

The American Role in the Political Crises of the Arab World: Iraq as a Case Study (2011–2021)

“Fatima Azhra’a” Al- Rhamneh^{1*}.

¹The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 24 Apr 2023

Accepted 28 May 2023

Published 01 Oct 2025

*Corresponding author:

The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.

Email fatoomazhraa95@gmail.com.

Abstract

This study aimed to analyze the American stance on the political crises occurring in the Arab world, using Iraq as a case study from 2011 to 2021. To achieve this, analytical, descriptive, and qualitative methods were employed, focusing on the collection, interpretation, and analysis of secondary data, which were deemed most appropriate for the nature and objectives of the study. The results indicated that US-Iraqi relations have significantly shifted according to American interests. The U.S. position often influenced the onset, escalation, or resolution of political crises. For example, the U.S. occupation of Iraq and the poor decisions made during that period contributed to the emergence of ISIS. Initially, the U.S. adopted a non-interventionist stance, claiming ISIS was a local Iraqi issue and not affecting U.S. interests. This approach allowed ISIS to gain control of several Iraqi provinces. However, when the U.S. intervened and supported Iraqi forces, ISIS was eventually defeated. The study also found that the selection of political leaders, such as the prime minister in Iraq, is heavily influenced by U.S. interests, loyalty, or the influence of candidates deemed beneficial to American strategies. The qualification or sectarian background of candidates, such as Nuri al-Maliki's Shiite sectarianism and marginalization of Sunnis, was less relevant. During Maliki's tenure, Iraq experienced deteriorating security, increased violence due to sectarian divisions, worsened services, widespread corruption, and suppression of protesters. Despite this, he was appointed Prime Minister for a second term, even though another candidate had won the election. The study recommends further research into the extent to which the U.S. upholds democratic and human rights ideals during its involvement in such crises. More studies are needed to explore the contribution of U.S. policies to the rise of terrorist organizations in specific countries, to clarify the facts and better understand U.S. strategies, beyond the methods employed to distort the truth.

Keywords: Politics, Iraq, ISIS, Political Crisis, American Politics.

1. Introduction

The importance of major powers' roles in wars and political crises stems from their significant influence in ending conflicts and reaching agreements that can prevent severe losses, such as the

loss of lives and the displacement of nationals. These situations cause immense suffering, making addressing such crises a humanitarian duty to prevent further harm.

As one of the world's great powers with a powerful military, robust economy, and advances in science, the United States of America is frequently requested for assistance when other countries are experiencing political unrest or armed war. But because our interpretations of events vary depending on how well we are informed about the facts and how well we comprehend the lies that exist behind the scenes, it is possible that the United States' decisions will be bad, destroy the nation, and worsen the lives of its citizens. The United States of America's fundamental values were best displayed in Iraq.

Since one of the goals of the study is to demonstrate how the United States collaborates with other nations and modifies its policies in a way that advances American interests, the analysis method was used to examine the factors that led the United States to change its policy towards Iraq, initially for the better and then later for the worse. The researcher also analyzes the statements made by US Presidents Barack Obama and Donald Trump, in addition to the tweets that commented on the Iraqi elections. In this research, it uses also the descriptive approach in describing and explaining the American position towards the political crises that occurred in Iraq from 2011 to 2021 and, accordingly, discovering the truth about the application of the principles advocated by the United States, such as the principle of human rights and the principle of democracy, which are the two principles most advocated by the United States. Furthermore, information about the Islamic State was acquired, President Obama's statements and treatment of ISIS were analyzed, and then conclusions were drawn.

2. Literature Review

Browne (2003) sheds light on George Bush's 2002 speech, in which he claimed that Iraq supported terrorism despite its commitments to the Security Council. He argued that following the invasion of Kuwait, Iraq had pledged to seize other nations, thereby jeopardizing global stability. Regarding weapons of mass destruction (WMD), Saddam Hussein also violated this agreement, despite the Iraqi government's earlier promise to suspend WMD development. Additionally, Iraq allegedly attempted to assassinate the Emir of Kuwait and a former U.S. president. The Iraqi government also openly praised the September 11 attacks, and it is well known that terrorists affiliated with al-Qaeda escaped to Iraq from Afghanistan. President George Bush requested permission from the UN Security Council to attack Iraq after presenting his justifications, much like how this body helped stop the civil conflict in Congo (Browne, 2003).

Pfaff (2020) explores US-Iraqi relations, U.S. objectives in Iraq, and potential sources of friction between the two nations. It also provides a justification for these interests, notably the rising influence of Iran in Iraq. Furthermore, it highlights corruption within the Iraqi government, which hampers reforms across various sectors and worsens the quality of services provided to citizens. As a result, the United States determines that investing in or lending money to Iraq is unfeasible. The book also discusses several steps the U.S. must take to secure its interests in Iraq, including removing Iraq from the conflict involving Iran. The main U.S. interests in Iraq are to: first, halt Iranian expansion; second, prevent the resurgence of terrorist organizations and ISIS; and third, make the Iraqi economy a partner for foreign investments (Pfaff, 2020).

