guardian* newspaper articles which were written before, during and after the Iraq war 2003 were typically written on the most important point in the article (Death, Bombardment, lay siege to an area, the launch of a battle, etc....). Moreover, the headlines of *The Guardian* newspaper were short, but sometimes were long; it depends on the nature of the topic and the article.

Journalists and reporters wrote their headlines in the way that gave the reader a basic idea of what the article deals with. Some of the headlines were attractive and caught reader's attention to read, while others were not. In

addition, in the *Guardian* newspaper headlines, reporters capitalized only the first letter of the first word and the proper names (Saddam Hussein, Tony Blair, George W. Bush, Tommy Franks, etc... .), the name of countries (Iraq, Britain ...) and regions (Basra, Mosul, Fallujah ...), while the rest of headline's words were not capitalized.

The headlines were mostly written in the two tenses: the past and the present, but rarely used the future even if they were talking about something that will happen in the future. Firstly, they used the past tense to shed light on the events that happened recently, for example (US: Saddam's sons dead). Secondly, they used the present tense to describe an action, or event was happening right at that time for example (Tribe gathers to bury Saddam's sons).

3.3.2.2. Leads:

The *Guardian* reporters and journalists used mostly scene- setting leads i.e. they began with a description where the event took place. They started their article leads with brief and short opening sentences or paragraph. Generally, the leads of *The Guardian* articles introduced the central idea of the article, but sometimes had separate and independent information from the other paragraphs and they were written in concise ways. Some of the leads excited the readers to continue reading and made them want to find out more. Furthermore, the leads of *The Guardian* newspaper often answered the following key questions: What happened? When and where did the action happen? Who involved it? And why this action happened?

Furthermore, some leads that left out confusing information because some *The Guardian* journalists and reporters sometimes did not cover the event in a convincing way and left the reader asking more questions to know what happened accurately. Besides, there were some leads which were written in a descriptive and narrative way: They set the scene for the article by depicting every detail. For example, Tim Butcher, in his article written on April 08, 2003, when he was talking about Saddam's palace 'Part Alhambra, part Barratt Home, President Saddam's palace had everything a megalomaniac tyrant could wish for, from gold-plated loo brushes to French-made ornate lampposts entwined with ivy' (para. 1).

In relation to the tense used in the leads, reporters used the past tense more than the others tenses because they were writing about the events that just already happened.

3.3.2.3. Body of the articles:

In covering the events of the US war on Iraq (2003), the body of the *Guardian* articles was always divided into different lengths of paragraphs, which contained different information and arguments. Each paragraph had separate information. Reporters commonly used quotes to speeches to add accuracy to the events; for example, quoting to US President George W. Bush, PM Tony Blair, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein speeches and sayings as pillar to their arguments and giving more details. In addition, *The Guardian* news' articles of are written

from bottom down. In other words, the most interesting news and information came first then followed by others.

The body paragraphs between 2 to 4 were long sentences; reporters used third person in writing their reports. The most predominant tense used in the body of *The Guardian* articles before, during, and after the War on Iraq (2003) was the past because news' reporters in most of the time were covering the events and describing information that had just happened and infrequently used the present and the future. As well, *The Guardian* reporters in writing their articles rarely used the transitions (firstly, secondly, finally, in addition, also ...). Besides, the most punctuation marks which were used in the body of the *Guardian* articles were: full stop (.), comma (,), colon (:), and quotations marks ("").

The paragraphs of *The Guardian* articles were not coherent, not connected and not flow together smoothly. They did not allow the reader to move throughout the article from one idea to another; so, he could not understand what the reporter would say in an easy way. Hence, the lack of coherence may inhibit the reader's ability to digest the main points. In addition, *The Guardian* articles were more depth because cover one subject from multiple angles.

3.3.2.4. Conclusions:

The *Guardian* news articles' conclusions sometimes did not conclude the whole article and did not remind the arguments that have been made, but they had independent information. Therefore, these led the reader to think that he is

still reading the body of the article. Moreover, *The Guardian* reporters did not use the words: finally, to conclude, in brief, in the end ..., they only wrote a short paragraph to conclude with. Therefore, *The Guardian* news articles' conclusions did not restate the main points of the article and that make the reader feel he has not reached the end of it. For example, Michael Howard, one of the *Guardian's* news reporters, conclude his article (2003) with the following paragraph 'He also met about 40 tribal leaders to enlist their help in restoring order and appealed to religious leaders to broadcast appeals for calm from the city's mosques. He plans to set up a representative council of Mosul's tribal, community and civic leaders tomorrow.' He did not conclude the whole article, but just gave more information to the previous paragraph i.e. the paragraph before the concluded one.

3.3.2.5. Language, vocabulary, and style:

The language used in the *Guardian* is the vigorous English language which is somewhat difficult for the readers to understand very well. In addition, the *Guardian* news reporters used mostly one of language's techniques: imagery technique, which has been typically used in the first and/ or the second paragraphs which can touch the reader's sight sense as well his imagination so he could draw the places, or the things which the journalist talked about and may feel himself in a fictional world. For example, Tim Butcher (2003), news reporter of the *Guardian*, when he wrote about president Saddam's palace 'There were Moorish screens carved from teak, giant marble-clad columns,

vaulted ceilings and stained-glass windows. There was parquet flooring by the acre and sweeping staircases connecting ballroom to ballroom' (para. 2).

The *Guardian*' journalists used declarative sentences and use the different parts of a sentence: nouns, pronouns, verb, adjective, adverb, and very rarely used preposition. Additionally, they use the various determiners: articles (the / an / a), possessives (his / her / its / their), demonstratives (this / these / that / those ...) and quantifiers (more / every / many ...). Additionally, they use acronyms but they expand them to make them clear, particularly if the acronym is not known to be a well-known for the audience.

The vocabulary of the sentences some of them are simple while others are complex, especially when they cover political issues; so, they used military and political vocabularies which might not allow the reader to understand the purpose of the article, or even sometimes to take a general idea of it.

The predominant style of the *Guardian* is the descriptive and narrative styles. The descriptive style was used to create vivid pictures of the events in reader's mind and influence his attention. Also, news reporters used the narrative style not only to transmit information to readers, but to construct and convey the events, complete with characters, conflict, and settings.

3.4. Content analysis:

3.4.1. Identification and data collection:

A detailed analytical route is pursued in this research and the qualitative method was followed. The data subjected to the present analysis are the articles

of the *Guardian* newspaper which talk broadly about the war on Iraq 2003. They were collected due to the importance of *The Guardian* coverage of the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. The data which were selected based on certain time from January 2003 to January 2004. The data and the time which were collected were not randomly chosen because they permit to adequately answer the stated research questions and evaluate the results to create better understanding of the research and make it valuable.

