

**PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIQC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY ABDELHAMID IBN BADIS –MOSTAGANEM-**

**FACULTY OF FOREING LANGUAGUES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH**

**MASTER
ANGLO-SAXON LITERATURE AND CIVILIZATION**

**American Foreign Policy in Post-Cold
War Era, 2003 Iraq as a case study.**

Presented by:

Boudahmani Menouar

Board of Examiners:

President: A. Larbi Youcef

Examiner: N.Abdelhadi

Supervisor: Mrs. Benmaati

Dedication

I dedicate this work from my deep heart

To my dearest parents, who gave me the inspiration to fulfill this dream with

Their support, help, patience and encouragement.

To my sisters, my brothers, my nephews and my nieces.

To my cheerful and dearest friends.

To all whom supported and encouraged me.

To all whom I love and respect.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would have been never accomplished without considerable help, advice and guidance of my supervisor Mrs. Benmaati. For that I owe my gratitude to her for her efforts.

I express my thanks to all teachers and students of Second Year Master. Also, my friends And classmates for their help and support.

I am very thankful to everyone participated in the realization othis work.

Abstract

This paper will analyze the American foreign policy in the Post-Cold War era. After the Soviet Union had broken up in 1990 the United States of America became the sole superpower. This gave it the advantages to practice its foreign policy freely which was promoting democracy abroad. The U.S. used every possible means to promote democracy, and to protect the human rights, even it used the military intervention to support its goal. The U.S. war on Iraq is an illustration of that. However, this paper will examine if the United States succeeded in building democracy in Iraq. In this regard, this dissertation is divided into three chapters. The first chapter will deal with the Post-Cold war era, its aim is to know how the Soviet Union collapsed leaving the United States as the sole hegemony power. The second one will discuss the American democracy promotion, its aim is to recognize the features of democracy and how the U.S. created institutions to spread and support democracy abroad. The third chapter will analyze the use of military intervention by the U.S. in Iraq to build democracy, its aim is to know whether America succeeded in its attempt in building a democratic system in Iraq.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgments.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Table of Content.....	IV
List of Abbreviation.....	V
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter One : The Period of Post-Cold War.....	3
1. The Cold War Order.....	4
2. The End of the Soviet Union.....	5
3. The United States as a Hegemony Power.....	6
4. Characteristics of Hegemony Power.....	7
Chapter Two : U.S. Foreign Policy ; Democracy Promotion.....	10
1. Background of Democracy Promotion.....	11
2. International Agencies of Democracy Promotion.....	12
3.Characteristics of Democracy Promotion.....	13
4.Objectives of Democracy Promotion.....	14
4.1. Connecting Development with Democracy.....	14
4.2. Creating Stability and Security.....	15
4.3. Redefining Democracy Building.....	16
5. Three Principles of Democracy Promotion.....	20
5.1. Democracy Develops Organically.....	20
5.2. Democratization is the Work of Generations.....	21
5.3. Limitation of U.S. Democracy Promotion.....	21
Chapter three : U.S. Foreign Policy from Theory to Practice.....	24
1. U.S. Democracy Promtion in the Arab World.....	25

2. Background of Iraq War.....	27
3. The Iraq War.....	28
4. U.S. Democracy Promotion in Iraq.....	29
4.1. Occupation rather than Democracy Building.....	29
4.2. Transitional Democracy.....	30
4.3. The U.S. Violation of Iraqis Human Rights.....	31
General Conclusion.....	33
Work Cited List.....	34

List of Abbreviations

NATO : North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

USAID : The United States Agency for International Development.

NDI : National Democratic Institute.

IRI : International Republican Institute.

CIPE : The Center for International Private Enterprise.

UNDF : The United Nation Democracy Fund.

DRL : The Bureau of Democracy , Human Rights, and Labour.

NED : National Endowment for Democracy.

MEPI : The Middle East Patnrship Initiative.

UNEAB : The United Nation Electoral Assistance Bureau.

OSCE : The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

BMENA : The Broader Middle East and North Afric

WMD : Weapons of Mass Distruction.

OIL : Operation Iraqi Liberation.

NGO : Non Governmental Organization.

NDI : The National Democracy Institute.

IFI : International Ferderal Institute.

OAS : The Organization of American States.

General Introduction

The Era between 1945 and 1990 were called the Cold War era. It was an ideological conflict between the Communist world which was led by the Soviet Union, and the Capitalist world which was led by the United States of America. The US accused the Soviet union of seeking to expand their version of communism throughout the world. The soviet Union in the other hand, charged the United States with practicing imperialism.

The conflict between these two superpowers took the form of an armed one in some occasions; the Korean War, the Vietnam war and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan are best examples of that conflict. In the strategic conflict between the USA and the SU a major area was the strategic of technology. It also involved covert conflict through act of spying. Another main feature of the Cold war was the race of arms between these two leading nations. All of these fields require a massive scientific and manufacturing investment, all of which led to enormous costs associated to the arms race.

The Cold war ended in 1990. This allowed the European nations to become whole and free. And the Soviet Union collapsed in early nineties because of its insufficient economic system, ignoring the civilian economy while pushing too much money on the military and the corrupt leaders. This left the U.S. as a single most powerful nation in the world, without competition. As a result, the U.S. had such a huge influence around the world, that witnessed a more instable period of international relations.

In the Post-Cold War era, the U.S. foreign policy was adopting democracy promotion Abroad, and protecting human rights worldwide by several means, in some situation it used the military force, as it used it against the dictator Saddam Hussein in Iraq in 2003, but the big question is:

Was the U.S. democracy promotion in Iraq success or a failure?