2.1 Iraqi-American Relations' Development

When an invasion or political turmoil occurs in a country in the Middle East, this causes the rest of the countries to draw new relations in their interest. For example, in 1979 the Iranian Shah was expelled and in 1980, Iraq invaded Iran, as a result of these two important events. The expansion of anti-Americanism increased, such as the Soviet Union, and groups of Islamic origins from Iran. It made the United States think that cooperation with Iraq would serve its interests in the Middle East, and thus Iraq was deleted from the terrorism list in 1982, and official dealings with Saddam Hussein began, in addition to all restrictions on arms purchases and technology exports were removed (Borer, 2003). Based The United States uses the economy as a tool to put pressure on countries, and the United States uses the economy to influence the policy of Iraq. As for Iraq, the focus of the United States, headed by Reagan, who is the fortieth president of the United States, was on finance, oil and agriculture. Because of the Iran-Iraq war in that period and its impact on shipping, Iraq lost a percentage of its oil revenues, also Iraq was exhausted economically because of debt, therefore, the United States was the largest beneficiary from focusing on those commercial fields, Iraq has also been a beneficiary of this economic cooperation, as it has become the largest exporter of flour, rice, wheat, cotton, livestock feed and many other commodities in the United States. As for the military field, the US position on the Iran-Iraq war was neutral, but it sold Iraq helicopters and various US weapons, indicating that the United States was supporting Iraq, but apparently was neutral. In 1984, the largest military aid to Iraq was when US President Reagan allowed cooperation between US national security and Iraq, which will allow the exchange of intelligence information between the two countries, and the result of this Iraqis were protected from the coup. There were fears in the United States that Iraq was working on regime Secret weapons of mass destruction and therefore requested US Assistant Secretary of Defense at the time Richard Perle when exporting advanced computers to Iraq, a condition should be imposed that they should not be used in the exploration of nuclear systems. On the foregoing, when the interest of the United States was with Iraq, official relations arose between the two countries, and the United States provided military support to Iraq. As we know, terrorism is one of the taboos of the United States, but it was removed from the list of terrorism, and this shows that when the interest rules, the country's past is erased and forgiven.

“It was stated in a classified document of the Reagan administration that despite the advantages that Iraq obtained, it continued to support terrorism.” (U.S Department of State Memorandum, 2003, p. 53). The relationship between the United States and Iraq began to tense due to several things that Saddam Hussein did, in the eyes of the United States these supported terrorism. Borer (2003) accentuates that, firstly, in 1982, the Israeli ambassador in London was assassinated, as discovered after investigations that he was assassinated by a colonel in the Iraqi intelligence. Secondly, in 1983 there were reports showing the Iraqi government used chemical materials against Iranian soldiers and Iraqi civilians and this is a violation of the document that prohibits the use of internationally prohibited weapons. Thirdly, Sabri al-Banna, who is nicknamed Abu Nidal, the Palestinian terrorist founder of the Abu Nidal Organization, an armed Palestinian group, was expelled under pressure from the US Congress. As a result, Saddam Hussein strengthened his relationship with Palestinian President Yasser Arafat and donated weapons to the Palestine Liberation Organization. Fourth, in 1985, four members of the Palestine Liberation hijacked a ship heading from Alexandria Governorate to Port Said Governorate in Egypt, and all the passengers on board were taken hostage, their condition was the release of the Palestinian

prisoners, and when the request was refused, the first American hostage, Leon Klingover, was killed. At that time the head of the organization apologized for the kidnapping and killing of the American hostage, there was indications that the Iraqi government helped smuggle terrorists. Fifthly, request from Baghdad to cancel diplomatic passport which is for Abu al-Abbas, who is a Palestinian political leader classified as a terrorist, but this was refused. Sixth, also in 1985, there were terrorist plans to implement them in several American sites by terrorists, to be known later when they were arrested in Rome, they are Iraqis. With reference to the point of Iraq's use of chemical materials against Iranian soldiers, despite the United States' knowledge of this, it continued to cooperate with Iraq in informing of the Iranian forces' movements and goals, in addition to these chemicals were also used to against the Kurds. The position of the United States, headed by Reagan, only stated that there would be controls when The export of these materials despite the fact that Borer (2003) clarifies that the United States imposed economic sanctions on Libya when it knew that it was developing chemical weapons, Borer (2003) explained the reasons that made the United States policy not strict on Iraq and not impose sanctions on it as follows: unequal interdependence makes the strong state that controls the resources of the other state, and the United States, by focusing on trade, finance and agriculture, has achieved the greatest profit, because Iraq depends on these resources. Therefore, the United States is interested in keeping relationship with Iraq stable, in addition to when there is no alternative for any country, this makes it somewhat weaker, for example, the United States, its consumption of oil is large and if decides to replace Iraq with another country, this will increase its costs also it may not be able to supply the United States with the quantity it needs, and therefore this made the United states to change their policy in the application of sanctions to ensure its interest. In addition, when the dominant regime is as strong as Saddam Hussein in his control of Iraq, the interest of the United States lies in the stability of the regime. The chemical materials are characterized by randomness, meaning that there are innocent people who are not a part to the conflict who will be killed by referring here to the Kurdish citizens in addition to the use of such weapons is prohibited, and therefore they cannot be used on Iranian soldiers, even if there is a conflict situation. So, all these actions are violations of human rights. In addition, I believe that the reason for Saddam Hussein's use of such weapons although he knows it is forbidden internationally is to create terror in the hearts of his enemies and thus achieve victory faster. The United States calls for the principle of human rights, but we notice that despite Iraq's use of chemicals on the Kurds, which is a violation of human rights, the United States did not take any action and put sanctions on Iraq, and this shows that because of the United States interest in Iraq, the application of the principles does not matter.