3.4.2. Units and categories of analysis:

3.4.2.1. The units of meaning:

Before, during, and after the war on Iraq 2003, *The Guardian*' journalists covered variety of topics but they were in one essential circle: The US- led coalition against Iraq.

Before the invasion, the *Guardian*'s reporters were against the war on Iraq. In their articles, they focused in their articles on two major and unified topics:

- Firstly, the causes that led George W. Bush invade Iraq and they hypothesized that the first cause is the US claim of Hussein's relation with Al-Qaeda and his possession of WMD, UN inspectors' searching of weapons as well Colin Powell speech, the US secretary of state to the UN security council;
- Secondly, they wrote about Bush allies, decision and the plan for this war.

These two topics answered the following questions: why US decided to invade Iraq? Who are the supporters and participants in this war? Also, they particularly shed light on British PM Tony Blair decision if he would join the war with the US president George W. Bush, or not. For example, the following titles were written before the invasion and talked about the aforementioned topics: 'Iraq: the case for decisive action', 'The real reason for the Iraq war', 'Blair and Bush to plot war on Iraq'. Moreover, *The Guardian's* journalists were against the war and started to write strong arguments to show the US and the world that this war is "illegal" as it was written in the following articles: 'War would be illegal', 'UK's 'biggest peace rally'.

During the war, *The Guardian's* journalists took mainly the following topics: the begin of the war, the criticism of US conduct against Iraq, and they wrote detailed coverage of the events that happened in previously mentioned country. Additionally, they covered the number and arrangement of both US and Iraqi troops. Also, they covered heavily the increasing casualties of the war, demolition of buildings, and criticized the US frequent bombardment. They also covered the popular disagreement of the war inside UK.

After the war, *The Guardian* reporters' major coverage was about: the end of the war and the George W. Bush declaration of 'mission accomplished', and the major combat operations which ended.

3.4.2.2. The set of categories:

In relation to the research questions and the objective of the research, we have determined the type of categories to be analyzed: Conceptual. It is a set of words and phrases. It is important for us to analyze these words and phrases as a part of our content analysis.

The articles of the *Guardian* shared common words and phrases. The news reporters used repeatedly the followings: the invasion of Iraq, the war on Iraq, operation Iraqi Freedom, the occupation of Iraq, WMD, War on Terror, Saddam Hussein, George W. Bush, Tony Blair, Colin Powell, UN Security Council, troops, armed forces, armored vehicles, tanks, bombs, casualties, deaths, injuries, the US marines, land forces, the officer, and the commander. These words have strong relation when talking about the war on Iraq.

These words and phrases; in fact, played a major role in the US invasion of Iraq. They will make the research focus more and more on the analysis. They will make the researcher narrow his scope of research.

3.4.3. Coding the content:

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| WMD | 143 |
| The War on Terror | 50 |
| The War on Iraq | 39 |
| The Invasion of Iraq | 28 |
| Operation Iraqi Freedom | 28 |

Table 1: List of words and phrases mostly repeated in the Guardian

3.4.4. Presentation and analysis of the results:

The above- mentioned words and phrases were searched in 130 articles of the Guardian newspaper in the period between January 2003 and January 2004. The articles which were collected represent the period before (January, February 2003), during (March, April, May 2003) and after (June, July, August, September, October, November, December 2003 and January 2004) the US invasion of Iraq 2003. The words and phrases were chosen to analyze and clarify why the Guardian emphasized on these words in particular.

According to the results obtained from the available data, the first most repeated word in The Guardian' articles is "WMD" and this showed that The Guardian coverage was largely about WMD which is the first and the major reason that made US and UK decide to invade Iraq in the aim of eliminating the regime that developed WMD since it was an imminent threat to US and the entire world. Thus, The Guardian' reports focused on the events related to WMD in order to offer its readers and audience much more details about it and clarify its risk.

The second most frequent phrase in the Guardian is "War on Terror". The Guardian' reporters used this phrase widely in their articles because they were covering US fear of WMD falling in the hands of terrorists, so they shed light on War on Terror which had strong link with WMD. Thus, the US salient goal from the War on Terror was to demolish the terrorist organizations and terrorist groups to make the world safer from terrorism as well as from any threat and

this was among the justifications of both US and UK to enter war with Iraq that The Guardian showed to readers.

The third most repeated phrase is “The War on Iraq” which had solid ties with both WMD and the War on Terror. The Guardian showed that according to US investigation, Iraq possessed WMD and did not accept to stop developing it and that what made the US afraid from WMD to be used by terrorist groups. Hence, the US decided to declare the war on Iraq for many reasons such as: disarming WMD from the hands of terrorists.

The fourth and the fifth phrase are “The Invasion of Iraq” and “ Operation Iraqi Freedom”. The Guardian reporters when talked about the invasion of Iraq, they mentioned Operation Iraqi Freedom and they showed the US aim from the invasion of Iraq which was to liberate Iraqi people from Hussein’s regime and build a new Iraq.

Finally, according to the analysis of the Guardian’s content, the Guardian was unbiased considering its coverage of the war in Iraq. It was covering the events without any tendency to US policy or Iraq; it gave reasonable information about the conflict and focused on US investigation of missing WMD in Iraq as the fundamental reason to Invade Iraq. Moreover, it provided information about: casualties, the number of the army, the number and quality of weapons, the number of deaths, for both the US and Iraq. Consequently, the Guardian became the most trusted and respected newspaper in UK and the entire world.

3.5. The impacts of the Iraqi war in relation to the Guardian's coverage:

Although most newspapers in the world in their coverage of the war on Iraq 2003 were biased with US policy and they gave US the full right to invade Iraq, the *Guardian* newspaper chose the unbiased road and did not affected by any factors; it was drawing the war with its own touch as well as its own style. It was dealing with the events in a descriptive way and was posting information about the war that attracts the reader. As a result, the Guardian coverage of the War on Iraq was according to its media policies without Leanings to any side, US or Iraq.

Conclusion:

The Guardian newspaper is the most trustworthy newspaper in the world, particularly in UK. It played a significant role in covering the military operation of the war on Iraq 2003. According to the analysis provided, *The Guardian* took unbiased and independent position concerning its coverage of the war on Iraq and its coverage of military operation. It had great part in shaping public mind and made people understanding the events of the conflict between US and Iraq in a deeper way.

General conclusion:

Media is considered as the primary source of information to the public, since it informs and criticizes several issues. It occupies pivotal role in covering any event since it has active relation with politics. It treats serious businesses and news in a way that attracts the audience. It has the power to influence public opinion in a profound manner. Moreover, media may cover the reality related to events, and this is called “propaganda” in the aim of catching public attention, especially in the issues of war.