It is hypothesized that the American democracy promotion in Iraq was a failure. And for knowing how it was a failure, the framework of this paper is divided into three chapters. The first chapter entitled on the period of Post-Cold War, it will deal with the cold war order, the end of the Soviet Union, the United States as a hegemony power, and the characteristics of hegemony power. The second one entitled on American democracy promotion, it will discuss the background, characteristics, objectives and principles of democracy promotion. And the last chapter entitled on democracy promotion from theory to practice, it will deal with the U.S. democracy promotion in the Arab world, the U.S. war on Iraq and its background, and the failure of democracy in Iraq.

Chapter one: The Period of Post-Cold War

The Cold War era was an ideological, political and economic conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States of America from 1947 to 1990. In this chapter we will deal with the Cold War Order, the end of the Soviet Union, the United States as a hegemony power and the features of hegemony power.

1 .The Cold War Order

After the Second World War ended in 1945, the world witnessed another kind of conflict which lasted from 1947 to 1990. This conflict was called the Cold War. The Cold War divided the world into two camps: In the eastern part of the world there was the Communist camp which was led by the Soviet Union and its allies in eastern Europe, where state control subjected all aspects of life. On the other hand, in the western part of the world, there was the Liberal Democratic Capitalist camp, which was led by the United States of America and its allies in western Europe and Japan.

The Cold War was an era of nuclear challenge, a time characterized by the limited contacts between the two superpowers. Both the Capitalist and Communist worlds created military alliances, which led to the increasing of division between them. The Capitalist camp created the NATO in 1949. In the other hand, the Communist camp created Warsaw Pact in 1955. The increasing of race arms was because of the star wars program in 1983 by the president of the United States Ronald Reagan who recognized that the state system of the Soviet Union was dominating economic and political life, which gave the Soviet Union the advantage to have much influence around the world. Therefore, Reagan focused military force by making the European allies strong and funded new weapon system. As a result, the United States restored its self-confidence, and the President was ready to open a dialogue with the Soviet Union, which helped in the Cold War's denouement. The denouement of the Cold War was facilitated much more when an active reformist leader in the Kremlin, named Mikhail

Gorbachuv who came in power in 1985. Gorbachuv proposed reformation of democracy and enter in a treaty negotiation with Reagan to reduce nuclear missiles.

Because of the major economic problems that Gorbachuv was facing, he attempted to integrate the Soviet Union into the Capitalist world by using some means such as starting on Perestroika and Glasnost. However, the local reform of Gorbachuv was not enough to make the Soviet empire breaking up. The years between 1989 and 1991, were the years of the last breath of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, and the end of the Soviet Union occurred.

2. The End of the Soviet Union

The Soviet Union was facing serious problems; from 1950s, there had been technological, economic and political reasons which caused the degeneration in the economic growth rate of the Soviet Union . The technical reason can be explained by the idea that the Soviet Union was not keeping up with the other countries. The economic reason can be discussed by the idea that the central plan of the economic command had led to unsuccessful use of resources and the failure of providing motivations from projects innovation.

The cost of supporting Communism regimes overseas increased when it invaded Afghanistan. As a result enormous defense burden occurred, which had to be converted from the consumer sector. Resulting in increasing lack of goods.

The worsening of economic affected the political and psychological life. Moreover, the dishonesty of information of Propaganda made people to consider it as the most illegitimate source of truth. The Soviet people became more and more discomfort able about the Propaganda of government _ controlled media, which was very strong. Meanwhile, more and more professionals and well_ educated people in the Soviet Union. These people were ready to embrace a more liberal state.

As it was mentioned earlier Gorbachev came to power in Moscow in 1985. And he established a new popular brand of socialism through: Restricting the economy by encouraging market forces and individual initiative, Promoting openness in politics and the media, tolerance of religion and socialist democracy. -Reducing defense spending by negotiating international arms – reduction treaties. At last the Soviet people had the freedom of speech and reading books which were forbidden to read for a long time.

And about the Soviet foreign affairs, the Soviet forces in Afghanistan were withdrawn. The changes that were made by Gorbachev generated more demand of freedom than he imagined. With all this pressure Gorbachev hoped that the Hold of the communist party would be loosened on the Soviet Union people's life. By 1989, in western Europe, a wave of protests were demanding economic reformation, free speech and free education.

Fifteen republics were forming the Soviet Union. Some of them were much eager to be independent. All of Soviet republics were pressing either for independence or greater autonomy or self-rule by the end of 1990. Later on, the communist regimes and ideas was totally abolished in the eastern Europe. The rest of 1990s, became the era of Post Cold War with The US as a Hegemony power.

3. The United States As a Hegemony Power

By the year 1991 the Cold War ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union leaving the United States of America as the sole superpower. The Post Cold War era called as the New Global Order. The United States was eminent in every field of power - economic, military, diplomatic, ideological, technological, and cultural. Resulting in the ability to promote its interests throughout the world.

The first understanding of hegemony and its implications still exists today, because those reflections are essential to understand the way the world is lead today. If the history of the twentieth century is examined, commencing from the First World War to the Gulf War in 1990s, it will be found that the military, economic and ideological conflicts are the common controllers.

Historians said that the United States has emerged as the hegemony power without competitor. This advantage gave the United States the capability to participate in world conflicts mostly as the film hero, showing its dominance over the rest of the world.

Nowadays, the fact that the United States global supremacy does not seem to have changed to a greater extent. And without forgetting to mention its preponderant role in the technological and scientific development. The United States was showing its global supreme role once again after the event of September eleventh by replacing this event as a high issue on international agenda. It is sure that the terrorism is an important issue. However, the way the fight is being led against terrorism by the United States is overreacting (Hanson 43).

