

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of 8 Mai 1945/ Guelma

جامعة 8 ماي 1945/قالمة

Faculty of Letters and Languages

كلية الآداب و اللغات

Department of Letters and English Language

قسم الآداب و اللغة الانجليزية



**The Democratic Peace Theory and US Post-9/11  
Interventionism:  
Case Study of Iraq**

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English Language in Partial  
Fulfillment of The Requirement of the Master's Degree in English Language,  
Literature and Civilization.**

**Board of examiners**

**Chairman: Mr. Boudechiche Hamid**

**Guelma University 8Mai 1945**

**Supervisor: Mr. Ali Zoui Mahfoud**

**Guelma University 8Mai 1945**

**Examiner: Mrs. Layada Rhadia**

**Guelma University 8Mai 1945**

**Student:**

**Supervisor:**

**MIHOUB Hadjer**

**Mr. ALI ZOU I Mahfoud**

**June 2017**

*Acknowledgment*

*In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful*

*Alhamdulillah,*

*all praises to Allah for the strength and His blessing his gave*

*me in completing this work.*

Special appreciation goes to my supervisor Mr. MAHFOUD ALI Zoui for his supervision and constant support, his invaluable help of constructive comments and suggestions throughout the whole work.

I would like to express my appreciation to all my teachers who accompanied me throughout my five years of study from 2012 to 2017, for their patience, support, help and hard work for building my knowledge .

Also thanks to all the administrative staff of our university starting with our department to the library, to the central administration for their help and work

Great thanks offered to the examiners for their interest and time to check and scrutinize the work.



*Dedication*

*I dedicate my work to my Parents, the source of my strength, confidence  
and ambition*

*To all my family members My sisters and my brothers*

*Ratiba, Hassan, Aida, Ayache, Rima, Sisto, Omra*

*Who inspired me to*

*Be the person i am today*

*Sincere thanks to all my friends*

*With Whom I*

*Spent all these years*

*From the first time i set foot on school till the university today*

*For their kindness and moral support during my study.*

*Thanks for the friendship and memories.*

*To my beloved teachers,*

*Whom i thank for their guidance, faith and tolerance*

## **Abstract**

The current study aims at investigating the Democratic Peace Theory in essence and its relation to United States interventions following the September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2001 attacks on the world trade center in New York City. It introduces the concept of The Democratic Peace Theory which is rooted in the work of Immanuel Kant in 1795. It offers a descriptive account to the theory's statement being one of the most important international relations regulations asserting that democratic states are less likely to go to war with each other. The study discovers the relationship between democracy and peace and draws upon the significance of democracy leading to and causing peace. It offer insights into The United States striving to spread democracy worldwide and farther explains its foreign policy and the most significant incident that elaborated its foreign policy principle of democracy promotion, thus the 9/11 attacks. The case study that is prominent to US attempts at 'democracy promotion' is Iraq: "Operation Iraqi Freedom", 30<sup>th</sup> March 2003. The study also concludes that the U.S allegedly prioritized its democracy promotion in order to tackle the problem of terrorism, the call for democracy in Iraq didn't meet with the primary goal of "peace", it rather left it with destruction and chaos. The Democratic Peace Theory was used by the USA as a justification for the invasion of Iraq, yet this theory didn't uphold the enforcement of democracy nor taking military actions to preserve it. Invoking the propositions of the DPT to justify the use of destructive force under the pretext of spreading democracy is, therefore, baseless and unjust.

## ملخص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التحقيق في نظرية السلام الديمقراطي في جوهرها وعلاقتها بالتدخلات الأمريكية بعد هجمات 9 سبتمبر 2001 على مركز التجارة العالمي في مدينة نيويورك. وتقدم مفهوم نظرية السلام الديمقراطي التي تتجذر في عمل إيمانويل كانت في عام 1795. ويتم وصف بيان النظرية كونها واحدة من أهم أنظمة العلاقات الدولية التي تؤكد أن الدول الديمقراطية أقل عرضة للذهاب إلى الحرب مع بعض. تكشف الدراسة العلاقة بين الديمقراطية والسلام وتعتمد على أهمية الديمقراطية التي تؤدي إلى السلام وتسببه و تقدم نظرة ثاقبة عن الولايات المتحدة التي تسعى جاهدة لنشر الديمقراطية في جميع أنحاء العالم، وتتقدم أبعد إلى تفسير سياستها الخارجية. من أبرز حالات محاولات الولايات المتحدة "تعزيز الديمقراطية" هي العراق: "عملية تحرير العراق"، 30 مارس 2003 وتخلص الدراسة أيضا على الرغم من أن أمريكا تزعم أن الأولوية هي تعزيز الديمقراطية لمعالجة مشكلة الإرهاب، إلا أن الدعوة إلى الديمقراطية في العراق لم تلب الهدف الأساسي المتمثل في "السلام" بل سببت لها الدمار والفوضى. وقد استخدمت الولايات المتحدة نظرية السلام الديمقراطي كمبرر لغزو العراق، إلا أن هذه النظرية لم تؤيد إنفاذ الديمقراطية ولا تتخذ إجراءات عسكرية للحفاظ عليها. ومن ثم فإن التذرع بمقترحات هذا القانون لتبرير استخدام القوة المدمرة تحت ذريعة نشر الديمقراطية أمر لا أساس له من الصحة وغير عادل

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter One: The Democratic Peace Theory.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. Nature of The Democratic Peace Theory:.....	5
1.1.1. Structural/Institutional Explanation.....	11
1.1.2. The Normative /the Cultural Explanation.....	13
1.2. Background of the Democratic Peace Theory.....	14
1.3. Types of the Democratic Peace Theory.....	20
1.3.1. Dyadic.....	21
1.3.2. Monadic.....	23
1.3.3. Systemic.....	24
References .....	26
<b>Chapter Two: USA Democracy Promotion and Democratic Peace Theory.....</b>	<b>33</b>
2.1. The Democratic Peace Theory and the Spread of Democratic Regimes.....	34
2.2. The Democratic Peace Theory Practice in the International Relations.....	39
2.2.1. Non-Military Democratic Promotion.....	40
2.2.2. Military Democratic Promotion.....	43

2.2.3. Humanitarian Interventions and Democratic Promotion.....	44
2.3. Democratic Peace Theory and US Foreign Policy.....	45
2.4. Democratic Peace Theory as Justification for US Foreign Policy Interests and Methods.....	50
2.5. US Democracy and Interventions in the Middle East.....	54
2.6. Conclusion .....	55
References.....	58
<b>Chapter Three: The Case Study: USA Intervention in Iraq 2003.....</b>	<b>62</b>
3.1. Relation between Iraq and USA before 9/11.....	63
3.2. The Role Played By 9/11 in the Interventions in Iraq.....	66
3.3. The US Justification for the Iraqi Intervention.....	69
3.4. Promoting Democratic Peace in Iraq after the Invasion.....	71
3.5. Comparing the Propositions of DPT and the Current Situation of Iraq.....	76
3.6. Conclusion.....	80
References .....	82
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>89</b>

## **List of abbreviations**

CNN: Cable News Network.

CPA: Coalition Provisional Authority.

DPT: Democratic Peace Theory.

EU: European Union.

IAEA: International Atomic Energy Agency.

IGO: inter-governmental organizations.

IIG: Interim Iraqi Government.

LA: Los Angeles.

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

OAS: Organization of American states.

OPEC: Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries.

SFA: Strategic Framework Agreement.

TNA: Transitional National Assembly.

UK: United Kingdom.

UN: United Nation.

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund.



USA: United States of America.

WHO: World Health Organization.

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction.

## Introduction

The notions of conflict and peace have been discussed through many theories within political science and international relations. One of the most discussed theories is the “Democratic Peace Theory”. This theory has generated much controversy in recent years. It holds the idea that democracies are less likely to fight wars against each other and that democracy brings more peaceful, less aggressive foreign policy.

The Democratic Peace Theory regards three main versions. The first one is called Monadic, which states that democracies are peaceful and are less likely to wage wars on any type of governments. The other version is called Dyadic, it argues that democracies are peaceful with one another but are willing to go to war with non-democratic states. The last version of Democratic Peace is called Systemic. It asserts that after democracies grow in number, the international political system will become more peaceful.

The nature of international relations is extremely chaotic. The intervention of the United States in other nations, for example was seen as a hope for spreading democracy and thus peace. Yet, this notion is debatable. Some scholars stated that this theory is true and its main aim is true peace, others argue that it is used only as a rational explanation to wage war against specific countries for hidden purposes.

Many scholars and political scientists have been using the propositions of The Democratic Peace Theory to justify US military interventions in the post-9/11 era. This study sheds light on the consequences of US interventionism post-9/11 and compares them to the propositions of the Democratic Peace Theory. This chapter sheds light on the origins Case studies that

prove the inconvenience of the theories' application are: the Afghanistan war (2001), the Iraq War (2003) and its intervention in Syria (2013).

The debate on the legitimacy of US intervention in countries like Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and the so-called Arab Spring has been among the most heated debates in recent year , it hold a great deal of controversies. This claim has been harshly criticized “The Democratic Peace Theory that asserts that democracies are less likely to go to wars or to threaten the security of other democracies has been used to justify US interventionism to spread democracy”.

This study is constructed to show the real practical side of the theory with taking the case study of the United States intervention in post 9/11 events in many countries and focuses its attention on the most brutal intervention as a case study which is Iraq. How it utilized the theory for its own purposes in addition to the outcomes presented after the occurrence of the intervention.

Farther, it aims at proving that the propositions of The Democratic Peace Theory do in no way justify or legitimize USA interventionism under the pretext of exporting democracy. It also seeks to discover the actual practice of spreading democracy through waging wars with specific focus on the true intentions for its use. Also the concern is devoted to the outcomes of the US spread of democracy on its own terms, its effect on the societies, the consequences on other foreign policies and showing that there is always a private benefit behind each encounter and spread of democracy other than securing world peace.

Basing on the analysis of the theory and the consequences of US attempt to impose democracy by force in certain countries, the main question of this study is: Do the

propositions of The Democratic Peace Theory support or legitimize US military intervention abroad?

This research will be based on the qualitative method, since the nature of the topic demands a lot of detailed explanation and the investigation of a huge body of information, to reveal to the target audience the varieties of positions toward the issue of the Democratic Peace inclinations by the united states, with reference to the United states interference in the affairs of other nations.

In order to accomplish this research work, data collection of reading materials must be provided. Hence, this research will be based on a variety and multiple resources that will be a subject to reliability as well as credibility. The resources are made up of many primary as well as secondary sources such as: Interviews, Journal articles, professor's presentations, debate records, books which are the most crucial tools for the undergoing of this research.

This work is to be divided into three chapters, an introduction and a conclusion. The introduction of the work sets the boundaries by which this study will be conducted upon along with the method and aim of the work. Chapter one is devoted to The Democratic Peace Theory itself. It provides the nature and definition of the theory. In addition to, exploring the historical grounding of the theory and its different types.

The second chapter explores The Democratic Peace Theory and the Spread of Democratic Regimes all over the world along with its Practice in the International Relations scope. Furthermore, it clarifies the use Democratic Peace Theory as Justification for US Foreign Policy and specifies it to the spread of democracy by the Interventions led in the Middle East

The third chapter sheds light upon one of a case study of American intervention in Iraq. It provides a historical background of the relationship between the two countries, along with shedding light upon the role played by the 9/11 event in the intervention. Later, it explains the invasion and the reaction towards it and it explains the political outcomes post the invasion. Concluding this chapter is with the difference on the social sphere between what used to be before the invasion and post invasion.

## **Chapter One:**

### **The Title: The Democratic Peace Theory**

When Plato said that only the dead have seen the end of war (MacArthur Frequently asked), his remarks echoed the history of his time. In ancient Greece, war was a constant measure for power and recognition. It was considered as a necessity in some cases and jeopardy in others. From Plato's time to the contemporary period of political science and international relations theorizing, philosophers and theorists have been first and foremost concerned with discovering human nature, its role in social and political life as well as means of giving meaning to human life. Peace has been central for discovering the purpose of life, and the search for it led humanity to its present.

Theories of peace and war have been central. Theories have been generated to illuminate our understanding of how nations interact, the causes of war, the motivations to establish peace and how these causes and motivations have the possibility to manage humanity to reach a stage where peace is not "an armistice in a war" as Thucydides (431BCE) stated but "a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, confidence, justice" (Spinoza 1670).

#### **1. Nature of the Democratic Peace Theory**

DPT is one of the well known and heated debated theories in political sciences. Many scholars have approached the theory from different angles. The theory has been discussed through different representation of and it has been given many other naming such as: mutual democratic pacifism, non-aggression hypothesis... etc. The Democratic Peace Theory

represents the core idea to be discussed in this study. It is defined with its simple form as the notion that democratic countries naturally do not go to war against one another.

DPT or liberal peace theory or simply the Democratic Peace holds that democracies and liberal democracies never or almost never go to wars or military conflicts. It is one of the most important statements between democratic countries that defines the correlation and interaction between them. It provides insights on the domestic norms and institutional democratic states by which neither state will seek violence as a way to settle any indifference or conflict of interests that arise between them. When democracies come to conflict with one another, they only rarely threaten to use force or military power because it is 'illegitimate' to do so. DPT explicitly holds that it is the very nature of democratic political systems that accounts for the fact that democracies do not fight or threaten other democracies.

It has been argued that the absence of war between democratic states comes as close as anything to an empirical law in international relations (Levy 62). Although statistically the probability of war between any two states is considerably low, the absence of war among liberal democracies across a wide range of different historical, economic, and political factors suggests that there is a strong predisposition against the use of military violence between democratic states (Doyle 11). This Democratic Peace proposition not only challenges the validity of other political systems such as fascism, communism, authoritarianism, totalitarianism but also confronts the prevailing realist account of international relations, which emphasizes the balance of the power calculations and the different strategic interests in order to explain the peace and stability that characterizes relations between liberal democracies (Doyle 57).

There are two main parts to The Democratic Peace Theory statement as stated by Thomas Risse: the first part is that democracies do not fight other democracies, this statement implicates that democracies do not fight each other. It appeals to both the public opinion where people will decide not to go to war unless there is a necessary need to defend themselves, and if all nations were democratic constitutional republics, aggression against nations and the notion of war could no longer exist. In addition to the academic spheres of the society where the effects of hostility and violence will destroy the educational system of every country involved in violence. The second part of the theory is that democracies are no less likely to fight other non-democracies; this statement admits the importance of the inherent political systems where by each country seems to depend fully on its previous experiences and regimes and act on that basis (Risse 2).

The Democratic Peace Theory offers specific regulations for political action in the international sphere. It explains the conditions under which peace is preserved. It also provides a coherent vision of the global security in the community of democracies (Strugliński 03). For instance regarding the United states political positions, as it is stated by president Bill Clinton, in his State of the Union Address in 1994: "... ultimately the best strategy to insure our security and build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere, democracies do not attack each other, they make better trading partners and partners in diplomacy...". In this quotation president Clinton stresses the importance of democracy, he argues that spreading democracy will be beneficial in many aspects of international politics and with the inclusion of economic interaction between



countries it will farther enhance the economic well being of the countries involved (Owen 87) .

This theory can be grounded on several important concepts such as: democracy, peace, liberalism, international political institutions, international relations and far more notions. The logical relation between these concepts and the DPT stands mainly for the correlation between democracy and peace and to have a better understanding of the theory, it is critical to identify the components by which it is grounded.

The common agreement on democracy is “people vote to create a government, and the country is ruled by people” as cited by Joseph de Maistre, it means citizens vote to elect their representatives to act on the people's interest; they are also called Democratic Republic. Referring to the subject of DPT, Kant believed the format of Republic is the way to express his view on democracy. Melvin Small and David Singer described the feature of democratic country as: firstly, regular election. Secondly, at least allow 10% of population in voting. Thirdly, a constitution to control and monitor the government operation (Cheung Mung 05).

