

مركز البيدر للدراسات والتخطيط

Al-Baidar Center For Studies And Planning



Book Review

The American Empire and the Raid on Iraq

Abdel Khalek Kazem Ibrahim

Introduction:

The importance of this book in the field of political history stems from the prominence of its author, Mr. Mohamed Hassanein Heikal, one of the most well-known Egyptian and Arab journalists of the twentieth century. Heikal began his journalistic career at a young age and helped to shape Arab politics as well as Egyptian politics during the monarchy. Since the 1960s of the 20th century, he has been one of the most well-known scholars in documenting and recording Arab events thanks to his famous weekly articles in the Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram. His works and writings covered the Arabs' modern political history, including all of its significant occurrences, changes, wars, coups, and vicissitudes.

Two sentences in the book's preface, "These chapters are the story of actual political realities, and at the same time they are the form of impending political conditions," by the author, captured the essence of his work. His predictions of what will happen in the world and in the Arab world in particular over the next few years are revealed in the first two sentences.

The book discusses significant turning points in American foreign policy in the twenty-first century and how they relate to the invasion and occupation of Iraq. It examines US President Bush Jr.'s strategy and its connection to the invasion of Iraq, revealing US policy both before and after the occupation. It also paves the way for it by providing a historical reading of the US march in its early setting. In order to cover a wide range of issues, he began with a rapid and succinct history of the United States of America. He then examined the American mindset and its cultural foundation, beginning with its founders and ending with the World War I, to determine what makes it unique. He highlighted the new realities that emerged on the international stage and the ways in which America took advantage of the opportunity to

impose its hegemony on underdeveloped nations at the time in order to transform into an empire. In doing so, he shed light on the power dynamics in the world after World War II.

He then discusses the web of connections between America's political decisions and the massive businesses of armaments, oil, automobiles, and energy. He discusses the extent to which these corporations have come to shape American foreign policy and decision-making due to their enormous potential; sales for these corporations account for 25% of the world's output, and the combined revenue of five American corporations exceeds the national output of 182 nations. Exxon Mobil Petroleum generates more revenue than the sum of OPEC (the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries).

Regarding the American invasion of Iraq, he discusses both the overt and covert reasons why the United States launched its attack. According to him, this invasion was nothing more than the start of a new Middle East that America sought under a covert plan for the region, and the wars and destruction that are occurring right now are the most significant elements of the "creative chaos" scenario that US administrations have been constructing over the past 40 years in order to maintain their absolute dominance over the world. It is evident from this that the author intended to lay the groundwork for the history of American politics and the laws that govern it before going in depth into the actual details of the American invasion of Iraq in 2003. He did this to demonstrate how this invasion is a continuation of a previous path that America began since its founding as a country that, in his opinion, relied on piracy and raiding other societies. Additionally, it marks the start of a new Middle Eastern pathway at many historical junctures, one that was paved by Iraq.

A Search Mission into the American Conscience

The author makes reference to the Arab world's "fundamental dilemma," which is skillfully and intelligently portrayed in its interaction with the American Empire. The author claims that the issue requires coping with circumstances that are nearly insurmountable and that resemble the sides of a closed box. The first is the challenge of forging genuine friendships because the opportunity was lost and essentially vanished in 1948 following the first Arab-Israeli war. The second is the threat of developing into utter animosity since the nation is unable to handle the problem because it is, at least temporarily, outside the scope of its resources and capacity. The third: the rush to the end in such an endless hostility; Because it brings its companions to helpless hatred, which is more a recipe for failure than success. The fourth: is the impossibility of patience in the case that the Arabs believe they can ignore America and let time and natural forces deplete it of its resources and weaken it.

He comes to the conclusion that the Arab nations of today are extremely close to the American empire and extremely distant from all logic and action. Since he thinks that the result of these connections is a struggle that shouldn't be left unattended to but rather controlled, he compares it to the Greek tragedy. Insisting that despite the fact that it is important to be cautious and carefully examine the case of the American empire, the American policy, which at the time appears to the Arabs as an unrestrained storm of violence, should not frighten and tempt them to flee; Being a faction that differs from its predecessors with characteristics and advantages that were not available to other empires.

The real test for the Arabs at that point and moving forward is whether they will join forces with other world powers to put an end to the excesses of the American empire. They must also accurately assess

the components of the conflict that aim to tame American power so that it is subject to the rule of law. Because the great empires of history have always been conquered by themselves via the excessive use of force and conceit rather than by their opponents in direct battles to the death.

It reassures the Arabs to some extent that they are not alone in facing it, but they more than others need to start a search mission of the personality and conscience of this empire. In order to prevent people from being vanquished without cause, held as prisoners without struggle, or victims without a cost, as has occurred to them occasionally, it is important to examine the sources of that action. When an attempt is being made in the conscience of a vast empire, this function of scrutiny demands understanding rather than trial and condemnation.

