

US invasion of Iraq: Neo-cons, media responses and humanitarian implications

Muhammad Hassan

M.Phil (Area Study Center, UoB)

ABSTRACT

U.S 'War on Terror' (WOT) under Bush administration in Iraq was launched with the pretext of Saddam Hussain's 'collaboration' with terror network, al-Qaida, and conspiracy of developing 'weapons of mass destruction' (WMD). However, to construct a narrative to legitimize Iraq's invasion diverse opinions and perspectives were popularized in media, press conferences, newspapers, policy statements and presidential speeches. Iraq was popularized as a country run by Saddam's regime that was responsible for violating human rights, demoralizing and suppressing Iraqis' urge of democracy, dictatorship, sponsoring terror networks and weaponizing Iraq with WMD. Iraq, under President Bush policy, was in nutshell a rogue state operating in the nexus of 'axis of evil'. To undo Saddam's regime of dictatorship, to democratize Iraq, neutralize Iraq from WMD and eliminate al-Qaeda, U.S under President Bush invaded Iraq. This paper will critically explore the rationale of war on Iraq and its implications. Beyond rhetorical underpinnings this paper will critically examine rationale of Bush's invasion of Iraq. The paper will be based on how neo-cons lobbied for war on Iraq, role of media in sensitizing and providing legitimacy to invade Iraq and how Iraq's invasion led to human sufferings.

Key words: War on Terror (WOT), War on Iraq, Bush Doctrine, Neo-Cons, President Bush, Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), Terrorism, Corporate Media

Lobbying war: neo-cons and Bush's invasion of Iraq

Introduction

As tragic events of 9/11 shocked the world, George W. Bush, president of USA, declared Iran, Iraq and North Korea in his category of axis of evil. After invading Afghanistan and removing Taliban's regime, Bush administration was readying itself in preparing another war in his global effort of fighting terrorism. Iraq was chosen next to Afghanistan as their primary battles in the global WOT. With the promise to liberate Iraqi people from the tyrannical dictatorship of Saddam Hussain, remove threats of biological and nuclear bombs – Weapons of Mass Destruction – and breaking Saddam-al-Qaida linkage, Bush administration planned and executed war on Iraq. (Hoehn, Grissom, Ochmanek, Shlapak, Vick, 2007). President Bush, in September 2002, stated that, "you can't distinguish between al-Qaeda and Saddam when you talk about the war on terror." In their public presentations and speeches Bush and his counselors would often argue how Saddam is not only developing WMD but also willing to use them against US citizens and homeland. (Alterman & Green, 2004). Bush administration emphasized that Saddam is collaborating with al-Qaida and making an effort to import nuclear material from Niger. However, he would use humanitarian ground and emphasize peace overtures in gaining UN support as is shown in his speech to the UN in 2002, "Tens of thousands of political opponents and ordinary citizens have been subjugated to arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, summary execution and torture by beating and burning, electric shock, starvation, mutilation and rape. Wives are tortured in front of their husbands, children in the presence of their parents – and all of these horrors concealed from the world by the apparatus of a totalitarian state." (Hehir, A. 2008).

War on Iraq was popularized as an international urge but opposition to the war was even more transnational and exceptional. At international legal front experts of international law viewed Iraq's invasion as unlawful and arbitrary. Notwithstanding any opposition and alternative options, on March 17, 2003, President Bush gave an ultimatum to Saddam and his family members to leave Iraq within 48 hours or be prepared to be bombed. (Bush, G. W. 2003) After invading Iraq with all possible military might and Britain's cooperation by providing 46000 troops, Bush, as Hehir (2008) notes, described the war as "relatively short and hugely successful" and that, "our mission is clear, to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, to end Saddam Hussein's support

for terrorism, and to free the Iraqi people.” Despite the facts that Saddam had nothing to do with 9/11 and that he neither possessed WMD nor had any links with al-Qaeda threatening American interests, soil and citizens, yet Bush speeches, indicating Saddam’s regime as a threat, created a necessity of invading Iraq.