Other DPT supporters further defined democracy as at least 50% of adults is entitled to have the voting right; shifting of power from political party to its opponent, free competition of election, freedom of speech and religions, the interpretation of democracy is very clear, the majority to win the decision making right by voting. It is reasonable to interpret democracy as over 50% of adult is entitled to vote, either through direct or representative system, or in republic or constitutional monarchy; and there is the common law to promote justice and to protect the interest of minority, that is why democracy is considered as cause of peace. Democracy is seen as means to achieve better lives (Cheung Mung 06).

Peace is a situation or a period of time in which there is no war or violence in country or an area. Peace also means the presence of positive and respectful cultural and economic relationship. The extension of peace in international relationship is called pacifism, which oppose any form of war or violence as a means of settling disputes or gaining advantage, it is also called “anti-warism”. Peace is considered as the goal of human beings, it consists the absence of insecurity, fear of violence and hostility; and external peace involves the harmony relationship between people and countries without conflicts and physical fighting peace consists of internal peace: absence of insecurity, fear of violence and hostility, and outer peace: harmony relationship between people and countries without conflicts and physical warfare. This expresses that people should be equal in order to have the same stand point which lead us to liberalism.

Liberalism can be crudely defined as the “freedom for the individual” as it believes that humans are good-natured beings. Liberalism’s core ideals stress individualism, human rights, universality, freedom from authority, right to be treated equally under the protection of law and duty to respect and treat others as “ethical subjects” as well as freedom for social action. Closely connected to these individual freedoms is the concept of representative government as well as the importance of the ownership of private property, right to free economic activity without state interference (Doyle 208-206-207; Fukuyama 42-44).

Liberalism is defined by Doyle in his foundational 1983 article “Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs: “a belief in the importance of moral freedom, of the right to be treated and a duty to treat others as ethical subjects”(66) .This follows Kant’s concept of the categorical moral imperative introduced in 1785 and to which Doyle explicitly refers in

his article. Kant defined the two things needed to reach freedom in a liberal society: first, persons or nations must be enlightened, aware of their interests and how to secure them; second, political institutions must allow people's true interests to shape politics. This is secured by a meaningful political competition, Political and economic freedom takes shape in the following characteristics of democratic, liberal societies.

Liberalism and The Democratic Peace Theory are highly interrelated. Liberalism with its specific principles helps democracy follows the quest of keeping peace within the states there must be principles that will uphold the rights of every citizen. Meaning that liberalism is the dominant thought and citizens have the right over war decisions with a visible liberal presence, and that feature free speech and regular competition election of the officials empowered to declare conflicts. Liberalism tend to bring democracy and peace.

Though liberals believe that individuals everywhere are fundamentally the same and are best off pursuing self-protection and material well being when freedom is needed and peace is crucial. Which creates kind of harmony of interest among all them, each citizen must be allowed to follow his interests as long as they do not diminish another's freedom. Liberal scholars such as Kant focused on harmony between people overseen by institutions such as judiciary and the representative form of the government where leaders exercise their authority with the consent of "free people existing in a political order" (Doyle 209). As the liberal state is represented through sovereign government of the people, its sovereignty and integrity is not subject to any external control such as an authority (Doyle 213).

Democratic Peace Theory shows the relationship between democracy as a doctrine to govern nations and the seeking of peace worldwide, with its pivotal grounding of democratic

states never or rarely go to war against each other; it works to perceive democracy and liberalism as the core notions to lead to the responses desired. DPT states that if there is any sort of conflict between democratic states both of them would prefer to resort the conflict in a peaceful discussion rather than using military forces and armies. As a result, it is an extension of liberalism and thus strives to elaborate the mutual democratic pacifism (Osorio2).

The idea that democracy is the best defense against war and that all democracies maintain mutual peace, is very old. Kant in his essay *Perpetual Peace* had argued that republics would be less inclined to war than monarchies, because representatives of people would treat wars as hunting expeditions (Shea 88). According to Kant, in democratic states, the general public opinion will oppose war due to the costs that the mass population would be compelled to bear, hence leaders who make decisions for war will be removed and replaced with more pacifist individuals. Autocratic leaders, Kant reasons, do not hold power on the basis of election and therefore are unconstrained in pursuing a belligerent and violent foreign policy.

Those who argue in support of Democratic Peace offer two explanations in support of their hypothesis the cultural/normative explanation and the structural/institutional explanation. One explanation centers on the political culture of the democratic state. The other explanation focuses on the democratic political structure (Geller and Singer 85-88).

### **1.1. Structural/institutional explanation**

One of the two main alternatives of The Democratic Peace Theory, the structural account argues that it is the institutions of representative government, which hold elected officials

and decision-makers accountable to a wide electorate, that make war a largely unattractive option for both the government and its citizens (Russett 38-40). Because the costs and risks of war directly affect large sections of the population, it is expected that the average voter will throw the incumbent leader/party out of office if they initiate a losing or unnecessary war, because they could be replaced if they fail to maintain an adequate foreign policy. This view has been supported in the work of Geva Derouven and Minz(224)when concluding : “The major reason why the use of force against other democracies is counterproductive from a political standpoint is because it is perceived by the public as a failure of foreign policy ”A thus, providing a clear institutional incentive for democratic leaders to anticipate such an electoral response before deciding to go to war (Russett 21-22). The structural explanation concerned with how liberal institutions within a state encourage and participate in free debate, in theory removing the capacity of leaders to follow ambitions outside of the public interest. The decision to go to war taken within a liberal democracy must first pass through several constitutional institutions that place constraints on the ability to take quick, single-minded decisions. Hence, the liberal democracy is considered rational and allows the public to effectively control the decision to go to war.

This view does not assume that all citizens and elected representatives are liberal-minded, but simply that democratic structures that give citizens leverage over government decisions will make it less likely that a democratic leader will be able to initiate a war with another liberal democracy (Owen 123-24). Thus, even with an illiberal leader in place, institutions such as transparency and free speech, political pluralism, and competitive elections and legal rights will make it difficult and leaders to convince or persuade the public

to go to war (Mansfield and Snyder 23-27) and minimize the possibilities of governments creating false justifications in order to persuade population to declare war on other state, when thinking about democratic dyads, transparency is an important factor because it means that both states can clearly perceive or infer the others intention. Star (157) states: "such transparency means that each party has too much information about the other to create convincing enemy images, for either elites or masses" (Osorio 2-3).

## **1.2. The Normative / Cultural Explanation**

The next normative view argues that shared democratic and liberal values best explain the peace that exists between democratic states. According to this view, democratic political culture encourages peaceful means of conflict resolution which are extended beyond the domestic political process to other democratic states because leaders in both countries hold a reasonable expectation that their counterparts will also be able to work out their differences peacefully (Elman 11-12).

Political ideology, therefore, determines how democracies distinguish allies from opponents; this explanation maintains that common liberal and democratic concepts explain stability and peaceful relations between democratic states. According to this variant to this knowledge and culture regarding to democratic political values and means of conflict resolution, supports honest relations between states and their leaders.

In addition, these leaders expect that their counterparts will also understand the necessity of solving the differences without the use of violence methods, because democratic states are bound by cultural and social norms that call for non-violent resolution and negotiations

among them ,this perspective of one state by another could affect and modify the motivation for warmongering policies, this argument supported by Elman (13): “political ideology ,therefor determines how democracies distinguish allies from adversaries :democracies that represent and act in their citizens”interests are treated with respect and consideration whereas non-democracies that use violence and oppression against their own people are regarded with mistrust and suspicion ” .The importance of perception means that even if a particular state has ‘enlightened citizens and liberal-democratic institutions,’ unless other democratic states regard it as a genuine liberal democracy then the Democratic Peace proposition will not hold (Owen 96-97).

Although some scholars regard the institutional and normative explanations as mutually exclusive, a much more intuitive and persuasive defense of The Democratic Peace Theory emerges from combining these two viewpoints. Thus, the particular democratic practices that make war with other liberal democracies unlikely – free and fair elections, the rule of law, free press, a competitive party system – are driven by both ‘converging expectations about what conventional behavior is likely to be (institutions) and ‘standards for what behavior ought to be’ (norms).These two explanations are complimentary and mutually reinforcing: cultural norms influences the creation and evolution of political institutions, and institutions help generate a more peaceful moral culture over time (Mansfield and Snyder 29, Lee Ray 33-37) .

## **1.2. Background of the Democratic Peace Theory**

The DPT in essence is dependent on the notion of preserving world peace. It strives to spread democracy as a regime in order to achieve its purpose of maintaining the well being

of the world. The Democratic Peace Theory is the first political theory that was used as an international relation law. It is used as classic argument proposed by the liberal research tradition to deal with international affairs. The theory of Democratic Peace is based on the idea that it is possible to limit some negative aspects of anarchy in the international system by the spreading democracy as a regime to be followed by the world states, this is undoubtedly the most important aspect of its practical side. The theory can be traced far back into history to its root to democracy in its first appearance, where it can be traced back to ancient Greece 500B. It was the first representation of individual having the right of self determination. This gave the people the chance to choose their own ruling officials through making one of the most sacred rights for democratic states which is the vote.

Later in the enlightenment era, Charles Montesquieu, a French political thinker, in his writings he supported the advancement of politics from a monarchy to a separation of powers regime in respect of the norms of political order. Montesquieu has mostly focused on aspects of trade and its cause for spreading peace as he states in his book entitled *The Spirit of the Law* (1748) .Peace is the natural effect of trade. Two nations who traffic with each other become reciprocally dependent” .Furthermore; he regarded international relations to be highly influenced by commerce by modifying manners of both political and institutional implications, thus affecting world peace and the relationships existing between nations .Montesquieu believed that the ideology of nation expansion can be exchanged by the notion of peace and liberty with focus on balance of power and eventually peace will become true.

Going back to the first appearance of the theory, the most important figure to establish its philosophical side is the German philosopher Immanuel Kant in 1775, he was the first to



raise the frame work of The Democratic Peace Theory, in his article "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch" 1795. In his article he discusses many stand points of the theory with its significance to world peace and the international regulation on the international sphere.

This article is regarded as the base for and the starting point of contemporary liberal thought. These writings are Kant's peace program proposition, where he lists the 9 pillars for attaining perpetual peace stated clear as a foreground in each section of the book. The first pillar is: No secret treaty of peace shall be held valid in which there is tacitly reserved matter for a future war. The second one is: No independent states, large or small, shall come under the dominion of another state by inheritance, exchange, purchase, or donation, third one is: Standing armies shall in time be totally abolished. The fourth one is: National debts shall not be contracted with a view to the external friction of states the fifth one is: No state shall by force interfere with the constitution or government of another state

The sixth pillar is: no state shall, during war, permit such acts of hostility which would make mutual confidence in the subsequent peace impossible: such are the employment of assassins, poisoners, breach of capitulation, and incitement to treason in the opposing state. The seventh pillar is: The civil constitution of every state should be republican. The eighth pillar is that: The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states, the last pillar is: The law of world citizenship shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality (Kant 22).

Kant in his book argues that the state of peace between people living side by side is not a normal state, where there is always a constant situation and a permanent threat of aggression even if the state of war it is not always declared. If the situation of peace is to be

“recognized” and declared, ending of war is not a guarantee of peace, and if a neighboring country does not receive such a guarantee, there may be treated in an enmity. From this standpoint, Emmanuel Kant clarifies the question of Can there ever be lasting peace between these various nations, which are still in a state of primacy in their relationship with one another.

The idea of achieving lasting peace is a very good idea for all nations. With the notion of multiculturalism this does not prevent it from being realized, where at least it cannot be realized in the same way that philosophers and thinkers have imagined over time. This is one of the points agreed by Russell and Kant. Both of these writers have many common opinions on peace matter; Russell confirms the fact that people always tends to classify people as friends and enemies and Kant explains that normality is closer to war than peace. Thus some of the ideas he presented were utopian ideas, or philosophical wishes and dreams cannot be embodied as a reality in this life .even if Kant tried to make it as close to reality as possible.

Kant’s vision of perpetual peace is represented through democracy peace is conditioned by the spread out of democracy furthermore, this condition must be maintained by politics by political sphere between states with the recognition of the government being a representation of society and the notion of separation of powers .the core of the theory is democracy and it implies that global democracy would provide a solid foundation for a global peace. His theory is based on a theoretical world based on the idea that people will not decide to go to war unless there is a need to defend their own peace and themselves, and if all nations were democratic constitutional republics, there would be no aggressor nations and the war will not exist anymore. For Kant, the reluctance of the people to support war and its costs restrains democratic leaders from engaging in clashes with other nations (Furia33).

In late 18th century nationalism in Europe was highly prominent with the Napoleon war; it resulted in the building of hostile groundings that paved the way for the approaching war. Specifically in 1814 the Anglo French war ended napoleon ambitions of rule and the first international meeting which was the Congress of Vienna, attempted to falsify a peaceful balance of powers in the midst of European countries.

With the development that accrued at that period, specially by the 1917 the United states declared its engagement in WWI basing its intervention on preserving world peace under the presidency of Woodrow Wilson, which become later an essential part of his vision to a new world order .At that time also there were only few republics, and they were mainly in the western world such as: The United States, France, some Italian cities. Yet none of which were truly democratic states by today's principles.

Early 20th century, Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter stated that capitalism was a vital component that pushed modern states to inherent a peaceful nature , and thus economically favoring the elitist, thus as long as the states are in need of economic exchange thus the peace between them will be the result of this cooperation. Since WWI there has been a wide spread of literature that democratic states are peace loving but this notion was not highly discussed by social sciences, where the gradual spread of liberal democracy in the world into the second half of the 20th century have raised momentum and great deal of attention to the relationship between peace and read out of democracy. (1-9-39)

Following these years race to armament was highly present especially in European countries, such as Britain, Germany, France and Russia. The outbreak of WWI and WWII and the failure of League of Nations it broke the truth about balanced powers on the

international sphere and its effect on the preservation of peace. Starting from 1970's The Democratic Peace Theory had been rearranged, since its formal background was an ideology, its different stand points driven from liberalism and realism aroused a series of debates and researches, and influenced the view of political scientists.

By the ending of 1990's, the cold war was ended with the victory of the western democratic powers. And Democratic Peace Theory was sought to be not only a cause of peace prevailing but even on the academic sphere with the literature presented, it was foreseen as all nations should go for democracy so that world peace can be achieved.

In contrast to liberalism, its theoretical opponent realism does not attempt to show an optimistic picture of international affairs; in fact realism's main drive in international relations theory is to highlight the anarchic nature of international politics. The realists whom were dominant and their believe of balancing powers between states will result in the balancing of threat among them where war will be a last resort, liberalists presented the idea of harmony between people overseen by institutions such as judiciary and the representative form of the government where leaders exercise their authority with the consent of free people existing in a political order of the states, thus they searched to employ international institutions, international economic regimes, economic dependence and Democratic Peace Theory.

However, mentioning the facts that those countries, either democratic or nondemocratic, The DPT cannot be sought as source to the prevailing peace of that era. Putting more focus on post world wars I and II, relatively there was no great war among countries during these

period and since USA, Western Europe and Japan already formed the alliance after the war, so that there would be no war,

Furthermore, this did not mean there is peace among them. For example: The Korea War in 1950s, Vietnam War in 1960-70s, the British-Argentina Falklands War in 1980s, Gulf War in 1990s, and US-Afghanistan War in 2001, Iraq and USA invasion 200, air-force attack to Libya 2011, all this did not come up with a peaceful world. Most of the wars involved democratic nations such as United States and United Kingdom. It this resulted in what it seems that the DPT can only explain part of the history in a specific timeframe and clarify the notion of peace over the world but in a restricted ground.

### **3. Types of the Democratic Peace Theory**

DPT is one of the high-profiled political theories and it has made many substantial developments since its foundation, it became stronger and tackled in a diverse manner (Chan 2009). DPT now stands often for many conflicting theories. It deals with both interstate and intrastate relations and represents three prominent models: monadic, dyadic, and systemic. The division between these types is stated on the basis of whether state are likely to go to war or choose peace, and depending on the political regimes it follows, thus it gives insights and indications on if there is faith is the democracies to bring more peace and how the foreign policies are to be organized with the other states.