From State to Empire:

Here, it deals with the founding of the United States, which had diasporic, exiled, and a haven for various and contradictory samples of people, including explorers and adventurers who discovered the new world and its tremendous richness, first of which was gold. After that, migration continued to that country, which needed a labor force, so the kings of Europe sent their inmates to it, so another influx of immigrants was represented by the religiously and politically diverse. The Israeli solution was analogous to the American solution, which comes from the saying: “There was something similar to what happened in Palestine in order to get rid of the African-American indigenous population” (killing the husband and seizing his property and raping the bride by occupying the land). Where the author claims that America was a pioneer in this behavior and has continued to practice it against any real or perceived enemies, as American law gave the president the authority to order the CIA to kill anyone it believed to be an enemy of the United States or a leader of a major nation up until the year

1974. Which was suspended by President (Gerald Ford), who issued a presidential order prohibiting the practice of killing political leaders of foreign countries and remained in force until President George Bush Jr. issued a presidential order to return to it in America's ongoing holy war (against terrorism).

The desire to escape to a new geography and a departure from a past history was the United States of America's initial guiding concept because it was founded on an entirely emergency principle that it had never known previously. Additionally, they require culture, law, and morals from sources that are appropriate for conditions that are distinct from those in which states have previously arisen. The first line of their new history, which had to start with "killing the other," was required to be a blank page. Because killing serves both the humane purpose of providing security and the benefit of the killer (which is a right from the point of view of its owners). The creation of a morality format that claims innocence in order to lessen the burden of what they were forced to do and cover it with justifications and necessities of stability and progress was the second phase of the experience of immigrant communities. In addition to prayers, interest is mixed with a sort of legend. It was able to develop and construct the moral standards required for the American enterprise, and it was up to the law to assess that (what is beneficial to its owners – is necessarily legal).

The roots of this experience can be understood through the logic adopted by American policy, especially in the Middle East, in particular with regard to the Palestinian issue, where the historical backgrounds are canceled and the present is adopted, and the writer cites this in his meeting with Henry Kissinger, the former US Secretary of State, who asked him to tell him about Egypt alone without entering into the issue of Arab nationalism, and to tell him about the current moment without going back to what was before that, relying on an Arab saying that (let

bygones be bygones), and refers to the forerunner of the American appearance with figures who relied on piracy or the extermination of entire tribes or from gunpowder trade. Therefore, the first builders of the American imperial force, as Theodore Roosevelt describes them, are the robber barons who later bought the most beautiful inheritance of European culture with dollars.

With regard to the rules of international law that were developed without the participation of America and in its absence, it is not binding unless they recognize it based on the existence of an American interest, and even in the case of recognition, the application of the law becomes selective, as in its reduction of the authority of the international organization in the Security Council, especially in the case of Iraq and other issues. Evidence for this is that most of the cases before the International Court of Justice are filed against the United States. Therefore, the standard reference in American policy depends on direct interest, and with this reference, it is possible to explain America's exit from many international treaties and conventions.

The founding of the American state took place in the midst of a unique historical journey that was not bound by a common connection. Since they are the biggest, richest, and strongest, and since it is the promised land and a heavenly grant (God's grace) to the strong and capable, there is a claim that the only thing binding them is courage. As a result, it depends on the profit and loss principle, which explains why it entered the World War I three years after the conflict began and the World War II more than two years later.

Based on the policy of (avoiding bloodshed), the rest of the parties in the world have no choice but to go for what is required to obtain satisfaction and serve the American decision without review or accountability, and either hesitation or delay in acquiescence is unacceptable to them. And then America will have the right to act

unilaterally and arrange for itself authorities that determine their size and extent by a unilateral decision without a partner. From this perspective, it has the right to respond to the aggression in kind, to strike the sources of threat and deter the intentions of the enemies, and it has the right to choose others to beat in order to discipline others, as it is war (on the mood) until the review of sanctions take place and the most difficult sides are seen and learnt without costs or expenses.

The writer cites many facts that confirm that America's standard of governance is the account of profits and losses, and it does not accommodate claims of pride or dignity, also` it is ready to abandon its most important men and allies without heavy burden on conscience, as in its abandonment of its most important men in the Middle East, the Shah of Iran (Mohammed Reza Pahlavi). Likewise, what it did in the question of the slaves who were brought by ships from Africa in heaps like goods, half of them die during the duration of the voyage due to the hardships and harshness of the ocean, while they are chained and offered at auction, whose number reached from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth century between 25-30 million Africans. The bonds of servitude were applied to them ,and they were the cause of the industrial revolution. Despite the end of slavery, but it was done without liquidating its effects, and racial discrimination remained a deep wound in the American conscience - unheard of - and likened it - the writer - to a gunpowder storage, because until this moment without treatment, because silence about the pain does not heal it.