With the end of the Iran-Iraq war Borer (2003) clarifies that in 1988, the goals set by the United States had been achieved, namely the decline of the Soviet Union in the region, and the fundamentalist religious groups also retreated in their spread from Iran to the Middle East, specifically the Gulf States. In the same year, the US Senate approved that the US policy with Iraq will change, thus canceling many of the concessions that Iraq had obtained which are First, US imports of Iraqi oil are prohibited, and secondly, loans will not be given to Iraq until the issue is studied in all respects whether from the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, thirdly, all commissions and types of bank financing are cancelled on import and export, stated that this was to show the US position's dissatisfaction with the Iraqi government's policy against the Kurds. But all these measures were taken in 1988, that is, at the end of the Iran-Iraq war, and since Iraq, when it came out of this war, was economically exhausted, and debts were increasing period after period, and the reconstruction of Iraq because of the devastation caused by the war, this also needs an amount of money and as mentioned the strategic goals set by the United States have been

achieved, also stated that the reason for these measures is the policy of the Iraqis against the Kurds, even though Saddam Hussein fired at them chemical substances and The United States did not show a strict position, so the United States taking these measures at this particular time is a questionable time. But according to when the United States realized that these measures were affecting them, it began to ease these sanctions then they vanished, Iraq used the method of reverse participation, as it reduced one dollar per barrel of oil, and therefore the more it reduced the price, the more economically the United States was linked to it and this helped greatly strengthen US-Iraq relations, in addition to the fact that Iraqi merchants were pressuring members of the American Congress not to take any measures or sanctions against Iraq, and thus "Trade is the best key to political influence in the United States, not necessarily in other countries." (Borer, 2003). Keeping in mind that Iraq's strength was lay in alerting the United States to economic threats.

The United Nations' imposition of harsh economic sanctions in 1990 marked a turning point in the lives of all Iraqi citizens. As a result, projects were shut down, the health system failed, unemployment rose, and many people fled to other countries as a result of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. The port of Aqaba in Jordan served as the only port of entry for Iraqi trade during the 13-year duration of these restrictions. Iraq was compelled to accept when it was requested in 1996 to sell its oil only in exchange for humanitarian relief. When the US attacked Iraq in 2003, these sanctions came to an end.

2.2 American democracy's road in Iraq

The Americans, according to Byman and Pollack (2003), think that some peoples are not suitable for democracy. For instance, due of their upbringing under repressive regimes, they perceived Germans as being incompatible with democracy after World War II. They also think that since black people have always been treated like slaves, they are ineligible to participate in any democratic political process. As a result, they see democracy in the United States as a system that has to be implemented in the nation since its founding. Returning to Iraq, the army got involved in politics, Saddam's rule began, and as a result, there was no such thing as a democratic political system in Iraq. The goal of the United States of America after overthrowing Saddam Hussein in 2003 was to transform Iraq into a democratic state, but the Americans believed that because Hussein had participated in numerous wars and had been the target of international sanctions without his dictatorial regime changing, the transition to democracy would be easier and quicker after his overthrow.

Other Middle Eastern countries will be inspired to adopt a democratic system if it is established in Iraq and becomes more stable. One of the prerequisites for democracy is a political culture, but the dynamic between the Iraqi government and its population is disastrous and violent. Protests are put down by force, and groups resort to bombings to show their opposition to a particular government action or to show hostility towards the opposing party, causing the explosion to occur in a neighborhood where followers of the hostile party live. Byman and Pollack (2003) discovered that there are several claims that Iraq is a nation that cannot become democratic. The first claim is that Iraq is in a challenging situation because its society is made up of various sects and races, making it difficult to apply that and possibly requiring significant effort to succeed as a democratic state. The second allegation is that there are alternatives to democracy in Iraq, but these alternatives are growing violence and causing the deaths of innocent people. Therefore, any alternative to democracy must be rejected. The third claim is that other nations with more favourable and stable conditions than Iraq have failed to enact democracy. I disagree that this should be taken as generalisation. Each nation has its own set of circumstances. It's likely that

these nations lacked the motivation to act because they supported their current system and did not want to change it. The fourth accusation is that Iraq has never been governed by a democratic government. But in the same way, there are other nations that were governed by authoritarian regimes but eventually became democratic nations that yielded to the will of their citizens, including Kenya, Bolivia, and Bangladesh, as well as within those nations, particularly in northern Iraq. There are the Kurds, who despite experiencing internal strife as well as economic collapse, have had considerable success implementing democracy. Iraq's democracy is not hindered by these allegations. Since the formation of the democratic foundations, the educational system has undergone significant expansion in Iraq also it possesses a wealth of natural resources, including oil, the "black gold" of the country, which is present in vast quantities also suitable soil for cultivation. If there is work and will, democracy will come to Iraq.