Lobbying war: neo-cons and Bush’s invasion of Iraq

To understand Bush’s war on Iraq one must understand intentions of U.S global strategy in the Middle East. This grand strategy of the U.S under President Bush was to globally assert its hegemonic muscles. Bush Doctrine and 2002 NSS (National Security Strategy) was aimed to coercively respond to 9/11 attacks that called for U.S dominance through preventive wars, an abandonment of traditional approaches of containment policy, unilateralism and necessary coalitions that would help U.S fight terrorism. With the policy of “with or against us” the Bush administration threatened each state or government under their watch list that not standing with U.S is equal to supporting terrorism. US were single handedly declared as the only legitimate liberal model whose authority can interrogate any sovereign state. However, the advocacy of utilizing the strategy of US military prowess was long imagined and proposed by the architects of Bush administration known as neoconservatives or hardliners. (Rhodes, E. 2003)

Such a strategy was aimed in reshaping the Middle East, especially the Muslim part, in prolonging and sustaining US imperial and hegemonic designs. War on Terror, thereon, provided an ample space in coordinating and launching new wars. Iraq, as it had no hand in 9/11 attacks, was long considered a threat to US interests in the region and therefore the architects of US grand global strategy propagated an invasion of Iraq. Often called as neo-cons (neoconservatives) or hardliners in Bush administration these architects of US foreign policy forcedly propagated the invasion of Iraq. These neo-cons, architects of the New American Century, had a projected lobby in US, had negative views on the outcomes of Persian Gulf War and campaigned with an open letter to President Clinton in 1998 to use military force in Iraq to bring regime change. (Sifry & Cerf, 2003) They saw an emerging opportunity in mobilizing consent and war efforts thought to be decisive in securing US interests by reshaping and transforming the Middle East. (Clarke, R. 2004)

To formalize and blame Iraq as a terror threat to US and her allies the argument of weapons of mass destructions (WMDs) was placed as a primary

source of WOT against Saddam Hussain and his regime. He was actively blamed for collaborating with al-Qaida and developing weapons that could be used by terrorists against US and her allies. Contrary to the architects of Iraq war and their claims no evidence was found of developing WMDs. It was also proved that Saddam had no links with al-Qaida. Their claims were exaggerated and they knew that Iraq was no threat to the US. The threat, however, was Saddam's capabilities in constraining US freedom of action in the Middle East. (Ritter, S. 2005)

For neo-cons US must be an omnipotent power in restoring and sustaining order and peace in the world as Robert Kagan and William Kristol notes, "American hegemony is the only reliable defense against a breakdown of peace and international order." (Kristol & Kagan, 1996) This hegemony as hypothesized by neo-cons was deemed beneficial both for the US and the world which, as Robert Jervis notes, was US commitment in establishing American empire or primacy. This was an enshrined part of Bush Doctrine narrativized and constructed by neo-cons. (Caraley, D. J. 2004)

Bush Doctrine asserted its hegemonic vision by disseminating the need of preemptive strikes in the form of military force. (Renshon, & Suedfeld, 2007). Preemptive strikes or war was primary aspect of Bush Doctrine that became one of the most controversial elements in justifying Iraq's invasion. This policy had profound implications which affected intellectual, moral and international norms and laws as it received critical attention. (Falk, R. 2002) Bush Doctrine predicted worrisome threats emanating from terrorists and rogue states possessing WMDs and their willingness in harnessing terror plots on American soil. After 9/11 a climate of fear was inflamed by neo-cons, usually and repeatedly appearing on Fox News and MSNBC, to construct threat environment against rogue states and terror networks perceived to cause widespread destruction and therefore deemed unacceptable by Bush administration. (Kaufmann, C. 2004) President Bush earnestly picked this perspective as he judged it necessary to eliminate such threats. In National Security Strategy (2002) it states that, "we must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends. We must deter and defend against the threat before it is unleashed."

They perceived, as enshrined in neo-cons philosophy and extendedly found in National Security Strategy, that US national security is facing threats. To

neutralize such threats by using force in the form of preemptive war is not unprecedented. Bush, therefore, considering that US won't remain idle would, "if necessary, act preemptively". Bush administration had to face critical opposition in acquiring Security Council resolution if he needed consensus on use of force in Iraq. However, the behavior showed that the Bush administration didn't need multilateral consensus on using force in Iraq. US, as neoconservative would propagate, possessed unipolar authority and therefore must act unilaterally.