Quackenbush and Rudy argue that an evaluation of the democratic peace is necessary, for several reasons. First although most empirical analyses and

theoretical explanations have focused on the dyadic nature of democratic peace, arguments in favor of a monadic democratic peace have become increasingly prominent (Ofoe Doe 33-35). Unfortunately, empirical evaluations of the monadic democratic peace have tended to be bivariate and rely upon simple statistical tests such as comparison of means (Boian 8-36). Secondly, the 2001 attack by the United States and other democracies on Afghanistan and the 2003 attack by the United States and other democracies on Iraq are recent, very salient events that call for the monadic Democratic Peace argument to be re-examined (Quackenbush, Stephen 37-51).

### **3.1. Dyadic**

The dyadic version of the DPT is one of the most commonly accepted among DP theorists it states that democracies are peaceful with one another, but are just as likely to fight with non democratic. it is noted that democratic states have rarely fought other democracies, however there are plenty of examples of democracies fighting tyrannical states where democracies will often help and join other democracies in their conflicts against autocratic states (Doyle 205-235).

Modern political science first observed the dyadic Democratic Peace during 1970s. The observation enjoyed greater attention in the 1980s where the political scholar Michael Doyle in his writings offered support for it. He argues that liberal states are not pacific, as such, they are so only among themselves, but are aggressive against non-liberal states. In fact, the idea that “republics” progressively establish peaceful relations among themselves is, without a doubt, the nucleus of the dyadic version of democratic peace (Doyle 200).

There are different explanations of the dyadic theory, where the normative explanation regards that democracies do not fight against each other out of mutual respect for each other, where they reject the idea of forcibly conquering a fellow democracy. The other explanation is the structural explanation; it regards the dyadic modal to deal with conflicts with peaceful resolutions with making of compromises instead of violence, where the rule is for the majority with neglecting of extreme policies. With the dyadic modal leaders face audience where they are held accountable and thus it makes them honor commitments that presented to the people (Nardina 12-26).

Furthermore, explaining dyadic peace has two more versions, the first highlights Characteristics like transparency and audience costs to prove that democracies are more reliable in entering binding contracts. The second assumption postulates that democratic Leaders face a higher risk to be removed from office when they lose in conflict ( Müller 13). Finally, continuity in democratic institutions means that successor government remains bound by obligations undertaken by their predecessors. More positively, that there has not been any war between democracies despite a rapid growth in the number of democratic dyads within the international system (and thus an increase in the probability of conflict between democracies) (Maoz190) points to a significant trend: the incidence of conflict should gradually decline over time if more countries become democratic ( Russett and Oneal 114-16, 22-24). This is important not only because liberal democracies must still retain military force as a means to prevent or defend themselves from aggression in the current international system, but because democracies are more likely to receive challenges and threats to their security while this peace still remains 'separat' (Gelpi and Griesdorf 645-46).

### 3.2. Monadic

The monadic hypothesis, however, experienced growing support during the end of the 1990s, it states that in general democracies are more peaceful and less likely to go to war with any type of states (Elman 12-13). This is likely due to the fact that democratic states still function in a multi-regime world, where democracies have only recently gone from being a minority to the slight majority within the post-Cold War period. Thus politics, therefore, is still a necessary reality for most democratic states, particularly given the high levels of conflict between mixed regimes. Nonetheless, there are a number of important advantages for democracies such as: they are more likely to enter low-level conflicts than full-scale wars; more willing to refrain from escalating disputes into an actual war; and less likely to initiate the use of violence against another state thus keeping the social groundings intact (Russett 13-14).

On the other hand democracies that do initiate war are more likely to win than nondemocratic states. Because public support for war in democracies decreases considerably over time, there is a strong incentive for democratic leaders and decision-makers to not only choose to initiate only wars that they can win, but ones they can win quickly. The public opinion is extremely important (Reiter and Stam 10-11-178-79).

Although there are a number of notable exceptions, such as the USA-led wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Vietnam, this does suggest that the global spread of democracy would bring additional benefits beyond simply reducing the possibility of war between democratic states. This would include a greater number of low-level conflicts in proportion to full-scale wars, an increase in the number of states less likely to either initiate war or escalate non-



violent confrontations into war, and a greater number of short, successful wars as opposed to long and protracted wars. Thus, even though an increase in the number of democratic states may not reduce the overall number of democratic-nondemocratic conflicts, this should not detract from these largely positive qualitative changes one would expect to occur.

### **3.3. Systemic**

This theory states that ; as democracy grow, the international system as a whole becomes more peaceful. Although the Democratic Peace Theory is quite controversial and has both weaknesses and strengths, it provides a logical explanation for the peaceful relations with transparency and legitimacy, are not only peaceful with their neighbors, but towards their own populations; democracies do not engage in foreign or domestic violence, or genocide as the autocratic states do. A non-violent foreign policy is the direct result of a peaceful domestic policy consisting of civil rights, equal participation and a representative government.

Yet, there are undeniable weaknesses with the theory. In 1968, Karl Popper wrote, “every solution of a problem raises new problems; the more so the deeper the original problem and the bolder its solution. The more we learn about the world and the deeper our learning, the more conscious, specific, and articulate will be our knowledge of what we do not know our knowledge of our ignorance”(26-55). Perhaps the solution for a completely peaceful existence between nations will never be found but the Democratic Peace Theory still provides a necessary plausible description of this theoretical state of peaceful coexistence.

The 21st century assigns a great responsibility to the leaders of the nations to protect international stability and non-violent coexistence. The War on terror, as a worldwide problem, served to redefine international relations between nations and the norms for the use of violent means. Integration and democratization processes are more necessary than ever .using the implication of the theory could redefine the policies of democratic nations in order to obtain a global peaceful system.

**Works cited**

Ajin Choi, "The Power of Democratic Competition" *International Security* 28, no. 1

(Summer 2003):144-45, web.

Bill Clinton, "1994 State of the Union Address" *The Washington Post*, web, accessed on

10/02/2017.web.

Boian, Christopher "Russia Moves Toward Recognition of Georgian Rebel Zones" *Agence*

*France-Presse*, August 20, 2008 p.8.web.

Bruce Russett, "Democracy, War and Expansion through Historical Lenses" *European*

*Journal of International Relations* 15, no. 9 (2009): 11-12.web.

Cheung Mung, Simon. "What Is The Democratic Peace Theory? Do You Agree With It?

Why Or Why Not?" *Department of Global Political Economy The Chinese*

*University of Hong Kong*.1-15:(Oct 2002).Web Accessed 2017/03/05.

Christopher F. Gelpi and Michael Griesdorf, "Winners or Losers? Democracies in

*International Crisis, 1918–94*" *American Political Science Review* 95, no. 3

(September 2001): 633-34.web.

Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam, *Democracies at War* (Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University

Press, 2002), 10-11.web.

Doyle, Michael W. "Liberalism and World Politics", *The American Political Science*

*Review*, Vol. 80, n. 4., 1986. pp. 1151-1169. web.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs”, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, n. 12.1983, pp. 205-235, pp. 323-353.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*. New York: Norton & co. 1997.web.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs” *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, Vol. 12, No. 3 .1983 205-235.web

Elman, Miriam Fendius. “The Need for a Qualitative Test of the Democratic Peace Theory.”  
In *Paths to Peace: Is Democracy the Answer?*, edited by Miriam Fendius Elman, 1-57.  
Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1997.10-18.web.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992.Web  
Accessed 2017/01/08 .

Geller, Daniel & J. David Singer, *Nations at War: A Scientific Study of International Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 68-90:1998.Web.Accessed 2017/02/9.

Gelpi, Christopher F., and Michael Griesdorf. “Winners or Losers? Democracies in International Crisis, 1918–94” *American Political Science Review* 95, no. 3 (September 2001): 633-47.web.

Kant ,Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, 1795, Web.accessed 9/02/2017

Jack S. Levy, "Domestic Politics and War" in Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb, eds.,  
the Origin and Prevention of Major Wars, Cambridge: Cambridge University  
Press, 1989, p. 88. web.

Layne, "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace" 1994.12-13. web.

Lee Ray, James. "Does Democracy Cause Peace?" Vanderbilt University, Nashville,  
Tennessee. Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. 27-46:1998. Web. Accessed 2017/02/08.

Levy .S. Jack. "Domestic Politics and War" The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 18, no.  
(Spring 1988): 661-62. Web. accessed 2017/01/06.

Lewis, Andrew, "Montesquieu Between Law and History", published in Law and History.  
Volume 6, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. pages 83-95. web.

MacArthur, Douglas. "Frequently Asked Questions about Plato: Did Plato write "Only the  
dead have seen the end of war" ?" ED. Bernard Suzanne. First published May 16,  
1996:01. web. accessed 2017/02/09.

Mansfield and Snyder – "Democratization and the Danger of War(1995)" Foreign Affairs  
74:79-97 .June 1, 1997. Web. Accessed: 2017/01/02.

Maoz, Zeev. "The Controversy over the Democratic Peace: Rearguard Action or Cracks in  
the Wall?" International Security 22, no. 1. 1997: 162-98. web.

Melvin Small . David Singer. "International War An Anthology" 1989. Web. Accessed  
2017/02/01.

Mintz, Alex, and Nehemia Geva. 1993. "Why Don't Democracies Fight Each Other? An Experimental Study" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37(3): 484–503. Web. Accessed 2017/03/02.

Müller, Harald, and Jonas Wolff. "Dyadic democratic peace strikes back: Reconstructing the social constructivist approach after the monadic renaissance" Länk: [http://www.sgir.Org/conference2004/papers/Mueller% 20Wolff.2004](http://www.sgir.Org/conference2004/papers/Mueller%20Wolff.2004). web.

Osorio, Andres Eduardo Fernandez. "Democracies Do Not Fight Each Other. Why?" University College. London. 5-9:13 December 2012. Web Accessed 2017/01/06.

owen, John M, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19.2 (1994): 87-125. pdf.

Paul R. Hensel, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl, "The Democratic Peace and Rivalries," *The Journal of Politics* 62, no. 4 .November 2000: 1187. web.

Risse, Thomas. "Democratic Peace - Warlike Democracies?: A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument" Universiteit Brussel (2004). Web. Accessed 2017/01/03.

Robbins, Keith. *The Abolition of War: the Peace Movement in Britain 1914-1919*, University of Wales Press, accessed 03/02/2017. web.

Russett, "Democracy, War and Expansion through Historical Lenses," 2009. 13-14. web.

Russett, Bruce, and John R. Oneal. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001. 114-16, 22-24.web.

Shea, Christopher. "Who Wars With Whom". *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 88: July, 5<sup>th</sup>, 1996. Web. Accessed: 2017/01/04.

Singer, J. David. *The Historical Experiment as a Research Strategy in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge University Press 1977. 1-22 .web.

Small, Melvin., *The Applicability of Quantitative International Politics to Diplomatic History* 1976. 01 May 2009. 1.web.

Spinoza, Baruch. "Theological-Political Treatise". ED, Jonathan Israel. *Institute for Advanced Study*. Princeton (2007). Web. accessed 2017/02/18.

Spiro, D. The insignificance of liberal peace. *International Security*, 19(2), 1994. 50-86.web

Starr H.,. Democracy and integration: Why democracies don't fight each other. *Journal of Peace Research*, 34, 153-162: 1997. Web. Accessed 2017/03/09.

Strugliński, Damian "Strengths and weaknesses of the democratic peace theory: A critical evaluation." King's College London. School of Social Science & Public Policy. Department of War Studies. Accessed 26/02/2017. 1-5.web PDF.

Teichman, Jenny, *Pacifism and the Just War: A Study in Applied Philosophy*, Basil Blackwell, 1986. 12-45.web.

Kant, Immanuel, and Norman K. Smith. Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Boston: Bedford, 1929. Web.Accessed 2017/03/22.

Kant, Immanuel. Kant's Political Writings. 2d ed. Edited by Hans S. Reiss. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Web.Accessed: 2017/04/16.

Furia, Peter A., "Dispute Intensity, Degree Of Democratization and The Democratic Peace." Paper Presented At The Annual Meeting Of The Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Il, 33-46:April 1997. Web. Accessed 2017/09/02 .

Schumpeter, J. A. (1918–1919). Zur Soziologie der Imperialismen. Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, 46(1–39), 275–310. Web.Accessed 2017/01/30.

Quackenbush, Stephen L. 2006. Identifying opportunity for conflict: Politically active dyads. Conflict Management and Peace Science 23(1): 37-51:. Web. Accessed 2017/05/01

Ofoe Doe, Kingsley, A Critique Of The Democratic Peace Theory: A Case Study Of The Russo-Georgian War Of 2008. University of Ghana. 40-60:July2005. Web. Accessed 02/02/ 2017.

Nardina Terrye.Ed C. William Walldorf . Just Politics: Human Rights and the Foreign Policy of Great Powers.16-95.2002. Web Accessed 2017/01/12.

Müller, Harald. "The Antinomy of Democratic Peace" International Politics, ,41, (494-520) 2004. Palgrave Macmillan UK. Web.Accessed: 2017/03/6.



Popper K., Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge. New York: Harper Torchbooks. 26-55:1968. Web. Accessed 2017/01/3.

## **Chapter 2:**

### **The Title: USA Democracy Promotion and Democratic Peace Theory**

There are many concepts that can be referred to when engaging in any nation's history such as: war, conflict, power, and balance. War is generally introduced as an international conflict between communities in order to achieve political goals; the policies employed by any country have been the core interest of many scholars over time. The Democratic Peace theory is the most well established theory that defines the liberal democracies relationships with other states.

The problem of war and peace has been of primary political importance since the advent of time. The wars of the twentieth century and the beginning of the nuclear age have threatened the future existence of human society and reaffirmed the need for peace. While peace may indeed be the "end to all hostilities" (Reiss 93). As Kant famously proclaimed in the theory of Democratic Peace, peace cannot be considered valid if it is embedded in fears of a future war and it remains more complicated than war and the difficulty in maintaining peaceful relations between nations is evident throughout human history.

With the worldwide spreading of democracy after the Cold War, the moralities of democracy and respect of peace seems to guide international foreign policies. Scholars, policymakers, and commentators embraced the idea that democratization could become the key to world peace. Yet the question of whether democracy causes peace has been the focus of much investigation, and studies in recent years. Essentially all scholars agree that the

levels of violent conflict, especially wars, within democratic pairs of states are significantly lower than levels of violent conflict within other pairs of states.

### **1. The Democratic Peace Theory and the Spread of Democratic Regimes**

The Democratic Peace Theory seems to be supported throughout the whole world and it has gained a large momentum during the last century, especially with its large interconnectedness with democracy as a political system. This later has become largely widespread regardless of ethnicity, religion, or world region. DPT has contributed to the general international political practice; it has led to many new approaches used around the world.

This theory accepts democratic governance to be the only way which can build peace for a long time and any other forms of political system (i.e. autocracy, fascism, monarchy, and communism) are directly rejected to be eligible forms for peace. Democracy, ideological commitment to basic human rights and transnational interdependence are considered to be the three pillars of Democratic Peace statement. Moreover, in democratic governance, the power of decision making in a state is either going to war or not lies upon the people. The politicians need to draw a strong support in favor of war from its citizens before commencing a war.

People do not want to go to war because it is an additional burden to them in terms of security, economy and other calamities that are brought up to them by any war. Without the popular support, the leaders of the democratic countries cannot solely decide to go to the war because they are accountable to their citizens. Therefore, democratic states are reluctant to go to war and they try to solve any disputes in a peaceful way.

Democratic Peace Theory and its core democracy is embraced today more universally than ever. It is no longer what might once have been called 'traditional Democracy' or 'old democracy', It is rather appealed by a majority of states .The number of states qualifying as democracies has grown so much since the end of World War II. Whereas in 1950, there were about 20 democracies in the world, this number grew to 40 % by 1975, and to 120 out of the 193 states in today's world. Today democracy is more and more flourishing.