After the American invasion of Iraq, the United States seeks to rebuild Iraq and establish a political system that provides Iraqis with a better livelihood, in addition to achieving stability in the Persian Gulf, which is important for the United States to achieve its vital interests. In addition, the United States will give Iraq the resources it needs to end tyranny and restore democracy. Therefore, Iraq is seen as distinct from other countries since the presence of the United States may facilitate the situation. However, other people believe that Iraq will never become democratic because forces hostile to American presence will not allow them to stay to achieve their aim. As a result, American forces must work with Iraqi forces and training them in order to win over the Iraqi people. Instead of paying for the expenditures of the occupation, oil wealth should be used to meet Iraq's requirements for in-building.

About each specific sect or political party simply wants to rule Iraq according to Byman and Pollack (2003) Shiites reside in the south of the country, Kurds in the north, and Sunnis in the west. However, Baghdad, the country's capital, is diverse and home to both Shiites and Sunnis. When the elections are held, the candidates will endeavor to avoid bias and come up with a compromise that pleases both sides without favoring one over the other. However, how will this occur as long as the media is controlled and only reports what is in the best interests of those who possess it according to Al-khalidi (2017). Since Saddam Hussein's administration was toppled in 2003, numerous privately held television channels, newspapers, and radio stations have launched. The majority of media organisations are, nevertheless, supported by political parties and ethnic groups. The government manipulates and exerts pressure on public or private advertisers to change the editorial content of various publications. Furthermore, records demonstrate that many journalists in the nation experienced constant threats and physical harassment from both state- and non-state actors. Iraq currently lacks a national law granting access to government information, so journalists continue to struggle. The Committee to Protect Journalists became aware that at least five journalists were slain in 2015 while performing their jobs and that many more people, including bloggers and those who obtain information online, were also in danger and faced threats. As a result, media freedom in the nation is still threatened with reprisal or legal action by influential individuals. Each specific sect or political group solely seeks to control Iraq, and it uses the media to promote its messages and further its own interests. Everyone should therefore identify this problem and resolve it since it prevents the implementation of democracy.

“Iraq is not as infertile a soil for democracy as other places where it has taken root.” (Byman and Pollack, 2003).

2.3 The US stance on the elections in Iraq

The Baath Party was a political organization that was created in 1951 by Iraqi politician Fuad al-Rikabi, according to the *Britannica* website. Up until the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, Saddam Hussein was in charge of this party, so the United States was keen not to participate in the former party members in any political positions after Paul Bremer, the civil ruler of Iraq chosen by George Bush to oversee the reconstruction of Iraq, ordered the party's dissolution. The United States does not want anyone who was associated with Saddam Hussein or who was a part of the political system during his era to take part in the political process even after Hussein's overthrow, which was the main objective of the American invasion of Iraq. It is observed that the United States interfered with the political system in Iraq when it prevented former Ba'ath Party members from participating in the political process, despite the fact that they are Iraqi citizens with the right to run for office and cast ballots. However, during the American occupation of Iraq, everyone who was politically active, opposed Hussein's regime, and sought to topple it was appointed as prime ministers in the Iraqi government, such as Moammad Bar al-Ulum, a political opponent of Saddam Hussein's regime, and he was sentenced to death in absentia, in addition to Iyad Allawi who is a political activist who also opposes Hussein's regime. "The Americans were not amiss in thinking that Iraqis would be better off without such predatory entities in their midst. The consequential error lay in the timing." (Dawisha, 2010). However, I believe that not only improving the lives of Iraqis but the fall of the dictatorship also made it simpler for the United States to take control of the Iraqi political system, run it for American interests, and subordinate it.

Al-Maliki gained political advantages as a result of the signing of security and strategic agreements between the United States and Iraq (Katzman, 2011). Over time, al-Maliki's influence in the United States grew, and he became a favourite political figure for them. One of these agreements is the security accord, or SOFA, which governs the temporary presence of US military personnel in Iraq and their withdrawal. The Strategic Framework arrangement is a different arrangement that permits the United States to take part in political, educational, economic, and cultural matters. The House of Representatives approved these agreements in 2008. Although the Sadrist movement opposed these agreements, they became effective in 2009. Additionally, there are claims that there are supporters of al-Maliki and his party in the United States. Since al-Maliki and the party he controls received the same number of votes, it is obvious that the United States had a hand in the elections. However, these accusations were confirmed after the election results were announced (Younis, 2011).

