



T.C.

İSTANBUL ALTINBAS UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

MASTER OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS

**THE ROLE OF MEDIA IN IMPLEMENTING AMERICAN
FOREIGN POLICY**

CASE STUDY: AMERICAN WAR ON IRAQ IN 2003

MOHANAD KHALID ALSOUFI

THESIS SUPERVISOR

Asst. Prof. Dr. Eylem AKDENİZ GÖKER

İSTANBUL, 2019

The Role of Media in Implementing American Foreign Policy

Case Study: American War on Iraq In 2003

By

Mohanad Khalid Alsoufi

Master, Political science and International Relations, 2019

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences in Partial Fulfillment

of The Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Politics and International Relations

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Political Science and international relations.


Assist. Prof. Dr. Eylem AKDENİZ

GÖKER



Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:


Associate Prof. Dr. Edip Asaf BEKAROĞLU

Assist. Prof. Dr. Bahadır KAYNAK

Assist. Prof. Dr. Eylem AKDENİZ GÖKER

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of political science and international relations.


Assist. Prof. Dr. Eylem
AKDENİZ GÖKER

Head of Department



Approval of Politics and International Relations.

Associate Prof. Dr. Nur Banu
KAVAKLI BİRDAL



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Mohanad Khalid Alsoufi



DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family who encouraged me every time of doing my master and supported me in different circumstances to complete the master's degree, I am grateful to their efforts and attention.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There have been many people who have supported, helped and provided guidance during the preparation of this thesis. I have accumulated different personal debts through the writing journey of this thesis, and I am so glad to finally have a chance to acknowledge them. The first debt goes to Allah who has continually showered me with his richest blessings all throughout my life. Without Allah's grace and guidance, I would not have been able to undertake this thesis and witness its germination. My next debt, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Eylem AKDENİZ GÖKER. Her notes, feedback contributions, and guidance helped me with scientific benefit and professionally as well.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Mouath Salem Al-Rawi and Professor Abdulrahman Al-Ahmad, President of the International Academy for Leadership and Development, for helping to steer my ship in the right way and to bring me back to life after I left Mosul alone.

ÖZET

ABD dış politikasının uygulanmasındaki medyanın rolü

durum incelemesi: ABD'nin Irak'taki 2003 yılında olan savaş durumu

Alsoufi, Mohanad

Yüksek Lisans Siyaset Bilimleri ve Uluslararası İlişkiler, İstanbul Altınbaş Üniversitesi

Danışman: Assist. Prof. Dr. Eylem AKDENİZ GÖKER

Medya artık iki taraf arasında bilgi taşımacılığı yapan bir araç değildir dış politika hedeflerine hizmet etmek için iç kamunun yönlendirilmesinde fikrini ortaya koyarak önemli bir rol oynadığını ve bunu kanıtladığında, iki veya daha fazla taraf arasında bilgi aktarma aracı değildir. Dahası, bugün medya, diğer ülkelerin halklarını etkilemek için devletin yumuşak gücünü ve kamu diplomasının (medya) temel bir bileşenidir. Bu tez., 2003'te "(Amerik birleşik devletleri'nin)ABD'nin" Irak'a savaş açtığını tüm bunlara ışık tutmaya çalışıyor. Medyanın, savaşın tanıtımına ve pazarlanmasına katkıda bulunduğu ve Amerikan halkını Irak'ı işgal etme ihtiyacı konusunda ikna edebileceği sonucuna varıldı.

Anahtar kelimeleri: Medya, Kitle iletişim araçları, Irak'ın işgali, Medya politikası, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, Dış politika, yumuşak güç, kamu diplomasisi.

ABSTRACT

The Role of Media in Implementing American Foreign Policy

Case Study: American War on Iraq In 2003

Alsoufi, Mohanad

M.A. political science and international relations, Istanbul Altinbas University,

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Eylem AKDENİZ GÖKER

Media is not anymore just a vehicle to transfer information between two or more parties. Media, and especially news media, have significant role in formulating and directing internal public opinion to serve external policy goals. Besides, currently, media is considered an important pillar of a given country's soft power and its public diplomacy. This thesis seeks to examine the above-mentioned issues within the framework of American war in Iraq in 2003. It concluded that the media contributed to the promotion and marketing of the war and was able to convince the American people of the need to invade Iraq.

Keywords: Media, Mass Media, Invasion of Iraq, Media Policy, United States, foreign policy, soft power, public diplomacy.

Table of Contents

DEDICATION	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VI
ÖZET.....	VII
ABSTRACT	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	XI
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 LITERATURE REVIEW: A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON THE USE OF MASS MEDIA WITHIN THE IRAQI WAR	3
2. THE THEORETICAL ROOTING OF THE WAR IN IRAQ	10
2.1 THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:	10
2.1.1 The opinion of the Constructivism theory on the Iraqi war:.....	10
2.1.2 The opinion of the realistic theory on the Iraqi war:.....	14
2.1.3 The opinion of the liberal theory on the Iraqi war:	16
2.2 US FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS IRAQ 1958 – 2003:	18
2.3 BUSH'S VISION OF A SOLUTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST:.....	20
3. MEDIA AND FOREIGN POLICY	24
3.1 THE CONCEPT OF FOREIGN POLICY:	24
3.2 THE TOOLS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREIGN POLICY:	26
3.2.1 The political tools to implement the foreign policy:	26
3.2.2 The military tools to implement foreign policy:	27

3.2.3 The economic tools of foreign policy:.....	29
3.2.4. Importance and Role of Media in Implementing Foreign Policy:	32
3.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MEDIA AND FOREIGN POLICY:	39
3.4 MEDIA POLICY: WHO MAKES IT AND HOW?.....	43
4. THE WAR ON IRAQ 2003.....	48
4.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF IRAQ FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY:	48
4.2 THE WAR:.....	52
4.3 THE ROLE OF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION:.....	55
4.4 THE ROLE OF THE MASS MEDIA:.....	60
4.5 THE ROLE OF CNN:	65
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	72
REFERENCES	77

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction.

US: United States of America.

IFI: Institution of Free Iraq

ASK: American Association of the Kurds

IMN: Iraqi Media Network

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

UK: United Kingdom

CNN: Cable News Network

BBC: British Broadcasting Corporation

CIA: Central Intelligence Agency

A P: Associated Press

UPI: United Press International

AFP: Agency France-Press

ALBA: The Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America

MRC: Media Research Center

KDP: The Kurdistan Democratic Party

PUK: The Patriotic Union of Kurdistan

VOA: Voice of America

USAID: U.S. Agency for International Development

NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations

CBC: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

ABC: Australian Broadcasting Corporation

MBC: Middle East Broadcasting Center

NBC: National Broadcasting Company



1. INTRODUCTION

Foreign policy is known as official, meaningful and outward-oriented political behavior. So, each action performed by the country in order to have an impact in specific country or environment is considered as an aspect of foreign policy. Forms, types, modes and tools to implement the foreign policy are varied where it includes policy and diplomacy as make alliances and have friendships. This sort of effort includes an economic dimension such as the provision of grants, loans and commercial exchange with other international actors. It may also exist in the form of a military character such as declaration of war, peace, provide military assistances, waving to use power, support alliances and liquidation of enemies. Through the huge technological development witnessed by media, debates around soft power has emerged within the political and academic fields. This power is used by specific country in order to manipulate any the other party to act (in accordance with the predetermined interests) without coercion or reparation but by encouragement and motivation. By the time the soft power has been utilized to target the ruling political elite at any given country, we take for granted that, general diplomacy operates to create direct communication channels between itself and the general populace to establish floors for recognition. As a result of all those efforts, the foreign policy priorities of the (so-called manipulator) actor will be met with gratification or at least without any opposition. Within this process media, as visual, audio, print and electronic media, fulfills a pivotal role. As it is widely claimed, in terms of domestic affairs, media is proven to have high ability to configure and direct public opinion. In some instances, it has also the potential to motivate politicians and decision makers in accordance with the predetermined aims by the media itself, and thereby operates autonomously. As an example we can find that aviation has been banned on Kurdish regions in the north of Iraq, as a result to what has been broadcasted by CNN channel of photos and videos that shows that suffer of Kurdish immigrants at the beginning of ninetieth of the last century, as a result of that the United Nations banned the Iraqi air force from flying above the Kurdish regions.