This behavior of unilateralism was openly exercised when US administration not only ignored UN Security Council but bypassed much of the international community (states) warnings and invaded Iraq. It was basically neo-cons faith in the US military power that convinced Bush administration to pursue go-it-alone strategy. They would argue that to achieve American interests US must reorder world system through use of force, "from its early beginnings, a proclivity toward the use of force has been an identifying badge of the neo-conservative ideology." (Halper & Clarke, 2004)

By declaring democratic institutions and liberal values, enshrined in con-cons led Bush Doctrine, as universal determinants, they committed themselves as torchbearers of democracy around the world. They advocated proactive method in materializing this dream while ignoring and leaving other possible alternatives. Iraq, therefore, was intended as a primary task in the broader plan of democratizing the entire Middle East. While contradicting US active support of monarchical and authoritarian regimes, the Bush administration pronounced that democracy was the only remedy in containing terrorism. The Middle East, as they would argue, is plagued by the rise of terrorism and could be saved if democracy is projected as the only remedy. By removing Saddam, as a justifying argument, democracy will flourish in Iraq and spread in regimes near and far. Basically, informed by a liberal world view, promotion and imposition of democracy in Iraq would serve fundamental interests of US foreign policy. Consequently, this will democratize Iraq and remove threats of terrorism emanating from Baghdad. Once democratization is achieved in Iraq the domino effect will spread and take other regimes in its fold. This transformation, as a firm belief of neo-cons was echoed in President Bush speech in 2003 while speaking to the 'National Endowment for Democracy', "Iraqi democracy will succeed – and that success will send for news, from Damascus to Tehran – that freedom can be the future of every

nation.” Accordingly, and if necessary, use of force must be employed in countering terrorism and extremism to democratize Islamic regimes. This coordinated effort in constructing war strategy and narrative would finally remove terror threats and help America achieve broader peace in the Middle East as it will result in establishing democratic zone beneficial for regional stakeholders and allies, particularly Israel.

Media responses: role of media in Iraq’s War:

Notwithstanding how neo-cons in Bush administration pushed war on Iraq what made controversy more appealing and therefore critical to note is the projection of war by the top American press media. This portion of the article will go in lengths in describing the role of media in constructing public opinion on Bush’s war in Iraq.

It is critically noticed that as war on Iraq approached American mass media had failed in covering and airing alternative debates that were critical to central policies of the Bush Doctrine. With military units thumping “shock and awe” assault on Baghdad the performance of mass media had generated controversy. As the frenzy of war footages and bombings settled in the initial phase of the war it became clear that neither US nor UN inspectors found WMD or any program of developing it. Media critics, fueled by the sensibility that American media outlets failed in upholding value judgments of democracy, scrutinized media corporations and their projections of war on Iraq. In their critical judgments they found that before the invasion media outlets didn’t report grounded debates and diverse alternative perspectives and therefore failed to offer fair and facts-oriented analysis to the citizens. Their failures in doing so, as watchdog groups note in their reports, consequently aided Bush administration to the path of a disastrous war based on rhetoric, flimsy evidence, unwarranted assumptions and erroneous analysis regarding Iraq’s capacity in developing weapons and sponsoring terrorist organizations. Their failures not only aided public opinion in the wrong direction as war approached but their coverage regarding post-invasion security, economic and political arrangements were also flimsy. Centre for Public Integrity, nonpartisan in nature and policy, for example, collected around 935 statements, including hundreds of objectionable claims, of administration’s top officials before the war. (Lewis & Reading-Smith, 2008) With few rebuttals from war dissenters and skeptics, these assertions were broadly given coverage by American media with little or no credibility or

investigation. However, growing critic of their performance pressurized *Washington Post* and *New York Times*. Rather than rendering apology they acknowledged that their reporting could have been better. (New York Times. 2004, May 26); (Kurtz, H. 2004) The evidence shows that those relying on major TV news channels were more fallible in holding false information about claims of weapons of mass destruction. (Ramsay & Lewis, 2003)