4. Characteristics of Hegemony Power

There are requirements have to be achieved to consider a particular country as a hegemony power. These requirements are the preponderance of material resources, capital sources, market domination and advantages in the production of highly value goods. According to these requirements, it is evident that the United States is a hegemony power. But if the word hegemony is defined by the lexical meaning, it does not have to require absolute dominance.

According to the above characteristics of the hegemony power, it is useful to see how the United States has set the international agenda. That is there is a debate about the degeneration of the United States and the hegemonic stability theory. In fact, this has been analyzed by

professors who argued that the law and social convention is not the ones which determine the consequences in international society but the relationships of power do. At the end they found out that even if the United States has an economic counterweight, its predominance based on its structural power (Rainer 60)

These led to recognize that the United States is strong in term of security powers, production, and finance and knowledge structure. It can be said that the power of the United States came from its belief and the implementation in the philosophical ideas such as democracy, liberty, self-determination and national interests (Dobson and Marsh 11).

The United States has two kind of powers, which are soft and hard powers. The military and economic issues cover the national interests and self-determination "hard power". In the other hand, «soft power " resides in indirect influence that comes from the political, economic and cultural values. Concentrating on the soft power concept, it is argued that it means the use of attraction instead of coercion in achieving desired outcomes in the international affairs. Basically, the soft power is when a country is able to set the political agenda in a way that form the preferences of soft power originated from values and cultural expressions, in the internal and external policies that a country follows. This will lead us to find out the reason that has made the United States to play these cards to encounter its change interests in the world politics. It is said that the state of super power include four basic axes of power: military, economic, political, and cultural community that a huge size of land, had a huge population with the same super capacity, such as local supplies of food and natural resources; with high degree of non-dependence on international intercourse; and most importantly, had a well-developed nuclear capacity.

To conclude, this chapter dealt with the forty five years after 1945, which was an ideological, political, economic and even military conflict between the two superpowers

which were the Communist camp and the Capitalist camp. It resulted in the breaking up of the Soviet Union and the winning of the United States of America as the sole superpower.

Chapter Two: US foreign policy; democracy promotion

The United States of America has made democracy promotion as a part of her foreign policy for a century. In this chapter we will deal with background of democracy promotion, the definition of democracy promotion, the International Agencies of democracy promotion, characteristics of democracy promotion, and the aims of democracy promotion.

1. Background of Democracy Promotion

Bush (the forty fifth president of the United States) administration is not the first one who adopted Democracy promotion. If we back on time we will find that democracy has been the Central American value since the founding fathers. Democracy has been the element of the United States' foreign policy. It can be said that the United States has supported democracy as its foreign policy since its earliest days. It is seen that in the modern era, that Woodrow Wilson focused just on promoting government that based on consent of the governed to be the country's foreign policy. Furthermore, the supporting for democracy as a central element in the United States' foreign policy has been placed by almost all the presidents of the united States from the era of the Second World War to twenty first century, from Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to George W. Bush.

Human rights was placed in a great interest by president Carter, and president Reagan took democracy so further that he created an American institution of democracy promotion, and another four institutions associated with the two political parties of the United States. The four institutions are the National Democratic Institute, the International Republican Institute, the centre for International Private Enterprise and the Solidarity centre. President George H. W. Bush extended the support of democracy by adding it to the portfolio of the Agency for International development of the United States.

The support for democratic development was also made by the president Clinton, he expanded it to be one of the three four pillars of the United States' foreign policy. And George W. Bush expanded promotion of democracy to the Middle East.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly since the Second World War. Among these rights are life, liberty and the security of person. The Universal Declaration addresses a link between sovereignty and people, that is everyone has the right to be a part in the government of his/her country. The authority of the government should be based from the people's will, that is the people should the ability to choose who governs them by a periodic and legitimate elections, which shall be by universal and equal suffrage.

The protection and promotion of human rights that was adopted by the Universal Declaration and numerous treaties which the United States has joined were central for achieving international security and peace.

2. The International Agencies of Democracy Promotion

The advancement of freedom and democracy in all over the world had been committed by the non-profit and nonpartisan organization of the International Republican Institute. For twenty five years, the spreading of democracy has been helped by the International Republican Institute trough expert trainer from all around the world on political party and candidate development, good governance practices, civil society development, civic education, women's and youth leadership development, electoral reform and election monitoring, and political expression in closed societies. IRI is active in 70 counties with offices in 42 countries.

In addition, there was another nonprofit organization that worked on strengthening and expanding democracy throughout the world, this agency called National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. This organization aims to improve Democratic values. It also cooperates with Democrats worldwide to build political and civic organizations, prevent fraudulent elections, and promote citizen participation.

3. Characteristics of democracy promotion:

Democracy promotion is a central focus in the administration of the United States foreign policy. One of the characteristics of democracy promotion is re-energizing alliances of the United States among democratic nations whether they were inside or outside the United Nations; announcing the intent to manage the promotion of democracy. Therefore, the United States worked with its allies and through international organizations to give such effort a greater legitimacy and an international face. Thus, announce endless support and funding to the United Nations Democracy Fund and the Development Program of the United Nations.

Another feature of democracy promotion is the attempt of the United States to fix the new Human Rights Council and extending the financial and political commitments of the United States to United Nations office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, all this by committing diplomatic resources.

Moreover, guaranteeing endless support for high-level participation in regional organization, such as The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe which is with the side of democratic principles, and of which the United States is a member. The United States should be a supporter for Democratic promotion efforts of other regional intergovernmental bodies, such as the African Union.

Extending Funding for programs that support democracy by organizations, such as the Department of State's Bureau for Democracy, the National Endowment for Democracy, the Department of State's Middle East Partnership Initiative, Human Rights and Labor, and the US Agency for International Development. Supporting congressionally-initiated funding for democracy support programs in Iraq.