Currently, the role played by the media confirms that media tends to appear as one of the most effective tools in the implementation of foreign policy goals of any given country. That is, it seems to be as important as the conventional or traditional tools and mechanisms of political terrain covering the wide spectrum from diplomacy, to the economic sanctions and to the

military policies. War on Iraq in 2003 might be studied as a milestone in clarifying the pivotal role currently held by the media. At the first glance, it might well be claimed that American media, leaving aside some certain critical voices, clearly participated in the war-making, either by promoting and/or adopting the point of view of American administration. The aim and ambition was of course to gather support of American ordinary citizen and consolidate this support for the government's decision of entering into a war in Iraq. It at least, functioned to eliminate and minimize the probable opposition which was to emerge against the war decision.

The major question of this thesis might be formulated as follows: although it has a tremendous superiority in military, political and economic fields, even the American government (Bush administration during the concerned period of time) needed to resort into means to gain the support of its own public. Media was the most effective tool within this process. Bush administration accorded utmost importance to the media in directing or, manipulating the public opinion just before entering a war in Iraq in 2003 and during the 2003 Iraq war. Within the limitations of this study, I suffice to present significant cases highlighting this process. In order to understand the major facets of utilization of the media within the Iraq War, I have been motivated by the following questions: Why was the Bush administration so interested in the media? How did the US government utilize from the media during the Iraq war? To be more precise, the question that inspired me during this dubious work might be formulated as follows: What is the role accorded by the US media in 'marketing' the war and orienting the American public opinion to provide support for the policy makers in their decisions?

Throughout my studies, I have arrived at the conclusion that, at least in the light of the Iraq war in 2003, we may argue that, media have accorded a tremendous role in achieving the foreign policy interests of any given role as important as the conventional means such as the economic, military and political (in the limited sense of the notion, 'political' of course). The experience of the Iraq war of 2003 seems to offer that the US media in the main (leaving aside some exceptional voices), tended to abandon its professionalism and operated as an apparatus of the Bush administration. Although this is a limited study, I believe, it might offer insights about the transformation of the media, relations between the media and power blocs and the diminishing of the media ethics. The study does not intend to dwell upon the questions centered

around those problematic issues, yet it attempts at least to inspire others to reflect upon those haunting questions.

The thesis has been organized in five chapters, consisting of three main chapters besides the introduction and the conclusion. In the Introduction, I have tried to delineate the question that has inspired the whole body of the study. The introduction has also underlined the significance of the study and its intended contribution to the academic field. I have also added a conceptual note to the introductory chapter covering the major arguments within the literature on the topic. Within the second chapter, I've addressed to the theoretical contemplation of the war in Iraq in 2003 to understand the reasons of the invasion in the point of view of each of main schools in international relations, namely realism, liberal and constructional schools. The second section of the chapter is devoted to an examination of the vision of Bush in the Middle East after the events of 11 of September. This chapter has been concluded by a historical account highlighting the foreign policy of the United States towards Iraq from 1958 until 2003. The third chapter focuses on the nature of relationship between foreign policy and media by defining foreign policy and the state and the conventional political, economic and military implementation tools. The chapter underlines that media appears as one of the most significant tools to implement country's soft power and its public diplomacy. The chapter is to be concluded by the definition of media policy and how it is made and who is to perform it. In the fourth chapter is entitled as "Media Theater to the War on Iraq in 2003". This chapter addresses the strategic importance of Iraq for the United States of America. Then, within the chapter, the utilization of the media by the United throughout the war of Iraq in 2003 has been elaborated. The chapter focuses upon the role of CNN and its coverage to the war of Iraq in 2003. Finally, within the Conclusion, a general discussion has been offered.

1.1 LITERATURE REVIEW: A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON THE USE OF MASS MEDIA WITHIN THE IRAQI WAR

To begin with, it should be noted that, the topic of this study, at least in its specific form has not been studied within the already existing literature. The existing literature has tended to focus upon one specific aspect of the utilization of media within the framework of Iraqi issue. Rather than employing an all encapsulating perspective concerning the role of the media with

regards to the Iraq case, they have preferred to shed light either one significant facet of the issue or offering a very concise yet unsatisfactory account. Emad el-din discussed the role of the US media in promoting US hegemony over the world through soft power. Aysha Emad el-din examined how the United States was able to 'market' to the world its point of view regarding the first Gulf War in 1991. But the invasion of Iraq in 2003 caused failure to US attempts to play the same role, due to the presence of several regional channels, which were able to convey and show to the whole world details of what was really happening in Iraq on live. Al-Jazeera and Al-Arabiya were very effective throughout the process. Emad El-din has stated that the United States is still on the throne of the world with regards to its military power; yet, in the fields of media, economy and other terrains, some significant nation-states have emerged to compete, with 2003 being the best proof to back this up (Aysha, 2005).

Christensen and Ferree have focused their efforts on pre-war media preparations, saying that over the course of the year preceding the war, the media followed the style of implicit expressions, in addition to direct and indirect revelations to guide public opinion to stand with President Bush. It was using images and caricatures and paying attention to newspaper and magazine covers, where the US media borrowed the symbol of cowboys to refer to American nationalism and the manhood and courage of President Bush. In contrast, anti-war views, especially in Europe, were referred to by the use of the image of gazelle, a symbol of femininity and gentleness. Even sometimes the Europeans were described as "innocent women" since they were calling for peace and avoiding war. Here we find that the American media was able to strike a very delicate nerve among the American people, through which they managed to lead those American people to war (Christensen & Ferree, 2008). This was in a way indicative of the gender dimension within the media portrayal of the war. Patriarchal values were to be an integral part of the process of appealing to the public opinion and encouraging the chauvinistic emotions.

In her analysis of Times and Newsweek pre-war magazines, which included 34 issues, Amy Fried has found out that the two magazines had resumed their news activities strongly after they had devoted their efforts to health and social affairs in 1990s and that this return coincided with the media mobilization launched by the US administration to invade Iraq. Where the two newspapers supported the government's point of view and began to draw readers towards war through cartoons and meaningful images, as well as the stories of American superiority and

showing an evil picture of Saddam Hussein, in addition on working to link the Iraqi regime with al-Qaeda and the terrorist attacks of 9/11, to the point that a map of Iraq showing the sites of nuclear and military and ballistic missile launchers became a Cover picture for Times magazine. Amy Fried analyzed Time and Newsweek the year before the war, which included 34 issues; the media coverage of the two newspapers focused on only two aspects of the invasion of Iraq: The first being Iraq's threat to the United States, and the second being US's ability to respond to such a threat (Fried, 2005).

Not only did the Bush administration do just that, it moved to sustain the American citizen's fear and it invested successfully in the events of September 11 by fabricating so-called “moral panic” by using the vocabulary of war, such as fear, terrorism, evil, terrorists, weapons of mass destruction, and many more. Despite the poor US relations with Saddam Hussein before 2001, we see a clear increase in the level of media escalation against Iraq. The offensive style in President Bush's speeches and White House hawks means that there is a deliberate policy of media escalation aimed at frightening the American public and pushing it behind The White House, as the author points out, the administration did not do all this for the sake of America's supreme interest and the American dream, but that the most important motives to go to war are the personal interests of senior leaders and White House staff and whom close to President Bush (Bonn, 2011).

In the context of public diplomacy, Professor Seib argues that the United States has felt that the hatred towards itself within the region. In order to change its image and this negative attitude towards itself, the United States has worked through public diplomacy to inform, share, and influence the foreign public. This was after the launch of Al-Hurra, the Arabic-language channel whose main purpose was to deliver the voice of the United States to the peoples of the Middle East in an attempt to compete with Al-Jazeera, which was anti-US establishment in the region. The United States then established Al-Hurra - Iraq to address the Iraqi public exclusively and to discuss Iraqi events from the US point of view. Besides printing of various books and providing scholarships and the establishment of American Universities and artistic events and celebrations, which was thought to transmit American art and culture to the region, this was another attempt by the US to reach at the local populace within the region. The foundation of Al Hurra – Iraq would absorb popular anger towards the United States and justify its political and

military standing in the region. After all these efforts, Al-Hurra was unable to gather support of the Arab viewers, since it could not approach them, touch on their concerns, and support their claims and political orientations. It was not being neutral at all, but it was adopting the point of view of the United States in an exaggerated manner, which further alienated the Arab public opinion (Seib, 2009).