The War on Iraq (2003) which was led by US and UK had a strong resonance in the world. It attracted the eyes of media. Therefore, media carried its pens and began to cover the war, especially in US and UK. Some of media were in favor of the war, while others were against. Media opinions differed on the real causes of the US invasion of Iraq. Many newspapers stated that the main reasons were about Saddam Hussein’s development of WMD and to demolish Al-Qaeda and terrorist organizations which could cause great threat to the US and entire world. On the other hand, other media mentioned that the main reason behind waging that war was mainly economic: Both US and UK aimed to seize Iraqi oil resources.

The present study focused on the issue of media coverage of the War on Iraq, with special attention on UK media in particular. It investigated how media influenced public interpretation, negatively or positively. It is very important to mention that before the War on Iraq, the US administration worked hard to convince the US public opinion that the war against Iraq is legal and justified.

However, when the war began, the control of Iraq war shifted from the US administration's control to media control. The main aim of the study is to analyze how UK newspapers covered the War on Iraq, shedding light on the *Guardian* newspaper which played a vital role in covering the events of the War on Iraq.

In the light to what is discussed and analyzed in the present research, it seems clearly that media and the War on Iraq have strong relationship with each other. The findings proved in the analysis of the *Guardian* newspaper which followed the War on Iraq with unbiased position from the initial stage to the end stage, in covering all events and aspects of the war.

It is noticeable that although media have standards that should follow in its coverage, there are some media which played the role as agitator; while other media tried to find resolution to the conflict. Therefore, it is precious that media should hold the middle position and cover the war events honestly with exact information and without any fabrication so that the audience, and public opinion, will be able to recognize the events of the war well and evaluate and judge it. Thus, media should be neutral and unbiased as the *Guardian* newspaper did in order to maintain news credibility that it provides. Therefore, the present research can be used to clarify that media is the backbone of society, since it is considered as the fourth power.

The limitation of the study:

Because of the lack of some articles of the Guardian, which were either deleted or archived, it was impossible to find valuable information on such battles of the US War on Iraq.

References:

Abbasian, P. (2017). 'UK Media Coverage of Iraq War: A Content Analysis of Tony Blair Position in the Guardian Newspaper 2003-2007'. *Global Media Journal*, 15 (29): 1- 8.

Ahmed, K. (2002). 'Blair and Bush to plot war on Iraq'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/feb/24/usa.iraq>

Ahmed, K., Beaumont, P., Vulliamy, E., Goldenberg, S. (2003). 'Blair: war can start without UN arms find'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/26/iraq.foreignpolicy>

Alterman, E. (2006). No Link? Who Knew? *Americanprogress.org*. Available at:
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/general/news/2004/06/17/834/think-again-no-link—wh-knew/>

Amini, M., & Luce, D. (2003). Basra hit by bombardment. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/21/iraq8>

Arie, S. (2003). British military chief 'targeted by terrorist cell'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/feb/02/terrorism.italy>

Army Sergeant Jacob Butler, 24. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jun/05/iraq21>

Barnett, A. (2003). 'Bush ally set to profit from the war on terror'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/may/11/usa.iraq>

Bassil, Y. (2012). 'The 2003 Iraq War: Operations, Causes, and Consequences'.

Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR), 4(5): pp. 29- 47. DOI:

10.9790/0837-0452947

Beaumont, P., Branett, A., & Hinsliff, G. (2003). 'Iraqi mobile labs nothing to do with germ warfare, report finds'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jun/15/iraq>

Beaumont, P., & Vulliamy, E. (2003). 'UN inspectors fear Bush will ignore them'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/05/iraq>

Bennis, P. (2003). 'Understanding the US- Iraq Crisis'. *The Transnational*

Institute (tni.org). Available at:

<https://www.tni.org/en/article/understanding-the-us-iraq-crisis>

'Blix: Iraq must cooperate more fully'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/16/iraq1>

Body count: casualty figures after 10 years of the "War on Terror": Iraq,

Afghanistan, Pakistan. (2015). (Fathollah-Nejad, A. Transl.). (1st

International Ed.). Washington DC.

Booth, R. (2016). 'With you, whatever': Tony Blair's letters to George W Bush'.

The Guardian. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/06/with-you-whatever-tnony-blair-letters-george-w-bush-chilcot>

Borger, J (2003). 'After the onslaught, a leap in the dark'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.julianborger>

Borger, J. (2003). 'FBI uses new powers to bug anti-war groups'. *The Guardian.*

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/24/usa.politics>

Borger, J. (2003). 'Leaked memo exposes Rumsfeld's doubts about war on

terror'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/23/usa.julianborger>

Borger, J. (2003). 'The unreported cost of war: at least 827 American wounded'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/aug/04/iraq.usa>

Borger, J. (2004). 'War "making world safer" '. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/jan/21/uselections2004.usa>

Borger, J., Harding, L., & Norton-Taylor, R. (2003). 'Longer war is likely, says US general'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/28/iraq.richardnortontaylor1>

Borger, J., MacAskill, E., & Wintour, P. (2003). 'The hunt for weapons of mass destruction yields– nothing'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/sep/25/iraq.iraq>

Borger, J., & Younge, G. (2003). 'Dead: the sons of Saddam'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jul/23/iraq.garyyounge>

Bowcott, O. (2003). 'Cluster bombs shut out of arms fair'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/aug/30/armstrade.london>

Bowcott, O. (2003). 'Synagogue bombings highlight dangers for close allies of US'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/18/turkey.alqaida>

Bowcott, O. (2003). '£100m in aid funds diverted to Iraq'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/07/society.iraq>

Bowcott, O., & Birech, N. (2003). 'Targets and timing point to work of al-Qaida'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/21/turkey.alqaida>

Bowcott, O., & Norton-Taylor, R. (2003). 'War on terror fuels small arms trade'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/10/armstrade>

richardnortontaylor

Bowman, S. (2007). *Iraq: U.S. military operations*. CRS Report for Congress.

Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

'Britain has never been a nation to hide at the back'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/mar/21/uk.iraq>

Bright, M., & Asthana, A. (2003). 'Bush visit set to paralyse London'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/nov/09/london.georgebush>

'British troops start Iraq withdrawal'. (2009). *France24.com.* Available at:
<https://www.france24.com/en/20090331-british-troops-start-iraq-withdrawal->

Burke, J., & Harris, P. (2003). 'America's hidden battlefield toll'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/sep/14/iraq>

Burke, J. (2003). 'Chefs set to lead the way in war on Saddam'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/12/iraq.observerpolitics>

Burns, F. J. (2003). 'A Nation at War: The Iraqis, Looting and a Suicide Attack as Chaos Grows in Baghdad'. *The New York Times.* Available at:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/11/world/nation-war-iraqis-looting-suicide-attack-chaos-grows-baghdad.html>

Butcher, T. (2003). Commandos launch battle for Basra. *The Guardian. Com.*
Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/31/iraq4>

Butcher, T. (2003). 'Only dust and doves in this stunning testimony to Saddam's extravagance'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/08/Iraq>

Byrne, C. (2003). 'Kelner named editor of the year'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/dec/17/theindependent.pressanspublishing>

Byrne, C. (2004). '42 journalists killed in 2003'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2004/jan/07/pressandpublishing.television>

Bysyuk, V. (2010). *Terrorist Attacks US International Tourism Development.*

(Bachelor Thesis). Modul Vienna University, Vienna, Austria.