4. Objectives of democracy promotion

The United States of America adopted democracy promotion as one of its foreign policy for particular objectives, which are connecting development with democracy, creating stability and security and redefining democracy building.

4.1. Connecting development with democracy

In the course of recent years, there has been an obvious change in the attitude of the contributor group, worldwide money related establishments, and those supporting democratic advancement that realizes the interconnectedness amongst political and financial change. Indeed, even from the point of view of common outside help, the foundation of democratic establishments was the most ideal approach to guarantee manageable development. The 2002 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) introduced a clarion call about the significance of the connection amongst democracy and advancement. Participation of democracy is a basic end of human improvement, not only a method for accomplishing it. The report made the democratic government motivation one stride assist by declaring that, "politics," not just civics, is as critical to fruitful advancement as financial aspects. Today, the UNDP is proceeding to construct connects amongst democratic government and improvement, and other UN organizations and global foundations are pushing this approach Making democratic system work to convey better lives for the people is a supported and basic test. Making strides past starting leaps forward, for example,

advancing financial improvement and closure debasement are integral to keeping up mainstream support. The test, especially in another democratic system, is to construct support for law based administration that keeps choices from making progress—regardless of whether they are dictatorial administrations, populist covers for tyranny, or radical belief systems that advance bigotry and brutality.

4.2 Creating stability and security

Each real peace agreement consulted over the most recent two decades has included, as a key objective, decisions and the likelihood of democratic administration. Creating just procedures over the span of building manageable peace is active to accomplishing soundness and security—both locally in those nations and universally. The arrival on this speculation is galactic. The appreciation of lives spared in spots as differing as East Timor, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nepal, El Salvador, and Kosovo, to list just a couple, goes a long ways past the uses that assistance to manufacture comprehensive political procedures that make warriors put down arms and take part in calm competition for legislative power.

The motivation in acknowledged and potential financial improvement and the financial ramifications got from global peace, and strength likewise must be considered in the condition. Democratic governments give the best other options to encouraging peace crosswise over outskirts by keeping up inside soundness and accomplishing monetary and social advancement.

Alternately, dictatorship, defilement, and absence of responsibility worsen weakness, destitution, and narrow mindedness and breed flimsiness, expanding the potential for strife and fanaticism, while impeding attempts to address starvation, sickness, and different matters basic for human advancement (Diamond 93-95)

Democratic governments give the best contrasting options to encouraging peace crosswise over outskirts by keeping up interior steadiness and accomplishing financial and social improvement (Diamond 96).

4.3 Redefining democracy building

"Regime change" is not an objective or target of Democratic system help. Extra enhancements and democratic change — at a pace that each body politic sets—characterize the method of operation. At the point when the individuals who hold control mishandle it and baffle the will of the general population to such a degree, to the point that the general population choose to make sensational move to ensure their sovereign rights, an administration might be cleared away in light of its resistance to democratic system. That cannot be orchestrated or imposed by outside forces. Dictatorship is an imposition; democracy is about choice (Diamond 97).

There are clear illustrations where the individuals who held power ruptured their conservative with citizens and utilized the forces of government to smother the will of the general population in the matter of who ought to speak to them. The Philippines brought forth "people Power" in light of such mishandle of energy, as was all the more as of late the circumstance in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine. In each case, people worked for responsiveness and accountability of government before turning to more dramatic means of changing those in power.

The use of military force has never been predicated principally on democracy policy. Toppling an administration must be saved for uncommon conditions where those responsible for a state are manhandling its forces in ways that meet all around perceived justification for mediation, for example, propelling universal hostility or genocide and different violations against mankind. This move is best made multilaterally under authorize of

U.S government bolster for democratic government programs originates from an assortment of sources.

In the early 1980s, these projects were financed principally through the NED and its centre foundations, which give solid expression to America's democratic values while serving the nation's national enthusiasm by advancing political situations those are cold to political radicalism. Since the 1980s, bolster from The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has took into consideration a huge increment in democratic advancement exercises, as has the Department of State's utilization of Economic Support Funds for these reasons. Significantly expanded assets inside the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) and the formation of the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) amid the George W. Shrub Administration have permitted significantly more noteworthy open doors for greatly required creative popular government help with nations and geographic regions that are not conventional USAID beneficiaries (Bounce 16).

The United States likewise puts resources into democratic system working through its commitments and projects in multilateral organizations; contribution to the United Nations support the general augmentation of the manage of law and give guide appointive help to a large number of the world's residents, frequently through the Electoral Assistance Bureau. As in 2007, about portion of the World's countries had gotten UN help with holding and checking races and numerous more have gotten UN help in making or reshaping their constitutions. The United States additionally adds to particular, deliberately subsidized offices of the United Nations that advance vote based system and great administration, similar to the UN Democracy Fund, which was made on July 4, 2005, with the support of the Bush organization. The Democracy Fund gives little gives to governments and common society associations around the globe to bolster developing democratic systems with legitimate, specialized, and monetary help and counsel (Cramer 18).

This pluralism in democratic government help has served the United States well, taking into account different yet reciprocal programming that, over the long haul, couldn't be maintained by an exceedingly static and brought together framework. Financing by the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), for instance, has permitted its centre organizations to react rapidly and adaptably to rising open doors and sudden issues in quickly moving political conditions. What's more, the NED has possessed the capacity to work adequately in shut social orders where coordinate government engagement is more troublesome. Reserves from USAID have given the premise to a longer-term duty in building up a nation's law based foundations; while financing from DRL and different projects inside the State Department, for example, MEPI, have given the U.S. government the ability to bolster without bulky controls—bleeding edge and exceedingly engaged democratic system programs in individual nations and in addition provincial and worldwide activities. While the U.S. government can set the tone and remote guide can give required assets to democratic improvement, a great part of the work on the ground must be finished by nongovernmental associations (NGOs). While the picture of democratic system working in the United States has experienced relationship with the war in Iraq, the reaction against universal support for vote based change frequently originates from nondemocratic administrations.