Photographs were not far from the media battle as Michael Griffin focused on this aspect of the war media within his accounts and noted that photographs were present in the first Gulf War, the war in Afghanistan and the war of the invasion of Iraq. He stressed that the constant image was one of the most important fields of the Iraq war, where the focus of media efforts clearly on the visual media through the covers of newspapers and magazines, and emphasis on the importance of these images to be exciting and expressive, and able to deliver the idea without words. By using its photographs, US newspapers have focused on strengthening three key aspects - the US military arsenal, showing how powerful it is, as well as transfers of military equipment, mobilization and training, in addition US aircraft, aircraft carriers and troop carriers in the desert. Thirdly, it was highlighted that professional photographs of the leaders were taken and shown them to be strong, assertive and confident, being headed by President Bush. On the other hand, Griffin pointed out that the focus was on the images of Iraqi civilians welcoming US troops, as well as images of Kurdish fighters who were alongside the occupying forces. The newspapers also deliberately published photographs of the Iraqi prisoners, it was also natural that the images of the invading forces were not avoided, and they provided assistance to Iraqi civilians, women and children. A photo of a US family was also used when they were greeting a member of the family who is going to take part in the war, as well as photographs of American women greeting their husbands in military bases in order to raise viewers' sympathy for the invasion (Griffin, 2004).

In order to understand the importance of media coverage of international events, we may utilize from Daniela and Jesper's comparison of the position of the US and Swedish media about the war in Iraq in 2003. This comparison pointed to the great differences in the attitude of the national masses in both countries of the war. Swedish media regarding humanitarian aspects and addressing the views of the opposition to the war in various countries of the world, did not rely heavily on US government sources. The authors have underlined that the US media had focused

on the military aspects and emphasized the need for victory in the war and relied heavily on US government sources. This tended to create positive attitude of the American masses with regards to the invasion which was not the case relevant with the Swedish masses (Dimitrova & Stromback, 2005).

These differences between American and Swedish media coverage are the result of different cultural environments in both countries. As is well known, the journalist is a citizen before he is a journalist and therefore carries an intellectual and cultural baggage. Therefore, the journalist collects information that is compatible with what he/she believes and at least presents information according to his/her social and cultural/intellectual baggage. The social and cultural/intellectual baggage is not immune to general societal framework that defines and conditions the collective reasoning of the society as a whole. It seems possible to find striking differences between the media coverage of the same incident or topic in both America and Sweden, based on the different journalist's view of what is accorded in either of the countries. The institutional framework and the societal structuring within which the journalist operates determines his/her degree of professionalism. Barker, offers a categorical (yet, questionable) comparison of American and Swedish societal and cultural frameworks in terms of the media professionalism and argues that the former tends to be male-oriented culture that seeks firmness, achievement, triumph and boasting, while the latter tends to appear as feminine and seeks to observe law, protect civilians and avoid injustice (Barker G. , 2012).

In the pro-war media momentum, it was not easy to find a place for opposing voices, as media deliberately manipulated and directed the masses in one direction. It also amounted to scorn and ridicule opponents of the war and embarrass them live on the air. Morgen and Mark, in their article, discussed the neutrality of the media and its professionalism in a time of total compliance with the will of the US government. They contended that the role of the media is to defend the truth and to make sure the information is accurate before it is made public. Thus, the media is more like a filtering station for news and information, not just a vector without a will. To this end, the authors analyzed the role of the educational level of the public in distinguishing the correct news from the one that is false, because the learner is exposed to a greater amount of information, in addition to being able to access more information if necessary, which makes it easier for him/her to make the right decision from the current events without giving up his/her

own thoughts to the media. But, it is strange that the conclusion of the article indicates that there is some superiority for those who are educated over the others, yet, in the invasion of Iraq and the result of the huge amount of information broadcast by the US media pro-war, writers found and that those who are educated and those uneducated were equal in believing what the media was saying and they were treating it as an absolute fact (Morgan & Joslyn, 2008).

Andrew discusses the invasion of Iraq in 2003 in terms of the Bush administration's real intentions and how the new administration used the media in line with its own interests. Thus, he asserted that the United States was aware that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction and that Saddam Hussein had no links to al-Qaeda and 9/11 terrorist attacks, nor was Iraq a threat to the United States. So, the author assumed that the real reason for the invasion was the desire of the neo-conservatives, who formed the majority in the Bush administration, with their desire to lead the United States to the world in the 21st century, and impose American imperialism on the world, which required superiority in military, economy, media and terrains. Effective control of the strategic sites in the world, especially the Arab region was a part of that too. The writer assumed that the occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan was a clear target before the arrival of President Bush to power and that terrorist events were invested in an excellent way to achieve what the new administration wanted, and this was done through the use of the media to convince the local and international public opinion (Calabresa, 2005).

Douglas Kellner, one of the renown and influential scholars on the media studies, has confirmed the same idea and added that strengthening the US hegemony over the world, protecting Israel through the destruction of Iraq, and controlling of oil sources were the major factors that facilitated the war on the side of the USA. Kellner also drew attention to the religious motives of the war, quoting President Bush's statement as a crusade, as well as US companies' monopoly of Iraq's reconstruction and war spoils. The writer also stressed that the media was the most prominent and powerful player in this war after the US administration relied on it to market the war, alter facts, and falsify information (Kellner, 2004).

Unlike all previous writings on the impact of media coverage on the direction and leadership of public opinion, Kevin Coe has believed that the impact of war justifications in the news channels was limited, and the real reasons that led people to support the war were the reasons for the benefit, in addition demographic and requirements of reality (Coe, 2012).

All of those scholarly works that have mentioned have discussed one side only. However, in contrast, it can be said that they were limited, non-expanding works, most of which are articles dealing with the subject from one angle or two, and some of which discussed only the role of the media before or during the invasion and some articles discussed the subject in a way comparing the United States and other countries that covered the Iraq war. Among the authors were some that were more accurate by talking only about photographs, or analyzing the mass media content of one or two of the mass media, while this study worked to cover all aspects related to the title of research as much as possible, which includes the psychological aspect of constructivist theory, as study devoted A full chapter to talk about media policy-making and its relationship to foreign policy. Finally, this study sought to cover all aspects of the media, both before and during or after the war. Therefore, we hope that we have contributed to enriching the research process for the subject of research above.

2. THE THEORETICAL ROOTING OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

2.1 THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:

Theories of international relations are intellectual attempts like other human efforts in the humanities and seek to explain and understand what is happening between international actions at the global level, whether those actions from countries or non-countries such as international and regional organizations and even multinational companies and international organizations. Therefore, the role of theories of international relations is to work on explaining what is not tangible in order to better understand reality as well as help improve it through the design and dissemination of ideas and ideologies at the international level.

2.1.1 The opinion of the Constructivism theory on the Iraqi war:

Nicholas Greenwood was the first one who used the term “constructivism” in interpreting the behavior of international factors in international relations in 1989, as he made a simile between country and human. However, the Constructivism theory was quickly criticized and was said that it offered only theoretical hypotheses to be an intellectual theory that explains the behavior of the state in the field of international relations. On the other hand, the inability of realistic theory and neo-liberal theory to explain the collapse of the Soviet Union opened the door to constructivism theory to provide an explanation for this overwhelming event. It should be noted that constructivist perspective is based heavily on several arguments, including the identity and personal speeches of leaders and social upbringing in addition to the prevailing customs and thus the interests of the state subject to change because of the change of leaders. The constructivist school of thought is divided into two, the first of which includes traditional North American structuralism that focuses on social norms and identities in interpreting the behavior of the foreign state. The second section includes European scientists who focus on language and social discourse and this section usually called Explanatory or analytical (Behraves, 2011).