As a result, the American state was largely founded on the labor of others who were engaged by the simplest means and the least expensive rates, both in the realm of thought and its acquisition of the stock of literary and scientific legacy as well as the outcome of the entire global political and economic thought. In the same way, when it comes to the topic of work and the debate over slavery, it has embraced the logic

of products and the logic of the corporation. This is especially true when production rises and activity broadens beyond local boundaries, waterways, and continental boundaries and turns to a global market. From this point on, it relies on customers who act as its interests' advocates. Therefore, the candidates who would serve as representatives, operators, or partners in domestic manufacturing when it entered the Middle Eastern markets were three, as the article portrays it:

- Saudi Arabia (given that the greatest American interest, which is oil, lurks under the sands of its desert and is therefore theoretically the first).
- And Egypt has the benefit of being the first practically and culturally (at the time), having the largest Arab population, which may enable it to serve as the US advocate.
- Turkey (since it is the largest and strongest Islamic country, and in addition to that, it holds the memories of the previous Islamic caliphate, which naturally prepares the path for it to represent America)

The American President (Franklin Roosevelt) interviewed the proxy candidates on board the American warship (Quincy), where he also met King Abdulaziz Al Saud, who greeted him with groveling and pleading because he saw Mr. Roosevelt as the powerful and just leader. "The man seemed to me to be a nomadic type of noble savage type, reflecting bygone times and traditions extending back to centuries that now have no place," Roosevelt wrote about this encounter. After that, Roosevelt met with King Farouk of Egypt and then with President Ismet Inonu of Turkey, who informed him that, in his perspective, Arabs are willing to follow orders from conquerors and are not welcome to collaborate with them on an equal basis.

The writer is shocked that, from that point on until now, American perceptions of the candidates among regional citizens have not changed significantly. In any case, Israel continues to be the only officially recognized agency of the American empire. being the dependable and reassuring safe agent.

War in American History:

The author spends a significant portion of his work explaining the past and future characteristics of the American Empire as they relate to White House political agendas, with a particular emphasis on the presidents' perceptions of (war). Every American president was aware that his standing among his country's politicians and in its history is not complete unless he has (his own war) In it because the American state was founded on violence and wars, and because there was no war in the twentieth century except that it was a member to it and it is the only power that used nuclear weapons.

Indian leader Jawaharlal Nehru said in 1958 while he was on his sickbed: ((We are trapped in a competition between two American powers, one is evil and mysterious used to subjugation and subordinating, which is the CIA), and the second is glamorous and deceptive, which is Hollywood. "Used for seduction and flattering ((the capital of Cinema)). Our problem is that if the CIA wins, our freedom is threatened, and if Hollywood wins, our culture is threatened. His assistant adds a third power that must be included in the equation, which is the power of (the Pentagon).

Nehru comments on his words that the loss of people's freedom and culture takes place without clamor and even without realizing it, but when the weapon moves, it makes a fuss alerting others that they are exposed to the threat of fire.

The writer cites the American Wars series, and he is with this difficult work in the function of inspection the American conscience,

behind which he aims to enable the Arabs to stand with others in the world – to make understanding a prelude to a goal that does not exceed in its demand a mere removal of imperial arrogance that shows its determination to be the end of the empires of history forever – or for the entire twenty-first century at least.

As soon as the half-million-person civil war came to an end in the nineteenth century, the American imperial advance began to move. By the time the nineties of the twentieth century rolled around, the American imperial expansion had learned and internalized its lessons from everything it had encountered on the ground. It began its march towards other empires with the logic of the validity of piracy and by virtue of the obligations of honor, sacred tasks, and necessary imperatives, as the American advance in the Pacific Ocean towards distant coasts began to progress and spread. The enemies of American expansion must realize that freedom is only appropriate for people who can rule themselves, and that for those people who cannot do that, their sacred duty before God requires that they lead to the American model in life because it is The right model of honor. As a result, it is not just a US issue; rather, the goal is to spread freedom and bring blessings to all.

After that, the writer dwells on the American conflict with the European and Asian continent, especially the conflict of the two world wars, as well as its conflict in the Middle East, which aims at its presence in the strategically important centers in that region, and obtaining the lion's share in its enormous oil wealth, the exact details of which will be revealed in the American invasion of Iraq.

The American Tornado

Here, Heikal explained the United States' new approach of using weapons by understanding and analyzing the scene of the American hurricane that hit the Arab region in 2003. Wars throughout history

have needed legal, moral, or semi-legal and moral veils or pretexts. In the case of the American empire, the use of force was satisfied with what it had, without any aesthetic human additions.

For the purpose of securing America's supplies of oil, which the countries of the region, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, and the Gulf Emirates occupy more than 70% of the oil stock below its soil, which requires stabilizing the situation in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states, taming Islamic intransigence in Iran, and dealing with Iraq that was exhausted from its war with Iran. To achieve this goal, the American strategy adopted striking Iran by aiming at Iraq, and vice versa, and intended to consume the power of two countries that could not be reassured together in the long term. According to the policy of (dual containment), which was expressed by Henry Kissinger by saying (This is the first war in history, I hope that there will be no victorious, but rather both parties will come out defeated..

However, following the Iraqi regime's invasion of the Gulf's restricted land for oil locations in 1990 through its conquest of Kuwait, which violated then-existing red lines, American efforts shifted in several directions:

The first was taking advantage of how surprised most Arabs were by the invasion of Kuwait.

Two: ensuring that Iraq enters the IMF and does not leave it

Third: Strengthening the military presence in and around Iraq.

Fourth: Assembling a substantial international alliance to attack Iraq.

Fifth: Waging war, which started with an airborne preparation that lasted more than forty days.

Sixth: Once Iraq's resistance was overcome and it was made evident

that the ground operation that followed the airstrike had resulted in a horrific bloodbath.