On the other hand, the Iranian-backed Fatah coalition's defeat in the elections of 2021 and its vulnerability in potential negotiations to form a new Iraqi government are due to its demand for the withdrawal of US forces; as a result, the coalition had to neither oppose nor stand in the way of the US if it wanted to win (Adnan & Malsin, 2021). In addition, in order to reduce Iran's influence in Iraq, the United States needs Muqtada al-Sadr. Even though they have a long history of hostility, such as in 2004, there were clashes between al-Sadr and American forces, which led to threats to kill him. In the Battle of Najaf, American forces wanted to kill al-Sadr, but Iraqi politicians warned them against doing so because doing so would result in a bloodbath, so the United States held off on doing it. In his speeches, Muqtada al-Sadr made it clear that having an embassy in Iraq does not entail allowing it to meddle in Iraqi affairs. This was meant as a warning to the United States. However, now that he has declared his opposition to Iran, the United States believed that would contribute to Iran's expulsion from Iraq and the Middle East (Bar'el, 2021). After declaring his election victory in 2021, Muqtada al-Sadr stated in one of his broadcast appearances that Iraq is similar to every nation that seeks to live in peace without occupation or

terrorism and that, as a result, the use of weapons must be limited. When interests coincide, parties come together, and this assures that the United States is continuing fooling the Iraqis into believing it is implementing democracy. This Shiite religious figure was one of the possibilities provided to the United States to limit Iranian expansion in the Middle East.

Additionally, Michael P. Pregent, a renowned Middle East analyst, tweeted on the 2021 elections: "Remember McGurk, Blinken, Austin, & Biden chose Maliki over Allawi, Allawi should have formed the 2010 government, I was in the room when Odierno got the "hands off" call from D.C. to not impede Maliki stealing the election. McGurk, Austin, Blinken, & Biden will support Maliki." Our analysis of this tweet leads us to a number of conclusions, including the first that democracy does not exist because although Al-Alawi won the 2010 elections, the United States improperly named Nuri al-Maliki as prime minister. Second, even if someone else wins the election, nothing can stop the United States from appointing someone as president or prime minister. As a result, the United States' interests are those that regulate and determine. Thirdly, it is simple for the United States to prevent someone from altering the political system or raising or lowering the quality of services. Therefore, the United States might have prevented the bloodshed that the Iraqi people experience as a result of protests or when sectarian conflict arises, so when it intervenes, it saves a great number of lives.

Furthermore, since George Bush has been president of the United States, he has promised the Iraqis that after the war, the political system would be reformatted and democracy would be implemented, but this has not yet occurred. As a result, this is a lie through which the Iraqi political system is chosen that serves and achieves the goals of the United States, regardless of the opinion of Iraqi citizens and what they need for stability. Thus, democracy is a fantasy that has not yet been realized.

2.4 American stance on ISIS

Bull and Ollivant (2018) discovered that the strategic objective of the United States in Iraq is to turn Iraq into an ally of the United States due to Iraq's strategic location, the presence of the second-largest oil reserves on earth in its territory, and the fact that both the United States and Iraq have sacrificed soldiers and citizens in the name of democracy. After the occupation of Iraq, Dietrich and Carter (2017) clarify that the United States decided to completely alter the Iraqi political system. American officials also decided to deny jobs and pensions to the Sunnis loyal to Saddam who were forming the Baath Party, in addition to the officers. As a result, thousands of Iraqi citizens were left without employment or pensions, and it appeared as though the United States had facilitated the rise of terrorist groups. Additionally, there is now a split among the clans, with some of them supporting and others opposing these organizations.

The United States was unaware of the threat posed by this organization, the potential for its extension into a variety of regions, and the prospect that its presence may last for years. For instance, based on the *Politifact* website (2014), President Obama claimed that ISIS is not Islamic like al-Qaeda and is instead a "jayvee team," and this term means "a member of a junior varsity team who are not the main players in a competition" (*Merriam-Webster* website, 2021). ISIS is thus described by him as a group that lacks sufficient capability and strength, is not a significant force, and does not directly threaten the United States. Obama recognized that he was mistaken about ISIS and that it not only poses a serious threat but is also steadily expanding throughout the Middle East. Because in another interview with Chuck Todd, who is an American television journalist, and should note that according to the *Politifact* website (2014), this interview was

conducted following ISIS's takeover of Fallujah. *NBC News, Meet the Press* (2014) discovered that Obama responded that he did not mean ISIS and that, when you mention terrorism to anyone, the first thing that comes to mind is al-Qaeda and its founder Osama bin Laden. In addition, when asked why he chose to characterize ISIS in this way, he responded that either he was ignorant of the gravity of the situation or that the intelligence he had was inaccurate.

Obama's remark received harsh criticism from many journalists as ISIS's presence in Iraq and Syria increased, particularly after they seized control of Mosul, the second-largest governorate in Iraq. Obama may have made severe mistakes as a result of his inability to understand the makeup of the state (Wood, 2015). In addition to this, it is also proven by what was published in *The New York Times*, quoting General Michael K. Nagata, commander of US special operations in the Middle East at the time, who said: *"We have not defeated the idea, we do not even understand the idea."*

According to Wood (2015), Obama claimed that the Islamic State organization is not Islamic, and Muslims appreciated his support of them in their opposition to al-Baghdadi. Many Westerners, meanwhile, refused to accept that this organization is regarded as pious because Islam calls for tolerance and mercy between people of different sects, and they also tried to research the guiding principles and ideologies of the state organization to help them understand it better. The US misunderstood ISIS, however, because they applied the same strategy they used to deal with al-Qaeda to all terrorist organizations that appeared after it without taking into account how these terrorist organizations evolved and had different guiding principles.