Conflicts and wars around the world were not only of a material nature; war or peace were simply created to change one another's view of himself or of another (from enemy to friend or vice versa). For example, the Cold War did not end because the Soviet Union could not meet

the economic, technological and military challenges of the West, but rather something else happened. That is, the Soviets began to reconsider some of their ideas and embrace some new Western ideas. Thus, Constructivism differs from other new schools and neo-liberalism, combining the physical and social aspects of objects in order to reach their true meaning. Through the perspective provided by the constructivism we have the methodological advantage to understand that people might not deal with things not for themselves, but because of the meanings they have been retaining. At the state level, the constructivism theory contends that a state defining other states will help them distinguish between friends and foes, so that they can get rid of ambiguity and uncertainty in their external relations and thus be more stable and able to know the behavior of other countries in the long term (Nugroho, 2008).

State's (A) perspective of state (B) will have a fundamental impact on the security interests of state (A), and thus on the nature of its interaction in the context of chaos. If state (A) views state (B) as an enemy, this means that the former sees the latter as a threat, which means that the likelihood of a war will be greater than if it sees it as a friend. For example, the US view of British missiles is not the same as of that regarding Russian missiles, although the physical missile power is equal to the two sides, meaning that the US definition of the other side ultimately decides (Wendt, 1992). Here, almost all constructivists agree that the most prominent feature of constructivism theory is the emphasis on the social construction of international relations and politics. Therefore, the facts of the international community are not material or social, but rather a combination of the two. Therefore, we find that what the state does in its external environment stems from what it retains and believes in by customs and social ideas (Barkin, 2003).

The constructivists discuss the identity of the state and its lack of sense of security from a social point of view. Therefore, they tend to argue that national identity and interests are only reflection of local norms, cultures and identities as well as intended political action. In order to achieve this, the state stands as a political entity with its own identity, and then present itself to the outside world (Das, 2009).

Regarding chaos in international relations, constructivists believe that identities are essential to ensure predictability, order and stability. The world without definitions and identities is chaotic and insecure. Here the state will define itself to the others, but this does not mean that

the others are forced to believe this identity and this definition, as the others will define the state based on the actions and daily behavior, and not based on what it claims. For example, Yugoslavia, during the Cold War, viewed the Soviet Union as Russia, because the Soviets spoke Russian with the citizens of Eastern Europe (Hopf, 1998). When the constructivists interpret the international order, they see that the structures of human gatherings are based on common ideas rather than material forces, and therefore the international order is a distribution of ideas. This contrasts with what the realists see as a distribution of material capabilities while the liberals define the international system as a distribution of institutional forces alongside material strength (Wendt, 1999).

Despite the starting point of the Constructivist theory in its interpretation of international relations from a community perspective, since the first day it was to be launched, it has been facing sharp criticism. The criticisms generally revolve around the question whether it deserve to be real and independent theory in the field of international relations or not. Additionally, its critics/opponents and proponents have yet to agree on a specific definition since it has still been on a continuous evolution. The Constructivism has undergone two phases throughout its history, pre- and post-modern. Adler defines Constructivism as a theory that explains the formation of the physical world and human action and its interactions through normative and dynamic interpretations. Perhaps the most prominent social scientists and theorists of constructivist theory are: firstly, Wendt who focuses on identity and maintains that international relations are socially constructed before they are defined with solely with regards to the benefits. And therefore, people deal with things based on their meanings and that these meanings evolve and grow with time and through interaction. The second prominent social scientist that is worth mentioning is Kratochwil. In his analysis of the behavior of the State in international relations, he focuses on the Goals and endings, which means that there is no value to the action if the desired effect is not achieved. Thus, what is not important is the act, how the state moved in its environment, but what is important is the result of this move. Onuf, the third prominent social scientist at the constructivist school, believes in the need to link international relations with international law. He also believes that human beings are innate social beings and that their sociality make them humanitarian, for that Onuf sees that the people and society make each other through speech and physical actions, which requires the existence of rules governing this relationship (Zehfuss, 2002).

The constructivists are very interested in the identity of the state in international relations, but more importantly their opinion on how identity is formed. In this respect, they maintain that identities are socially constructed and not given and that construction shall be done through the State's monopoly on the legal use of violence and sovereignty over society and land. The State thus expresses its identity in its interaction with other States through its endeavor to preserve its national interests of material security, independence, economic well-being and self-esteem. Through this interaction between the state and others, the identity of the state is formed and identified for itself and for the other party (Guzzini & Leander, 2006) . The events of 11 September were not passing events in the history of the United States, it was a real shock to American citizens and decision makers.

When Richard Haass the former director of the State Department's Policy Planning Team was asked about the reason for the invasion of Iraq, he said that he did not really know why Iraq was on the US foreign policy agenda. Constructivists attribute the cause of the war to psychological and ideological reasons, primarily because terrorist attacks were an affront to the prestige and global standing of the United States. Therefore, the values and national identity of the United States were called to enhance the confidence of the American citizen to his country so The United States should have exported the crisis abroad and sought a goal to punish. The constructivists explain why the invasion of Iraq was based on the Americans' view of themselves. They say that the American people view themselves as highly idealistic and see that they are the most civilized and developed. And the American people deserve to be a model for the rest of the peoples, which reflected on US foreign policy and President Bush in particular, where he saw the United States as the leader of the world and an exceptional country, From this door, President Bush was able to convince the American people that the United States should intervene to protect the peoples of the Middle East and provide them with protection and democracy. Doing so is the duty of the American people to lead the United States in the 21st century (Hassan, 2015).

Constructivist theory contends that Iraq was invaded because of a change in the strategic security culture of the United States of America. The former security culture, based on containment and geopolitical stability based on the idea of deterrence, emerged on the scene after the events of 9/11 based on the idea of preventive unilateral war, which is believed by the neocons. Thus, the project to promote democracy in the Middle East through power and

hegemony was launched. Iraq was like a test-case of the new vision. It served to be a litmus paper for the policy orientations of the US administration. Once the war was over, the United States was unable to continue as a result of the strong opposition it faced from other international parties opposing to the new foreign policy. In addition, the cost of material and moral warfare was very high along with the large number of American deaths. This has forced the United States to return to the previous state of containment and the use of soft power methods to achieve foreign policy goals (Lauterbach, 2011).

Canada's position on the Iraq war in 2003 helps us to understand the extent to which cultural and social aspects influence the foreign behavior of a state. Canada had participated in all the strikes carried out by the United States against Iraq during the last decade of the 20th century, but it refused to participate in the invasion of Iraq in 2003. The reason for the rejection was not the weakness of its military capability but its unwillingness to say yes. It should be noted here that national identities and therefore national interests are not the result of the state's interaction with other countries, but also the result of the state's interaction with its internal society. This is what happened with Canada in its position on the invasion of Iraq, as the ruling party did not want to lose the Canadian public opinion, which was opposed to the war, despite the knowledge of the party that this would adversely affect Canada's foreign relations and interests (Vucetic, 2006).

2.1.2 The opinion of the realistic theory on the Iraqi war:

All theories of international relations sought to answer a very important question: Why do wars between nations arise? The realistic theory attempted to answer this question by emphasizing that the origin in international politics is chaos and that the only actor in the international environment is the nation-state and it has absolute sovereignty over its territory and its people and does not follow any higher authority and is certainly independent. Therefore, it is unacceptable from the realists' point of view that there is a world government, if any, the state's accession to it or to any international organization such as the United Nations or the European Union is optional and it does this on its own and to achieve its national interests and can withdraw at will. Because of the absence of the international government, the sovereignty and independence of the absolute state and the differences and conflicts of interests among the

countries, chaos appears as the most prominent feature of the international environment. That is, the occurrence of war is a foregone conclusion because these will act in contradiction to achieve their conflicting interests. The realists usually resemble the state with humans and argue that one of the qualities of the human being is seeking interests selfishly and that the state is selfish and seeking solely for its interests (Weber, 2005).