Key criticism of reporters came months before the invasion because they were keenly observed in accepting Bush administration's justification of invasion. As critics point out those journalists rarely showed skepticism about Saddam's connection to terrorism and development of biological weapons. Rather paying more attention to anti-war perceptions they promoted pro-war narratives. Michael Massing clarifies that, "In the period before the war, US journalists were far too reliant on sources sympathetic to the administration," and "those with dissenting views – and there were more than a few – were shut out." (Massing, M. 2004) Consequently, as the argument exposes, the US citizens were repeatedly opinionated and told why Saddam's regime had to be eliminated or invasion of Iraq must happen. The American public, as a result, was rarely exposed to skeptical and dissident arguments.

The perceptions whether US corporate media is objective and critical in providing spaces of dissent and skepticism of war on Iraq is contentious. Additionally, it is found that US and some other major western media networks, sympathetic to Bush's invasion of Iraq, constructed war narratives which were not only problematic in misleading public opinion but justified claims of WMD and Saddam's linkage to al-Qaida. In the wider Arab and Muslim world it was seen as aggression and invasion. Mass media of all forms, though with exception of low coverage of dissent and critical views, served Bush administration in its propaganda to legitimize the invasion of Iraq. The Iraq war was carefully orchestrated and planned in media propaganda as a necessary conflict. The public sense was developed on ideological grounds of us vs. them, evil vs. good, civilization vs. barbarism and enlightened modernity vs. fascism/totalitarianism. This ideological narrative was popularized in a sense that them, evil, barbarism and fascism were connoted as symbols or binary variables in labeling Iraq, Saddam, his regime and Islamist terrorists while us, good, civilization and enlightened modernity were used for the wider West in general and US in particular. Iraq, as campaigned in US media warfare propaganda, was portrayed as an

imminent threat not only to the US but the whole world. Messages media conveyed to masses intended consent and normalization of opinion that the invasion of Iraq was for just causes; that this war will result in broadening peace and eliminate terrorism. Thereby, as the premise dictates, military operations conducted against Iraq were considered as peacemaking efforts. The corporate media in US would manipulate words and slogans repeatedly as to convince masses that the President's intention and speeches in and on invading Iraq were purposed to ensure independence, freedoms, liberation and solidarity. Usage of terms like liberation and independence were meant to interpret and explain the intentions of war. They would use such weak clichés repeatedly in reiterating the purpose of the war. (Joint Intelligence Committee, 2002)

Media, as scrutinized in the heydays of bombardment of Iraq, had enabling relationship with diverse elite stakeholders – corporations, political and military industrial complex—in propagating unlimited messages of war. Media, while providing technical tools to produce consent and opinion manipulation, has inherent interest in the political economy of wars. They profit from war news and make money out of it. US corporate media houses on March 19, 2003 broadcasted live images of ground troops ready to attack Iraq, stationed at Iraq-Kuwait border, sent chilling and frenzy feelings around the world. (Crawford & Lutz, 2021) In media reactions it was “shock and awe”. The US bombardment of Iraq was presented as military triumphalism. However, when the international and local news reporters, while staying in Baghdad, were killed and injured by the US in separate attacks it represented different standards. (The Guardian, 2003) Donald Rumsfeld responding on US attacks in Baghdad claimed that these bombings were precise and targeted only military installments.

During Afghanistan and then Iraq wars media corporations promoted nationalism as a rallying cry in manufacturing consent by employing concepts like America under attack to America strikes back. Because of such war language, news manipulation and tools of nationalist fervor US governments, with abundant support from media corporations, publicized invasions and short military operations as spectacular undertakings in protecting US citizens, homeland security and international peace. However, the actual and underlying intent of successive military interventions was to serve hidden agendas of the profiteering elites and corporate classes. (Nayar, K. 2003).

Notwithstanding how wars can be beneficial for the vested interest of elites, live streaming of bombings and explosions by media corporations carry appalling and psychological impacts. While frightening, life-losing and lethal for non-combatants and observers, media networks showing bombings and explosions as potent strikes against evil reduced citizens caught in the conflict to the concept of collateral damage. Rather than portraying Iraqis as victims of an imposed war and ruthless violence, media networks failed to perform their primary duty in reporting on civilian casualties. War crimes were either ignored or justified as collateral damage.