For instance, al-Qaeda was geographically spread out, having cells in various places, and it was flexible, as its founder, Bin Laden, did when he asked for specific political requests like withdrawing from Afghanistan. In regards to ISIS, they were more optimistic because they thought that because of this group's limited capabilities, it would not be able to spread or control many areas in Iraq or Syria. ISIS seeks to revive the Islamic caliphate and implement it nationwide in addition to maintaining the legitimacy of the land. Patel (2015) elucidates that in 2014, President Obama laid out a strategy to eliminate ISIS. In addition, Shane and Hubbard (2014) clarify that ISIS resorted to the method of kidnapping everyone who holds a foreign nationality, specifically an American. In each video, a person wearing a black mask appears, and his speech is directed to President Obama to provoke the United States and announce it to invade ISIS. Many see that air strikes are a bad military option because the effect of these strikes is slow, but the United States is not ready to endanger more American forces or to sacrifice more American citizens.

The United States demonstrated its support for peace in 2017 by aiding Iraqi forces in their fight against ISIS. Regarding the challenge the United States faces in Iraq, it is its ongoing effort to lessen Iranian influence. In addition, the relationship between the United States and Iraq, according to Bull and Ollivant (2018), is more than just an occupation. There is also a partnership relationship in the reconstruction of Iraq, as evidenced by the strategic framework agreement that was established in 2007, as well as a relationship to defeat terrorist organizations. Regarding the instruction and direction, the United States gave Iraq to destroy ISIS, Bull and Ollivant (2018) confirm that there have been successes for the Iraqi military against ISIS as a result of the United States training the Iraqi forces and establishing the Counter-Terrorism Service.

As a result of this training, there were achievements for the Iraqi forces against ISIS. Firstly, in 2014 the Baiji Oil Refinery, the largest oil refinery in the country, was besieged by ISIS for 18 weeks, and the Iraqi forces succeeded, with the help of the American commando forces of

the Golden Division, to break this siege and restore the refinery. Secondly, in 2015, in the Battle of Ramadi, the Iraqi forces defeated ISIS and regained the city of Ramadi. During this battle, the engineering units in the Iraqi army performed a heroic act, building and maintaining a floating bridge over the Euphrates River during the battle, a skill they had not possessed before the US training. Thirdly, in 2016, the Iraqi forces won the Battle of Fallujah, which forced ISIS to leave after taking control of it in 2014. However, because the United States' major objective was to eliminate ISIS by whatever means necessary and at any cost, it engaged in this conflict without giving the potential deaths of innocent civilians any consideration. According to *Al Jazeera* News, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Zeid bin Raad stated that there were violations against civilians. According to *Al-Rafidain*, Abdullah Al-Turki, Secretary-General of the Muslim World League, stated that civilians in Fallujah were subjected to genocide. According to the European Association for Iraqi Freedom (EIFA), Struan Stevenson, President of the association, stated that the international community must move to save civilians from Fallujah. On the other hand, according to the Iraqi Ministry of Defense website, the US ambassador to Iraq, Stuart Jones, denied the presence of violations by the armed forces in Fallujah.

Additionally, in 2016, there was the Battle of Mosul, in which the city of Mosul was retaken with the aid of coalition airstrikes. However, similar to Fallujah, there were violations: many citizens were displaced, and many families lost their members and possessions. Therefore, when there is an interest for the US, it does not matter how many civilians will be killed, and there is no place for applying human rights. Even if ISIS is the cause, what happened in Iraq exposed the fallacy of human rights.

The US is acting similarly in Syria to how it acted in Iraq (*The New York Times*, 2021). Yet there is no justification for the deaths of innocent people and the devastation of their resources. According to a *New York Times* investigation, 80 people were killed by American troops in a Syrian camp in 2019, the majority unarmed civilians. This mindset is appalling because it disregards the human rights it professes and kills women and children for absurd reasons. The US Central Command argued that the ISIS militants' wives and children were also armed and occasionally firing in the camp.

Furthermore, Elnagar (2018) discovered that the US State Department released a report in 2018 explaining the situation of human rights and how well they are protected in various countries. The author wonders how the US is able to publish this report given that it is accused of aiding and taking part in international political crises and wars. A blatant example of a human rights violation is the detainees at Guantanamo, in addition to cases brought against US presidents for war crimes. Therefore, before enforcing human rights in other countries, the US must respect and protect these rights. If not, the US will maintain its pretence of upholding human rights.

ISIS was defeated with American assistance, and Iraqi territory was returned in Mosul; this demonstrated the significance of American involvement in any political crisis and the strength of its impact in dismantling terrorist organizations. It should be recalled that Haider al-Abadi's era is the one during which the true accomplishment—the defeat of ISIS—took place. Haider al-Abadi served as Iraq's prime minister from September 2014 until October 2018. In the first government following Saddam Hussein's overthrow, he previously held the position of Minister of Communication from 2003 to 2004. Additionally, Haider al-Abadi handled the ISIS situation better than Nouri al-Maliki because, in the opinion of Bull and Ollivant (2018), he gained the support of Sunnis and was less sectarian than al-Maliki. Moreover, ties between the United States and Iraq improved during the administrations of Donald Trump and Haider al-Abadi.