Realism is based primarily on all material, and instead it recognizes only what nature accepts and rejects what cannot be measured. Realism arose as a reaction to the ideal theory in international relations after World War II and revolves its ideas in addition to the foregoing on the state and power and interest and also the concern of security and survival. Realism has gone through several phases in response to the transformation and change of international realities. Classical realism was born then followed by structural realism in the eighties of the twentieth century and the latter is also divided into offensive and defensive realism. Then, the ideas of classical realism came back but became less radical and more flexible (Spegele, 1996).

The realism owes in its intellectual antecedents to Machiavelli and Hobbes. And the thinker Morgenthau in his book “Politics Among Nations”, pointed out the most notable notions of traditional realism that resemble the state of the evil human being who believes in the idea of survival of the strongest in a chaotic and insecure environment. Therefore, the main concern of the state is to strengthen its military power in the first place. However, the competition among nations is not based on ideologies. This is because the state's goal is to military expansion, and accordingly, the rest of the economic, political and cultural forces occupy a second place after the military in realist thought. Moreover, morality has no place in the foreign policy of the state and the origin of the state's dealings with other countries is the balance of power (Aydin & Tekin, 2016).

Realists maintain that the post-Cold War unipolar system was a direct cause of the invasion of Iraq, as the United States wanted to preserve and strengthen US hegemony in an important region such as the Persian Gulf to ensure United States national interests. Iraq was also seen as a source of danger to the United States and its allies in the region. According to some realists, the invasion of Iraq was for the purpose of the US military parade. Realists criticize the war in Iraq and argue that it is based on the ideas and ideologies of American liberalism as its goal was to spread freedom and democracy. This ideology contends that any legitimate system

should be based on the consent of the people and that its rulers should gather the consent and recognition of the masses. On the other hand, free and democratic peoples must help fight dictatorships and have an interest and a responsibility to do so to make the world free (Deudney & Berry, 2017).

Unlike the liberal school, realists have little faith in, or depend on, international organizations unless they work effectively to serve the state. Realism only supports international institutions if they serve their interests and strengthen state authority. As for the position of realism about the invasion of Iraq, it can be said that it was not a supporter of the invasion and this is because there is not enough clarity to take this is a dangerous and bold decision. The realism sees that the invasion of Iraq will not increase the strength of the United States but will weaken it. Moreover, Al-Qaeda has not been attacked even though it is the prime suspect in the 9/11 attacks “With the need to refer that Al-Qaeda is not a state in the sense of realistic theory”, but the United States has attacked Afghanistan and Iraq. This can be said that the realist theory could not provide a coherent explanation for the decision to invade Iraq, as well as that many of the pioneers of this theory were against the war (Aydin & Tekin, 2016).

2.1.3 The opinion of the liberal theory on the Iraqi war:

Liberal theory is one of the most prominent theories that explain international relations. It is based on several main ideas, including equality and individual freedom. It also requires not only the state in the international arena, but also recognizes international organizations, multinational companies and even some internationally prominent individuals as important and influential actors in the international arena. First harbingers have appeared in the enlightenment Era. And continued to develop until it reached a crescendo in the era of US President Woodrow Wilson where he announced his vision reform of international relations after World War One, which included 14 points. Liberal theory holds that the only way out to avoid war is through open diplomacy, giving peoples their rights to self-determination, promoting free trade, the need for disarmament, and the need to resolve international disputes peacefully through international organizations. Liberals have been able to contribute to the founding of the League of Nations and despite their somewhat coherent arguments, liberal theory was soon harshly criticized after the proclamation of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. Liberalism remained on the defensive until the

outbreak of World War II in 1941. Strong theoretical credibility in its ability to prevent war because the League of Nations failed to achieve world peace. Liberal theory in international relations stems from individual liberty or self-independence. For this reason, it is taken to support republican governments or constitutional monarchies because they serve the individual and provide equality and political representation in the presence of independent legislative bodies, the rule of law and the protection of human rights. The definition of the individual in liberal thought is the human personality, which has a self-interest and the desire to preserve the self, along with a high possibility of moral and logical thinking and human sympathy. Now, however, the liberal international suffers from a weak influence in Western circles as well as in the world circles as it has lost its credibility and legitimacy (Griffths, 2007).

All theories of international relations share basic ideas, but they differ from each other in their preference for some ideas over others. At the time when the realist school does not regard the real importance of the economic aspects in international relations, we see the liberal school attaches great importance to economic affairs and believes in the difficulty of separating the economy and politics, whether at the level of the individual or the human group. On the intellectual level, liberal theory is based on six basic principles: the individual, freedom, natural law, spontaneous order, limited state and rule of law. These are the basic ideas from which liberals begin to interpret political issues internally and internationally (Vande, 2009). US liberals have been reluctant to support the war in Iraq. They believe that the possession of weapons of mass destruction by terrorist states and organizations poses a serious threat to interdependence and international cooperation, but they reject preemptive warfare and emphasize the need to curb international armaments so that world peace and security can prevail. They also refuse unilateral remedial action by any country without reference to the relevant international organizations, led by the UN Security Council. However, international liberalism believes that such acts can undermine international cooperation. They believed that the most appropriate solution to address the Iraqi situation is the establishment of international coalitions and alliances to fill the new and expected security gaps (Deudney & Berry, 2017).

The origin of liberal thought is to avoid war and achieve peace among peoples, but this does not mean that war does not occur in any way, as well as the possibility of supporting it in special cases. Therefore, liberals are allowed to resort to force only in cases where such military

intervention is under the international misleading, i.e. under the auspices of a collective international organization, provided that such intervention is limited and aimed at achieving long-term peace through democratization in the target country. Alternatively, we may conclude that the use of violence in liberal thought is permissible and legitimate only if it is to punish a state that transgresses international law or to promote democratic principles and values under collective patronage and in accordance with international law. Therefore, only states that abide by the law and practice democracy have the right to claim international protection, and therefore the international community can intervene by force to achieve democracy in an authoritarian and undemocratic state in this sense, we can say that there is a liberal basis for the idea of invading Iraq (Heinze, 2008).

2.2 US FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS IRAQ 1958 – 2003:

Since the founding of the Iraqi state in 1921 Iraq has been a relatively stable monarchy close to the West, namely the United Kingdom and the United States. But the 1958 coup against King Faisal marked a turning point in Iraq's history and foreign relations. Republicans dominated the country and began to approach the Soviet Union, which is hostile to the Western camp and the United States in particular, which means ending the Baghdad Agreement (1952). Iraqi-Soviet relations continued to improve significantly to include political, economic, military, and even cultural cooperation. This shift in Iraq's foreign policy became frightening for the United States, especially as Iraq became a concern for US allies in the region - Saudi Arabia and Iran. The rise of the Baath Party to power in 1968 contributed to a significant increase in Iraq's estrangement from the western camp and was amassed after the border problems with US allies "Iran and Kuwait" and Iraq's position on the Palestinian cause rejecting the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories. Relations between Iraq and the United States continued to worsen until the Islamic Revolution in Iran against the Shah began. The United States felt that it had lost its regional ally, Iran. The US foreign policy towards Iraq began to improve with a view to achieving regional balance. (Edwards, 2014).

As the Iran-Iraq war began in 1980, the United States began to approach Iraq again, and the United States found in the war an opportunity to weaken the Soviet Union by weakening its powerful allies in the region - Iraq and Iran. In fact, the United States supported both sides to

perpetuate the war and was deliberately working to prevent either side from achieving military superiority. Once it felt overwhelmed, both sides began to support Iraq militarily and politically and removed Iraq from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. In order to let Iraq, win the war and not to be a regional power (Marr, 2012).

The first Gulf War in 1991 marked a turning point in Iraq's political life as it was the beginning of the collapse after Iraq was at the height of its power. It emerged from the war with Iran as a winner and was able in a record time to control Kuwait. Despite President Bush's call for Iraqis to rebel against Saddam Hussein and the United States seeking to stand with the Kurds in northern Iraq and Shiites in the south, it has in fact provided only moral support and has never wanted regime change in Iraq. The goal of the war was to liberate Kuwait and bring Saddam back to its borders only. The United States knew that removing Saddam through military intervention meant that US troops were plunged into a very large quagmire. Therefore, the Gulf War was not aimed at arranging the Iraqi domestic house and defending the Shiites and Kurds, but using the Kurds and Shiites to weaken Baghdad and deplete its capabilities through harsh international sanctions and siege, which could encourage the internal opposition parties to launch a quiet military or political coup (Farkas, 2003).