As anti-war protests erupted in the US and public gained confidence in disowning Bush administration's war policies on Iraq media corporations were still reluctant in creating spaces for dissent. They, however, chose to set media centre at military bases stationed in Saliya, Qatar, costing over a million dollars. (Walter, 2013) With spreading disinformation and war propaganda, media outlets strived to win public consent over unjustified claims of Bush administration in invading Iraq but they miserably failed in convincing dissenting and critical voices worldwide. (Zelig, J. M. 2005) Despite mass protests in disowning Iraq's invasion, US administration coupled its efforts in deploying troops claiming to protect US interests. (Rutenberg, J. 2003) As estimated more than 900 journalists directly participated in war journalism under the protection and sponsorship of Pentagon. (Robinson, P. 2014) The invasion of Iraq and its war footages, reports and press releases and conferences was dawn of a new era in US journalism as some top media houses openly showed their conviction in supporting war as duty and patriotism to US national pride. Fox News' owner Rupert Murdoch was not only an open voice in declaring his conscience in owning and supporting war, he ran US flag as a screen feature on his channel and aired "America's Bravest" in promoting pro-war perceptions. (Rutherford, P. 2004) As a result, while Fox News having top viewership in the US, media industry indulged into ratings' race and followed into the footsteps of glorifying Bush administration's war efforts. On contrary the invasion of Iraq was neither authorized by the UN Security Council nor was it waged in self-defense against Saddam's armed attack. In fact the benefits raised and achieved in this war were to ensure unipolarity, maintaining influence, regime change, expanding US hegemony in the Middle East, sustaining oil monopoly and aiding allies, particularly Israel. This war

enriched many corporations of different sorts. Halliburton, oil field Services Corporation, profited \$39.5 billion in US-led Iraq war alone. Other beneficiaries include private security contractors, arms' manufacturers, oil companies, think tanks and media corporations.

Humanitarian implications of Iraq War:

This final section of the paper will outline humanitarian implications of the war Bush administration waged on Iraq. The focus of this section in highlighting civilian sufferings, loss of life and property and the state of diverse issues will be limited to the year 2007. This chapter won't cover the aftermath of Iraq as Obama administration took charge of US presidency but will mainly focus outcomes of war in the time of Bush administration.

US war on Iraq devastated socio-political and economic conditions. The lurking and ever-present danger to life caused displacement, socio-political instability and suffering. Media reports on scores of people killed each passing day and world's highest ratio of military, read security, personnel to civilians (Bayati, A. 2007) depict complexity and gravity of war situation in Iraq. The focus of this section will be centered on humanitarian crisis that unfolded in the form of health, education and the most vulnerable part of Iraqi society - women and children.

Education:

After US invasion of Iraq higher education capacity in providing professional academics was gravely affected. The brain drain began as professional academics and educationists faced life threats. The fear of death in academic circles was voiced by 91% respondents in a survey. (Jalili, I. (2007) As per reports, in 2005, 296 academic members were killed (UN Office for Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs), 180 more killed since 2006, 3250 fled the country and 100 kidnapped. This is in addition to burning and looting of academic institutions after the invasion of Iraq. Consequently, young Iraqi generation were deprived of professional academics including teachers and doctors and, as per 2007 report, students were taught by assistants as professors were either non-existent or lacking in numbers. (Glain, S. 2007)

Of 3.5 million only 30 percent school age children were enrolled (Education International. 2007), 100 were killed and 95 injured in attacks on schools. Those killed or injured while on their way to school or going back home are not counted here. (IRIN) Furthermore, Baghdad had 30 percent shortage of

teacher and 22 percent primary school age children (about one million in size and of whom 74 are female) didn't attend school. (Save the Children, 2006) Since 1980 Iraqi children have gone through series of wars. Many generations of them are, therefore, war affected. Of Iraqi children one-eighth die before reaching the age of five and one-ninth is malnourished. (Beling, L. 2005) While less than 1/3 children in Iraq have access to safe water. In cities like Basra and Baghdad huge numbers of children are deprived of basic rights and are prone to despair. As per assessments 90 percent of children, while living in fear, had learning impediments caused by war sufferings. (Oxfam International & the NGO Coordination Committee in Iraq, 2007) In addition, schools were shut down as security problems worsened in the form of kidnappings, bombings and targeting of teachers.