Pioneers of these administrations frequently make false allegations to attempt to undermine bolster for indigenous law based developments. Utilizing the quality picked up from monetary benefits in extractive enterprises, certain legislatures are in all out attack mode to obstruct change developments that are looking for tranquil change and regard for a wide scope of human rights (at times including financial, social, and social rights). While the late twentieth century saw an extraordinary development in democratic system, there has been numerous mishaps. These incorporate the development of populist rabble rousers, the re-rise of dictatorship in a few conditions of the previous Soviet Union, and the race or expanding

quality of radical Islamist bunches in some Arab nations. While the reasons are fluctuated, democratic government as a framework and idea—has some of the time been reprimanded for not conveying expanded expectations for everyday comforts or for not satisfactorily giving the necessities of life. Tyrant Leaders—regardless of whether in Eurasia, the Middle East, or Latin America—have utilized these apparent failings to push their own image of one-gathering or one-man run the show. To be effective, democratic system can't be only an arrangement of ideas or procedures; it must deliver enhancements in individuals' lives. Developing acknowledgment of the interconnectedness between monetary thriving and vote based system has delivered throughout the most recent decade a perpetually expanding pattern among countries, intergovernmental and nongovernment associations, and worldwide money related organizations to bolster popular government and human rights exercises. U.S. philanthropies NGOs occupied with helping democratic activists around the globe have been best when they have joined with others to share law based abilities. As a down to earth matter, people groups making the move to democratic systems require differing encounters. Those of democrats from different countries—from new and built up democratic governments alike—are frequently more significant than our own (Dobson and Marsh 101).

Helpful methodologies additionally pass on a more profound truth to countries attempting a move to democratic system: they are not surrendering something to the United States; they are joining a group of countries that have navigated a similar course. They can demonstrate that while despotisms are innately segregated and dreadful of the outside world, democratic governments can depend on characteristic partners and a dynamic bolster structure in light of the fact that different countries are concerned and are viewing. In the previous decade, various nations and intergovernmental associations have built up new democratic system bolster activities.

Inside the UN framework, the attempts of the UNDP and the UN Democracy Fund, noted prior, have given worldwide support to new or hailing democratic governments. The UN Electoral Assistance Bureau and different bodies have comparative orders to bolster developing democratic governments with discretionary exhortation, help, observing, and execution. The Organization of American States (OAS) embraced the Inter-American Democratic Charter in 2001 and behaviours activities through its Office for the Promotion of Democracy and different instruments. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights is dynamic thought Europe and Eurasia. The African Union set forth a draft contract on democratic system, decisions, and administration in 2006. The Commonwealth Conducts dynamic democratic system help programs. New intergovernmental foundations, for example, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, have appeared.

5. Three Principles for Democracy Promotion

5.1 Democracy Develops Organically

While in abnormal and exceptional conditions untouchables may give democratic system a managed push, as a democratic advancement is driven by nearby performing artists. Significantly more uncommon is the burden of democratic government at the purpose of a firearm. The misperception that outsiders can force democratic.

A result frequently prompts confused strategies and off base presumptions. The emphasis on democratization with regards to the Iraq War is however one case of this. More common, be that as it may, is the inclination by policymakers, and even the public, to consider democratization to be a top-down, state-driven process. Democratization is to a great extent driven by an enabled citizenry and kept up by the foundation of establishments intended for shepherding and defending equitable practices. Additionally, captivating with non-elites and

common society associations has an imperative multiplier impact, initiating a procedure of decentralization and nearby strengthening that must be energized in future democratization tries (Cohen A and Figueroa 20).

5.2. Democratization is the Work of Generations:

While there are periodically exceptions to the govern, democratic evolution don't happen overnight. It can take years, even decades, for equitable practices to wind up plainly implanted. Nor, when all is said in done, does the event of a free and reasonable decision flags the authority of democratic rule run the show. For sure, while free and reasonable races are a vital benchmark, they are just a starting stride making a course for democratization. It bears noticing that, from an automatic angle, U.S democratic government help assets are presently being focused more toward administration, lead of law, and common society programs instead of direct discretionary support—a savvy portion of assets. However, while it is for the most part comprehended that democratization requires some investment, the talk of U.S. political pioneers does not generally mirror this reality, bringing about uplifted desires, and after that terrify when occasions start to move in the wrong bearing. More terrible still, policymakers over and over again lose enthusiasm after a first free and reasonable decision, and neglect to keep up the level of bolster delicate democratic governments require. Democratic government incidentally shows itself in incredible recorded minutes, however regularly it is the collection of little, yet basic, progressions (Bauman 111).

5.3. Limitation of United States' Democracy Promotion

In spite of the media consideration that regularly encompasses American attempts abroad, the capacity of the U.S. to influence democratic moves is more obliged than is by and large caught on. In spite of the fact that U.S. subsidizing can encourage transitioning nations keep on moving in a positive bearing, make breathing space for common society performing artists,

and distinguish and engage neighbourhood law based pioneers, it can't change an illiberal administration into a democratic government overnight. Democracy occasionally manifests itself in great historical moments, but most often it is the accumulation of small, but critical, advancements.