For instance, the Trump administration was successful in destroying the Shiite crescent that Tehran was attempting to establish through Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon. Also, in 2017, Haider al-Abadi paid a visit to the White House. After that, Trump's son-in-law travelled to Baghdad, and the trip was very successful. As a result, Iraq was taken off the list of nations whose citizens were prohibited from travelling. However, Trump had no stable relationships with any nations, so relations with any nation changed based on American interests. For this reason, throughout his administration, he said a number of things regarding Iraq, including, according to *Al Jazeera* News, that America will not act as the Middle East's police force. Each nation is responsible for its own defense. Therefore, the worst choice the United States has ever made is to maintain a military presence in Iraq. He threatened to impose sanctions if Iraq did not pay the cost of the American military bases' stay. But Iraq has not stabilised its financial or security situation and continues to experience corruption, poor services, and poverty. According to *Al Jazeera* News, Iraq was required to make payment as of November 20, 2021. Iraq had already paid Kuwait 490 million dollars in damages for the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and it was to pay another 629 million dollars the following year. As a result, the Iraqi people will be forced to pay for the dictatorship of their own government and the corruption that results from each sect's desire to rule without considering how this decision will affect the Iraqi people as a whole.

Returning to Trump's statements, he claimed that he wanted to establish an American military base to monitor Iran, even though Washington did not ask Iraq for permission. This is also a violation of the 2008 agreement, which states that Washington is not allowed to use Iraqi territory as a military base for attacking other countries.

Even though he supported the war in Iraq, US President Joe Biden sought to prioritise human rights when he took office in January 2021. Because this is seen as a major contradiction, he acknowledged that he erred in supporting the war resolution. Researchers analyse the situation in various nations as a result of what politicians write on social media, which has now become a part of politics. For example, Biden tweeted: *"This afternoon, I'll be hosting Prime Minister Mustafa Al-Kadhimi for a meeting in the Oval Office. I look forward to strengthening the strategic partnership between the United States and Iraq and working to advance bilateral cooperation."* Thus, Biden announced the visit of Iraqi Prime Minister Mustafa Al-Kazemi. During this visit, US President Joe Biden and Iraqi Prime Minister Mustafa Al-Kazemi signed an agreement that would officially put an end to America's combat mission in Iraq by the end of 2021, but exclude coalition forces stationed there. From this, it can be inferred that Biden wanted to work with Iraq and aid in its recovery from the violent conflicts it experienced, the persecution of its citizens, and the exploitation of its resources. Because Biden is an advocate for human rights, we can only hope that this will be done without regard for US interests.

Although ISIS left the Iraqi provinces it ruled in 2017, there are still sleeper cells connected to the group that carry out attacks periodically and aim to harm US forces wherever they are. For instance, according to *Sky News*, an ISIS member detonated a suicide bomb in Kabul Airport, killing many civilians, including 13 US troops. As a result, the US took action in August by using a drone to launch an air strike, which resulted in the death of an ISIS member who was one of the attack's planners. This reveals that, contrary to its prior statement that ISIS was an issue that needed to be addressed locally in Iraq, the United States is today employing every military tool available to it to combat the terrorist group ISIS.

3. Conclusions

The purpose of the current study was to analyze the American position on the political crises that occur in Iraq. The analysis of the results has shown that the United States is causing the political crisis to worsen by taking moves that could worsen the situation rather than making it better, and it only acts in its own self-interest. The most significant findings from this study are as follows:

1. As long as it supports its interests and does not oppose them, the US maintains relations with foreign nations.
2. The United States' choice to occupy Iraq and Joe Biden's acknowledgment that he made a mistake by supporting the war are examples of bad judgments that can destroy a nation.
3. Regarding the Iraqi elections, the issue is first addressed by promoting democracy. Additionally, this is a national responsibility for the growth of Iraq and its stability, and the United States welcomes the outcome, no matter what it may be. As a result, the Iraqis cast their ballots for the candidates they believe will best serve their interests, and once the results are announced, if the victor does not advance American interests, another candidate may be elected in their place. Americans view democracy in Iraq in this way.
4. Unlike al-Qaeda, the US originally refrained from intervening in the fight against ISIS in Iraq, referring to it as a "jayvee team," and asserting that the organization is a domestic Iraqi issue, but When ISIS began attacking American forces and abducting Americans on Iraqi soil, and when it became clear that several oil-producing regions in Iraq were under its control, the United States intervened and provided the Iraqi government with funding and weapons to fight this organization.
5. Human rights are not upheld by the United States, as was evident during the 2017 battle for Mosul and when it was fighting ISIS in Fallujah while killing civilians.
6. The fact that the Islamic State was defeated in Iraq with American assistance demonstrates the extent of the country's influence in aiding in the destruction of the organizations.