The vast American media apparatus and the secret services started to stir up unrest inside Iraq when the regime was able to maintain control, but American airstrikes continued, from Operation Desert Storm to Operation Desert Fox. The campaign continued, but American lawmakers advised the Clinton administration to focus all of the country's diplomatic, political, economic, and military efforts on asserting American control with a first action that ensures Saddam Hussein's ouster. The Iraq Liberation Act and the need for its prompt execution were what American interests required when the topic of Iraq was brought up in the context of the American presidential elections in 2000.

The reality is that the problem is no longer Iraq; rather, after Bush's victory, Iraq served as the model for the empire of the twenty-first century. Behind these electoral frauds and legal false news are imperial plans and policies, within which eleven US presidents have followed over the course of fifty years. The presidents all followed the same road, and the author discusses their accomplishments along this path, starting with Franklin Roosevelt and ending with George Bush Jr. Each of them moved in it according to his manner, as well as the management's mood and the climate of his time. And if the entire region is a partner and ally of the United States, then the partnership and alliance were lessened due to the Arabs' reliance on American policy. It was then up to George Bush Jr. to lay the foundation for the imperial construction project, which had its most significant pillars built on Arab land, Arab sites, and Arab resources. Due to the fact that the majority of Arab nations joined the coalition in the war to free Kuwait, they later moved from the barn to the march, which is the ongoing process of making peace with Israel, and during this time there was neither dread of the Arabs nor fear of them.

An Empire from Texas

The stated goal of the second Gulf War was the liberation of Kuwait (Gulf oil), while its second goal was a lesson that America gives with live ammunition in the effectiveness of oppression that no one forgets. The significance of this lesson is for the world, not just Iraq, to understand the strength of the American will. Bush Jr.' estimate was against the background of the liberation of Kuwait, obtaining a second term in which the process of imperial consolidation will take place and three goals will be confirmed: absolute American control in the world, direct control over oil sources that control its production and rationing its consumption, deep and firm penetration into a region that represents the heart of the world and the crossroads of its land, air and maritime routes.

American policy since 1992 has proceeded in the light of the document which states: (The United States of America must work with all its might to make sure that any competing power (or friend) anywhere in the world will not reach a status equal to its position in power and its factors...). The poles of American politics focused on the provisions of political and military control over the Middle East, and they believed that Israel was the main pillar of their plans in that region. Because the Middle East has two countries that have the necessary qualifications to serve their project: the first is Israel because it is a country that possesses competence, and the second is Turkey because it is by size the strongest country in the region, and at the same time it is a non-Arab country. The preparation for the post-Clinton era continued through three focal points (the imperial project groups - the oil industry - and the thinkers and theorists of strategies and policies) until the imperial project resumed its march more resolutely and swiftly.

The Idea of War on Iraq

regarding Heikal's reading of Bob Wood Ward's book (Bush in War), which was published in late 2002, as he attempts to concentrate on particular images in this book in order to respond to a query that has numerous implications and continued to preoccupy him: How? From where? Also, when? also, where? Then why? When did the American imperial enterprise switch its focus from fighting terrorism to fighting Iraq? In the events of September 11, 2001, how did the focus shift from New York to Kabul and subsequently from Kabul to Baghdad? How, therefore, did the masks go from having Sheikh "Osama bin Laden's" characteristics to having President "Saddam Hussein's" features so quickly?

To answer these questions, he reviews the meetings of the National Security Council at the White House, and says that:

- On the afternoon of September 11, US President Bush heard the intelligence chief (Tent) tell him that Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda were responsible for this attack.
- On September 12, Bush convened the National Security Council, and Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld brought up questions about the plan to attack Afghanistan and al-Qaeda.
- After that, there were many meetings to discuss the issue of launching a military strike against Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, and Iraq was not mentioned at all in these discussions.
- Only four days after the events of September 11, that is, in the meeting of the National Security Council on September 15, US President George Bush asked Cheney, Powell, and Rumsfeld a specific question, which was: (Is our war against al-Qaeda or against terrorism in general?).

Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld began the answer by saying (we cannot establish a continuous coalition just to strike Al Qaeda because it is limited and can fade away), and Vice President Cheney confirmed this view more clearly when he said (that terrorist groups are just (ghosts) and we will be more successful in working against (body) in the sense that we focus on countries that sponsor terrorism), as if he was paving the way for what Rumsfeld proposed, surprisingly, when he said: Isn't it necessary to strike Iraq as well, not only Al Qaeda? Iraq can be a target embodied in front of us and can be attacked on the grounds that it is a sponsor of terrorism; Saddam Hussein is not a ghost but a country.

Rumsfeld conveyed the opinion of the Pentagon group working with him that Saddam Hussein is a grave danger; Because he is determined to acquire weapons of mass destruction that can reach terrorist groups, therefore (attacking Iraq can start quickly and our plans are ready). Powell noticed that the plans to attack Afghanistan were not ready, but Rumsfeld asked in previous meetings a set of questions to prepare a plan to attack Afghanistan while the plan to Iraq is ready!