Health:

Considered one of the best health care systems in the region, Iraq turned worst as violence engulfed the country after US invasion. As violence perpetuated and affected life in different spheres, statistics collected in various forms of diseases depict grave health care situations. Diarrhea, malaria, measles and respiratory infections had worst indicators while 30 percent of Iraqi children went under-nutrition which contributed to extreme rates of child mortality. Moreover, Stephen (2006) reported that cholera and tuberculosis, long been disappeared, reemerged. Malnourished children rose to 50 percent and one in ten children suffered from a chronic disease. Crippled and disabled Iraqis rose to one million, a 30 percent increase since US invasion. (Hameed, H. 2007) On the other hand drug usage increased throughout Iraq; in Baghdad alone, their numbers have doubled and in southern Iraq it tripled. (IRIN, 2005) The situation is aggravated to the level that 10 percent of total registered medical doctors have either left Iraq or driven from work. (Travernise, S. 2005) There were, as Glain (2007) noted then, 30,000 practicing doctors in Iraq before the US invasion of Iraq but in 2007 their numbers shrunk to mere 8000.

As reports from years 2007-8 indicate poverty in Iraq increased after the US invasion. This is in effect that poverty can influence health and economic life in more ways than one. At this stage 60 percent of Iraqis were unemployed, one third was living life below poverty line, 5 percent in extreme poverty and non-availability of food affected 69 percent families. (Shamaa, H. 2005) Further, 80 percent households had no savings, 30 percent had no access to

clean water and 40 percent of the population had no access to the food distribution system. (WHO, 2007)

Women:

Women, in wars, are generally more vulnerable. In Iraq, after the invasion of US, they were hardest hit. Either targeted directly or affected accidentally, women face another dimension of threat and suffering which is rooted in their social status of society. Women, in Iraqi society, are not breadwinners as men are mostly responsible for household needs. For each man killed in war or conflict there is a wife, daughter, mother or sister to mourn. Worst as they must cope with life assurances in the form of security and livelihood in the absence of male presence. For each man injured or crippled, responsibility of tending to his care and family needs are looked after by women in the family.

Therefore, many thousands dead men in the US war on Iraq impacted women as they suffered heavily. Left unmarried or became widows, women had to struggle to earn and look after their children. The ratio of maternal mortality among Iraqi women increased by 65 percent since US invasion of Iraq. (AFSC, 2006) Missing persons and prisoners of war hugely impacted hundreds of thousands of women who had to live with the dilemma of facing uncertainties and social consequences. Further, women comprised half of the displaced persons and those who sought refuge. Situation for women was even more aggravated as they had to face and live with male-centric society. Those who were in detention had to suffer and face the risk of ill-treatment, torture and sexual abuse. (Dakkak, H. 2007) They were unable to actively participate in normal daily affairs as atmosphere of fear and violence surrounded their lives. They were restrained in different walks of life including education, professional work employment, civil societies and decision-making forums. Women activists and political leaders had to avoid public places as they faced attacks and threats. Moreover, sexual abuse, violence and rape against women sharply increased after the US invasion of Iraq. (Zoepf, K. 2007) As reported by Zoepf (2007) two thousand women have been kidnapped since US invasion of Iraq. However, the numbers could be higher as reporting rape is stigmatic. Women, before the US invasion of Iraq, were greatly represented in the service sector as they occupied 79 percent positions; 44 percent in the technical and professional sectors. After

the invasion their numbers fell dramatically. As Zoepf (2007) further indicated only 14 percent of women were employed in year 2007. Their voices in demanding equal status, justice and rights were confined to a few cases only.