The largest increase in democracies' number has occurred in 1990s following the end of the Cold War and breakup of the Soviet Union. even most of the states which do not meet the basic democratic criteria of public participation and freedom of choice have found it very important at least to implement the vocabulary of democracy and claim some relevant political measures to legitimize their governmental systems and accord them as popular, representing the will of the majority of their people. Many have pointed to the existence of some forms of 'pluralist representation' and 'electoral legitimacy' to show the popular sovereignty and ultimately a functioning democratic system of governance (Saikal 2).

By the late twentieth century many more countries possessed democratic institutions and applied the democratic system, they used the Democratic Peace Theory propositions also. These transformations have accrued in modern world as three waves of democratization. Each wave affected a number of countries.

The first wave of democratization had its roots in the American and French revolutions. During the nineteenth century, most countries developed gradually their democratic institutions, for this wave Jonathan Sunshine has provided two standards for achieving a minimal democratic qualification: the first is that 50 percent of adult males are

eligible to vote, second a responsible executive who either must maintain majority support in an elected parliament.

Following these criteria it can be reasoned that the first wave took place around 1828 in the US. It argued that the basic democratic principles were set as a blueprint of Clinton's presidency (Lagon Evolving U.S. Policy). In the following decades other countries gradually enlarged the suffrage, reduced plural voting, introduced the secret ballot, and established the responsibility of prime ministers and cabinets to parliaments. Several smaller European countries made the transition to democracy before the turn of the century such as: Switzerland, the overseas English dominions, France, Great Britain.

Shortly before World War I, Italy and Argentina followed by Ireland and Iceland were democratic. In the very early 1930 after the first wave had effectively ended, Spain and Chile moved into democratic column. In the course of a hundred years over 30 countries established at least minimal national democratic institutions. In 1920, James Bryce reviewed its history and speculated as to whether the "trend toward democracy now widely visible, is a natural trend, due to a general law of social progress" (Huntington 16-23).

The second wave started in World War II. A second short wave of democratization occurred. The United States during this period played a significant role in deepening and widening the range of democracy mainly in Western Europe. The allied occupation promoted initiation of democratic institutions in West Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan and Korea, while soviet developed democracy in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Later, after the Cold War. The United States encouraged European integration to stabilize the West European democracies,

and NATO was a barricade within which Italy, West Germany, Portugal, and Spain democratized (Lagon Evolving).

In the late 1940 and early 1950 Turkey and Greece moved toward democracy. In Latin America, Uruguay returned also to democracy. In four other Latin American countries Argentina, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela election in 1945 and 1946 supported popularly chosen governments. In all four countries, however, democratic practices did not last and dictatorships were replaced. Many of those countries failed in supporting the Democratic Peace Theory and its political systems. Meanwhile, in other countries such India, Sri Lanka, the Philippines democratic institutions were sustained for decade or more, and in 1960 Africa's largest state Nigeria began life as a democracy (Huntington 23).

The third wave; democratic regimes and liberalization started to replace authoritarian regimes. This takes place in every region of the world and was intensified by the fall of Communism. Democratic regimes replaced authoritarian ones in approximately thirty countries in Europe, Asia and Latin America. In 1970 and early 1980 also witnessed the final phase of European decolonization. The end of the Portuguese empire produced five nondemocratic governments.

In 1975, however, Papua New Guinea becomes independent with a democratic political system. In addition to the Gathering up what is mostly island of the British Empire produced a dozen tiny new nations, almost all of which maintained democratic institutions, although in Grenada these institutions had to be restored by outside military intervention. In 1990 Namibia became independent with a government chosen internationally supervised election.

Meanwhile in Africa and the Middle East movement to democracy in the 1980 was limited .Nigeria shifted back from military rule to a democratically elected government. By the 1990s some liberalization had occurred in Senegal, Tunisia, Algeria, Egypt and Jordan and democratic rumblings were occurring in Nepal, Albania and other countries whose previous experience with democracy had been modest or nonexistent.

Overall ,the movement toward democracy was a global one .In fifteen years the democratic wave moved across southern Europe ,removed through Latin America ,moved on to Asia ,and destroyed dictatorship in the soviet bloc . While in the early 1974 eight from ten of South American countries had nondemocratic governments. In 1990 nine had democratically chosen governments. In 1973 according to freedom house estimates 32 percent of the world's population lived in free countries, in 1976, as a result of emergency rule in India, less than 20 percent of the world's population did .By 1990, in contrast, close to 39 percent of humankind lived in free societies.

During the period from 1946 to 2011, the proportion of democracies increased from 28% to 58%, while there was a drop in the number of autocracies, from 27% to 13%and also of anocracies, from 45% to 29% .According to these findings it is “for the first time in human history that the global system is predominantly comprised of independent states and populated by democratic regimes “Out of all three regime types democracy proved to be the most resilient to regime transition. While some states keep changing the regime type fewer leave the democratic category. If this pattern is steady eventually the democratic category might encompass most of maybe all of the countries (Monty and Cole 11-12).

## 2. The Democratic Peace Theory Practice in the International Relations

As a part of the process in developing the DPT, states also create international governmental organizations which they use to avoid conflicts by a process negotiation reflecting their own domestic judicial system. Organizations such as the international court of justice, international criminal court, United Nations, and the European Union have all been created with the explicit goal of increasing the rule of law, diplomacy, and international cooperation and their main aim is to decrease the use of war as a solution for any conflict.

All of the principles of these international organizations were based mainly on the preferences of democracies and democratic systems .the significance of these administrations is to spread peace, build a peaceful relations and most central element is prevent war (Rear 6). By performing the function of the Democratic Peace in parliaments and judiciaries, they are capable of mediating conflicts between states; improving the exchange of information, as well as creating norms of peaceful resolution of conflict through internal mechanisms and diplomatic processes instead of military actions (Oneal 162-166).

In international diplomacy, states shared the same values join together for defense against possible threats to their ideology and because they can more dependably predict how their allies will act and count on them to be trustworthy (Oneal 59-60). The most prominent example of this phenomenon is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization created by the United States and its Western European allies following World War II to discourage Soviet aggression. The predisposition of ideologically similar states to form alliances is not limited to democracies, as the examples of the dynamics of military alliances that plays a further role in eliminating any chance that democracies will declare war upon each other (Rear 7).



What is noticeable in the world politics is that most of the leading countries in the world are presently democracies, and their political practices have a crucial impact on the rest of the world's countries, and the international system as a whole. The direct linkage between democracy and peace is recognized by the Democratic Peace Theory. It helped to establish democracy promotion as a common feature of international politics and the idea of democracy promotion also follows the characteristics of the Democratic Peace Proposition which implies a vision of worldwide inter-state peace once democracy is the predominant political regime of the international system (Bouchet 572).

Since democracy promotion gained a prominent status, related political practices started to have a major impact on international relations. There is a broad range of democratic promotion practices which can vary enormously specifically relation to one thing –if military means are used or not such as:

a) **Non-Military Democratic Promotion**

In the eye of democratic politicians, democracy precise equal peace promotion very often equals peace promotion, democratization has been predominantly perceived as a “one-way ticket” to more peaceful domestic political order and external relations of a state. However, empirical studies on this matter are rather ambiguous. On one hand, empirical findings confirming the presupposed peaceful impact of democratization, in which the process of democratization reduces the probability of a country to be involved in war .In the other hand, states that have recently undergone democratic transition are much more war-prone than states that have not gone through regime change (Mansfield and Snyder 13).

Peaceful democracy promotion practices include various kinds of assistance that would help build a nation's capacity for democratic governance such as the most common practice is free election assistance. Such activities can be carried either by national governments or by various intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), like the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), or the Organization of American states (OAS). These IGOs usually provide states with monitoring, supervising, organizing, and legitimizing free elections .the actual effect of their judgment is quite substantial since it can decide if a government or political leader will be recognized as legitimate by the international community (Bridoux 235).

In situation when a dictator take hold of power from a fairly elected government ,the IGOs can isolate or remove this dictator .the OAS helped to prevent or reserve military coups in Paraguay 1996,Ecuador 200and Venezuela 2002.moreover ,the IGOs have the right and ability to impose variety of economic and political sanctions on a government that gained power in an undemocratic manner or that violated severely human or political rights of its citizens .like the case of Syria ,Iran ,Burma ,and Belarus.

In 2003,the IGOs discovered that Iran had established a program to enrich uranium, that what lead IGOs to sense the threat that Iran could use it in producing a deadly weapons .so it tried to persuade Iran to follow THE Non-proliferation treaty principles which allow Iran to process uranium only for peaceful purposes. in 2006 the IGOs imposed Sanctions in response to Iran lack of cooperation .the IGOs implemented the sanctions imposed by the UN consisting of a travel ban, arms embargo, freezing of assets and commodity boycotts but decided to more broadly interpret the instructions indicated by UN resolution and extended

the assets freeze and travel ban to 23 new targets, including individuals and companies than the list was extended in 2001-2009 to reach 79 targets in June (Olejníková 47).

In the case of Syria, following Tunisia and Egypt and Libya, Syrian requests for political rights were expressed in organized protests in Homs and Aleppo. The protests mounted and violence soon became central in the conflict, with national forces shelling districts of cities and being accused of using violence indiscriminately against citizens. What ends with open civil conflict. Two years later government was targeting civilians with chemical weapons. So IGOs sent a warning statement to the government to respect human rights and refrain from using violence, after the statements fell on deaf ears, the IGOs decided to impose sanctions against Syria and persons responsible for violence against civilians including Assad's family and 179 individuals and 53 entities.

The IGOs extend not only the list but also the travel ban and financial restrictions were extended to include a ban on the import of crude oil, the suspension of new investments of the European investment bank, and the suspension of gold and minted coin imports, the bank of Syria, but these sanctions did not help to change the civilians suffering and sorrows especially when the targets have significant external support and the senders of the sanctions have a reduced leverage and reduced capacity to control the flow of goods and the movement of people across the borders. In this case, the role of sanctions is merely to contain an active conflict and to keep the attention of the international community on events and to send the signal that there is a line between acceptable and unacceptable behavior (Gleditsch et al 14).

### **b) Military Democratic Promotion**

As it is stated by the theory of Democratic peace, democracies rarely initiate war they do get involved very often in ongoing wars, the democratic involvement in large-scale wars is ,however ,not as frequent as the use of military intervention, often pursuit for the purpose of human rights protection and spread peace and democracy promotion allegedly. Intervention can be carried out for various self-interest reasons .however; the humanitarian interventions have become predominant.

Interventions have become a regular and quite popular tool of foreign and international policy as a low-scale alternative to war and it have increased with the end of the Cold War along with utilization of democratic ideas for its justification, promotion of democracy, peace keeping, help in humanitarian crisis or protection if civilians before their own governments .these interventions can carried out unilaterally by democratic or by organization like NATO for example.

The US however has a key role in this field since majority of military interventions were initiated by the US government. Since the September 11 attacks on the United States, most people in the world agree that the perpetrators need to be brought to justice, without killing many thousands of civilians in the process. But unfortunately, the US military has always accepted massive civilian deaths as part of the cost of war. The military is now poised to kill thousands of foreign civilians, in order to prove that killing US civilians is wrong. These military interventions leads to destabilization of the regime of the target country and regime change is likely to take place .if the intervener is democratic the change is likely to go in a democratic direction .however the democratic improvement appears to be only in the first

year after the intervention The military intervention in Iraq accounts for something quite different than humanitarian intervention, eventually it was presented as a project of forced democratization, however the true motive and aims of the US establishment still remains (Gleditsch 40-41).

The US invasion of Iraq in 2003 was the most controversial foreign policy Decision in the Post Cold War era .Much of the controversy derives from the fact that George W. Bush and his administration failed to provide a sufficient and coherent explanation of the leading cause for them to enter into this war. A set of entirely different explanations were articulated in order to justify violation of Iraqi sovereignty and large-scale war. First, the US Intelligence brought to light evidence that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), and that Saddam Hussein can possibly provide support for Al Qaeda. Saddam Hussein, and his regime were proclaimed to be of a great danger to the US, and George W. Bush called for a pre-emptive strike.

### **c) Humanitarian Interventions Democratic Promotion**

The international intervention were directly against domestic authoritarian regimes that were using extreme military means to suppress their own citizens and thus committing a large violation of human rights in. the best two cases are of Kosovo and Libya .

The military intervention in Kosovo against the Milosevic authoritarian regime of Serbia was carried out by NATO after a year of ongoing war in the area with a long history of ethnic violence .the explicit goal of the operation was to “halt a humanitarian catastrophe and restore stability(NATO 2004). the alliance lead to quick withdrawal of Serbian forces from Kosovo and shortly after its defeat the Milosevic regime collapsed .the multinational

peacekeeping mission was introduced to secure fragile peace that was occasionally disrupted by the occurrence of ethnic violence .the intervention followed by transitional UN administration brought stability to the state of Kosovo and consequently helped to stabilize south-eastern Europe. The whole process graduated in 2008 when Kosovo declared independence and later democratization of the country.

In Libya wide civil uprising against al-Qaddafi in 2011 when he used all the power he had to suppress the uprising and responded with a brutal crackdown on the Libyan citizens. the reaction of the international community was : the UN security council imposed economic and political sanctions followed by a no-fly zone over Libya ,and the Arab league suspended Libya from its session .in consequence to nonstop violence ,the humanitarian intervention was authorized by the UN allowing UN number to take all the necessary measures to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas under threat of attack in the Libya .finally in 2011 Libya is recently undergoing democratic regime after the fall of the Qaddafi role (Fisher and Biggar 699).

### **3. Democratic Peace Theory and the USA Foreign Policy**

The USA has historical traditions to the democracy spreading in the world. Since the era of the founding fathers, American leaders had a mission to promote democracy aboard, but in practicing these ambitions have been characterized by self interest and is American strategic interests in terms of economic and security benefits. American leaders have more than ever tried to implement this tradition mission into policies in their foreign affairs to promote Democratic Peace aboard, Such as Governor Bill Clinton statement calling for “an American foreign policy of engagement for democracy” Throughout his campaign and since becoming

president, Clinton has continued to emphasize the democracy promotion theme (Carothers23-38).

American foreign policy has been influenced by concept of identity and power and this identity has been shaped by three elements of democracy, liberal rights and capitalism .thus, the role of democracy promotion in US foreign policy has been pressured by US domestic politico economics model and capitalist economy. Over five decades in modern history of US after the end of the Cold War and the end of contradictions with soviet union, US democracy promotion has intensified and has attempt to export the American model of liberal democracies based on institutions building ,free market, focus on elections ,rule of law ,civil society support and protection of fundamental rights .

American leaders have emphasized the promotion of democracy abroad as a key element of America's international role. President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed that America was fighting World War I ``to make the world safe for democracy." In the 1920s and 1930s, US politicians cast the various military interventions in the Caribbean and Central America as missions to establish democracy. In World War II, America fought against fascist tyrannies in the name of freedom. US officials of the postwar period emphasized democracy promotion as they formulated a policy toward a vanquished Japan and Germany and then framed the emerging Cold War as a struggle to preserve ``the Free World." In the early 1960s, President John Kennedy embraced the idea of a noble campaign to foster democracy in the developing world. Two decades later, President Ronald Reagan renewed the democracy theme by casting his ardent anti-Soviet policy as a democracy crusade. In the 1990s, Presidents George

Bush and Bill Clinton asserted that democracy promotion was a key organizing principle of US foreign policy after the Cold War (Jackson 12).

President Woodrow Wilson was the first to embrace DPT as the foundation of US grand strategy. In 1917 Woodrow Wilson supported his request of Congress for a declaration of war against Germany which he called a 'natural foe to liberty' with the immortal words 'the world must be made safe for democracy'. President Wilson's belief in the virtues of freedom was so strong that he saw the spread of liberal democracy not just as a worthy cause that the US should passively promote, but also as a reason in itself to go to war (Jackson 35).