In an informal meeting called by Bush for a quieter discussion at the Camp David resort, he elaborates on, "The American people want a big, terrible action, a big explosion." I do not want a battle, but I want an extended war that the American people feel and make sure that we continue to defend them at the ends of the earth; I do not care about the arrest of one man or the arrest of several men. Rather, I am interested in reaching an actual formula that gives us an open authorization to work wherever we want. I do not care that any of us tries to put imaginary borders on the action of American power, or monetary limits that restrict the field of its work...» Colin Powell recounted that «at this moment I felt that the president wanted to kill someone. I saw in front of me a man who had all his homicidal instincts

awakened from his sense of the shock of what happened in New York and from his burning desire for revenge, whatever the cost. During the discussion about what President Bush said about the (big bang), Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz said: “What the president is asking for can only be achieved in one case, which is the case that we direct our strikes against the state sponsors of terrorism or terrorist states. Iraq is the top of the list with it is headed by Saddam Hussein.

This point of view was confirmed by his Secretary Rumsfeld, because Iraq is overstretched and isolated and easy to be singled out and overthrow its regime, also it has large targets that can be strike with absolutely astonishing, just as there are huge prizes in Iraq that can be seized with the least perceived sacrifices, and the pretext of weapons of mass destruction gives legitimacy to the war on Iraq. Despite all this, Rumsfeld did not succeed in convincing President Bush and the National Security Council to move the battle from Afghanistan to Iraq, and everyone saw the relevance of what he was proposing, but they differed with him on the timing, and so the war on Afghanistan began on September 11, 2001 AD and ended on January 29, 2002 AD to begin with its end the plan to occupy Iraq in order to achieve two goals this time, namely, to continue the war on terrorism to prove America’s power and control over the world, and the second is to secure the victory of Bush Jr. in the upcoming presidential elections.

George Tenet and James Buffett focused on three main enemies: the first: terrorism and the vanguard of its global front, al-Qaeda, the second: the unprecedented proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and potentially reach of rogue states or fanatical groups, and the third: China, which has escaped the consequences of underdevelopment and blockade and has become a superpower “Aggressive” on the other side of the Pacific Ocean.

At that moment, there were no weapons of mass destruction owned by Iraq that were wanted to be removed from, in the White House calculations, or a dictatorship that stifled the people and wanted to break its grip on their necks, and there was no democracy and freedom that suddenly absent from the land of Iraq and was intended to shine again, and there were no links to Al-Qaeda and its terrorist cells, which are intended to be liquidated as part of the global campaign against terrorism; Rather, there were humanitarian conditions, political conflicts, imperial claims, oil necessities, and election supplies, all of which overlapped and mixed in the cooking -up of the American decision, and this needed improvements, touches of beauty, and temptations such as disarmament of weapons of mass destruction, removal of dictatorship, guaranteeing human rights, and the future of democracy.

The writer emphasizes the role played by intellectual centers and institutions and became the shadow government in America, and even confirmed that it is the real invisible government that formulates and writes the political decision, and then leaves the task of signing it to the president and his senior collaborators in the administration, so tens and hundreds of institutions arose in the aftermath of World War II, they bears the names of the biggest stakeholders (Rockefeller, Ford, Rand, Carnegie, and others).

The writer then moves on to George Bush Jr.'s election period as President of the United States of America, whom he describes as (the Emperor-Caesar), and says that he was not convincing in the basis of his legitimacy, and the world felt that the United States of America had handed over the reins of power to a man who did not deserve. Ideally, he did not know that coming to power is a project that has owners who have a ready agenda that they want present. Led by Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Colin Powell, this project has been agreed upon

in advance and can be summarized in the following three points:

1. An American empire that does not accept partnership or competition with anyone.
2. Full control over the oil resources and (its sites), supervising its management and controlling the distribution of its shares.
3. A global campaign against terrorism confronts a self-proclaimed threat while providing moral cover for the American empire.

The agreement on the imperial project did not prevent the differences and problems in prioritizing the Bush Jr. administration when they were sitting at the National Security Council table in the White House in late January and early February 2001. Opinions and discussions were distributed and divided according to the following directions:

Secretary of State Colin Powell believed that the counter-terrorism clause should be a high priority, because it is capable of attracting Europe, Asia and China before others, and through it the United States can win over Europe and reach a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

On the other hand, Vice President Dick Cheney saw that the new president should not follow the steps of his former predecessor (Clinton) and waste his time on the Middle East problem diplomatically. Rather than entering it through the issue of counterterrorism and not through the issue of Palestine, because the Arab friends do not care about Palestine as much as they care about (protecting their regimes), and they attribute to terrorism alone the causes of all their concern, and that the United States can penetrate through this concern to the oil sites directly Without wasting time on the Arab-Israeli conflict.

As for Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, his assistant Wolfowitz, and the Director of Strategic Planning in his department

(Richard Perle), they raised for the first time the issue of Iraq as a means to achieve the goals of the American empire. It is that the time is right to launch a direct strike on Iraq as a gateway to full control over oil instead of wasting time on intractable issues such as the Arab–Israeli conflict, and that (settling) the score with Iraq opens the door to (settling) the old scores with Iran, which paves the way for the emergence of a new Middle East under American firepower in a region that only understands the language of “fear,” despite its many rhetoric of peace.