Displacement:

Wars displace people. Iraq, while going through series of wars, has experienced mass expulsions before and after 2003. Iraq-Iran and Iraq-Kuwait wars, military operations within, western sanctions and US invasion led hundreds of thousands of Iraqis to flee their country for safety and better life, often trying to reach industrially developed states. However, many would not reach intended countries of their choice. They were restrained, compelled and forced to live in camps. This resulted not only in brain drain as mentioned before but also caused immense social pressures. The international community, after the US invasion of Iraq, already expected expulsions and displacements. Facing such human catastrophe and having no proper understanding of its nature and scale they envisaged poor strategies in handling the crisis. Humanitarian organizations and international agencies installed camps which attracted no staff attendant. Efforts in registering internally displaced persons and refugees also failed because large numbers of them didn't wish to register as they wanted to live with their family relatives or to find shelter on their own.

In 2007, around 4.5 millions Iraqis were quoted as displaced within and outside the country. 2.5 million of them were living inside and 2 million had been living outside Iraq. (IRCS, 2007) The impacts of displacement in Iraq are far reaching as societal bond in Iraq is deeply engraved in tribal, communal and family associations. Displacement, therefore, impacts millions of people than only those who left their homes.

Displacement began right after the US invasion of Iraq (Rosen, N. 2006) but most statistics often quote Samara bombings in 2006 as the starting year of displacement. In Iraq the displacement critically impacted societal fabrics or to say social cohesion as evictees who belonged to mixed ethnic and sectarian locations like Baghdad were separated in ghettos and cantons. Social bond they formulated in centuries were abruptly transformed in sectarian and ethnic violence. Displacement, therefore, had collective and communal impacts on Iraq's social structures.

Mass exodus of Iraqis who migrated to Syria and Jordan are not treated as 'refugees' because most of the countries they moved on are not party to international treaties. The politicization of these 'refugees' and internally displaced Iraqis (IDPs) further aggravated the situation as local and international stakeholders often played with displacement.

Conclusion

US war on Iraq was framed and executed on a very wrong footing. The narrative neo-cons helped in shaping Bush Doctrine was aimed not only to remove Saddam and eliminate his Ba'ath regime but to strengthen US hegemonic designs in the wider Middle East. War on Terror (WOT) was extended as a global urge in the Iraq war to reshape Middle Eastern and global hegemonic designs of US dominance. Therefore, WOT, primarily focused on Afghanistan, was soon framed as an international effort fighting civilization's war against barbarism. As proved bogus and flimsy on factual grounds, Iraq war, however, became neo-cons' favorite war strategy in gaining and sustaining US's official dominance. Fuelled and narrativized by frenzy media discourses, Iraq's invasion was channelized to strengthen war hysteria in the US. Thus building on mass consensus the WOT chapter of Iraq became everlasting terrorism wars of Bush Doctrine. Notwithstanding, the sheer urge of Iraq's occupation and senseless violence led millions of Iraqis suffer as Iraq not only lost thousands of innocent lives but peace, stability and human capital.

References

- Alterman, E. & Green, M. (2004). *The Book on Bush: How George W. (mis)leads America*. USA: Penguin Group. p 252-254.
- Bayati, A. (2007). Iraqi parliament member, interviewed by Al-Khaleeg Arabic.
- Beling, L. (2005). Iraqi children are paying the price of war. *Forced Migration Review*, 42-4.
- Bush, G. W. (2003). New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/18/politics/text-bushs-speech-on-iraq.html>
- Caraley, D. J. (2004). *American Hegemony: Preventive War, Iraq and Imposing Democracy*. New York: The Academy of Political Science. p 14.