President Ronald Reagan also was the first to truly position the ideology of democracy as a guiding principle of US foreign policy in the belief that freedom could defeat the evil empire of the Soviet Union. The Reagan administration subsequently formulated the strategy of democracy promotion establishing much of the infrastructure of democracy as the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) and implementing reform initiatives in countries as diverse as the Philippines and Chile and Poland. The actual role of democracy promotion in Reagan's foreign policy was jagged; it evolved substantially, from the early line of accepting anticommunist dictators as necessary allies to a limited but growing willingness to support democracy against dictators of either the left or the right.

The end of the Cold War gave rise to the appealing notion that the traditional tension in US foreign policy between real political security interests and Wilsonian moral interests was over. Both President Bush and President Clinton, along with their top foreign policy advisers, repeatedly declared that in the reconfigured world, promoting democracy serves not only moral interests but also practical ones, thereby linking the longstanding realist-idealist



divide. Democratic governments, they asserted, do not go to war with one another, produce refugees, or engage in terrorism. They make better trade partners and further pragmatic US interests in other ways as well. As Clinton declared in his second State of the Union address in 1995, "ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere"(cited in Owen 123).

The democracy rhetoric escalated across the decade, leading to sweeping, utopian declarations such as Clinton's prediction in his second inaugural addresses that, "the world's greatest democracy will lead a whole world of democracies." In 1994, in the association situation speech Clinton declared that democracies never go on war with each other. He meant that it is better for our security and peace to support the progress of democracy in the world. In fact, Clinton wanted a kind of democracy which is called pragmatic idealism. This kind included use of force for expansion of democracy. For instance, the operation for support of democracy in Haiti named Operation Uphold Democracy.

After Clinton, Bush administration decreased its support for such policies that has continued in regions like Balkans. But after eleventh September a turning point happened in American foreign policy about nation-making and promotion of democracy especially in the Middle East (Mirtorabi 76). Bush's policy especially focused on Egypt, Indonesia, Liberia, Russia, Ukraine, Venezuela and Iraq and the major focus was on democratization in the Middle East. Bush's advisors have said that the policy of democracy promotion is for the whole of the world. Some believe that there has been a stronger link between democratization and American foreign policy. Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush and Bill Clinton concentrated on democracy with realistic elements. But his policy was

different and he put stress on militarism, focuses on the Middle East and related it to war on terror. George Bush invalidated the policy by Iraq war.

A minority of Americans support this policy. Although Bush claimed that invasion to Iraq was a democratization policy, but this is a controversial issue inside and outside of the US and after few years of attack no reasonable justification has been brought for considering this policy as democratization. Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney believe that this attack was for verification of American power after eleventh September and destruction of weapons of mass destruction of Iraq. They claim that America has more limited interest in Iraq after Saddam. On other hand, Paul Wolfowitz, deputy of Bush's secretary of defense believes that the purpose of attack was democratization. He adds America wanted Iraq to be a loyal country to the west and with its democratization becomes a model for the region and activates democratization all though this claim has not been true for Iraq and even the recent developments in the region shows that the process of democratization has no roots in American liberalistic values (Carothers 77).

However, security and economic interests still often point US policy in a contrary direction. In more than a few countries, including Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, China, Indonesia (before the fall of President Suharto in May 1998), Armenia, and Azerbaijan, the Bush and Clinton administrations downplayed democracy and pursued friendly relations with governments for the sake of interests ranging from oil and trade relations to regional security and stability. Democracy promotion remains at most one of several major US foreign policy interests, sometimes complementary to but sometimes in competition with other, stronger interests.

#### **4. Democratic Peace Theory as Justification For USA Foreign Policy Interests And Methods**

The policy of democracy expansion has been of interest of the US administration from the beginning, especially after Wilson. America always has looked at liberal democracy from a value-oriented posture and has tried to expand it in the world based on its hard and soft powers. Although American statesmen always introduce it as public good for other nation, but this policy in fact, serves mainly Americas vital interests, America reaches to its identity in international system via this policy.

Democracy always has been defined in American policy for foreigners as a value and ideal type. They claim that because of their historical background in this regard, they have an obligation for its promotion. But American interests are more than others in this regard and in many cases it is a pretext for American intervention in other countries. Clinton's secretary of state made a statement as it is said, the policy of democracy expansion is not a duty for the US, but it is an intelligent policy that propels American interests (Ikenberry et al 33).

Woodrow Wilson reports to congress showed that America must create a safe world for democracy and this is not just because of its moral dimension, but democratic states are better colleagues than monarchies or dictatorships and serve better the American interests, Tony smith, professor at American history, believes that America created a framework in the twentieth century that democratization has a major role in it. In this framework the emphasis is on law institutions and self determination for forming the world order that America wants, all of these efforts were part of the strategy of democracy promotion. It means that promotion of liberalism in democratic form is necessary for the future of American order (Lenon 2-3).

When US governments are going to try to promote democracy in another country, they typically reach for various tools. The officials may use diplomatic measures, as either carrots or sticks: criticizing a government that is backtracking from democracy, praising a democracy leader, granting or withdrawing high-level diplomatic contacts in response to positive or negative developments. Also, they may apply economic tools, again as carrots or sticks: economic pressure, such as sanctions, on governments that crush democracy movements. Finally, use economic rewards, such as trade benefits or balance-of-payments support for governments taking steps toward democracy. In extreme circumstances, the United States may even employ military means to promote democracy, intervening to overthrow a dictatorship and install or re-install an elected government—although US military interventions that politicians justify on democratic grounds are usually motivated by other interests as well (Carothers 60).

Democracy promotion can be defined in the form of American vital and fundamental interests. American national interest has three elements: First, maintenance of the US security especially by military means. Second, continuing American economical success and associating and accelerating cooperation with friendly countries. Third, maintenance of the stability of the ruling system in the world .This set of three elements serves the interests of the US Democracy promotion by the following methods serves the American interests. Democracy expansion has its first priority in keeping America's hegemony. American administration believes that the power of a great power declines when it stops to support an idea. Without this idea other countries face better with America and reach to equilibrium (Lenon 5).

Democracy promotion and agreement with American values: The measure of democratization for America is faithfulness to liberalism norms. Adherence to liberalism norms and principles will result in democracy promotion which creates players that are in agreement with American values and have no challenge for American vital interests. The acceptance of liberalistic norms serves reinforces and reproduces norms of the system. If the performance of individuals takes place in accordance with the framework of the principles of democracy then the cost of its maintenance increases dramatically. In fact, the promotion of liberalistic values causes the continuity of the order of after the Cold War. Therefore, acceptance of the norm serves American interests (Dehshyar 9-10).

Democracy promotion and peace: This is a proverb in international relations literature that democracies never go on war with each other. Democratic peace is one of the fundamental based of American foreign policy. American policy makers have reiterated it repeatedly. Clinton calls democracy the pillar of its foreign policy. Designers of American foreign policy based on Democratic Peace thesis which was presented in 1930 decade, believe that when there are more links between players, there are more channels for peaceful dispute settlement.

Democracy and public diplomacy: Today, public diplomacy is one of the most important parts of diplomacy. Public diplomacy affects governments indirectly by addressing its people. Influence of people over authoritarian regimes is not simple. Therefore democratization is a prerequisite for public diplomacy and influence of people over their governments. America follows public diplomacy through the channel of democratization.

War on terrorism: Neoconservatives believe that democratization hinders the growth of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. They believe that because Islamic fundamentalists have not been successful in reaching to their goals in their countries, they try to justify the military interventions through this believe. George Bush's remarks in his inauguration speech in 2004 in the congress, shows this link between terrorism and democratization in the Middle East. Bush said: Until the time that the Middle East is a region under dictatorship and hopelessness and wrath, it grows people and movement that threaten USA and our friends. Therefore America follows freedom promotion in the Middle East (Mirtorab 76).

America tries to justify its wars Based on this reason. But academic studies do not show such a relationship. In many cases Islamic fundamentalists fight because of their rulers' dependence to America. In some countries democratization has worked against Americas will. Palestine election in 2005 and Hamas victory, Iraq election. are some examples. Robert Pape in his new book titled *Dying for victory: The strategic logic of suicide terrorism* writes: suicide attacks are nearly for all democratic countries, but the motivation of attackers is self determination and fight against occupation. Their motivation is not making democracy, but refusal of foreign domination (Gause 5).

Democracy as a solution for Arab-Israeli peace: Israel security always has been one of major principles of American foreign policy. In the Middle East one of the reasons for democratization is finding a solution for Arab-Israeli problem. Sharansky say in his book that: There is no hope for Arab-Israeli peace, unless Arabs go towards democracy. Shimon Perez as a leftist in the book titled *New Middle East* and Benjamin Netanyahu as a rightist in his book titled *Position of Nations* talk about democracy as a solution for peace with

Palestinians. This democracy is based on expansionism and believes a long time is needed for democratization and in this time Israel can dominate over all of the Palestinian lands (Shahidi Analysis of).

### **5. USA Democracy and Interventions in the Middle East**

In the past twenty years, democracy promotion has been a particularly significant part of US foreign policy. The expansion of democracy that began in Southern Europe, spread to Latin America and parts of Asia, and then accelerated dramatically with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the breakup of the Soviet Union. Dictatorship around the world has fallen and societies as diverse as Bolivia, Bulgaria, Mongolia, and Malawi have attempted transitions to democracy, the US government has frequently responded with support. Its democracy related policies and programs have been prompted by the global movement toward democracy.

There are many events that have raised questions about the extent to which military intervention promotes democracy and the degree to which this depends on the nature of the intervene .these issues is best obtained by focusing on the policies of the target state that have the greatest implications for the political survival of the intervening state's leader and the kind of governmental institutions in the target state that are most likely to produce them. This perspective generally predicts that third party military intervention in civil wars, other intra- or interstate disputes and wars will lead to little if any improvement, and all too often erosion in the trajectory of democratic development (Bueno and Downs 628).

America has been a driving force in the Middle East and North Africa with respect to supporting America's national interests. It has supported non-democratic regimes and some regimes that were not necessarily well respected in the Middle East. Examples include Gulf

State regime, Saudi Arabia, the early Saddam regime, Morocco, Algeria, etc. As a result, many in the Middle East question the motives of the United States and its desire to establish democracy in the Middle East (Carothers 35).

The democratic transformation of the Middle East emerged as a central objective of US foreign policy during the Bush administration. This new policy is a sharp reversal of several decades of steadfast support for many autocratic regimes in the region. It reflects the new post-9/11 conventional wisdom that Middle East democracy which is the best solution to Islamist terrorism. Although this desire for democracy may be heartfelt, the United States has a lengthy laundry list of other priorities in the region such as: access to oil, cooperation and assistance on counterterrorism, fostering peace between Israel and its neighbors, stemming the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and preventing Islamist radicals from seizing power.

Democracy in the Middle East was viewed much more differently before and after September 11. After the attack, people's consideration in the US and in the European policy communities changed their point of view about democracy in the Middle East and understood that it highly lacks it. This resulted in the reflection that the lack of democracy is the major reason of violence in the area thus having security problems. In order to demolish the roots of terrorism, a policy priority should focus on promoting political reform and eradicate Islamic radicalism. Therefore democratization in the district is very important (Carothers and Ottaway 3).

US interest in the Middle East have by far exceeded any other region in the world, its promotion for stability and the security of allies its and also maintaining the free flow of oil have caused a lot of controversial debates. Its call for limitation of weapons of mass



destruction and flying arms as a counterpart to terrorism is one if its core actions to encouraging allegedly a peaceful world.

Yet these interests can be seen on another angel such as the process of the settlement between Israel and the Arab states. As today we witness the collaboration between Saudi Arabiya and the new president Donald trump. “Air Force one touched down earlier Saturday at the King Khalid airport in Riyadh, where Mr. Trump was greeted on a red carpet-bedecked tarmac by Saudi King Salman bin Abdul Aziz Al Saud and other high-level Saudi officials. The grand welcome — which featured a military brass band and a fighter jet flyover — demonstrated just how highly anticipated Mr. Trump’s arrival was to this Middle Eastern kingdom” as it is reported by Megan Palin a reporter for the news calling it *A ‘SWORD’ dance, curtsy to the king and an ‘unconvincing’ speech.*” As well as Israel and Palestinians .with the US s commitment to Israel s security because Israel is an important key component in projecting US national and military and economic interests in the region, and it has often done that by supporting illegitimate regimes a situation that still.

## **6. Conclusion**

The future of democracy promotion as part of US foreign policy is uncertain. Under George W. Bush, democracy promotion has been widely discredited through its close association with the Iraq war and preventing terrorism post 9/11 era. Only a minority of the US public now supports democracy promotion as a US foreign policy goal.

Getting the United States back onto a better track with regard to democracy promotion will not be easy. The damage that Bush’s administration has wrought in this domain is considerable. Bush policies have engendered powerful suspicions abroad about the very idea both of the United States as a democracy promoter and of democracy promotion itself. This

is true especially in the Middle East, mainly Iraq as the focal region of the Bush democracy drive.

Antidemocratic leaders on several continents are taking advantage of these sentiments to mount a serious push back against Western democracy support programs and policies. These facts, together with the general loss of momentum of democracy's third wave of spread out, make this the most daunting environment for democracy promotion in this generation.

Finally, although many Americans have been soured on the idea of democracy promotion due to Iraq, the US public maintains a belief in the sorts of underlying principles, such as multilateralism, US global engagement, and the importance of human rights, that a new administration can use as the building blocks for rejuvenating public support for democracy promotion (Carothers 7-32).

## Works cited

Abulof and Goldman: The Domestic Democratic Peace in the Middle East .IJCV: Vol. 9 (1)

2015.2-5.web.

Bridoux,jeff. "Us Foreign Policy and Democracy Promotion: in Search Of Purpose"

.international relations .vol.27 no.2.2013.235.web.

Bouchet Nicolas 2011 "barack Obama s democracy promotion at midter"vol.15,no.4:572.

Bueno ruce de Mesquita and George W'I Downs . Development and democracy .Foreign

Affairs, Vol. 84, No. 5 .New York (Sep. - Oct., 2005), pp. 77-86

Carothers, Thomas. "A League of their Own," Foreign Policy July-August Clinton, William

Jefferson (1994) State of the Union.accessed 12 March2017 .web.

Carothers, Thomas. "Democracy Promotion under Clinton." Critical Mission: Essays on

Democracy Promotion, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington,

D.C., 2004, pp. 23–38.web.

Carothers,Thomas."Aiding Democracy Abroad The Learning Curve .Carnegie Endowment

for International Peace .Washington.December 31, 1999p:22-60.web.

Carothers.Thomas, Marina Ottaway"Funding Virtue: Civil Society Aid and Democracy

Promotion". Wshigton,October 27, 2000.03.web.

Cox M, Ikenberry J and Inoguchi, T. American Democracy Promotion, Impulses, Strategies,

and Impacts. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000P :33.web.

Dehshyar, H. 'Hobbesians Liberal in America's Foreign Policy and Promote Democracy in the Middle East'. *Middle East Studies Quarterly*, Spring 2005p:9-10.web.

Fisher, David and Nigel Biggar .Was Iraq an unjust war ?Adebate on the Iraq war and reflections on Libya. *International Affairs*87(3):2011.687- 707.web.

Gause III, F. 'Can Democracy Stop Terrorism?'. *Foreign Affairs*. September/October 2005.5..web.

GleditschL,Nils Petter and Håvard Hegre. *DemmocraticJihad, Military Intervention and Democracy*. *WorldBankPolicyResearch /Working Paper*4242,2007:1-62.web.

Huntington.Samuel P. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* .University of Oklahoma Press. 1991 16-23.web.

Jackson,Jennifer.*Democratic Peace Theory: An Appropriate Guide to Foreign Policy*,University of Kent.Jun 2<sup>nd</sup> 2011, 3-45.web.