After 9/11, the United States placed Iraq on the Axis of Evil list in a 2002 speech by President Bush in which my father was marketed as the main threat to the United States. Post-Cold War US foreign policy was based on the concept of rogue states, including Iraq. It was not taken into account all the statements of the UN weapons of mass destruction inspection committees, which indicated that Iraq was free of these weapons, which means that the invasion of Iraq was based on false assumptions and not facts.(Lock-pullan, 2006) As the United States were not hiding their efforts in the search for a safe zone in the Middle East in order to protect their access to oil in the Arabian Gulf and control it. So, Saddam Hussein provided a golden opportunity for the United States when he invaded Kuwait in 1991. In the 1990s, the United States sought to end the Iraqi regime through a range of measures, including defamation, a no-fly zone and military intervention under President Clinton in December 1998, in the name of Operation Desert Fox, under the pretext of Iraq's non-compliance with Security Council resolutions and interference in the work of UN inspectors (Gardner, 2008).

2.3 BUSH'S VISION OF A SOLUTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST:

Shortly after Bush took over as president of the United States, he found himself facing the most important global event - the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The president reacted to these events like other American citizens and showed empathy and firmness. He also said that what was happening was based on ideological differences. He also divided the world into two categories: enemies and friends and declared what was later known as the Axis of Evil (Hirsh, 2002).

Bush was not a traditional president. He was able, through his rhetorical style and his deliberate repetition of certain vocabulary such as democracy, freedom and terrorism, to convince the American public of the importance of preventive war and the need for the United States to democratize the Arab region and the Middle East. That he was able to convince the US Congress that the use of force to overthrow authoritarian regimes in both Afghanistan and Iraq is a significant shift in the approach of US foreign policy (Nye, 2006).

Perhaps the most important point in changing the administration's view of the Middle East solution is the new administration's belief that the cause of terrorism is the weakness of democracy in those countries. The absence of political freedom, democracy, women's rights, the weakness of civil society institutions and freedom of expression are a direct cause to the emergence of extremist organizations hostile towards the United States, and the reason is that these organizations believe that the United States supports the tyrannical governments in their countries and stands with corrupt rulers. In order to address these situations, the United States launched a series of Middle East initiatives, the most prominent of which is the Middle East Partnership Initiative (Stewart, 2005).

After 9/11, the United States changed its policy toward the Middle East directly. Having been satisfied with Arab leaders' support for it, the United States now started seeking support from the people. In order to achieve this, it agreed to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. In a related context, the French Foreign Minister said that the cause of terrorism in Palestine was the accumulation of popular anger as a result of the events taking place there. This confirms the change in the West's view of how to deal with Middle East issues (Freedman, 2002).

In the Bush era, the American administration sought to answer three fundamental questions posed by the 9/11 events, which are very important despite their simplicity. These questions; are who is our enemy? Why does he hate us? How will we respond to him and overcome him? The answer was that our enemy is the terrorist groups and the governments that support them. These groups hate the United States because it guarantees its citizens the freedom of religion, expression, freedom of assembly and difference, and how to respond by bringing them to justice or achieving justice for them. For this reason, President Bush said that the world is evil and good, and that his war on terror is not only for America but for all who believe in freedom, pluralism, tolerance and other democratic principles (Dunu, 2005).

Not only did Bush do so, but he also made another statement on November 2003 stating that not only military force could be used to bring about change, but we also need to strengthen democracy in those countries to dry up the sources of terrorism. To achieve this goal, the United States has replaced authoritarian regimes with democratic ones, and pressured rulers and leaders there to be more democratic and civilized. With regard to the invasion of Iraq, President Bush maintained that the establishment of a free Iraq is a turning point in the path of the revolution towards democracy, because the survival of the Middle East without freedom means that the causes of hatred and violence that can be transmitted to us at any time remain (Dunu, 2005, 26-27).

There is no doubt that the Arab-Israeli conflict is the most complex point towards peace in the Middle East. With regards to this controversial issue, the United States has presented itself as a peace sponsor in this region, which was confirmed by King Abdullah II, Bashar al-Assad and Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak at the time. In this regard, President Bush pointed out the importance of linking the war to Iraq and achieving peace in the region and said that the United States will do everything in its power to do so, and that the first steps are to invade Iraq and overthrow the regime of Saddam Hussein and invest this in advancing the peace (Chafee, 2007).

Arab intellectuals believe that the negative attitude towards the United States and the West in general wasn't out of thin air, as it is the result of the actions of the United States for decades. This American behavior began with the launch of Eisenhower's Middle East policy and intervention in the Syrian Crisis in the 1950s. The Arabs' loss of the 1967 war and the rise of former Egyptian president Gamal Abdel-Nasser against the West pushed this trend strongly. All

this, in addition to the position of the United States in support of Israel and its efforts to control the oil sources in the region through its military presence, has contributed greatly to provoke the anger of Arab nationalists and then Islamic groups and Islamists in general (Baroudi, 2007).

To be closer to the Iraqi situation, it can be said that although most of the substantive studies and even the CIA believed that Saddam Hussein did not own the nuclear bomb and could not produce it soon, and even if he owned it, he would only use it if he felt in danger, It does not pose a threat to the interests of the United States. But the Bush administration saw Saddam as a reckless figure and a threat to the United States and its allies in the region. Then, the administration decided to remove the regime in order to spread democracy, but it failed to arrange the post-Saddam papers in a complex, multi-ethnic and sectarian country such as Iraq, which cast doubt on the success of democracy. The US administration did not take into account the legitimacy and acceptability of the new regime and did not expect the reaction of the Arab and Iraqi citizens towards the new rulers who came on the back of the tank (Larrabee, 2002).

The Bush administration was not free to take the decision to invade. There were opposition voices in both the Democratic and Republican parties. These voices believed Bush was looking for his personal glory and wanted to give a new impetus to his war on terrorism. Despite all this, the opposition could not stand up to the fact that the public opinion was at that time very sensitive to everything related to security and terrorism after the events of 9/11. To say that Bush was able to invest the wave of discontent and anger by declaring war on Iraq in 2003 (Larrabee, 2002, 48).

Bush's doctrine is considered a huge and a basic revision in the foreign policy of the United States where it became more aggressive as a normal reaction on 9/11 events. This was contrary to what was followed in the time of Truman where the United States tended to follow containment strategy by the granting of military and economic assistances for other countries threatened by Soviet expansion. This policy somehow resembled a policy of seeking to structure international security in accordance with American interests by power. Bush's doctrine was based on four basic pillars. The first pillar was American hegemony which was defined broadly and not restricted on cultural and economic hegemony as the case in the wake of the Cold War. It exceeded to include military hegemony in order to impose the new international system by punishing any a rogue state that violates United States interests. The second pillar was the

distribution of democracy by force as the case in Afghanistan and Iraq. Third pillar was the Preventive war. This meant that the United States might attack and disrupt the ability of other party on attack in future. On the hand, it also meant deterring any country considering threatening the United States or its allies and preventing it from thinking of such a step. Fourth pillar was Unilateralism. It meant the desire of the United States to work uniquely and from one side in order to promote and protect its national interest where the political, military or economic interests. Some scholars have noted that, this unilateralism required the capacity of the country to depend on itself in everything and does not take into consideration the positions of other international actors. Uniqueness in decision-making and implementation would inevitably annoy the rest of the international community. With time, it would erode the power and viability of the United States (Griffiths, O'callaghan and Roach, 2008).

3. MEDIA AND FOREIGN POLICY

3.1 THE CONCEPT OF FOREIGN POLICY:

Initially, foreign policy was often accompanied by diplomacy. At that time the polity was simple and not complicated, and the diplomacy meant producing and marketing the polity to the other states and working to take into account the interests of the state abroad and avoiding the external hazards. The term of the foreign policy has significantly increased early of the eighteenth century as establishing foreign affairs ministries in the nation-states. The concept of foreign policy connected to the government conducting affective purpose state political outward oriented and that's the way that make foreign policy greater than what's achieved by the diplomats and foreign affairs ministry as its collective transaction with the international environment where the government here is acting on behalf of its citizen's taking into account their interests and protecting them from the external dangers. The international environment has become forked and complex and so it's not possible to perform the total isolation of the polity. The new international environment requires the presence of side holds the responsibility of making decision, holding responsibility and carry out the accountability process, and for that the governments were the legitimate authority to take this role and representing their Countries in front of other peoples. (Hill, 2003).