Available at: https://www.modul.ac.at/uploads/files/Theses/Bachelor/BYSYUK_Impact_of_9_11_on_US_International_Tourism_Development.pdf

Caputi, R. (2012). 'Iraqi protests defy the Maliki regime and inspire hope'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/jan/17/Iraq-protest-defy-maliki-regime>

Cargo ships 'may contain Iraqi weapons'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/feb/19/iraq>

Carney, S., A. (2011). *Allied participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom* (1st Ed.).

Washington (D.C.): Center of Military History, US Army.

Carr, D. (2013). 'British Invasion Reshuffles U.S. Media'. *The New York Times*.

Available at:

https://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/24/business/media/britain-as-a-breeding-ground-for-media-leaders.html?_r=0

Cirincione, J., Mathews, J. T., Perkovich, G., & Orton, A. (2004). *WMD in Iraq: evidence and implications*. Washington, D.C: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Clark, D. (2003). 'This pyrrhic victory on the Tigris'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/11/iraq.comment>

Cordesman, A., H. (2003). *The Iraq War: strategy, tactics, and military lessons*. (1st Ed.). Vol. 25. Washington, D.C.,: Praeger.

Costel, S., J. (2008). *Surging Out of Iraq?* NY: Nova Science Publishers Incorporated.

Dale, C. (2008). *Operation Iraqi Freedom: Strategies, Approaches, Results, and Issues for Congress*. CRS Report for Congress. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Dale, C. (2009). *Operation Iraqi Freedom: Strategies, Approaches, Results, and Issues for Congress*. CRS Report for Congress. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Daly, K. M. (2016). 'The Guardian's impact during the war in Iraq'. *Medium. Com*. Available at: <https://medium.com/understanding-9-11/the-guardian-impact-during-the-war-in-iraq-e64b2139757>

Day, J. (2002). 'War on Iraq; what the papers say'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2002/sep/25/pressandpublishing.iraq>

Djamarani, M. (Sep. 2000). 'Rebuilding Iraq's oil industry'. *Petroleum Review*.

54(644): 21- 3. London: The Institute of Petroleum.

Denny, C. (2003). 'Brown plan for extra \$50bn in war on poverty'. *The Guardian*.

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2003/jan/23/politics.famine>

Dodd, V., & watt, N. (2003). '45- minute claim on Iraq was hearsay'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/aug/16/davidkelly.iraq>

Duncan McLaren & Ian Willmore. (2003). 'The environmental damage of war in

Iraq'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/19/iraq5>

El- Shibiny, M. (2010). *Iraq: A Lost War*. (1st Ed.). NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

'Extreme must-use words meet untimely death'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

[https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2003/jan/02/highereducation.](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2003/jan/02/highereducation.internationaleducationnews)

[internationaleducationnews](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2003/jan/02/highereducation.internationaleducationnews)

Fagan M. & Robert Watts. (Mar. 2003). 'UK firms to work on rebuilding Iraq as sub-contractors to Americans'. *The Daily Telegraph. co. uk.*

Available at: [https://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/2846982/UK-firms-](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/2846982/UK-firms-to-work-on-rebuilding-Iraq-as-sub-contractors-to-Americans.html)

[to-work-on-rebuilding-Iraq-as-sub-contractors-to-Americans.html](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/2846982/UK-firms-to-work-on-rebuilding-Iraq-as-sub-contractors-to-Americans.html)

Fenton, B. (2003). 'Macmillan backed Syria assassination plot'. *The Guardian*.

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/sep/27/uk.syria1>

Fielding- Smith, A. (2003). 'Muddying the world's conscience'. *The Guardian*.

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2004/jan/09/voluntarysector.iraq>

Foot, P. (2003). 'Blunkett's legal logic'. *The Guardian*. Com.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/dec/10/britainand911>.

politicalcolumnists

Foot, P. (2003). 'Make a difference'. *The Guardian*. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/feb/12/antiwar.uk>

'France and Germany unite against Iraq war'. (2003). *The Guardian*. Com.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/22/germany.france>

Freedland, J. (2003). 'The blind prophet'. *The Guardian*. Com.

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/sep/03/usa.iraq>

Freeland, J. (2003). 'The gaping hole in Iraq'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/apr/30/iraq.iraq1>

'Full transcript of Tony Blair's statement'. (2001). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/11/september11.usa23>

'Full text: Bush's speech'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/18/usa.iraq>

'Full text: George Bush's speech to troops'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/26/iraq.usa1>

Ganley, E. (2003). 'French press critic sacked'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

[https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/dec/31/pressandpublishing.](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/dec/31/pressandpublishing.france)

[france](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/dec/31/pressandpublishing.france)

Glass, A. (Mar. 2017). 'Bush announces launch of Operation Iraqi Freedom, March 19, 2003'. *POLITICO.* Available at:

<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/03/bush-announces-launch-of-operation-iraqi-freedom-march-19-2003-236134>

Goldenberg, S. (2003). 'Bush wins \$87bn to keep up fight in Iraq'. (2003).

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/05/iraq.usa>

Goldenberg, S., & Norton-Taylor, R. (2003). 'Powell's doubts over CIA intelligence on Iraq prompted him to set up secret review'. *The Guardian*. Available at:

Guardian. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jun/02/usa.iraq>

Gökay, B. (2016). 'Why you can't explain the Iraq War without mentioning oil'.

The conversation. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/why-you-cant-explain-the-iraq-war-without-mentioning-oil-59352>

Gould, B. (2010). 'The real reason for the Iraq war'. *The Guardian Com*.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2010/jan/25/iraq-war-inquiry-tony-blair>

Gross, T. (2006). 'Bush, the CIA and America: 'State of War' '. *National Public Radio (NPR. ORG)*. Available at:

<https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5166040>

Guardian Reporters. (2002). 'Opposition grows to Iraq war'. *The Guardian*.

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2002/mar/21/guardianweekly.guardianweekly1>

Haddad, D. (2019). 'The fall of Baghdad, 16 years on'. *Radio France International*.