Lagon, Mark P.*The Whys and Hows of Promoting Democracy:Evolving U.S. Policy*.Georgetown University School of Foreign Service. February 11, 2011 .1.web.

Lenon, A. 'Democracy in US Security Strategy: From Promotion To Support'. London: Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS )March. 2009.p :2-5.web.

Mansfield, E.D. and J. Snyder. *Electing To Fight. Why Emerging Democracies Go To War*.Cambridge: MIT Press .2005.web.

Marshall, Monty and Benjamin R. Cole. *Global Report on Conflict, Government and State Fragility*, Vienna, VA USA: Centre for Systemic Peace, 2011. P: 11-12. web

Mirtorabi, S. 'Oil and Democracy in Middle East'. *Middle East Studies Quarterly*, no. 52, winter and spring 2008: 76. web.

Monty G. Marshall and Benjamin R. Cole. *Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility Global Report*, 2014, 10. web.

Olejnřková, Lenka Barbora. *Democratic Peace in Theory and Practice*, Charles University in Prague. 2012, 26-30. web.

Owen, John M. "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19.2 (1994): 87-125. Pdf.

Rear, Patrick G. "Democratic Peace Theory as Applied to Europe and the Middle East," *Global Tides: Vol. 7*, Article 4. 2013. 6-7. web.

Reiss, H. *Kant's Political Writings*. Cambridge: CUP 1971 p. 93. web.

Rieffer Barbara Ann J. and Mercer Kristan. "US Democracy Promotion: The Clinton and Bush Administrations." *Global Society*, vol. 19, no. 4, 2005. 385. web.

Russett, Bruce, and John R. Oneal. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001. 162-166 & 59-60. web.

Saikal,Amin & Albrecht Schnabel ed., Democratization in the Middle East: Experiences,  
Struggle, Challenges .New York: United Nations University Press, 2003 p2.web.

Shahidi, F. Analysis of the dual behavior of America with Democracy. Thought Club  
Website. 2005.1.web.

## **Chapter Three:**

### **The Case Study: USAI Intervention in Iraq**

The American invasion of Iraq in 2003 had begun, according to the view of the American government and their allies, as a legitimate, defensive response to the threat of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), which the Saddam Hussein government allegedly had in its arsenal. Saddam Hussein's government was immediately perceived as a threat and an affront to the international community in the wake the September 11, 2001 bombing of the World Trade Centre. America has found a casus belli to go to war under the so-called "war on terrorism" slogan.

According to the United States of America, there was a strong linkage between Saddam Hussein and international terrorism and the first priority of the United States government is to protect its citizens and its political and economic interests; its national security is always paramount. Also, the United States significantly supports democratic governments around the world and the Baathist regime was seen as totalitarian and undemocratic. Consequently, regime change in Iraq became the USA priority and the only way to achieve that was through the use of force. The Iraqi regime was a threat to the national security of America and America and its allies had to launch a pre-emptive strike at the heart of the Baathist outfit and remove the existential threat that it represented to America and the free world(Angle and Liss Report: Hundreds of).

In the post 9/11 era there has been an increase in the political and academic discourses calling on the United States to impose democratic regimes by force. In most of these

discourses there has been reference to DPT. This chapter light is going to shed on the attempts of the USA to impose democracy by force basing on the propositions of the Democratic Peace Theory.

The relations between the USA and Iraq countries during war have always been between restoration on one hand and deterioration on the other hand. There were four presidents who ruled Iraq and each of them had different policy towards the United States and the West. Therefore, the United States had also different policies towards Iraq in return. Not surprisingly, the most significant period in which the US-Iraqi relations reached its peak was during Saddam Hussein's presidency.

The fact is that Iraqi-US political relations have been affected by all events that happened in the region. The USA had armed Iraq in the Iran -Iraq war. Yet with the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the United States used force against its ally. So, the US-Iraqi relations have deteriorated because of invasion of Kuwait and Saddam Hussein's refusal to comply with the UNSC regulations and international community.

### **1. Relation between Iraq and USA before 9/11**

Iraq was created out of three past Ottoman Empire states that were gathered by the British rule as a British mandate post World War II, this country was later ruled by the King Faisal which was chosen by England and declared as a British backed monarchy.

The first phase of USA-Iraqi relations was defined by the political instability in Baghdad that came in the wake of the fall of the Iraqi monarchy in 1958. The United States pursued interlocking goals in Iraq. On behalf of USA political and economic interests in the country



and the region, USA officials sought a stable political relationship with the government in Baghdad, aimed to prevent the rise of communism within the country and to deny the Soviet Union influence there, and strove to prevent Iraq from becoming a source of regional conflict or war. In that time the USA leaders showed little support for democracy in Iraq or the advancement of its people, eschewing any such liberal political goals on behalf of the primary objective of keeping Iraq free of communism.

For several years after the 1958, USA officials accrued some successes in achieving its goals. They maintained diplomatic relations, negotiated the peaceful termination of the Baghdad Pact, averted conflict in an Anglo-Iraqi showdown over Kuwait in 1961, dispensed foreign aid to Iraq, and promoted business opportunities there. Nonetheless, USA-Iraqi relations declined in the late 1960s.

The second phase in USA-Iraqi relations opened in 1960, when Saddam Hussein seized power in Baghdad. Quickly, Hussein brutally suppressed all domestic rivals and thereby built internal stability in Baghdad, ending decades of political turmoil, and it was highly supported and financed by Washington. This rule used the as it is called “an iron fist” to control the affairs and wellbeing of the country.

The USA provided Iraq with the necessary weapons and intelligence to fight Iran in the Iraq/Iran 1980-1988 war. Launching a simultaneous invasion by air and land into Iranian territory on 22 September 1980 was due to a long history of border disputes, and fears of Shiite insurgency among Iraq's long suppressed Shiite majority. Iraq was also aiming to replace Iran as the dominant Persian Gulf state. During that period Iraq was supported by Washington even providing chemical and biological weapons used against the Kurds. The

third face in USA policy toward Iraq featured a short, indecisive war between the two states Iraq and Iran followed by a "long decade" of consequential complications. The military clash originated in Saddam Hussein's decision, in the aftermath of the Iran-Iraq War, to seek territorial and economic gains at the expense of Kuwait. In 1989 and 1990, Hussein signaled a growing intention to use force to against the tiny emirate(Phillips et all 16-99).

The George H.W. Bush administration reacted to the mounting tensions by using the relatively stable relationship that emerged during the 1980s as a brake on Iraqi recklessness. Viewing Iraq as an important counterweight against Iranian expansionism, Bush offered political friendship and economic incentives to lure Hussein into proper behavior. When tensions rose and Hussein moved 100,000 troops to the Kuwait border, Bush also bolstered the USA naval presence in the Gulf and warned Hussein against starting military action. Yet Bush continued to deal with Hussein constructively while ignoring his dreadful ignorance of human rights and foreign policy records, on the calculation that firmer measures might actually provoke the very aggressive behavior that the United States hoped to prevent.

The relation was abrupt into a reversal manner, from alliance to antagonism; Saddam Hussein led an invasion on Kuwait to control its oil fields. Seeing its interests under threat the US provoked the UN to act against Iraq, the economic sanctions were of a high importance to the extent of being "genocidal" and it devastated the Iraqi people, this was by far the worst legacy of the US policies in Iraq where it farther worsened the situation.

It is highly important to note that with the expulsion of Iraq out of Kuwait and the Gulf war a radical escalation of the USA dominance in the area, and with crushing Iraq as a regional power it demonstrated its military power to the world .after the Gulf War 1991

ended the US did not stop war against Iraq. The claims that were presented in defense of its presence in Iraq were the UN resolution, Iraq did not comply with them and USA is there to make Iraq obey these resolutions. Further resolutions were set in order to preserve many aspects of the countries wellbeing and maintaining order and peace with the other countries.

In the past decade, Iraqis have made some progress in building their government approving a constitution to replace that of the Saddam Hussein era, and holding successive elections for parliament and provincial governments, Despite strong opposition from influential Shiite factions ready to engage in military clashes with US forces, the Iraqi government wants an agreement with the United States to ensure that US troops remain in Iraq after the elimination of the former government (Malik Iraqi factions)

## **2. The Role Played By 9/11 In The Intervention In Iraq**

The September 11 attacks also referred to as 9/11 were a series of four coordinated terrorist attacks by the Islamic terrorist group al-Qaeda on the United States. An American Airlines Boeing 767 crashed into the north tower of the World Trade Center in New York City. The impact left a gaping, burning hole near the 80th floor of the 110-story skyscraper, instantly killing hundreds of people and trapping hundreds more in higher floors. As the clearing of the tower and its twin was proceeding, 18 minutes after the first plane hit, a second Boeing 767 United Airlines sliced into the south tower near the 60th floor. America was under an attack that was extremely sudden and unexpected.

The attackers are assumed to be from Islamic terrorists from Saudi Arabia and several other Arab nations. Reportedly financed by Saudi fugitive Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda terrorist organization, they were supposedly acting in retaliation for America's support of

Israel, its involvement in the Persian Gulf War and its continued military presence in the Middle East (The 9/11 Commission Report, Governmental Reports Of National Commission Of Terrorist Attacks 32-33).

The attacks of September 11 were seen as a direct threat and challenge for the military and economic super power of the USA, the Bush administration felt that it needs to prove its power. Hence, with the public opinion support of farther military operations in the Middle East, the United States used it as a justification for its interventions in the area. With the declaration of waging war on terror by President George Bush in his address to a joint session of Congress stating that “The attack took place on American soil, but it was an attack on the heart and soul of the civilized world. And the world has come together to fight a new and different war, the first, and we hope the only one, of the 21st century. A war against all those who seek to export terror and a war against those governments that support or shelter them” (George W. Bush, 10/11/01). USA gained more momentum to engage in war with Middle Eastern countries (Evereset 99).

The White House released a five-page document outlining efforts to prevent future attacks and gave the argument that "we are fighting violent extremists in Iraq and Afghanistan and across the world so that we do not have to fight them on American soil". The attention was directly focused toward Iraq, mainly the region of Baghdad, by preventing it from developing nuclear powers in addition to its non-conventional weapons will make the neighboring countries also vulnerable and give a chance to prevent any engagement of war with Israel, and the USA will uphold any attempt to harm or risk towards Israel.

USA convinced the United Nations to keep the international financial restrictions forced during the Gulf War until Hussein complied with all U.N. resolutions, including one calling for Iraq to eliminate its weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Along with the air banding this was imposed on Iraq air crafts. The suppression policy, which lasted until the USA invasion of Iraq in 2003, achieved its immediate goal. Although Hussein kept control over Bagdad, yet he was unable to inflame another regional conflict, attack his own Kurdish or Shiite peoples living under the protection of Western military aircraft, or down a single one of those aircraft.

With no weapons of mass destruction found in Iraq following the 2003 invasion, actually this fact was known perfectly by the Bush Administration , they were destroyed early 1990s,. The main goal of this invasion was never merely to disarm Iraq; the policy of slaughter and bombings was designed to preserve and make way for the USA and UK imperialistic aims in enriching their economic statues and making profit. Crippling Iraq by preventing its rebuilding its industry, economy and military was a key element and a first step to make Iraq venerable and thus lurching the invasion.

The events of 9/11 represent a big shift in USA political relations toward the Middle East this situation had a deep impact on both the US foreign policy and the world. In October 2002, the disarmament of Iraq was primarily a diplomatic situation, with the joint resolution to authorize the use of the USA armed forces Against Iraq, the USA president was granted by the congress the authority to use anything necessary against Iraq, based on the claims that were repeated by the Bush Administration to the congress, and what the public believe of Iraq still owning weapons of mass destruction. " (Washington Newsletter Joint Resolution)

### **3. The USA justification for the Iraq intervention**

The USA engaged in Iraq due to the nuclear weapons of mass destruction that were claimed to be on the Iraqi soil. With the building up of the huge campaign over the hostilities of terrorism, seven months later the weapons of mass destruction were not found.

The official grounding of the US presence in Iraq was never clear, and even Making the linkage between Al Qaeda and Iraq has always seemed ambiguous and in a way non-natural. Furthermore, US tried to make a link to the WMD, or to spreading democracy. Yet through the inhuman acts committed it proved that the war was not about weapons of mass destruction or to prevent terrorism or to make Iraq comply with the UN resolutions, with this intervention the credibility of USA was in question, yet it was strengthening to the USA both on a global and regional sphere of influence.

Bush administration was dreading that the survival of Saddam Hussein could threaten the US generated harmony in the area. It plans to stay the world's superpower that was built over decades since World War II, thus preventing other countries from gaining military superiority and controlling the economic transactions (Katzman 03-20)

The United States Congress passed a resolution calling for the authorization for the use of military power against Iraq. By November 2003, the United Nations Security Council called for a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations and inspection over weapons of mass destruction and Ballistic Missiles. The resolution also warned for the immediate and unconditional clearance to any site to be chosen by the UN inspection.

President Bush addressed the nation and gave 24 hours for Saddam Hussein and his sons Uday and Qusay to quit Iraq. The United States and the United Kingdom started the invasion of Iraq on the 20th March 2003. About 90 minutes after the deadline, explosions were heard in Iraq in spite of both the Iraqi disarmament report by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and also the request of the UN inspector for more time. This war was a violation of the UN charter, being waged with no approval of the UN Security Council. The UN secretary general Kofi Anan said in September 2004 “from our point of view and the UN charter point of view it was illegal”.

The troops that contributed to the strike were mainly from USA and UK other countries contributed with only 2% of this force. Kuwait was the primary base for the invasion where troops utilized it to move onto the Iraqi soil in rather a swift manner. The entrance was characterized by first, the collapse of Saddam Hussein government; later the fall of the Iraqi military both on ground and in the air by the attack started from Rumaila oil fields passing the Nasariyah which was a strategically important due to its neighboring to the Talil Airfield. After securing the airfield, USA was at a strategic point right at the heart of southern Iraq .By 27th/28th the US troop’s advancement to Njaf and Kufa was slowed down due to strong sand storms in the area(Leibstone 35)

On July 22nd 2003 during US attacks, Saddam’s sons Uday and Qusay and one of their sons were killed, and on the 13th December Saddam Hussein was captured by US army.

The war with Iraq was set to show the USA as a full on global empire, and seizing the role as a responsible and authoritarian police officer over the whole world, even farther going the whole way to taking the opportunity to have a global dominance; this gives a more

reasonable evidence that provides clarity to all the mysterious acts. The major questioning is reserved to the exit strategy from Iraq once the tyrant rule of Saddam Hussein is over, that the administration cared so little about. And thus the only logical explanation that it never attended to leave Iraq but rather its work in the region was to create a military base to overlook at the powers which surrounded Iraq specially Iran, since it was also developing its nuclear program.

The USA humanitarian intervention policy was made to make the Iraqi citizens rise up against their tyrannical regime and call for a revolution against the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, and it used the situation to gain control over Iraq and demonstrate its power with in the process of what it regard as safe keeping of the country along with the hole international sphere. The United States claims to keep peace for the Iraqi people thus promoting democracy in the region, this was a key justification to gain a positive appearance on a global scale and gain a positive Iraqi people public opinion .

#### **4. Promoting Democratic Peace in Iraq After the Invasion**

September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 terrorist attacks and Saddam's use of chemical weapons were the starting point in the Iraqi War. The United States justified itself by enhancing global human security and decreasing internal political violence. The foreign policy of the United States is mainly War on Terror and supporting the Democratic Peace in the area. Washington have worked with several international organizations to achieve a peaceful, stable, and prosperous world, and thus democratizing and spreading democracy through all the ways was seen necessary.



The United States administration made it clear that removing the current Iraqi president Saddam Hussein from power is vital. George Bush asserted that the goals of his campaign against Iraq were clear, they are represented as follows: ending Saddam's dictatorship in Iraq, destroying his nuclear and unorthodox weapons, improving the economic situation in the area and most importantly creating a new Iraqi administration that would adhere to both expectations of Washington and the Iraqi people alike (Shaul Mofaz 02).