Secrets of the American invasion of Iraq

Muhammad Hassanein Heikal adds that in that atmosphere charged with discussions following the accelerating events in the region, (Colin Powell) went himself in March 2001 to the Middle East region to meet its rulers with a message from the new administration stating that (Iraq) is the crisis, Palestine is the problem, and the crisis must address before the problem). Powell could not convince anyone of the logic of this message, and in fact he himself was not convinced of it, and his opinion – and from his previous experience in the second Gulf War – was that Palestine is (the mother of crises) in the region.

The new American president, Bush Jr., was confused between these ideas. Therefore, the first half of the year 2001 AD witnessed confusion in domestic and foreign policy. Every official was trying to make his ministry a protected and no-man’s-land for others. Vice President Cheney appeared as the first man in the Republican administration before the new president, who is still (immaturity) and his image is shaky before public opinion at home and abroad.

Suddenly, on the morning of September 11, 2001 AD, the incident occurred: an attack by civil aircraft on several targets in New York and Washington, and the collapse of the World Trade Towers, blown by the winds, with the death of thousands of workers and those present in

it. As well as the destruction of one of the wings of the US Department of Defense, so the world did not sit still, where all hell broke loose, and the United States of America declared the actual war on terrorism.

In early 2002, before the end of the war in Afghanistan, the president's advisor for internal affairs and campaign official (Karl Roffe) found that Afghanistan would not benefit President Bush Jr. in the upcoming presidential elections, especially since he did not expect pleasant surprises in the economic and social conditions in the United States. Therefore, he held contacts and discussions with Rumsfeld, who convinced him that Iraq is the stage prepared to overcome these electoral concerns. Rumsfeld saw that Afghanistan does not have a single goal that arouses imagination or tempts with a prize. It has 9 targets that were hit and returned to again and again, and repetition became a joke. Therefore there must be another arena in which America proves its might, and the place is Iraq. President Bush Jr. was ready to adopt the option of war on Iraq at this stage, and therefore the State of the Union speech came before the US Congress on January 29, 2002 A.D., the day the war on Afghanistan ended, when President Bush Jr. launched the slogan "Axis of Evil," pointing the finger of accusation specifically at Iraq, and saying in the text: "The United States of America will not allow the most dangerous regime in the world to threaten it with weapons of mass destruction that it owns and develops." can be used).

The General Staff prepared a plan for the war on Iraq, and Rumsfeld put the plan up for discussion, objecting to it because it requires a lot of forces and equipment, while Iraq possesses only weak weapons, without aircraft, and does not have a naval power. Likewise, the no-fly zones removed the south from the authority of the army, and the north became independent, leaving only the center controlled by the central authority, which is a poor area compared to the oil of the north and south, which is originally in the hands of the United Nations. Rumsfeld

added: Iraq will be in the next battle inside a closed box because all the countries surrounding it are against it. And he concluded by saying (So we are in a state of complete land, air, sea, space, and political superiority...), in light of all this, Rumsfeld proposed a new plan for a rapid war with a psychological effect (shock and awe), and for the regime to be violently beheaded to the point of forcing the generals of the Republican Guard and the Iraqi army are forced to believe that there is no longer any point in fighting.

During these accelerating events, Britain was discussing the issue of participating in the invasion of Iraq, and taking such a decision was not easy in a society that finds the plans of arms and invasion heavy on British public opinion. Indeed, former British Foreign Minister and majority leader in the House of Commons, Robin Cook, told his friend British Prime Minister Tony Blair (that he was astonished by the argument that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, and that stripping it of these devastating weapons was the legal and moral justification for the invasion). Nevertheless, Blair decided to participate in the war, believing that an invasion of Iraq would take place even if Britain was not convinced.

On September 12, 2002, President Bush Jr. delivered a speech before the United Nations General Assembly in which he declared: Either Iraq must comply unconditionally to disarm weapons of mass destruction, or it is war because these weapons are ready to be operational within 45 minutes by order of Saddam Hussein, who is the most dangerous man in the world; because it threatens everyone, therefore he gives others the right to self-defense before attacking them. Four days later, Iraq agreed to receive the international inspectors unconditionally. But the world was surprised by the American reaction to the Iraqi decision. It came with a new logic that says: Iraq did not accept the return of the team of inspectors until it managed to hide its weapons of mass

destruction. This meant that the United States had no time to listen. Because her interest was confined to military plans, the issue for it was not the existence or non-existence of weapons of mass destruction, but rather the issue of taking over Iraq, overthrowing the regime there and occupying the country.

After Bush delivered his speech on January 29, 2003, no one in the Joint Chiefs of Staff had any reason to doubt that the war on Iraq would come without delay, and that weapons of mass destruction of all kinds were ready to be operational within 45 minutes by order of Saddam Hussein, who is the most dangerous man in the world because he threatens everyone. The meetings between Iraqi and American intelligence agencies did not stop in Ankara before the war was launched, and among those meetings was what the Iraqi side asked: Are they ready to deal with Qusay Saddam Hussein if his father relinquishes the presidency to him? Will Washington recognize him in this case and deal with him on a new basis in the relations of the two countries?