(RFI. FR). Available at: <http://www.rfi.fr/en/middle-east/20190408-fall-baghdad-16-years-saddam-husseini-george-bush>

Hai, Y. (2003). 'War on terror chic'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2003/feb/07/fashion.shopping1>

Hall, S., Norton-Taylor, R., & Harding, L. (2003). 'Blair WMD claim a 'red herring', says Bremer'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/dec/29/uk.iraq>

Hamourtziadou, L., & Gokay, B. (2016). 'Will Chilcot mention the real reasons for the Iraq War and the hundreds of thousands who have died since March 2003?'. *Opendemocracy.net*. Available at:

<https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/north-africa-west-asia/will-chilcot-mention-real-reasons-of-iraq-war-hundreds-of-thousa->

Happold, T. (2003). 'Lib Dems focus on "war on terror" '. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/sep/24/libdems2003.liberaldemocrats2>

Harding, L. (2003). 'Bush's man rejects Blair weapon claim'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/dec/28/usa.iraq>

Harding, L. (2016). 'Tony Blair unrepentant as Chilcot gives crushing Iraq war verdict'. *The Guardian Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/06/chilcot-report-crushing-verdict-tony-blair-iraq-war>

Harris, P. (2003). 'Democrats' general on the retreat'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/23/uselections2004.usa>

Harris, P. (2003). Hit-and-run attack on Basra. *The*

Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/30/iraq7>

Harris, M. (2006). 'Why Did the United States Invade Iraq in 2003? (pp. 1-45).
Available at: [https://www.uww.edu/Documents/colleges/coeps/cni/social studies/lesson plans/2006-2007/Mike Harris.pdf](https://www.uww.edu/Documents/colleges/coeps/cni/social_studies/lesson_plans/2006-2007/Mike_Harris.pdf)

Hearst, D. (2003). 'Aid agencies ill-prepared for aftermath of chemical attack'.
The Guardian. Com. Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/news/2003/jan/11/terrorism>

Helmore, E. (2003). 'Private Jessica says President is misusing her 'heroism' '.
The Guardian. Com. Available at:
[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/09/usa politicsphilosophyandsociety](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/09/usa_politicsphilosophyandsociety)

Heinrich, M., N. (2015). 'One War, Many Reasons: The US Invasion of Iraq'.
E- International Relations. Info. Available at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2015/03/09/one-war-many-reasons-the-us-invasion-of-iraq/>

Hinnebusch, R. (Spring, 2007). 'The American Invasion of Iraq: Causes and Consequences'. *PERCEPTIONS*. pp. (9- 27)

Hirst, D. (2003). 'Bush has thrown open Pandora's box in a paradise for international terrorists'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/dec/23/iraq.israel>

Hooper, J., Black, I., & Henley, J. (2003). 'Chirac and Schröder unite to press for peace'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/23/germany.france>

Hooper, J. (2003). 'Germans 'sold Iraq parts for supergun' '.
The Guardian. Com. Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/15/armstrade.iraq>

Hooper, J. (2004). 'Pope calls for a new world order'. *The Guardian. Com.*
Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/jan/02/catholicism.religion>

Hosenball, M. (2016). 'Tony Blair had qualms on Iraq war, but promised Bush support "whatever" '. Reuters. Com. Available at:
<https://www.reuters.com/article/britain-iraq-inquiry-note/tony-blair-had-qualms-on-iraq-war-but-promised-bush-support-whatever-idINK0ZM1CR>

'How did we get it so wrong? (2003). *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2004/feb/04/iraq.iraq3>

'How other security council members line up'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*
Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/16/iraq.usa>

Howard, M. (2003). 'Riots greet would-be leader of Mosul'. *The*

Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/16/iraq.michaelhoward>

Hutchinson, W. (2008). *Media, government and manipulation: the cases of the two*

Gulf Wars. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4225/75/57a828d9aa0dc>

Hyklová, M. (2010). *The Image of War: The Changing Role of the Media*.

(Master's Diploma Thesis). Masaryk University.

Ingrams, R. (2003). 'Perle and his whines'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/nov/23/guardiancolumnists>

'Iraq weapons inspector David Kay's congressional testimony (part 1)'. (2003).

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/03/iraq.usa1>

'Iraq War: Background and Issues Overview'. (2003). CRS Report for

Congress. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

'Iraq War: The invasion'. (n.d.). Available at:<https://www.nam.ac.uk/explore/iraq-war-invasion>

Islam, F. (2003). 'War 'would mean biggest oil shock ever' '. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2003/feb/02/oilandpetrol.iraq>

Jeffery, S. (2003). UK's 'biggest peace rally'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/feb/15/politics.politicalnews>

Joint Operation Planning. (Dec. 2006). Wayback Machine. Joint Publication

5-0. Archived 2017-12-21 Available at:

https://web.archive.org/web/20171215110008/http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp5_0.pdf

Johnson. B., & Ashmore. J. (2016). 'UK rocked by damning report on former

Prime Minister Tony Blair's decision to invade Iraq'. *The Parliament Magazine.* Available at:

<https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/uk-rocked-by-damning-report-on-former-prime-minister-tony-blairs-decision-to-invade-iraq>

Katzman, K. (2008). *Al Qaeda in Iraq: Assessment and Outside Links*.

Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Available at: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL32217.pdf>

'Keep killing to a minimum'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/22/iraq.theeditorpressreview1>

Kelley, S. R. (2004). *Rumors in Iraq: A guide to winning hearts and minds* (Doctoral

dissertation). Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School.

Kellner, D. (2004). 'Spectacle and Media Propaganda in the War on Iraq: A

Critique of US Broadcasting Networks'. Available at:

<https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/papers/mediapropaganda.htm>

Kerr, P. (n. d.). 'Duelfer Disproves U.S. WMD Claims'. *Arms Control*

Association. Available at: [https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2004-](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2004-11/duelfer-disproves-us-wmd-claims)

[11/duelfer-disproves-us-wmd-claims](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2004-11/duelfer-disproves-us-wmd-claims)

Klein, N. (2003). 'A deadly franchise'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/aug/28/usa.comment>

Laidlaw, J. (2011). 'Bush and Blair: the impact of a special relationship on

national interests'. *E-International Relations* (pp. 1-19).

Lee, P. (2012). *Blair's just war: Iraq and the illusion of morality*. (1st Ed.).

Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Left, S. (2003). 'What the international papers say'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/24/iraq.usa>

Lewis, J. (2004). 'Television, Public Opinion and the War in Iraq: The Case of Britain'.

International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 16(3): pp.

296– 310.