The need of the US to promote democracy in Iraq was also seemingly driven by the Bush Administration's desire to transform the whole Middle Eastern region into a democratic arena to address the so-called lack of democracy in the region, integrate the Middle East into the world economic system, build a strong civil society with the help of elites or intellectuals in order to exercise a hegemony over the masses and finally prevent the rise of a regional power as a step to solving the Arab-Israeli conflict which will all help promote stability and protect American interests in the region and the world as a whole (Boateng 33).

The overthrowing of Saddam Hussein resulted in a void in power in Iraq. USA tried to fill this vacuum by creating a new government that seeks to achieve a stable democracy. The Bush administration attempted to cultivate and control the political institutions of Iraq, used a number of Iraqi exiled elites and intellectuals and some Americans to form The CPA (The Coalition Provisional Authority) led by L Paul Bremer was the first attempt to deal with the situation. Through it the USA controlled all the politics in Iraq and gave voice to the people yet it was falling more deep in chaos. The CPA was plainly an "occupying power" for purposes of applying international humanitarian law. One of its works was the "Iraqi Governing Council" which was made up of 25 Iraqis who were selected by coalition leaders,

but who remained under the supervision of the CPA. The Iraqi people rejected US presence in their country yet they were met with an increase in power against them.

In November 2003, the CPA announced a plan to turn over the sovereignty to the IIG (the Interim Iraqi Government). This later was formed according to the Iraqi transitional constitution. The representatives were selected under supervision of the CPA as caretaker government pending constitution and elections and it was led by Sheikh Ghazi Al Yawer (a Sunni leader) as a president and as Prime Minister Iyad Allawi (a Shiite). , ruled for the period between 2004 and 2005. This government was a US friendly and The UN was highly disappointed with the transfer of power yet it never admitted the failure of policies applied in Iraq (Miller 26-60).

These intellectuals who were in exile and who share US interests, took up key posts in Iraqi ministries where they worked closely with American and other western officials, a move which can be explained by Gramsci's concept of organic intellectuals and control of the political society as they will help promote the western liberal democratic ideology and free market ideals, thereby making it appropriate and justifiable and leading to its acceptance by the masses as well as run the affairs of the country.

On June 30<sup>th</sup> 2005 elections was seen as a victory for democracy. the Iraqi people chose a representative for the newly formed 275 members Transitional National Assembly (TNA) .During which, USA troops whose tours of duty had been extended in order to provide election security would be pulled out of Iraq by the next month .while others have boycotted the elections mainly the Sunnis. The role national assembly is to appoint a president for the newly formed transitional democratic government. On the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2005 Jallal Talibani was

appointed a president, the former president of IIG was appointed as a vice president Ghazi Al Yawer along with Abdul Mehdi ( Boateng 34).

This transitional government found itself facing two major responsibilities; the first is the way to rule in these violent circumstances and with a destabilized political acceptance for the newly formed government, and the second is drafting the new Iraqi constitution. Iraq's democratization was hindered by cultural and religious factors that neither stimulate nor foster political liberty that resulted in many conflicts in promoting democracy. The Shiite and Sunni Muslim religious groups were against the existence of the US presence in the region. Both the Sunni and Shiite had many clashes in order to take control over the political sphere.

These conflicts did not follow also to the newly formed government and the new constitution was extremely controversial though it was seen as a way to calm the situation. The Sunni non acceptance to the newly formed government resulted in their absence from the political foreground. The bombing of a major Shiite shrine (Al Askari Mosque) in the Sunni dominated city of Samarra it is also called Salahuddin Province. Sunni-Shiite violence became so serious that were the US military was as failing to deal with the situation. Thus the promotion of the democracy was impossible to be achieved.

The newly formed constitution was put to a referendum. In spite the Sunni Arab call for boycotting the vote. Its implementation began by forming the new government that will rule from 2006 to 2010. The so called democracy was only present through the act of elections (Diamond 1-6).

In June 2006, the approval of a permanent government under Prime Minister Nouri al Maliki, he made sectarian reconciliation a top priority. The effectiveness of the new coalition government remained in doubt. Moreover, the reconstruction of the economy and civil society remained slow. Meanwhile, the death of rebellion leader Abu Musab al Zarqawi opposing Maliki in May 2006 resulted in rise in militia and terrorist attacks especially on civilian targets close to Baghdad.

By 2007, the US shifted its approach toward Iraq from one of trying to transform the politics, governance, rule of law into a more democratic regime and strong economy to helping rebuild Iraq as a unified state without sectarian conflicts and develop its security forces to be capable of defeating extremists and insurgents, as well as eventually becoming capable of defending its territories against external threats. And shift its ties to a strategic partnership with the US (Cordesman and Khazai 07).

US consulate in Baghdad have provided a new approach toward the situation in Iraq thus transference to the US diplomacy, it is stated: “Our objective in Iraq should be less about countering all-things Iranian, and more about developing viable alternatives and approaches that gradually alter the GOI's political, economic, and social worldview. Development of viable international alternatives in Iraq is one of the most effective measures of countering Iranian ambitions and, ultimately, integrating Iraq as a constructive member of the international community. Specifically, our ongoing efforts to bolster the GOI through capacity-building and assistance within the Strategic Framework Agreement (SFA) and to remove Iraq from Chapter VII remain our most valuable tools in this regard. Given the value placed on the SFA by the GOI and the Iraqi public, our ability to recognize, enhance, and

exploit the value of the partnership will constitute an essential element of any effort to counter "malign" Iranian influence.”

After US troops left Iraq in December 2011, Iraqis felt the heavy consequences of US occupation. Violence stemming from Iraq's deep ethnic divisions and insurgent groups continued to hinder progress towards a stable government, economy, and society. Sunni tensions with the central government were rising in Anbar and Diyala Provinces, and Arab-Kurdish tension remained a serious threat in Mosul and Kirkuk. Iraq's economy remained weak. Local governance was poor, and corruption was widespread. The US not only faced the challenge of Iran's presence in Iraq, but also Iraq remained a fragile state with uncertain security and political and economic instability (Gordon 22).

## **5. Comparing the Propositions Of DPT and the Current Situation of Iraq**

Peace keeping was the primary goal for the Democratic Peace establishment in Iraq, the promotions of the Democratic Peace Theory had always been related to the politics of the country. Establishing a new government that meets the expectations of all Iraqi citizens from different ethnic groups; Shiite, Sunni and Kurds, liberate Iraq from its dictator regime, and make Iraq united, stable and free nation was the main purpose for the Democratic Peace Proposition. Keeping peace of the nation and the whole world requires more advanced measures such as removing threat of WMD, biological and nuclear missiles, destroying the support of terrorism located in Iraq with eliminating the lie of al Qaeda being related to it. The suggestions of democracy by the united states in Iraq has never been met, it rather aggravated the Iraqi situation on many levels.

Prior to the war, Iraq had a dictatorship rule besides a stable socioeconomic status, it was held by the iron fist of Saddam Hussein. Later with the several wars against Iran and Kuwait the situation started to be stressful. With the invasion of Iraq, the status quo became shattering and worsened ever since. The USA interference in every political, economic and social aspect of the country resulted in creating a far worse situation.

The dictator rule in Iraq was holding every bit of freedom for the Iraqi people left them with no part in government affairs, thus being voiceless. With the invasion of Iraq 2003, the Iraqi people were faced with weapons, killings and were set as a scapegoat for the war, later with the development of the situation and USA interference gaining more power and installing a newer democratic government that will serve both the USA interests along with the Iraqi people, it brought down Saddam's regime and called for democracy thus giving voice to the voiceless, though this regime was weak and unstable yet it was seen as a better choice for the people.

Before the invasion Iraq oil production had been stabilized at a rate of 2,5 million barrels, the chronic corruption that accrued after the invasion caused the production by 2004 to reach 1,5 million barrels. Today Iraq's oil industry is flourishing and developing, this April 2017 it reached more than 4000 thousand barrels per day according to the OPEC charts and it is continuously progressing. Furthermore, balance of payments and currency during Saddam Hussein's regime, Iraq had only a 120 US Billion Dollars, and was downsized to 42 US Billion Dollars in 2004. In March 2005 the new Iraqi Dinar replaced the old one and was valued with 1.950 US Dollars.

Electricity and water at the time of the invasion were so poorly present. Water rates were extremely low; most of Iraqi people did not have access to drinking water. Electricity before the war was not enough to cover the whole country's needs and the situation worsened after the invasion. Without electricity there can be no communication and there would be no health care system, no education and no industry. The Iraqi Ministry Of Electricity made the Plan of Construction Goals 2012-2017 which outlined that the production is to reach about 24,400MW of new capacity that will be commissioned between 2012 and 2017. This includes 13,000MW of gas-fired capacity before 2015, and 7,000MW of thermal power capacity and 400MW of renewable energy.

With the reconstruction of Iraq and the ending of the war, unemployment was increasing. The only double jobs were restricted to the government, the army, security enterprises, or most importantly in the oil industry. This later was an attraction to foreign investment, mainly to Chinese enterprises.

From 1993-2003 the Saddam regime reduced public health expenditure by 90%. With the American Invasion nearly 12 percent of Iraq's hospitals were destroyed, Health care after the war was a catastrophic situation, with environmental pollution of drinking water, shortage of medication, the lack of specialized hospitals, and the rise of cases with liver cancer. Baghdad, 31 May 2017. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) are extremely concerned about the health conditions of about 180 000 men, women and children who are reportedly still trapped inside west Mosul's old city where access to health care services has been limited (Baker and Rubin 536).

Education during the regime of Saddam was both for free and was mandatory. By 1976; Iraq hosted the "Baghdad Conference for the Eradication of Illiteracy". Shortly after, he initiated the "National Campaign for Eradication of Illiteracy". The results were very positive, so much that Iraq was awarded The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) prize for eradicating illiteracy. During the war the schools were used by the Iraqi and USA armies and education was deteriorating. Years after the war the educational system is healing slowly. International agencies have been involved in supporting education in Iraq like the UN and World Bank.

In the decade since the USA invasion in 2003, procedural democracy was established in Iraq. A new constitution was adopted, creating a federal parliamentary democratic system and multiple regulations under Saddam Hussein, Iraqis enjoy greater civic and political liberties and multiple political factions compete for power. By a basic definition, Iraq is a democracy. The formal institutions of democracy, however, do not entail more than a minimum of democratic rights and they have not guaranteed tangible improvements in the lives of citizens.

The overthrow of Saddam was followed by years of USA military occupation, armed resistance to it and related political violence resulting from the breakdown of the state, which together led directly and indirectly to the deaths of several hundred thousand Iraqi civilians .The USA invasion and subsequent developments in Iraqi politics also brought about the increasing fragmentation of social and political life along sectarian lines, rampant corruption, further breakdown of public services and declining well-being in the population



The US occupation of Iraq did not fulfill its purpose of liberation and instead shifted into anarchy and civil war. Bush's vow for a mission strictly for liberation as he called it a "Humanitarian mission" and call for democracy was extremely off beam; he was met with resistance from the first day for the real purpose of this invasion was merely to preserve its imperialistic well being of the US on the cost of the economic and social statues in Iraq (Lecamwasam Iraq Invasion).

## **6. Conclusion**

Although Saddam Hussein was a bloody tyrant, and although deposing him served a noble purpose, one still may doubt the wisdom of the American war against Iraq. It is quite dubious whether the democratization of Iraq can serve as a justification of the American war effort. Properly understood, the Democratic Peace Proposition does not promise that poor, emerging, and illiberal democracies surrounded by autocracies are more peaceful than autocracies. By itself, the transition towards democracy is quite likely to imply some semi-democratic phase when the country is at risk of civil war. Moreover, the Democratic Peace Proposition says nothing at all about the likelihood of success of democratization in a poor, oil-rich, Arab and Muslim country where there is little common ground to unite the democracy-imposing occupier and the defeated country. Finally, defeating the insurgency in the Sunni triangle of Iraq might require means which a democracy cannot even wish to apply. Whereas the promotion of democracy by war looks like a dead end and is doomed to failure, the prospects of promoting peace by exporting capitalism, growth, and prosperity look much better. Such a strategy even serves the purpose of later democratization of those countries that now accept only creeping capitalism. Due to the fact that the intervention was

supposed to maximize the humanitarian results, minimize the slaughter of innocent people and promote and integrate democracy but it did not achieve its objectives, it rather exceeded to more bloody years and even the valuation of human rights (Roth 01).

## Works Cited

- Angle, Jim. Kehnemui Liss, Sharon. "Report: Hundreds of WMDs Found in Iraq". Online. Internet.FOXNews.com.
- Baker, Keith and Ellen V. Rubin, "Understanding Accountability and Governance in Post-invasion Iraq" Administration & Society, Volume 45, Number 5, July 2011, pp. 515-536.Web.
- BASS.GARY J. "Are Democracies Really More peaceful? » Princeton. JAN1 2006.web.
- Boateng Rhonie. Democracy Promotion And USA Hegemony: A Case Study Of Iraq. Aalborg University. Denmark 29th May, 2015.33.web
- CNN Library "September 11, 2001: Background and timeline of the attacks «dated 1308 GMT (2108 HKT) September 8, 2016.web.
- Cordesman, Anthony H. and Sam Khazai. "Iraq in crisis1984" . 01-46:May 2014.Web
- Evereset and David Ray Griffin «Neocon Imperialism, 9/11, and the Attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq» Information clearing house,02/27/07.web.
- Fisler Damrosch «IRAQ Security Council Resolutions» 1990-1991, 24. Web.
- Gambill and Stephen Zunes "Seven Reasons to Oppose a U.S. Invasion of Iraq «Foreign Policy in Focus august 1, 2002.22.web.
- Gordon, Michael R., "U.S. Leads Further Attacks on Iraqi AntiaircraftSites; Admits Its

- Katzman, Kenneth. "Iraq: Politics, Elections, and Benchmarks" Congressional Research Service. CRS Report for Congress. 1-20: December 8, 2009.Web.
- Diamond, Larry, "What Are There No Arab Democracies?" Journal of Democracy, vol. 21, no. 1, 93 –112: January 2010 .Web.
- Lecamwasam, Nipunika ; "Iraq Invasion: A "Just War" or Just a War?: An Evaluation of US Conduct Within the Framework of Just War Theory " University of Colombo. January 2013.Web. acceced 2017/05/02.
- Leibstone Marvin, "The war against Iraq: issues and lessons", Military Technology, 35;April 2003.Web.
- Malik Hamdi. "Iraqi factions divided over whether US troops stay" IRAQ PULSE March17, 2017.web.
- Miller, B. "Explaining Changes In U.S. Grand Strategy: 9/11, The Rise Of Offensive Liberalism, And The War In Iraq". Security Studies 19.1 (2010): 26-65. Web. 31 May 2017.
- Missile Hit Hotel," New York Times, 13-56:January 19<sup>th</sup> 1993.Web.
- Molavi Abdurrahman Alahverdi. RELIGIOUS MINORITIES: The Baha'i Community. January 1997 .152.web.
- Nazila Fathi.Iranians 'Death to America'. Cable News Network, Inc., a Time Warner Company. Posted Aug 12, 2015 .web.

Oshadhi Ratnaweera. "The Arab Leagues Involvement in the Gulf War (1990-1991)"Ground View Unlocked. University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka keen .web.

Phillips.Lauth, and Schenck, "U.S. Military Operations In Iraq:Planning, Combat, And Occupation" 2-102:April 2006.Web.

ProCon. "Historical Timeline, 1990 - 2011"Last updated on: 12/19/2011 .web.

Roser.Max. "'Democracy'. Published online at Our World in Data. Org .web.

Roth. John, Douglas Greenburg and Serena Wille. "National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States "Staff Report to the Commission.2004. 100-150.web.

Saylor. "The Golf War"1990–1991.19-20.web.