The image in the Security Council was public disorder. The information received from Washington to New York revealed to all delegations that despite Iraq's willingness to accept the return of the inspectors to it, the United States and Britain are now obstructing it, claiming that it is useless. Because the regime in Iraq did not accept the return of the inspectors until it managed to hide its weapons of mass destruction. While the delegations of the major countries and the General Secretariat demanded that an opportunity be given, just as public opinion in Europe and America demands that. But the new poles of the American empire were edifices of rock that were unaffected and overlooked what they saw in front of them and heard without response. The administration in Washington was insisting that it had classified information on Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

Bush asked for authorization from Congress to use armed force, and he received it on October 11, 2002. Within hours, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld was asking the Joint Chiefs of Staff to move a group of the Fifth Army and the First Marine Division to the Persian Gulf region. Secretary of State Colin Powell was uncomfortable with the military rush without a legitimate cover for it, with which Europe and others stood. So he met President Bush on October 16th alone. He made it clear to him that by their determination to proceed with a war against Saddam Hussein without a resolution from the United Nations and in the face of prominent opposition in the Security Council, it would show the United States in a state of defiance of the Security Council and the Charter, which would affect the legitimacy of their work in Iraq, and show it as a matter of imperial greed in that country and its resources. . Also, the war in this way will affect the (moral) and (legal) behavior of the Americans, and will fuel the popular opposition to the American policy, which is getting wider even in the nearest European capitals, including (London). As for the military side, Powell added that the first lesson he learned in military service (that American power is always in the service of a principle and this principle requires a legal cover and a moral cover); Because without this cover, the fighting will turn into (just killing), in which a general with four stars on his shoulder is no different from a mercenary holding a knife in his hand. There is a big difference for a warrior to be a killer and to be a fighter.

Bush was convinced by Powell's words, who led a political battle in the Security Council to obtain Security Council Resolution No. 1441 issued on November 8, 2002. There was no authorization for war, but it was a firm resolution, from which he understood that it was intended to intimidate Iraq so that the crisis would pass peacefully. But the White House administration understood it as an open mandate to dispose of weapons as it pleases. Therefore, according to the opinion of this administration, Iraq must be invaded without looking at the

(formalities), given that the results in themselves give the fighting its pretexts, so when the world wakes up to find that Saddam Hussein's regime has fallen and that the American flag is flying over Baghdad, America will be taken with a show of victory and the world Preoccupied with a fait accompli that has its influence, and the countries that hesitated and hesitated will be isolated and heartbroken.

Bush asked for the deployment of 50,000 troops in the Persian Gulf on December 21. When the British government formally announced the call-up of 1,500 reservists to serve with the movement of an aircraft carrier on January 2, 2003, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld started deploying groupings of these personnel to the congested areas in Kuwait. Hans Blix and Mohamed El-Baradei both turned in reports on the same day. Despite four weeks of inspection in extensive areas, Chief Inspector Blix stated at the conclusion of his report that they had not discovered any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and emphasized the necessity for further investigation (extra time to get the job done). El-Baradei followed suit, saying it would take six months to confirm the information.

The Iraqi government provided a comprehensive dossier on all of its WMD, which was (11) thousand pages long. Three copies were transported by the Iraqi delegation to the UN headquarters, where they were given to the president of the Security Council. Barely any time had elapsed, however, before the president's office was assaulted. The three copies of the report from Baghdad presented by the Iraqi delegation were demanded by the Security Council through a group from the CIA, and the President of the Security Council attempted to negotiate but was told that the matter did not allow for a compromise and that he had to hand over the three copies. The (raid) group then left the UN building for the Council Security with the three copies of the (Baghdad) report. The next morning, the delegations of the concerned

countries received copies of the report manipulated in it, with exposed American arguments and allegations, because the tampering with the Iraqi report was intended to conceal the role of American companies (the most important of which are twenty-five giant companies) that sold these weapons to Iraq, including weapons of mass destruction during the days of its war against Iraq. Iran and the United States want to conceal this information because if it were known, the administration's credibility at the Security Council would deteriorate, which would let foreign delegations stand up to the American delegation. The most notable official letter from a minister of the Niger government discusses the uranium deal plainly, according to some of the interesting stories in this file concerning Iraq's attempt to purchase 300 tons of uranium, the yellow cake used to make nuclear bombs. The US government finds that the claim is a fake and that the minister purported to have signed the official letter did not hold any office at the time the letter was written after conducting an inquiry to determine the facts of the situation.

On January 28, Blix returned to the Security Council to request that he be granted an additional period to complete his work, especially since he (is receiving a response in the procedures on the part of Iraq), so the Americans stipulated three weeks that Iraq open its skies to spy planes (U-2) by scanning and photographing what it wanted on the land of Iraq, which agreed. On this condition, the photos were going to the Ministry of Defense to serve the plan of the invasion. And the train of war began to increase in speed day by day, and with it the refusal to give the inspectors a chance escalated. Only 39% of the American public, according to opinion polls, supported President Bush in directing his strike on Iraq.

The American administration did not care about any opinion that intersected with its plans to invade Iraq, and set the zero hour to start

the attack at the last light of March 20, 2003 AD. Nevertheless, US President Bush Jr. signed a presidential order to kill Saddam Hussein with an urgent strike, even if the order led to anticipating zero hour, on the basis of information he was told that its source is now in his location, closely following the movements of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein inside Baghdad. Within hours, the intelligence chief (Tenet) hastily called the White House to say that they now know exactly where (Saddam Hussein) is. And (George Bush) gave his consent to start the opening strike of the war twenty-four hours before its time, and hoped that he would kill (Saddam Hussein) with wisdom that (the killing of one man reassures an entire army).