Macalister, T. (2016). 'US and Britain wrangled over Iraq's oil in aftermath of war, Chilcot shows'. *The Guardian*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/07/us-and-britain-wrangled-over-iraqs-oil-in-aftermath-of-war-chiclot-shows>

Macalister, T., MacAskill, E., & McCarthy, R. (2003). 'A matter of life, death – and oil'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/23/usa.iraq>

MacAskill, E. (2003). 'Saddam vow to repel Mongol hordes of US'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/18/iraq.ewenmacaskill1>

MacAskill, E. (2003). 'Straw admits oil is key priority'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/jan/07/uk.iraq>

MacLeod, D. (2003). 'Legal case for Iraq war opened for public debate'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2003/nov/06/highereducation.internationaleducationnews>

Maguire, K. (2003). 'Afghan leader hails 'magnificent' cooperation'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/oct/02/uk.labourconference>

Maheshwari, P. (n.d). 'Role of Media in Various Sectors -Advantages and Disadvantages on Youth'.

Marshall, R. (2018). 'This Week in History: 20 March 2003 The Iraq war begins'. *Studentnewspaper. Org.* Available at:

<https://studentnewspaper.org/this-week-in-history-20-march-2003-the-iraq-war-begins/>

Mason, R., Asthana, A., & Stewart, H. (2016). 'Tony Blair: 'I express more sorrow, regret and apology than you can ever believe'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/06/tony-blair-deliberately-exaggerated-threat-from-iraq-chilcot-report-war-inquiry>

Martin, G., S. (2016). *Gen. David D. McKiernan to address professional studies graduates*. Available at: <https://news.northeastern.edu/2016/04/12/gen-david-d-mckiernan-to-address-professional-studies-graduates/>

Martin, R. (April, 2008). [Interview with Zucchini, D.]. *National Public Radio*.

Org. Available at:

<https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=89489923>

McCarthy, R., & Vasagar, J. (2003). 'Blix suspects there are no weapons of mass destruction'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/may/24/iraq.rorymccarthy>

McCarthy, R., & Tremlett, G. (2003). 'Eight die in suicide bomb attack'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/10/iraq.rorymccarthy>

McCarthy, R. (2003). 'Salam's Story'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/may/30/iraq.digitalmedia>

McCarthy, R., Borger, J., & Millar, S. (2003). 'Battle for Baghdad begins'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/25/iraq.rorymccarthy>

McCarthy, R., Borger, J., & MacAskill, E. (2003). 'The battle for Baghdad looms'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/02/iraq.ewenmacaskill>

McCarthy, R. (2004). 'Uneasy truce in the city of ghosts'. *The Guardian. Com.*
Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/apr/24/iraq.rorymccarthy>

McCredie, I. (2016). 'Why Tony Blair Invaded Iraq'. *Fairobserver.com.*
Available at: <https://www.fairobserver.com/region/europe/why-tony-blair-invaded-iraq-77202/>

McGreal, C. (2003). 'Muted response by Sharon after suicide bombs'.
The Guardian. Com. Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/07/israel>

'Mesopotamia. Babylon. The Tigris and Euphrates'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2003/dec/29/features11.g25>

Miller, D. (2004). 'The domination effect'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/jan/08/usa.iraqandthedia>

Milmo, C. (2016). 'How the Special Relationship between Blair and Bush shaped Britain's approach to the Iraq War'. *Inews. Co. Uk.* Available at: <https://inews.co.uk/news/special-relationship-blair-bush-shaped-britains-approach-iraq-war-13283>

Milne, S. (2003). 'Iraqis have paid the blood price for a fraudulent war'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/apr/10/foreignpolicy.iraq>

Milne, S. (2003). 'The opponents of war on Iraq are not the appeasers'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/feb/13/iraq.nato>

Mix, E. D. (2018). *The United Kingdom: Background, Brexit, and Relations with the United States.* Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

'Mr Bush: heed world opinion'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/15/usa.iraq>

Mohan, G., Daniszweski, J., & Perry, T. (2003). 'U.S. Seizes Presidential Palace'. *Los Angeles Times.* Available at:
<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2003-apr-07-war-iraq7-story.html>

Muir, H. (2003). 'Germany and France send effusive congratulations'.
The Guardian. Com. Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/dec/15/germany.france>

National Intelligence Council (NIC). (Sep. 2002). *Iraqs weapons of mass destruction programs.* Available at:
https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/DOC_0005479946.pdf

Neilan, T. (2003). 'With Audio Tapes and Images, Powell Makes Case to UN'.
The New York Times. Available at:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2003/02/05/international/middleeast/with-audio-tapes-and-images-powell-makes-case-to-un-html>

Norton- Taylor, R. (2003). 'Iraq war has swollen ranks of al-Qaida'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/16/politics.alqaida>

Norton- Taylor, R., & White, M. (2003). 'MI6 chief's plan to quit not linked to Iraq, insists No 10'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/aug/04/iraq.bbc>

Norton- Taylor, R. (2003). 'Protester fined £200 for US base trespass'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/dec/18/politics.usa>

Norton- Taylor, R. (2003). 'Open arms'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/31/russia.politics>

Norton- Taylor, R. (2003). 'War on terror is 'making world more dangerous'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/may/29/usa.terrorism>

Norton- Taylor, R., & White, M. (2003). 'Report reveals Blair overruled terror warning'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/sep/12/uk.davidkelly3>

Oliver, M. (2003). 'Blair ready to act without new UN resolution'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/13/iraq.politics>

Oliver, M. (2003). 'European leaders support US against Iraq'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/30/iraq.politics>

'Osama bin Laden: Resist the new Rome'. (2004). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available At:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/jan/06/terrorism.comment>

'Paul Wolfwitz and the reasons for invading Iraq'. (Jun. 2003). Available at:

<https://edm.parliament.uk/early-day-motion/22456/paul-wolfowitz-and-the-reason-for-invasion-iraq>

Pollack, K. M. (2002). *Sizing Up an Invasion of Iraq*. Available at:

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/sizing-up-an-invasion-of-iraq/>

Porter, H. (2003). 'A very Roman lesson for today'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/apr/06/iraq.iraq>

'Powell Blames Himself, Others For Specious Iraq WMD Claims to UN'.

(2012). *The Transnational Institute (tni.org)*. Available at:

<https://www.nti.org/gsn/article/powell-blames-himself-iraqi-wmd-speech-un/>

Preston, T. (2003). 'The foot soldiers are rebelling'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/aug/25/iraq.iraq>

Puddephatt, A. (2006). *Voices of war: Conflict and the role of the media*. (1st

Ed.) Denmark: International Media Support.

'Pupils prominent in global anti-war marches'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/mar/24/antiwar.uk2>

Rangwala, G., & Plesch, D. (2004). *A Case to Answer: A first report on the*

potential impeachment of the Prime Minister for High Crimes and

Misdemeanours in relation to the invasion of Iraq. Nottingham: Spokesman

Books.