In general, there are two types of strategies that the polity practice in its foreign policy, the first strategy is that of the global extension. It is the strategy that within it the state aims to at the regional or global leadership, such kind of strategies is often used by super powers that regard themselves as Capable and qualified to manage the global system. The polity is practicing three types of leadership through its foreign policy that are dominations pluralistic leadership and participatory and finally, the ideal leadership. The first type of the foreign policy is often rejected from the other parties in its explicit and implicit from as the country inherently doesn't obey the other countries. The pluralistic leadership means making procedures to mobilize a group of nations to achieve mutual purposes like the campaign that launched by Malaysia which concerns the Asian values and Australia's leadership of Cairns which concerns agricultural exporters. Such kind of global or regional Leadership can be achieved through international organizations like the United Nations or European Union. The other type of foreign policy strategies is the state's

pursuit of ideal state of the other countries through solid or soft power and demanding of making free elections and the implementation of market economy and protecting human rights and others that may presenting a form of intruding the internal affairs of the other states. The second type of foreign policy strategies is defense strategy, which means that the weak state uses its foreign policy to market itself to the others and presenting itself as best as possible to ensure good friendship relations with other international parties and thus reducing the risk of exposure. (Hill, 2003, 242 246).

We can define the foreign policy that it is total state work or others international affective parties geared towards "the foreigner of this state or the international factor. Accordingly, it's possible to retain a clearly defined role for the transnational institutions and organizations. This role doesn't mean by any situation sizing the role of the nation-state, where the government is still even in the democratic states the authorized party that responsible for all foreign procedures and subsequently the relationship between the polity and the international organizations is cooperative relationship in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. It is no longer right to talk about the material interests of the state and its search for the safety when discussing foreign policy making where the constructivist school clearly indicates that the states external behavior reflects social and cultural internal reflections. From this point the state's intention in its external behavior is factored to understand its foreign policy which is "intention the first step of foreign policy then follows: "Concern" which means state's concern of states behavior bi to know whether its foreign policy is serving its interests or not. Then the third level of the foreign policy which is the state's deceive in affecting the policy of another state and then the stage of "intrusion which means making action that brings benefits to the foreign policy and sometimes the intensity of intrusion develops into occupation or colonization and this depends on the equal strength of the parties and the surrounding internal, regional and international circumstances (Muller, 2015).

Foreign policy is a natural response to a stimulus, this stimulus make decision maker to respond through purposeful political behavior. Here we talk about the intention and the goal that lies behind the political behavior for decision maker. Later, many options are provided to handle with such event and then the best replies are chosen under the international, regional and national environment to avoid the exaggeration of the event and to ensure achieving the best advantage in the political behavior. The whole process is done pursuant to mixture of interests, intentions, information and viewpoints of decision makers and this political behavior must be valuable in

other words to be purposeful and affective otherwise it there's a need to do the political action unless it achieves its goals states (Kalayci, 2019).

3.2 THE TOOLS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREIGN POLICY:

The states have wide authorities to implement their foreign policy and this depends strongly on the power and the abilities of and their global positions as the most outstanding of implementing states foreign policy are the political, diplomacy fails and the economic, military tools as well as soft power tools that will focus on the information aspect.

3.2.1 The political tools to implement the foreign policy:

Diplomacy is one of the most important pillows to implement the foreign policy to any state. As it plays a role in making decisions and the quality of coordination between institutions that are related and the competence of negotiators plays a role too in achieving foreign policy's goal, good proof of this is the role of the United States of America in ending the cold war peacefully through its high diplomatic performance in persuading Eastern European countries to defect from the Soviet Union and unite Germany by relying on its political and diplomatic efforts (Huthchings & Suri, 2015). On the other hand, regional and international alliances are extremely important means of implementing states foreign policy and strengthen their position globally. Venezuela, for example, under Hugo Chavez 2003 initiated the creation of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas and its abbreviation (ALBA) and this has helped Venezuela to be the leader of the Latin region against the United States after eight countries joined this alliance under Venezuelan leadership. Therefore, it can be said that the establishment of alliances or joining into those alliances appear to be important political and diplomatic tools to serve foreign policy. In addition to establishing or participating in international or regional alliances, the state works to achieve its external goals by threatening to withdraw from such political groupings or from negotiations, international treaties and summit meetings. Countries may also use the diplomatic recognition or to achieve their interests, as well as summon or expel foreign diplomats (Fuente, 2011).

3.2.2 The military tools to implement foreign policy:

There's no doubt that the security concern is one of the most important issues of concern to states throughout the ages, then empowered countries are therefore providing military assistance to other countries to enhance their military capabilities in return for achieving the desired military and security objectives. The United States, for example, has acted remarkably after 9/11 to combat terrorism by strengthening the military capabilities of its allies in the Middle East in order to ensure cooperation in the elimination of global terrorism. Here, the United States does not mind supporting military authoritarian states as long as they serve US interests. Egypt for example receives 30 US Dollars per citizen from US support, although it has failed in institutional and democratic aspects, India, which is more democratic than Egypt receives 16 cents per citizen for US aid. Therefore, some commentators note that, the goal of military assistance is to protect US security and military interests and win the friendship of recipient countries, not to promote democracy as the United States claims (Brainard, 2017). The ability of the state to defend itself and its willingness to do so is one of the pillars that strengthens its negotiating power in any negotiation process. The weak state will not be cared for, so the military power of the state is one of the most prominent elements of the strength of its foreign policy. In view of the different interests and plurality of states, there are conflicting views on a particular subject, but at the same time the degree of insistence of states and their enthusiasm on the same subject varies. Accordingly, what state "A" considers very important is what state "B" does not accord significance. Based on the importance of the issue between the state and others, it might be argued that, the relation starts to escalate, especially if it threatens the national security of the state when the diplomatic means fail or seem to the state to fail, it starts with escalation from verbal and media escalation, then the reduction of diplomatic representation to the military threat and finally military intervention. It also depends on how important the issue of disagreement is for the state. The state when using its military power, either to declare war and seize what it wants by force or it is taking a military step in order to improve its negotiating position or to force the other party to sit at the negotiating table, so in the second case the state uses military force as a means to advance negotiations in their favor, thus military force, whether used by the state in defensive or hostile manner, provides a high degree of international freedom of action for the state (Ebaye, 2010).

Usually, the political administration formulates the foreign policy of the country, however, technological progress and ease of communication between the field command and the political leadership, as well as the security issues or military affairs on the top of the priorities of the US administration after the events of 9/11 gave the military leadership a prominent role in the formulation of foreign policy instead of implementing it, the role of military Commanders increased with the advent of the neo-conservatives, the Pentagon was given broad powers at the expense of the State department. The decision-making process in the United States is based on institutional work through which information from relevant ministries is collected and discussed by senior leadership, this means that what the political leadership will discuss depends mainly on what was provided by the field military command, as well as the new security data gave the military leadership the opportunity to participate in the formulation of foreign policy because of the seriousness of the matter (Reveron, 2004).

One example of the state's use of military tools to serve politics is Russia's military intervention in Ukraine in 2014. The objectives of Russian interventions were not purely military, but were driven by political objectives, in order to achieve diplomatic coercion to force Ukraine to obey the Russian administration and sit at the negotiating table, Russian intervention did not destroy the Ukrainian forces (Charap, 2016).

The other aspect of the use of military tools in order to serve the objectives of foreign policy is in two forms: the first form is to provide financial assistance for the purchase of weapons and equipment to the recipient country. The second form is through the provision of weapons and equipment to the recipient Country. As is known in the world of politics, nothing is free. On the other hand, the results of these assistance are positive for the state providing assistance, whether political, economic or military profiles or at least, these aids contribute to avoid the expected dangers, Throughout the cold war, the United States provided military assistance to its Western European allies, not only for the benefit of these countries, but also for containment and protection from Soviet expansionism, besides, it was demanding Western Europe economic gains by forcing them to abide by export controls between east and west (Leigh-pippard, 1995).