Policymakers ought to perceive that not each nation can or will successfully use vote based system help with a similar way. For instance, for FY 2009, the U.S. distributed "administering fairly and legitimately" financing for advancing democratic government in Iran (\$65 million) and Cuba (\$20 million). It even assigned \$2 million for advancing majority rules system in North Korea. These are antagonistic administrations where democratic government help is probably not going to bring about noteworthy movements toward star fair conduct. However, these nations are regularly held up as evidence that democratic system advancement does not work. While fruitful moves, as in Mali or Indonesia, or the incremental advance is being made somewhere else, are given short shrift (Cramer 10). Despite the fact that American vote based system help has expanded as of late, regardless it remains at a fairly immaterial \$1.5 billion, which is about a similar measure of cash the U.S spent in 2007 to prepare security compels in Afghanistan.

Considering the restricted impact any one nation can have on another when it come to advancing democratic system, policymakers need to all the more barely and productively target U.S. attempts to produce the most ideal outcomes. We should not overlook the supposed most exceedingly awful of the most noticeably bad (North Korea, Zimbabwe, Burma), however we additionally should be perceived that democratic system. Democracy Promotion must be isolated from both domestic and worldwide politics.

Finally, this chapter dealt with the American foreign policy during the Post-Cold War era, which was adopting democracy promotion worldwide. Therefore, The United States created

multiple institutions and organizations that were related to democratic systems and values to support democracy promotion. One of the areas to promote democracy was Iraq.

Chapter Tree : American Foreign

Policy from Theory to Practice

As it was mentioned earlier in the second chapter, the United States of America adopted democracy promotion after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990. One of these areas was Iraq. America used military intervention to end the old regime of Iraq and build a new democratic one. However, in this chapter we will discuss if the American attempt in building a democratic system in Iraq was successful.

1. US Democracy Promotion in the Arab World

The primary US venture toward this path was the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI), reported in December 2002 by US Secretary of State Colin Powell. MEPI's "procedure" has been formed, to a limited extent, by the United Nations Development Program, Arab Human Development Report of 2002, which recognized three key shortages in political Freedom: ladies' strengthening and information. The activity laid on four columns : financial, political, instructive and ladies' rights , and suggested an assortment of nation particular and area wide undertakings. A moment majority rules system advancement activity was the Broader Middle East and North Africa Partnership Initiative, declared in June 2004 at the G8 summit in Atlanta, Georgia. Despite the fact that not solely an American venture — its motivation was to make vote based system advancement a helpful endeavour amongst G8 and Middle Eastern governments (Diamond 100)

The second level of US vote based system advancement in the Arab Middle East has been conventional and open strategy. Over and over since 2001 open pundits and state authorities, also the top organization authorities, including the president himself and secretaries of state Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice, have stressed that fair change in the Middle East has turned into a centre goal of U.S approach in the area. A standout amongst the most vital articulations of this strategy was Bush's discourse at the National Endowment of Democracy in November 2003, in which law based change in the Middle East was a principle centre .

Finally, on a third level, majority rules system advancement has turned into a basic piece of an interventionist US remote arrangement in the Arab Middle East, embodied in the intrusion and control of Iraq. As already on account of Afghanistan, the 2003 Iraq war was advocated on the grounds of self-protection against assumed weapons of mass pulverization (WMD) multiplication and fear mongering (Diamond 104-105).

In any case, democratization was likewise some portion of the reason for military activity. It was contended by the US organization that a vote based Iraq would be a characteristic American partner and that its illustration would empower political change in the Arab world in general. The reaction to US majority rules system advancement arrangements over the Arab district has likewise turned out to be more composed and has appeared as provincial gatherings which have created ace change articulations. In January 2004, at an expansive universal meeting in Sana'a, Yemen built up the Arab Democratic Dialog Forum. The Alexandria Conference of Arab authors, savvy people and political activists on 'Middle Easterner Reform' in March 2004 in its last archive called upon Arab governments to actualize changes that incorporate the cancelation of highly sensitive situations. In June 2004, the Doha Declaration for Democracy and Reform was received at the end of a meeting in Qatar went to by more than 100 masterminds and government officials from different Arab nations ; in most of the Arab nations: Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Algeria and Morocco, at different circumstances and to different degrees, have enhanced social equality and have permitted more noteworthy political participation, usually through races.

Upon the arrival of the intrusion, the United c Egypt is perhaps the best illustration of these ambiguous forces and influences. Since 2001 Egypt has been a fundamental focus of US majority rules system advancement as a result of its crucial part in the Arab world and closeness to the US. Hosni Mubarak's administration has reacted by starting changes, for

example, making the Human Rights Council, transforming the National Democratic Party and presenting multiparty contestation of the presidential races. He has additionally permitted some open articulation of political dispute and has given more breathing space to faultfinders of the administration. Ostensibly this more prominent openness has given a chance to casual inverse Syria was portrayed by the Bush organization in 2002 as a major aspect of a 'vile forces that be', and the US has put weight on it to revoke its WMD projects and stop from supporting the Iraqi revolt. Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon would add to accomplishing these objectives.

2. Background of Iraq War

The Persian Gulf War situated in south-western Asia at the bay northern is little, oil rich nation called Kuwait, and its northern neighbour, Iraq. It was unfriendly to Kuwait. On August 2, 1990, Iraqi strengths emptied over the bordure into Kuwait. Iraq's President, Saddam Hussein, had arranged gigantic military to attack Kuwait. After six days, Iraq declared that it had added Kuwait since Hussein had asserted that Kuwait was a piece of Iraqi domain. Additionally, he had been furious with Kuwait for different reasons. Both nations were makers of oil, however Iraq asserted that Kuwait was pumping out excessively oil, bringing down world oil costs and ountry security gathering issued determination censuring the assault, and requested that Iraq pull back from Kuwait; there was additionally worry that Hussein, by involving Kuwait, controlled excessively of the world's oil.