Based on the results obtained in the current paper, the researcher proposes the following recommendations:

1. More research is needed to determine how much the United States of America has upheld democratic and human rights ideals during the political crises in which it has been involved, also in order to understand US strategy independent of the techniques it uses to distort the truth, it is also necessary to conduct further research on the extent to which the US contributed to the growth of terrorist organizations in particular countries.
2. Regarding the challenges I encountered while writing this research, when I wrote about the Iraqi elections, there weren't enough sources of information because I found information from news websites, and there weren't any prior studies that focused specifically on the American position towards political crises that occur in various Arab countries. Therefore, I point to researchers to shed more light on the American position towards political crises. Additionally, Researcher recommends examining the connection between American interests, the state's natural resources, such oil, and political interference in this state.

Acknowledgments

I extend my sincere thanks to the reviewers and the Editor-in-Chief for their valuable comments on the initial draft of this research paper. I also express my appreciation to The University of Jordan, Jordan, for facilitating the data collection process. Any remaining errors or shortcomings are entirely my responsibility.

Ethical Declarations

This study was conducted in accordance with the principles of academic integrity and research ethics. Since the research did not involve human participants, there was no need for informed consent or other participant-related ethical procedures. However, all data sources and materials used in the research were handled responsibly and with due regard for intellectual property rights. The research process adhered to the principles of accuracy, transparency, and reliability to ensure the integrity of the findings

Data Availability Statement

The datasets collected and analyzed during this study are available from the researcher upon request.

Funding

No funding was received for conducting this research.

Conflict of Interest

The researcher declares no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

- Fatima Azhra'a Al-Rhamneh conceptualized and designed the study, in addition to collecting and analyzing the data.
- The first draft of the manuscript was written by Fatima Azhra'a Al-Rhamneh.
- The researcher reviewed and edited the text and approved the final version for publication.

Consent for Publication

The researcher agrees to submit this paper for publication and awaits the editorial decision after the peer-review process, agreeing to its publication. She also confirms that this work has not been previously published and has not been submitted to any other journal for consideration.

References

- Adnan, G., & Malsin, J. (2021). Iraqi election could determine the future for U.S. forces in the country. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/iraqi-election-could-determine-the-future-for-u-s-forces-in-the-country-11633856112>
- Bar'el, Z. (2021). Analysis | To stop Iran, America needs an Iraqi cleric fighting it. *Haaretz*. Retrieved from <https://www.haaretz.com/middle-east-news/iraq/.premium-to-stop-iran-america-needs-an-iraqi-cleric-fighting-it-1.10317338>

- Biden, J. (2021). *Twitter*. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/POTUS/status/1419676978303619074>
- Borer, D. (2003). Inverse engagement: Lessons from U.S.–Iraq relations, 1982–1990. *The U.S. Army War College Quarterly: Parameters*, 33(3), 21–36.
- Bull, B., & Ollivant, D. (2018). Iraq after ISIS: What to do now. *New America*. Retrieved from <https://www.newamerica.org/international-security/reports/iraq-after-isis-what-do-now/>
- Byman, D., & Pollack, K. M. (2003). Democracy in Iraq? *The Washington Quarterly*. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/democracy-in-iraq/>
- Dawisha, A. (2010). The long and winding road to Iraqi democracy. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(3), 877–885. Cambridge University Press.
- Department of State. (2021). Department press briefing – October 15, 2021. *United States Department of State*. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/briefings/departments-press-briefing-october-15-2021>
- Dietrich, L., & Carter, S. (2017). *Gender and conflict analysis in ISIS affected communities of Iraq*. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/rr-gender-conflict-isis-affected-iraq-300517-en.pdf>
- EIFA. (2016). Iraq: The international community ignores the ethnic cleansing of Fallujah. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20200103002043/http://eu-iraq.org>
- Elnagar, G. (2018). America and human rights. *Aljarida Newspaper*. Retrieved from <https://www.aljarida.com/articles/1524421686275613700>
- Katzman, K. (2011). *Iraq: Politics, elections, and benchmarks*. Congressional Research Service.
- Meet the Press. (2014, December 14). *Meet the press transcript - December 14, 2014*. NBC News. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meet-press-transcript-december-14-2014-n268181>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Jayvee. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved November 10, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/jayvee>
- New York Times. (2002, September 20). In Saddam Hussein's words: It's for oil. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/20/world/threats-and-responses-in-saddam-hussein-s-words-it-s-for-oil.html>
- Patel, D. (2015). ISIS in Iraq: What we get wrong and why 2015 is not 2007 redux. *Crown Center for Middle Eastern Studies*.
- Pollack, K. (2010). The political battle in Iraq. *The Brookings Institute*. Retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2010/0630_iraq_trip_pollack.aspx
- Pregent, M. (2021). *Twitter*. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/MPPregent>
- Sky News. (2021). Afghanistan: At least 73 people killed in blasts outside Kabul airport – including 13 U.S. troops. *Sky News*. Retrieved from <https://news.sky.com/story/afghanistan-explosion-outside-kabul-airport-pentagon-says-12391238>

Younis, N. (2011). Set up to fail: Consociational political structures in post-war Iraq, 2003–2010. *Contemporary Arab Affairs*, 4(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17550912.2011.552702>