Ravi, N. (2004). *Different Stories: How the newspapers in the United States, Britain and South Asia covered the Iraq War*. (1st Ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University research center.

Rayburn, J. D., Sobchak, F. K., Godfroy, J. F., Morton, M. D., Powell, J. S., & Zais, M. M. (2019). *The U.S. Army in the Iraq War*. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press.

Record, J. (2003). *The Bush Doctrine and War with Iraq*. Available at:
<https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=1859>.

Reid, H. R. (2004). 'A fine Balance'. *The Guardian. Com*. Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/nov/10/iraq3>

Reuters, K. (2003). 'Karachi bomb death sentences'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jul/01/pakistan>

Ritter, S. (2003). 'Galloway's a crook - how convenient'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/apr/25/iraq.labour>

Roberts, I (2003). 'Car wars'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/18/iraq.usa>

Rosen, A. (2015). 'Here's the full version of the CIA's 2002 intelligence

assessment on WMD in Iraq'. *Businessinsider.fr.* Available at:

<https://www.businessinsider.fr/us/heres-the-full-version-of-the-cias-2002-intelligence-assessment-on-wmd-in-iraq-2015-3>

Rosenberg, E. (2011). 'Rumsfeld denies making claims Iraq had WMDs'.

Seattlepi.com. Available at:

<https://www.seattlepi.com/national/article/Rumsfeld-denies-making-claims-Iraq-had-WMDs-1202942.php>

Russel, J. (2002). *WMD Proliferation and Conventional Counterforce: The Case of*

Iraq. Available at: <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a527149.pdf>

Said, E. (2003). 'A window on the world'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2003/aug/02/alqaida.highereducation>

Sale, M., & Khan J. (Apr. 11, 2003). 'Missions Accomplished?' *The New York Times Learning Network*. The Bank Street College of Education in New York City. Available at:

<https://learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2003/04/11/missions-accomplished>

Sanders, R. (2016, July). 'What Did Happen To Saddam's WMD?' *History Today*. Available at: <https://www.historytoday.com/what-did-happen-saddam's-wmd>

Schor, E. (Mar. 2008). 'Saddam Hussein had no direct ties to al-Qaida, says Pentagon study'. *The Guardian*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/mar/13/iraq.usa>

Schwarz, J. (February, 2018). 'Lie After Lie: What Colin Powell Knew About Iraq 15 Years Ago and What He Told the UN'. *The Intercept*. Available at: <https://theintercept.com/2018/02/06/lie-after-lie-what-colin-powell-knew-about-iraq-fifteen-years-ago-and-what-he-told-the-un/>

Sevastopulo, D. (2005, April 26). 'US team concludes Saddam had no WMD'.

Financial Times. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/b8956280-b67e-11d9-aebd-00000e2511c8>

Smith, H. (2003). 'Jittery Turkey eyes restive province'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/09/turkey.kurds>

Smith, M., & Nicholls, M. (2004). 'Ron Davies in talks with Greens'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2004/jan/26/greenpolitics.uk>

Snow, N. (2003). *Information war: American propaganda, free speech and opinion control since 9-11*. (1st Ed.). NY: Seven Stories Press.

Soroka, S., N. (2003). 'Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy'. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 8(1): pp. 27- 48.

Steuter, E., & Wills, D. (2008). *At war with metaphor media, propaganda, and racism in the war on terror*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Straw: Saddam faces moment of choice. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/feb/05/politics.iraq>

Sutherland, J. (2003). Arnie's beloved Hummer. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/13/usa.comment>

Taylor, R. (2003). 'Press review: the price of freedom'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/nov/20/foreignpolicy.uk2>

Taylor, R. (2004). 'Operation Phantom Fury'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/news/2004/nov/09/wrap.rostaylor>

Tempest, M. (2003). Blair: Iraq oil claim is 'conspiracy theory'. *The Guardian.*

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/jan/15/foreignpolicy.uk>

'Tim Predmore: We are facing death in Iraq for no reason'. (2003). *The*

Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/sep/19/usa.iraq>

'Timothy Garton Ash: Next stop Syria? (2003)'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/jan/22/syria.usa>

Tisdall, S. (2003). Resist the official pol-speak of Bush's 'war on terror'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/04/usa.iraq1>

'The legacy of the war on terror'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2003/sep/11/guardianletters2>

The US Congress. (2002). *Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq*

Resolution of 2002. Washington, D.C.: United States Government

Publishing Office. Available at:

<https://www.congress.gov/107/plaws/publ243/PLAW-107publ243.pdf>

'The war game. (2003)'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

[https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/sep/21/israelandthepalestinian.
bookextracts](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/sep/21/israelandthepalestinian.bookextracts)

The White House. (May, 2003). *President Bush Announces Major Combat*

Operations in Iraq Have Ended. Available at: [https://georgewbush-](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030501-15.html)

[whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030501-15.html](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/05/20030501-15.html)

'Tony Blair: The price of my conviction'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/feb/16/iraq.foreignpolicy>

Tryhorn, C. (2003). 'Havas counts cost of Iraqi war'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/may/13/havas.iraqandthedia>

Tumber, H., & Palmer, J. (2004). *Media at war: The Iraq crisis*. (1st Ed.).

London: Sage Publications.

US forces may have killed Saddam's sons. (2003). *The Guardian. Com*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jul/22/iraq.usa>

'US troops 'within six miles' of Baghdad'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/03/iraq4>

Vasagar, J. (2003). 'British Muslims fear conflict for generations'. *The Guardian.*

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2003/jan/23/politics.famine>

Vuillamy, E. (2003). 'Israel seeks pipeline for Iraqi oil'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/20/israelandthepalestinians.oil>

Wachman, R. (2003). 'Standard Chartered bids to manage new Iraq bank'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2003/aug/03/iraq.theobserver>

Walsh, P. N. (2003). 'Russian warships on standby to sail to Gulf'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/10/iraq.russia>

'War Crimes Committed by the United States in Iraq and Mechanisms for Accountability'. (2006). *Grassrootspeace.org* Available at:

http://www.grassrootspeace.org/war_crimes_iraq_101006.pdf

'War's loose ends. (2003)'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/may/02/foreignpolicy.iraq>

'We ascertained there wasn't a secret agenda against us'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/dec/20/libya.politics2>

'What Andrew Gilligan said in the Mail on Sunday'. (2003). *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/jul/22/mailonsunday.iraqdossier>

Wheatcroft, G. (2003). 'Weapons of mass distortion'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/may/02/iraq.iraq>

Whitaker, B. (2003). 'Battle Station'. *The Guardian. Com.* Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/feb/07/iraqandthedia.afghanistan>

Whitaker, B. (2003). 'Syria woos EU in the person of the Spanish king'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/oct/21/spain.syria>

Whitaker, B. (2003). 'US forces enter heart of Baghdad'. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/apr/07/iraqbriefing.iraq>

White, M., & Borger, J. (2003). 'Blair wins time with bravura Iraq speech'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/jan/16/uk.iraq1>

White, M., & MacAskill, E. (2003). 'Rebel MPs deliver war ultimatum'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/jan/09/september11.politics>

'William Shawcross: Why Saddam will never disarm'. (2003). *The Guardian*.