The leadership of the army was terrifying in its overarching ambition for military decisiveness. In his final chapter, Haykal discusses encounters with strangers. The meeting between American forces and the Iraqi people and the extreme sensitivity that General Franks felt when he responded to the meeting's failure (that my forces were fighting formations and that their duty was to find the enemy and kill him, not to smile at him and embrace him), and not days had passed since the invasion and occupation of Baghdad on the 9th April 2003 before the invasion forces discovered that all the legal and proper procedures had not been followed. There are no weapons of mass destruction, and the regime in Baghdad did not have the ability to threaten the United States, Europe, or its neighbors within (45) minutes, and Iraq had no connection with al-Qaeda. Most importantly, the Iraqi people were not happy with these forces that came to "liberate" them. And I believed General Myers' statement to Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld: I know that what we are heading towards is a battle between an F-15 plane and a paper plane that children play with, but that does not make us forget that we will descend from the heights of the air into the dust This is a different battle. George Bush and the leaders of his administration put forward a number of goals mixed with each other to the point of

uncertainty regarding the issue of invading Iraq:

George Bush and the leaders of his administration put forward a number of goals mixed with each other to the point of uncertainty regarding the issue of invading Iraq

- The overthrow of Saddam is an essential part of the war against terrorism, through the information spread by Israel about the connection of one of the suspects in the events of September 11, 2001, Muhammad Atta, with the Iraqi intelligence.
- The Iraqi regime must be punished for threatening its neighbors, and the proof is the invasion of Kuwait in 1991.
- The third proposition is that the regime not only invaded Kuwait, as it was actually punished for that, but before that it invaded Iran, but this idea may have a reverse reaction because the invasion of Iran was at the instigation and assistance of America and its friends, and its efforts were managed by Rumsfeld personally in his capacity as Minister of Defense in the Reagan government. Therefore, opening this file is a booby-trapped parcel that explodes in the face of whoever opens it.
- The regime tyrannized and oppressed its people, and therefore it must be overthrown in the name and for the benefit of the Iraqi people, but this claim gives America a right and authority that has no basis in international law.
- The last proposition is Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction, along with missile means that can transport them far away, which represents a threat to the region, or the possibility that these weapons will be transferred to terrorist groups collaborating with its regime.

Iraq represents the center of a wide circle in light of what Donald Rumsfeld put forward for the imperial project in a clear and explicit way, and this represents a historic opportunity for the purpose of controlling the center of the circle (Baghdad) to be the fixed point in the wider circle surrounding it, as well as to liquidate the remaining sites of resistance, i.e. (Iran and Syria). Without having to use a weapon; because the presence of American forces in Iraq means blockading Iran from two sides: Afghanistan and Iraq, just as Syria is in a more difficult situation. Because it will be open from the east with an American presence in the neighborhood connected to it to the point of fusion, and besieged from the north by Turkey and the actual American presence on its lands and in the Kurdish areas in northern Iraq, and America is there with them alongside Israel from the south, as well as the fact that the Jordanian regime is not a friend in love with the Syrian regime, and in addition to The presence of elements in Lebanon that are not satisfied with Syria's control over the Lebanese decision, and in one fell swoop a completely new map of the Middle East is formed, which the United States is forming, drawing and cleaning from pockets of Americans who still argue and resist.

This matter has become clearly visible, and it confirms the introduction with which the writer opened his book through his careful anticipation of the future of the region, which summarized the American imperial project that stems from America's expansionist goals, which is still continuing, and its pivotal starting point was from Iraq.

About the book

Author: Muhammad Hassanein Heikal

Title: The American Empire and the Raid on Iraq

Reviewed: Abdel Khalek Kazem Ibrahim. A researcher and a Ph.D candidate of Arabic Language.

Pages: 448

Publishing house: Dar Al-Shorouk, Cairo Publication date: October - October 2022

Note:

The views and opinions expressed in this review are those of the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Center.



About center

Al-Baydar Center for Studies and Planning is a non-governmental and non-profit organization established in 2015 and registered with the NGO directorate in the general secretariat of the council of ministers in Baghdad.

The center seeks to contribute to developing the state and its institutions, by proposing ideas and practical solutions to the main problems and challenges facing the state, including improving public sector management, policies, and strategic planning, using reliable data and best practices. The center engages the relevant authorities in the state with regular meetings to support this objective and utilizes the support of international organizations dedicated to assisting Iraq's development. The center also seeks to support economic reforms, and sustainable development and provide technical assistance to the public and private sectors. The center also seeks to support the development of the private sector to provide job opportunities for citizens through training and upskilling, in a way that reduces dependence on government institutions and contributes to supporting and diversifying the country's economy.

The center aims to utilize the vast amount of potential in Iraq's human resources by organizing programs to prepare and develop promising young people, including leaders capable of proposing, adopting and implementing visions and future plans that advance society and preserve its value-system based on the commitment to a high moral standard and rejection of all types of corruption.

All rights reserved to Al-Baydar Center for Studies and Planning

www.baidarcenter.org

info@baidarcenter.org