On August 8, the main US troops touched base in Saudi Arabia to guard Kuwait. There mission was called Operation Desert Shield. That day, president George H.W. Shrubbery settled on discourse disclosing his choice to submit US strengths to the area and announced, "There is no legitimization at all for this absurd and ruthless demonstration of hostility" (OCHOA 23).

Bush sorted out a universal coalition included 39 nations from western European countries, for example, The United Kingdom, France, Germany and Spain; Eastern European countries, for example, Poland and Czechoslovakia; Asian nations, for example, Pakistan and South Korea; Latin American nations, for example, Argentina and Honduras; and African nations, for example, Niger. Some Arab nations additionally joined the coalition, including Bahrain, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria. In the time, Hussein viewed himself as the Arab's pioneer against Western nations. On November 29, the UN Security Council passed determination allowing the utilization of military constrain against Iraq on the off chance that he didn't expel from Kuwait on January 15, 1991. When the due date arrived, Iraq still involved Kuwait.

On January 17, 1991, allied aircraft rained bombes on Baghdad, and US chips propelled cutting edge Tomahawk voyage rockets; Hussein battled back however his antiaircraft safeguards were insufficient to crush the US air control; partnered powers attacked Iraq to cut off supply lines and keep Iraqi powers in Kuwait from withdrawing. Numerous Iraqi troops, unsettled by the weeks of besieging; and the outcome was the quick crumple of Iraq forces. After the Gulf War, Hussein stayed in power however his years were numbered. He was accepted to have concoction and natural weapons, and many thought he was attempting to create atomic weapons. Hussein guaranteed to annihilate these weapons of mass devastation within the sight of the UN. On account of his gathered inability to stay faithful to his obligations, the United States attacked Iraq on December 13, 2003.

3. The War of Iraq

The invasion of Iraq by multinational forces led by troops from the United States and the United Kindom claimed that Iraq's illegal possession of weapons of mass distruction, the troops led by army general Tony Franks, under the solgan « Operation Iraqi Liberation » and

the justification were : end the Hussein dictatorship regime, eliminate whatever Islamist militants, and distribute humanitarian aid.

The invasion was quick and decisive by using the largest special operation forces in the north since the successful attack on the Taliban government of Afghanistan just a year before. The Iraq army was quickly defeated.

4. The the U.S. Democracy Promotion in Iraq

4.1. Accopation rather than Democracy Building

Despite the fact that America talked much about the ideal of democracy and how its invasion of Iraq would end the old regim of Saddam Husein and build a new democratic system in Iraq, yet America acted as it wanted to accupy the country rather than give self-governing to Iraqi people. Basically, Bush administration agreed to more representative procedures and institutions only when it pushed to do so by the Iraqi people.

Not long after accupying the country, the United States selected an « Iraqi Governing Council » (IGC) as consultative body. At first, Washington upheld the establishment of Ahmad Chalabi as a leader of Iraq. At the point when that arrangement seemed unsatisfactory, U.S. authorities attempted to keep thier emissary Paul Bremer in power indefinitely. When it turned out to be evident that Iraqis and the international community would not tolerate that option either, the Bush administration pushed for an assembly framework in which American appointees would pick the new government and write the constitution. Just in January 2004, when that arrangement incited a huge number of Iraqi protesters in the street demanding a popular vote, and president Bush reluctantly agreed to allow elections to push ahead (Zunes)

Rater than proceeding with the poll in May as called for by Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani and other Iraqi leaders, however, U.S. authorities delayed the elections unti january 2005. They

contented that there was insufficient time to enroll voters and that the proportion record created amid the UN-administered Oil for Food program were lacking. Meanwhile, a dramatic growth of the the insurgency during the eight-month delay brought about a genuine weakening of security circumstances. When the elections at last took place , the the majority of Sunni Arab minority was to a great extent not able or unwilling to take an interest. In most Sunni-commended parts of Arab-Populated Iraq, dangers guerillas made it physically unsafe to go to the poll.

With parades and speeches, the U.S. authorities finally decided to transfer power to Iraqis at the end of June 2004.

4.2. Transitional Democracy

Democracy is the idea that the power of the government to rule should be from the consent of the governed. That is people should be able to choose who governs them with direct national election, in which every citizen who reached the appropriate age, regardless of his family background, his religious and plitical beliefs ,has the right to vote. However, the case in Iraq did not go in this way. Basically, Washington selected Ayad Allawi as the leader of the U.S.-appointed interim government, although polls of Iraqis showing that the rank of Allawi's popularity was quit low. His earlier carrer as a Baathist, including his support for political repression combined with his later years in exile and his ties to the CIA and anti-government terrorist group. Not suprisingly, he proved to be an unpopular leader. His autocratic governing style and his support for offensive military actions by U.S. and Iraqi government forces, resulting in large civilian causalities, undercut any claims to democratic rule (Zunes).

The interval constitution planned by U.S. occupation specialists required super-greater parts in the nationa get together and an agreement among the presidential chamber fpr real enactment to pass. Supporters of such a framework noted, to the point that such an expensive

agreement was important to advance solidarity in a nation raising up from dictatorship and divided ethnic and tribal loyalties. Critics charged, however, that it crippled the new government from taking decisive action on pressing concerns and kept the country overly dependent on the United States. Surely, it was almost two months before an interim cabinet was approved and the transitional government could begin governing.