Com. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/feb/23/iraq1>

Wislon, J. (2003). Hardcore protesters plot to halt traffic. *The Guardian. Com.*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/nov/15/politics.usa1>

Wilson, J. (2003). 'Tribe gathers to bury Saddam's sons'. *The Guardian. Com*

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/aug/03/iraq>

Wintour, P. (2003). 'Labour expels Galloway for urging killing of British troops'.

The Guardian. Com Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/oct/24/iraq.iraq1>

Wintour, P., & Boger, J. (2003). 'Blair stand puts strain on coalition'.

The Guardian. Com Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/jan/22/uk.iraq>

Wintour, P., & Blackstock, C. (2003). 'Archbishop balks at war thanksgiving'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/may/08/uk.iraq>

Wolf, A. (2010). *Young Audiences, Mass Media, and Political Information*.

(Master's Thesis). Vienna.

'Wolfowitz: Oil Motivated U.S. Attack On Iraq'. (Jun. 2003). *Stratfor.com*.

Available at: <https://worldview.stratfor.com/article/wolfowitz-oil-motivated-us-attack-iraq>

Wright, G. (2003). 'Report finds 'alarming deterioration' in Iraqi health'.

The Guardian. Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/11/iraq.georgewright>

Wright, G. (2003). 'World losing fight against Aids, says Annan'. *The Guardian.*

Com. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/28/aids.georgewright>

Younge, G. (2003). 'Support for Bush and war slumps'. *The Guardian. Com*.

Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/sep/13/usa.iraq>

Resumé:

La guerre américaine contre l'Irak en 2003 est considérée comme l'événement le plus marquant qui a caractérisé le domaine des relations internationales au début du troisième millénaire. S'appuyant sur la théorie de Bush sur la guerre contre le terrorisme, les États-Unis ont réagi unilatéralement au terrorisme mondial qui a frappé les États-Unis chez eux le 11 septembre 2001. Bien qu'il y ait des causes sous-jacentes à l'invasion américaine de l'Irak, les États-Unis se sont principalement concentrés sur le renversement du régime Baath dirigé par le président irakien Saddam Hussein et le lancement du nom 'Opération de libération de l'Irak' ont été la plus grande preuve de l'intention et du but de l'invasion américaine de l'Irak. La guerre américaine en Irak a été marquée par la participation du Royaume-Uni en tant qu'allié majeur des États-Unis.

Il convient de noter que la guerre contre l'Irak a attiré les médias de toutes les régions du monde, de sorte que la guerre était le matériau de consommation quotidienne des médias. Les médias de toutes sortes ont prêté attention aux reportages sur les événements et le déroulement de la guerre. Contrairement aux médias américains, qui ont fermement soutenu la guerre américaine contre l'Irak, certains médias internationaux: Comme les médias britanniques, il était soit anti-soit neutre dans sa couverture médiatique.

La présente étude explore l'implication du Royaume-Uni dans la guerre en Irak. Elle vise également à évaluer la couverture médiatique de la guerre américaine contre l'Irak (2003), en particulier la couverture médiatique britannique. Elle considère The Guardian comme une étude de cas pour cette étude comme un

guide précieux. À l'aide de méthodes de recherche analytiques et qualitatives, l'étude a conclu aux effets de la couverture par le journal Guardian de la guerre en Irak.

Mots clés: La guerre en Irak, aux États- Unis, au Royaume- Uni, Saddam Hussein, Tony Blair, couverture médiatique, The Guardian

الملخص

تعتبر الحرب الأمريكية على العراق عام 2003 الحدث الأبرز الذي ميز مجال العلاقات الدولية في بداية الألفية الثالثة. واعتماداً على نظرية بوش في الحرب على الإرهاب، ردت الولايات المتحدة بشكل انفرادي على الإرهاب العالمي الذي ضرب الولايات المتحدة في الداخل في 11 سبتمبر 2001. على الرغم من وجود أسباب كامنة للغزو الأمريكي للعراق، إلا أن الولايات المتحدة ركزت بالدرجة الأولى على إسقاط نظام البعث بقيادة الرئيس العراقي صدام حسين، وكان إطلاق اسم "عملية تحرير العراق" أكبر دليل على نية وهدف الغزو الأمريكي للعراق. وقد عرفت الحرب الأمريكية على العراق مشاركة المملكة المتحدة كحليف رئيسي للولايات المتحدة.

جدير بالذكر أن الحرب على العراق جذبت إليها وسائل الإعلام في جميع أنحاء العالم، فكانت بذلك الحرب المادة ذات للاستهلاك الإعلامي اليومي. وقد اهتمت وسائل الإعلام بكافة أنواعها بالتقارير الإخبارية عن الأحداث وسير الحرب. على عكس وسائل الإعلام الأمريكية التي ساندت بقوة الحرب الأمريكية على العراق، فإن بعض وسائل الإعلام العالمية؛ مثل وسائل الإعلام البريطانية، كانت إما ضد أو محايدة في تغطيتها الإخبارية. تكشف الدراسة الحالية مشاركة المملكة المتحدة في الحرب على العراق. كما تهدف إلى تقييم التغطية الإعلامية للحرب الأمريكية على العراق 2003، ولا سيما التغطية الإعلامية البريطانية. تأخذ في الاعتبار صحيفة الجارديان كدراسة حالة لهذه الدراسة كدليل قيم.

وباستخدام أساليب البحث التحليلي والوصفي النوعي، خلصت الدراسة إلى تأثيرات تغطية صحيفة الجارديان في الحرب على العراق.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الحرب على العراق، الولايات المتحدة، المملكة المتحدة، صدام حسين، توني بليير، التغطية الإعلامية، الجارديان.

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University Mohammed Boudiaf of M'sila
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Language and Literature



Master Student's Research Achievement Report

This is to certify that Miss. **Rokbi Yassamine**,

Master two studens preparing a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the Requirement of Master Degree in Language, Literature and Civilization entitled:

UK media coverage of the War on Iraq: A content analysis of the Guardian newspaper

have already accomplished their research work and is of right to defend their work before a jury.

The Teacher/ examiner

The Head of the Department

Full Name & Signature

BOUTKHIL GUEMIDE

BOUTKHIL Guemide