Shaul Mofaz . "Swaidan and Mihai Nica "The 1991 Gulf War and Jordan's Economy"Jackson State University. MERIA Journal Volume 06, Number 02 (Jun 2002).web.

The 9/11 Commission Report, Governmental Reports Of National Commission Of Terrorist Attacks P: 32-33.web.

The New York Times "Confrontation in the Gulf; Excerpts from Iraqi Document on Meeting with U.S. Envoy" SEPTEMBER 23, 1990, 19.web.

Walker, Sebastian. "Iraq: After the Americans «Top Documentary Films, June 2003-2012.web.

Washington Newsletter. "Joint Resolution Authorizing the Use of Military Force against Iraq" Third world traveler. October 2002.web.

YouGov. "Public opinion on Iraq: wrong to go, right to leave – and don't go back " UK :2014.web.

Zaid Al-Ali. "Iraq's Economic Catastrophe" New York, NY 10017 | USA. April 7-13, 2005.web.

## Conclusion

This work has assessed the Democratic Peace Theory both the theoretical perspective and the practical perspective. The main objective was to present a deep analysis of the theory with its applications and different explanations along with special focus on the practical significance of the DP plan exploitation in foreign policy decisions of democratic states and practices of the international politics mainly through the United States interventions after the incident of 9/11 specifically in Iraq.

The research question that was provided at the beginning of the work was: “basing on the analysis of the theory and the consequences of US attempt to impose democracy by force in certain countries, do the propositions of the Democratic Peace Theory support or legitimize US military intervention abroad?”

The Democratic Peace Theory is one of the most prominent theories of international relations. Being of a descriptive nature, the Democratic Peace Theory implies and shows the actions of different states towards each other and foreigner policy measures that are likely to be taken. This political theory represents the idea that states that follow a democratic regime act in a specific way making them less likely to go to war against each other. It represents a kind of common law between states that is not drafted, but can be traced to many aspects of co-existence between states such as economic wealth.

With the spread of democracy in the world, the Democratic Peace Theory has gained a momentum being considered as the first international relations regulation. Many scholars strived to clarify the theory, its various forms, the true intentions of states towards each other,

and the difference between what the theories imply and what it is really used for. The shift of the theory from being of a descriptive nature to a prescriptive and applied as many claim has been exploited in many events, from a mere representative theory to an applicable norm followed by world states.

With the promotion of democracy, it has been noted that it is always at the hands of the United States but it is continuously caused by hidden interests. The United States used many measures to promote democracy, with peaceful interventions, using association and in many cases it used military interventions. After the attacks of 9/11, the United States sifted its political policy to a basic one which is War on Terror as it is presented by Bush's administration. The claims presented by the US of promoting democracy and preserving human rights also of preserving the world peace through banning nuclear weapons and those of mass destruction to protect the world have been always dependable, and goes hand in hand with preserving its interests.

One of the most important cases of misuse of the theory as a justification for military interventions was the post 9/11 invasion of Iraq (2003). The United States policy after the incident of 9/11 has shifted towards countering terrorism actions and was heightened with the use of nuclear threat to world peace

In Iraq, banning weapons of mass destruction was firstly through the calls of the United Nations to inspect for their existence in Iraq and later taking the necessary measures to address the situation but the US used military forces without paying any interests in the UN results of the inspection. With no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq the SA intervention was unjustifiable yet the bush administration articulation of the Democratic Peace Theory



was completely hollow. The Iraq war was not to spread democracy and it is proven with the catastrophic results that remain till today embodied in the geographical and social and political status of the country. The remains of the attacks are forever in the heart and minds of the Iraqi people. The fact that the situation in Iraq now is much more miserable than that before the US invasion makes it clear that invoking the DPT and the promotion of democracy when preparing for the invasion of Iraq war a big lie.

## Bibliography

### Books

BASS.GARY J. "Are Democracies Really More Peaceful? «Princeton. JAN1 2006.web.

Cordesman, Anthony H. and Sam Khazai. "Iraq in crisis1984" . 01-46:May 2014.Web

Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam, Democracies at War (Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002), 10-11.web.

Doyle, Michael W "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs", Philosophy and Public Affairs, n. 12.1983, pp. 205-235, pp. 323-353.

Doyle, Michael W.Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism. New York: Norton & co. 1997.web.

Fisler Damrosch «IRAQ Security Council Resolutions» 1990-1991, 24. Web.

Gause III, F. 'Can Democracy Stop Terrorism?' Foreign Affairs. September/October 2005.5. Web.

H. L. Mencken Quotes. (n.d.). Quotes.net. Retrieved February 13, 2017

Layne, "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace," 1994.12-13.web.

Reiss, H. Kant's Political Writings. Cambridge: CUP 1971 p .93.web.

Small, Melvin. The Applicability of Quantitative International Politics to Diplomatic History 1976. 01 May 2009. 1. Web.

Teichman, Jenny, *Pacifism and the Just War: A Study in Applied Philosophy*, Basil Blackwell, 1986.12-45.web.

### ***Dissertations***

Kingsley Ofoe Doe, *a Critique of the Democratic Peace Theory: A Case Study of the Russo-Georgian War of 2008*. University of Ghana. JULY 2015.web.

Olejníková, Lenka Barbora, *Democratic Peace in Theory and Practice*, Charlesuniversity. Prague .2012, 26-30.web.

Russett, "Democracy, War and Expansion through Historical Lenses," 2009.13-14.web.

Strugliński, Damian "Strengths and weaknesses of the Democratic Peace Theory: A critical evaluation." King's College London. School of Social Science & Public Policy. Department of War Studies. Accessed 26/02/2017. 1-5.web PDF.

### **Articles**

#### **Web articles**

Abulof and Goldman. *The Domestic Democratic Peace in the Middle East* .IJCV: Vol. 9 (1) 2015.2-5.web.

Boian, Christopher "Russia Moves Toward Recognition of Georgian Rebel Zones," Agency France-Pressed, August 20, 2008 p.8.web.

Bridoux, Jeff. "Us Foreign Policy and Democracy Promotion: in Search of Purpose" .international relations .vol.27 no.2.2013.235.web.

Bueno ruce de Mesquita and George W'I Downs. Development and democracy .Foreign Affairs, Vol. 84, No. 5 .New York (Sep. - Oct., 2005), pp. 77-86

Carothers, Thomas. "Democracy Promotion under Clinton." Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 2004, pp. 23–38.web.

\_\_\_\_\_. «Aiding Democracy Abroad the Learning Curve .Carnegie Endowment for International Peace .Washington. December 31, 1999p:22-60.web.

Carothers.T homas, Marina Ottaway"Funding Virtue: Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion". Washington, October 27, 2000.03.web.

Christopher F. Gelpi and Michael Griesdorf, "Winners or Losers? Democracies in International Crisis, 1918–94," American Political Science Review 95, no. 3 (September 2001): 633-34.web.

Cox M, Ikenberry J and Inoguchi, T. American Democracy Promotion, Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000P:33.web.

Diamond, Larry, "What Are There No Arab Democracies?" Journal of Democracy, vol. 21, no. 1, 93 –112: January 2010 .Web

Doyle, Michael W. "Liberalism and World Politics." The American Political Science Review, Vol. 80, n. 4, 1986. pp. 1151-1169. Web.

Elman, Miriam Fendius. "The Need for a Qualitative Test of the Democratic Peace Theory."

In *Paths to Peace: Is Democracy the Answer?*, edited by Miriam Fendius Elman, 1-57.

Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1997.10-18.web.

Evereset and David Ray Griffin "Neocon Imperialism, 9/11, and the Attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq» Information clearing house,02/27/07.web.

Fisher, David and Nigel Biggar .Was Iraq an unjust war? A Debate on the Iraq war and reflections on Libya. *International Affairs*87 (3):2011.687- 707.web.

Gambill and Stephen Zunes "Seven Reasons to Oppose a U.S. Invasion of Iraq «Foreign Policy in Focus august 1, 2002.22.web.

Gleditsch. L, Nils Petter and Harvard Hegre. *Democratic Jihad, Military Intervention and Democracy*. World Bank Policy Research/Working Paper4242, 2007:1-62.web.

Gordon, Michael R., "U.S. Leads Further Attacks on Iraqi Antiaircraft Sites; Admits Its Hunting. Samuel P. Huntington. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* .University of Oklahoma Press. 1991 16-23.web.

Kant, Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, 1795, Web. Accessed 9/02/2017

Jack S. Levy, "Domestic Politics and War," in Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb, eds., *The Origin and Prevention of Major Wars*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, p. 88.web

Jackson, Jennifer. *Democratic Peace Theory: An Appropriate Guide to Foreign Policy*, University of Kent. Jun 2 2011, 3.web.

- Lagon, Mark P. The Whys and How's of Promoting Democracy: Evolving U.S. Policy. Georgetown University School of Foreign Service. February 11, 2011 .1.web.
- Lenon, A. 'Democracy in US Security Strategy: From Promotion to Support'. London: Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) March. 2009. P: 2-5.web.
- Mansfield, E.D, and J. Snyder. Electing To Fight. Why Emerging Democracies Go To War. Cambridge: MIT Press .2005.web.
- Maoz, Zeev. "The Controversy over the Democratic Peace: Rearguard Action or Cracks in the Wall?" International Security 22, no. 1. 1997: 162-98.web.
- Marshall, Monty and Benjamin R, Cole .global report conflict, government and state agility, Vienna, a use: center for systemic peace, 2011.P:11\_12...web
- Miller, B. "Explaining Changes In U.S. Grand Strategy: 9/11, The Rise Of Offensive Liberalism, And The War In Iraq". Security Studies 19.1 (2010): 26-65. Web. 31 May 2017.
- Missile Hit Hotel," New York Times, 13-56:January 19<sup>th</sup> 1993.Web.
- Molavi Abdulrahman Alahverdi. Religious Minorities: The Baha'i Community. January 1997 .152.web.
- Müller, Harald, and Jonas Wolff. "Dyadic Democratic Peace strikes back: Reconstructing the social constructivist approach after the monadic renaissance."Länk: [http://www. sgir.Org/conference2004/papers/Mueller% 20Wolff.2004](http://www.sgir.Org/conference2004/papers/Mueller%20Wolff.2004). Web.

Nazila Fathi.Iranians ‘Death to America’. Cable News Network, Inc., a Time Warner Company. Posted Aug 12, 2015 .web.

Oshadhi Ratnaweera"The Arab Leagues Involvement in the Gulf War (1990-1991)"Ground View Unlocked. University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka keen .web.

ProCon"Historical Timeline, 1990 - 2011"Last updated on: 12/19/2011 .web.

Rear, Patrick G. "Democratic Peace Theory as Applied to Europe and the Middle East," Global Tides: Vol. 7, Article 4. 2013.6-7.web.

Rieffer Barbara Ann j .and mercer kristan” US Democracy Promotion: The Clinton and Bush Administrations “global society, vol.19.no4.2005.385.web.

Robbins, Keith. The Abolition of War: the Peace Movement in Britain 1914-1919, University of Wales Press, acceded 03/02/2017.web.

Roser.Max"‘Democracy’. Published online at OurWorldInData.org.web.

Roth. John, Douglas Greenburg and Serena Wille"National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States "Staff Report to the Commission.2004. 100-150.web.

Russett, Bruce, and John R. Oneal. Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001. 162-166& 59-60 web.

Saikal, Amin & Albrecht Schnabel ed., Democratization in the Middle East: Experiences, Struggle, Challenges .New York: United Nations University Press, 2003 p2.web.

Shahidi, F. Analysis of the dual behavior of America with Democracy. Thought Club Website. 2005.1. Web.

Singer, J. David. The Historical Experiment as a Research Strategy in the Study of World Politics. Cambridge University Press 1977.1-22 .web.

Spiro, D. The insignificance of liberal peace. International Security, 19(2), 1994.50-86.web

Zaid Al-Ali "Iraq's Economic Catastrophe" New York, NY 10017 | USA. April 7-13, 2005.web.

### ***Journal articles***

Ajin Choi, "The Power of Democratic Competition," International Security 28, no. 1 (Summer 2003):144-45, web.

Baker, Keith and Ellen V. Rubin, "Understanding Accountability and Governance in Post-invasion Iraq" Administration & Society, Volume 45, Number 5, July 2011, pp. 515-536.Web.

Bruce Russett, "Democracy, War and Expansion through Historical Lenses," European Journal of International Relations 15, no. 9 (2009): 11-12.web.

Dehshyar, H. 'Hobbesians Liberal in America's Foreign Policy and Promote Democracy in the Middle East'. Middle East Studies Quarterly, spring 2005p:9-10.web.

Doyle, Michael W. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs" Philosophy & Public Affairs, Vol. 12, No. 3 .1983 205-235.web.



- Gelpi, Christopher F., and Michael Griesdorf. "Winners or Losers? Democracies in International Crisis, 1918–94." *American Political Science Review* 95, no. 3 (September 2001): 633-47.web.
- Katzman, Kenneth. "Iraq: Politics, Elections, and Benchmarks" Congressional Research Service. CRS Report for Congress 1-20: December 8, 2009.Web.
- Lecamwasam, Nipunika ; "Iraq Invasion: A "Just War" or Just a War?: An Evaluation of US Conduct Within the Framework of Just War Theory " University of Colombo. January 2013.Web. accessed 2017/05/02.
- Lewis, Andrew, "Montesquieu between Law and History", published in *Law and History*. Volume 6, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pages 83-95.web.
- Mirtorabi, S. 'Oil and Democracy in Middle East'. *Middle East Studies Quarterly*. , no.52 winter and spring 2008:76. Web.
- Owen, John M, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19.2 (1994): 87-125. Pdf.
- Paul R. Hensel, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl, "The Democratic Peace and Rivalries," *The Journal of Politics* 62, no. 4 .November 2000: 1187.web.
- Phillips.Lauth, and Schenck, "U.S. Military Operations In Iraq:Planning, Combat, And Occupation" 2-102:April 2006.Web.

Shaul Mofaz "Swaidan and Mihai Nica "THE 1991 GULF WAR AND JORDAN'S ECONOMY «Jackson State University. MERIA Journal Volume 06, Number 02 (Jun 2002).web.

### ***Reports***

Carothers, Thomas. "A League of their Own," Foreign Policy July-August Clinton, William Jefferson (1994) State of the Union. Accessed 12 March 2017. Web.

CNN Library "September 11, 2001: Background and timeline of the attacks «dated 1308 GMT (2108 HKT

Leibstone Marvin, "The war against Iraq: issues and lessons", Military Technology, 35;April 2003.Web.

Monty G. Marshall and Benjamin R. Cole. Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility Global Report, 2014, 10.web.

Roth. John, Douglas Greenburg and Serena Wille "National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States "Staff Report to the Commission.2004. 100-150.web.

Russett, Bruce, and John R. Oneal. Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001. 114-16, 22-24.web.

September 8, 2016.web.

The 9/11 Commission Report, Governmental Reports Of National Commission Of Terrorist Attacks P: 32-33.web.

Washington Newsletter «Joint Resolution Authorizing the Use of Military Force against Iraq" Third world travler.October 2002.web.

YouGov"Public opinion on Iraq: wrong to go, right to leave – and don't go back " UK: 2014.web.

### *Newspapers*

Angle, Jim. Kehnemui Liss, Sharon. "Report: Hundreds of WMDs Found in Iraq". Online. Internet.FOXNews.com.

Bill Clinton, "1994 State of the Union Address," The Washington Post, web, accessed on 10/02/2017.web.

Diamond, Larry, "What Are There No Arab Democracies?" Journal of Democracy, vol. 21, no. 1, 93 –112: January 2010 .Web

Malik Hamdi"Iraqi factions divided over whether US troops stay" IRAQ PULSEMarch17, 2017.web.

The New York Times "Confrontation in the Gulf; Excerpts from Iraqi Document on Meeting with U.S. Envoy" September 23, 1990, 19.web.

### **Documentary films:**

Walker, Sebastian "Iraq: After the Americans «Top Documentary Films, June 2003-2012.web.