Neither the transitional government nor its successors have possessed the ability to exercise much expertise with regards to security. U.S. forces have been able to operate all through the nation freely, and the « sovereign » Iraqi government has had no privilege to limit their activities. Secretary of State Colin Powell claimed that U.S. forces and their sprawling bases throughout Iraq which expanding in ways that seem to show an intention to remain for the long terms (Zunes)

Moreover, the U.S. ambassadors have not been like other ambassadors. According to Bush administration, a considerable lot of the more than 1,500 Americans enjoyed prominent positions in nearly every Iraqi ministry, and the ambassador's office controls a significant part of the Iraqi government's financial plan. The U.S. citizens keep on enjoying extraterritorial rights. They can't be indicted in Iraq for any wrongdoing, regardless of how serious. The U.S. military power-numbering over 165,000 can move and attack anywhere in the country without the government's permission.

4.3. The U.S. Violation of Iraqis Human Rights

Since the U.S. powers assumed control over the nation, the level of violence has dramatically increased, not only dwarfing the violence during Saddam's final years in power but tripling the average annual death rates during his entire quarter century in power. Furthermore, the sheer arbitrariness of the brutality has left a huge number of Iraqis in a condition of endless fear. Since the U.S. attack in 2003, somewhere in the range of 50,000 to

70,000 Iraqi regular citizens have have died, many of them have died by the hand of U.S forces.

In addition, U.S. forces imprisoned over 50,000 Iraqis since the attack. But only one and a half percent of them have been convicted of any crime. The U.S. forces currently hold 15-18,000 Iraqi prisoners, more than were imprisoned under Saddam Hussein. Amnesty International and other human rights groups have cited the U.S. forces for widespread violations of international humanitarian law, including torture and other abuses of prisoners. In spite of the great extent effective attempts of the Bush administration to cancel the degree of U.S. torment of Iraqi detainees, the disclosures of mishandle in the Abu Ghraib jail were quite recently the iceberg. Given that majority of the prisoners in that jail were not terrorist or guerillas, but simply ordinary young Iraqi men captured in gigantic breadth by U.S. occupation forces.

To conclude, America pledged that its use of military force would help in building democracy in Iraq, however, it seemed that it behave in a way proves that the U.S. was more interested in occupying the country rather than giving the Iraqi people the right of a democratic self-governing (Zunes).

General Conclusion

The ideological conflict between the communist and the capitalist ended in 1991, with the collapse of the Soviet Union that was unable to make balance between its military and economic development. As a result, the United States became the sole superpower, and ready to practice its foreign policy freely, which was adopting democracy promotion.

The central focus of U.S. foreign policy was the war on terrorism, protecting human rights and democracy promotion by using soft and hard power till the use of military forces. It adopted this policy against dictator regimes and the war on Iraq is well illustrated that. However, America failed in building democracy in Iraq, because the U.S. did not care much about democracy in Iraq rather than caring much more about occupying the country for a long time. Democracy from the beginning has been more of a self-serving rationalization for American strategic and economic interests in the region than a genuine concern for the right of the Iraq people to democratic self-governance.

The U.S. also violated the Iraqi human rights by killing some, and imprisoning the others without committing crimes. Many Iraqis might have dreamed about democracy, but what they got instead was occupation and autocracy.

Work-Cited List

- Abu Hamoud, Mohamed. « U.S War On Iraq and The Arab Order ». Al Siyassa- Al Dawliya.Ed. Osama Al-Ghazali Harb. Egypt : Al Ahram Commercial Press Kalioub, 2003.14-19.
- Bouman, Rainer.In Compatible Conception of Global Order ? Empire, Hegemony,and Global Governance. University of Bremen : New York, 2005.
- Bunce, Valerie. DEMOCRACY BRIDGE : Multilateral regional efforts for the democracy and Defence of Democracy in Africa and America. Washington, D.C ? 2007.
- Cohen, A-Michael and Marie Figueroa Kupku. Revitalizing U.S promotion : A Comprehensive Plan For Reform. New America Foundation, 2009.
- COLLINS, D- Stephen. Democracy Sanction. « An Assesment of EconomicSanction as an instrument of Democracy Promotion » Taiwan Journal of Democracy. vol 5,No.2 :69-96.
- Cramer, LorneW New Direction For Democracy Promotion. Kenneth Wollack : National Democratic Institution NDI, 2004.
- Diamond, Lary. Promoting Democracy Post-Conflict and Failed States. Taiwan journal of Democracy. Vol 5, No.2 : 69-96.
- Dobson, Alan P and Steve Marsh. US Foreign Policy Since 1945. London : Routledge, 2001.
- Gordenker, Leon. What UN principles ? A U.S Debate On Iraq. New York : Global Governance, 2003.

Hanson, Jim *The Next Cold War ? American Alternatives For The Twenty-First Century*.
West Port, CT : Praeger Publishers, 1996.

Hughes, William. Ed. *Western Civilization EARLY Modern through The Twentieth Century*.
9 ed. Guilford, CT : Dusking Graw. Hill, 1997.

Lewis, R-Adrian. *The American Culture of War*. Abington, New York : Taylor and Francis
Group, 2007.

MC Faull, Michael. *Democracy Promotion As a World Value*. *The Washington Quarterly* :
Washington, D.C, 2005.

Myerson, B-Roger. *How to Build Democracy in Iraq*. *New York Times*. 31 Mar. 1998 : 3.

Ochoa, George. *America in The 1990s*. New York : Stonesong Press, LLC, 2006.

Shire, Iam Derby. « *The Break- Up of The USSR* ». *THE Hutchinson Encyclopedia*. United
Kingdom : Helicon Publishing LTD, 2001.

Stephen Zunes, « *Iraq : The Failure of Democratization* », University of San Francisco,
Common Courage Press, 2003.

