

Aabstract	
論文題目	<p><b>Effective Factors on the Nation-Building Process in a Post-2003 Iraq: A Study of Counterinsurgency and Security Sector Reform</b></p>
氏名	Rahman Loan Muhsin Al-Jothery
<p>Despite all the false pretexts that the United States framed for the occupation of Iraq, President Bush's move to promote democracy in the Middle East by invading Iraq went in vain. It triggered regional imbalance, growth of terrorist groups, rise of non-state actors. It's true that the invasion was, by all accounts, a remarkable military success. Yet, conflict management was generally floundering and confused overall, the Coalition Provisional Authority CPA decision to dismantle the Iraqi security apparatus was catastrophic.</p> <p>The US was unprepared for the post-Saddam reconstruction and stabilization of Iraq. Paul Bremer, admitted that "the biggest problem in Iraq was that we have not provided adequate security for the Iraqi population". Due to the growing resistance, the CPA quickly switched from a pre-invasion plan that did not include Iraqis in the governing of their country for two years after the invasion to a decision to return sovereignty to Iraq in June 2004. The armed organizations that engaged to resist the US occupation after 2003 were composed of former Iraqi army officers and the dissolved Baath Party members, who were indignant about the loss of their jobs and social positions. The mentality of how the 'battlefield' would be controlled rapidly, has dominated on the US military in Iraq. For them, firepower and technological superiority was the way forward. As the scale of the US casualties increased, the war changed significantly, and the US officers and soldiers began to seek to convince the Iraqi people to support the newly elected government and its policies and winning their hearts and minds.</p> <p>The situation in Iraq after 2003 is characterized by the emergence of two influential international factors which have an impact on the nation-building process in Iraq; a factor that is imposed through direct occupation, and another imposed by its geopolitics with Iraq. Since 1900, 16 of over 200 US military interventions are considered nation-building attempts.</p>	

Furthermore, the overall success rate is only 4 out of these 16. Iraq seems not among the successful ones.

For decades, Iraq has experienced instability due to dictatorship and the violence of terrorism. The Iraq policy of the US has swung between hyper-ambitious interventionism and dangerous disengagement. Protecting Israel's security is one of the most significant pillars of US Middle East policy. Israel is concerned about the lasting effects of the Iraq war, arguing that the war has so far benefitted Iran. The US emphasizes that it is seeking not to have Iraq controlled by Iran or Iranian proxies.

The problems of armed violence and terrorism, their impacts and consequences on the security and political stability in Iraq are complicated by the overlapping of political and security causes, external and internal factors. However, the structural imbalance of the Iraqi state is the dominant factor. For more than 17 years, the issue of combating terrorism, the implementation of counterinsurgency doctrine and how to tackle the security issue as a whole have been a constant conundrum that has plagued both the government and the citizen, and that has reached a dangerous level in 2014 that has seriously threatened the existence of the state and hindered its effective reconstruction

The cumulative effects of the 2003 Iraq war, security, in particular, have opened the way for the emergence of non-state actors and regional and international powers' interference, which has led to the state's inability to monopolize arms and the proliferation of armed militias, thus complicating the political, economic and security situation. For the purpose of rectifying the deteriorating situation, applying security sector reform SSR and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration DDR have turn out to be the mostly significant elements for conquering the dilemma of security in Iraq.

Explaining the impediments of nation-building in Iraq as a result of the repercussions of the US occupation, including security, constitutional and social impediments, as well as the catastrophic effects of regional and international interference in Iraqi internal affairs later, gives a clear picture of the nation-building situation in Iraq from 2003 until 2020. The study explores the potential weakness of the counterinsurgency doctrine in containing the phenomenon of insurgency in Iraq and also aims to examine the causes of the increase in multi-faceted terrorism and insurgency and its repercussions on the security and ultimately, the fragility of the state.

The study has adopted the chronological of events in Iraq after 2003 and the accompanying plans, approaches and doctrines to combat insurgency. It covers also the negotiation process between Iraq and the US to speed up the withdrawal from Iraq and compare the US-Iraq security agreement (SOFA) with a number of US agreements with the hosting countries of the US forces, the most important of which is the US-Japan SOFA. Some DDR practitioners praise Iraq-US SOFA especially in terms of sovereignty empowerment and also praise the successful negotiation process.

Despite what the US-Iraq SOFA includes in terms of sovereignty empowerment of Iraq, the US overpassed all the lines drawn by the SOFA and targeted General Soleimani and the leader of the Iraqi Hezbollah Brigades in early 2020. This action has sent a significant message to Iraq, that is the US is still adhering to the "shock and awe" approach to settle its disputes, even if it is at the expense of the sovereignty of independent states. Consequently, Iraqi parliament decided to ask the government to take action against the US forces presence in Iraq. However, the decision is still controversial. By targeting Soleimani in Iraq, the US wanted to neutralize and contain Iran's growing role in the almost entire region (Iraq, Syria, Yemen and Lebanon).

Iraq is likely to remain a priority for the US in terms of preserving a number of its forces on its soil, which ultimately indicates the continuation of the conflict with Iran indirectly, as well as continuation of internal debate among Iraqis about the American presence on its lands. The presence of American forces is focusing on providing advice to the Iraqi forces, intelligence information, air support and logistical support to train Iraqi forces, and this is consistent with the American vision not to maintain large combat forces on the ground in Iraq. The US hopes that Iraq will be its security partner, rather than partner to Iran.