- Clarke, R. (2004). *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror*. Free Press. p 44.
- Crawford, N. C. & Lutz, C. (2021). What the 18th anniversary of the Iraq War teaches us about the costs of war. *Military Times*.
- Dakkak, H. (2007). Confronting sexual violence and abuse of Iraqi girls and women. *Forced Migration Review*, 39–40. www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/Iraq/full.pdf
- Falk, R. (2002). The New Bush Doctrine. *The Nation*.
- Glain, S. (2007). The quiet exodus from Iraq. *Newsweek International*. www.stephenglain.com/Articles.htm
- Hameed, H. (2007). One million handicapped in need for assistance. www.daralhayat.com
- Halper, S. & Clarke, J. (2004). *America Alone: The Neo-Conservatives and the Global Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p 26.
- Hehir, A. (2008). *Humanitarian intervention after Kosovo: Iraq, Darfur and the record of global civil society*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan. p 60.
- Hoehn, A. R., Grissom A., Ochmanek D. A., Shlapak, D. A., & Vick A. J. (2007). *A New division of labor: Meeting America's security challenges beyond Iraq*. USA: Rand Corporation. p 10-13.
- IRCS. (2007). Report to UNHCR's International Conference on Iraqi refugees and displaced persons. Geneva.
- IRIN, Iraq: Children's education gravely affected by conflict. www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?
- IRIN. (2005). Iraq: Traumatized young Iraqis turn increasingly to hard drugs. www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportId525576
- Jalili, I. (2007). *Iraq's Lost Generation: Impact and Implications*. www.naba.org.uk/content/
- Joint Intelligence Committee. (2002). *Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction*. UK: Stationery Office Limited. p 79.
- Kaufmann, C. (2004). Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War. *International Security* 29, no. 1, 5–48.
- Kristol, W. & Kagan, R. (1996). Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy. *Foreign Affairs*, 75, 23.

- Lewis, C., & Reading-Smith, M. (2008). False Pretenses. http://www.publicintegrity.org/WarCard/Default.aspx?src=project_home&context=overview
- Massing, M. (2004, February 26). Now they tell us. *The New York Review of Books*, 51. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/16922>
- Nayar, K. (2003). Western Media Turns into a Willing Tool. *Gulf News*.
New York Times. (May 26, 2004). *The Times and Iraq*; Kurtz, H. (Aug 12, 2004). *New York Times*. p A10.; *The Washington Post*. *The Post on WMDs: An inside story*. p A01.
- Oxfam International & the NGO Coordination Committee in Iraq (NCCI). (2007). www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/policy/conflict_disasters/downloads/bp105_iraq.pdf
- Ramsay, K. S. & Lewis, C. (2003). E. Misperceptions, the media, and the Iraq War. *Political Science Quarterly*, 118, 569–598.
- Renshon, S. A. & Suedfeld, P. (2007). *Understanding the Bush Doctrine: Psychology and Strategy in an Age of Terrorism*. London: Routledge. p 87.
- Rhodes, E. (2003). The imperial logic of Bush's liberal agenda. *Survival*, 45:1, , 131–154.
- Ritter, S. (2005). *Iraq Confidential: The Untold Story of America's Intelligence Conspiracy*. London: I. B. Tauris. p 55.
- Robinson, P. (2014). Media Empowerment Vs. Strategies of Control: Theorizing News Media and War in the 21 Century. *Zeitschrift für Politik* 61 (4), 461-79.
- Rosen, N. (2006). Anatomy of a Civil War – Iraq's descent into chaos. *Boston Review*. <http://bostonreview.net/BR31.6/rosen.php>
- Rutenberg, J. (2003). A Nation at War: The News Media; Cable's War Coverage Suggests a New 'Fox Effect' on Television Journalism. *The New York Times*.
- Rutherford, P. (2004). *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War against Iraq*. University of Toronto Press Incorporated. p 127.
- Save the Children. (2006). Report. www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportId570697
- Shamaa, H. (2005), Professor of Economics at Baghdad University, *Iraq File, Issue 140*.

- Sifry, M. L. & Cerf, C. (2003). *The Iraq War Reader: History, Documents, Opinions*. New York: Simon and Schuster. p 67.
- Stephens, E. (2006). Health Care in Iraq, Then and Now. www.lookingglassnews.org/viewstory.php?storyid55613
- The Guardian. (2003). <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2003/apr/09/pressandpublishing.Iraqandthemedial>
- Walter. (2013). War, Propaganda and the Media. *Global Issues*.
- WHO. (2007). Violence threatens health in Iraq, press release. www.uslaboragainstawar.org/article.php?id513361
- Zoepf, K. (2007). Iraqi refugees turn to the sex trade in Syria. *New York Times*.
- Zelig, J. M. (2005). Recovering Iraq's Cultural Property: What Can Be Done to Prevent Illicit Trafficking. *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* 31 (1), 36.