Deterrence is also one aspect of employing the military capability of the state to achieve its interests. Deterrence in international relations is that the state uses the threat against another

state in order to force it to act or to refrain from doing so to serve the threatened state that made the threat. Here we find that the state does not use force toward the other party, but only moving and threatening to force the other party to comply with its political will, Deterrence includes not only nuclear weapons but all kinds of military force (Quackenbush, 2011). In addition to all that provided for military assistance is to another form, financial and military support secret and unspoken in addition to assassinations and political assassination by the state intelligence services to kill its enemies and opponents abroad, where the state is supporting its supporters in another country in order to strengthen their political and military position at the expense of enemies. This model was widely popular during the cold war era between the US and the Soviet Union, where both sides supported military groups and political forces in a third country with the aim at controlling this state and annexing it to the camp of one of the parties, this is known as proxy war (Sanchez, 1989).

3.2.3 The economic tools of foreign policy:

In addition to the political objectives of foreign policy, the economic objectives that the donor country is working to achieve through economic assistance, whether in the form of grants, loans or in-kind economic assistance, the donor Countries led by the United States aim to bring about economic change in the recipient Countries. In the economic systems such as economic openness and the application of systems of governance and market freedom in addition to strengthening the status of us companies with the recipient Country, this means that the aim of all these is not the development and economic well-being of the other party. Aids were not for humanitarian purposes, but the goal is to achieve political and economic interests by strengthening economic control in that country through economic concessions (Whang, Kim, Han & Kim, 2019) . Foreign assistance is one of the means of implementing the foreign policy of the state the United States through the US Agency for International Development (USAID) spent only in 2004 26.6 billion dollars in backs and economic aid, Iraq and Afghanistan have got the big amount of these aids, when president G.W. Bush administration thought these aids may contribute in making permanent economy in these countries, on the other side, Colombia got 3.2 billion dollars aids from the US to contribute in fighting international drugs trade and the same to Egypt and Israel, both got 12% of the total aids of Department of state from 1995 to 2004 as the US seek to improve the economic state to the rest of the world, so the US don't spend these aid

equally? The answer of this question comes up of the geostrategic importance of these countries are not equal to the US, plus the US aims at achieving political targets by its foreign aids. Foreign aid is therefore a tool used by foreign policy to achieve its goals of controlling those countries, extracting their political will, or even strengthening their regional position. The philosophy of foreign aid is based on the idea of protecting US interests. Poverty and government weakness (as claimed by the US government) in countries important to the United States means that these countries will remain unstable, which means the possibility of wars and conflicts, which will ultimately threaten US interests. US assistance will be working to promote democracy and economic development, which in turn will stabilize the country and thus protect US interests (Taffet, 2007).

The Non-Governmental Organizations in all around the world aims to help the nations to develop. Usually the NGO work in particular fields that target a specific segment of people to help them by producing health support and social needs. These organizations are active in the places that suffer from crises and wars. The question is about the relationship between these organizations and the donors. To be precise, keeping in mind this sort of relationship, we might ask the following question: are these organization's independent? It would not be an exaggeration to argue that, there exist several doubts and reservations concerning the independence of those organizations once the probable interests of the donors have been taken into consideration. That is why, many organizations are thought be covering for political, economic and social purposes that are unannounced. Financial dependence in one way or another might bring about subordination to the sponsor. In a speech to US non-governmental organizations, Indre Tatsios, a director of USAID, maintained that these organizations serve as arms to the United States abroad and that if they do not cooperate with US foreign policy goals, the US government will lift support for them. On the other hand, Colin Powell, Former US Secretary of state, pointed out that US non-governmental organizations express the repercussions of American power and hegemony (Picard, Groelsema & Buss, 2008). It's good to mention that some other means or methods such as providing supporting or banning the oil and its derivatives might consider to be important ways of supporting States' foreign policy .As is customary, Oil-export states use the oil as attempt to put pressure upon import-oil state to change its position and yield due to significantly of Oil to the national security of the import-oil state. When Britain, France and Israel occupied Suez Canal in 1956, Saudi Arabia initiated with some Arab states

cutting oil on the occupied states, but the US compensated the lack of oil which made the Arabic plan fail. But once the United States began threatening to refuse to compensate for the shortage or gain political and economic gains, the occupying powers withdrew from the Suez Canal and returned it to the Arabs. Thus, oil was a very effective means of achieving the foreign policy interests of both Arabs and the United States. And during the Iraqi Iranian war, Syria supported Iran and it closed the oil pipe that transfer Iraqi oil from Kirkuk to the Mediterranean Sea passing through Syria and Lebanon. This movement affected negatively on Iraq. But in return Jordan took the advantage and helped Iraq to export its oil through its territories on condition of getting oil from Iraq to Jordan with supported prices. Even after the crisis ended, Iraq remained exporting oil to Jordan at subsidized prices in order to maintain good relations with neighboring Jordan. Thus, oil is an effective tool used by the exporting countries to win the favor of the beneficiary countries or to force them to take a certain position that serves the interests of the exporting countries (Crane, Goldthau, Toman, Light, Johnson, Nader, Rabasa, and Dogo, 2009).

The economic sanctions played important role in saving the foreign policy along twentieth century. There were one hundred and three economic sanctions from 1914 until 1985. The US was topping the states that used this style in number reached 68 times. In spite of the efficiency of economic sanction in many times, yet it's not guaranteed always (Hufbauer & Schott, 1985). Economic sanctions have multiple forms, ranging from refusing to renew a specific trade agreement to mass urbanization of exports or preventing imports. Sanctions in language mean the threatening action being taken to obey, which is expected to bring good or prevent evil. Norms of human behavior are usually accepted by the society that is subject to such behavior, but this does not prevent the existence of an undisciplined category, so it was necessary to have sanctions in place to ensure the safety of all, and here sanctions are often applied by a higher authority. In the international community, sanctions can be enforced by UN resolutions, and the state can impose sanctions on another state or group of countries with the aim of forcing them to conduct certain behavior consistent with the objectives of the imposing state (Miyagawa, 1992).

3.2.4. Importance and Role of Media in Implementing Foreign Policy:

Feeling or hatred of popular discontent hold by people of specific country against some country is not unimportant or secondary issue. These negative points of views have high negative consequences on hatred country where they help directly in threaten the security of a country and its people. In addition, they hinder the processes of commercial, educational and cultural communication between those countries. Negative feelings of Arab peoples towards the United States contributed in sympathy of Arab countries with enemies of the United States and antagonizing those which corporates with the United States. Moreover, those antagonizing feelings contributed in receiving the financial, moral and material support by extremist organizations. In the end, this issue is reflected negatively on the security of the United States. At the governmental level, governments are not able anymore to neglect public opinion in internal and foreign issues. For instance, the position of Turkish government which refuse the collaboration with the United States to invasion of Iraq in 2003 which was a response of Turkish public opinion against this invasion (Nader, Yalonis, Milton, Alzaidi, and Al-ramyanand, 2006).

The public opinion scientist John Zaller contends that if media aims to effect in preferences of public policy; they should provide consistent prejudice of news. This means they should provide all or most of information and news in one direction with or against specific issue in order to provoke people in adopting opinion at this issue. If people expose to two opposing opinions about one issue, the media will not take a huge role of effecting the public opinion and these efforts will goes in vane (Claes & Boomgaarden, 2006). Therefore, if media targeting internal community, this enters within making and directing public opinion while if media message is directing outside, this is known as public diplomacy which is one of pillars of soft strength of state. Soft strength means the ability to affect others in order to obtain results wanted by the country by carrot, not intimidation and coercion. The soft strength here depends on what own by the country of resources, values and successful policies. Many countries resorted to this style in order to achieve their foreign interests when it is difficult to depend on traditional hard power and its high cost. Thus, most countries seek to implement their foreign policies by transferring targeted communities from the case of hostility to friendship by gaining their hearts and brains. One significant country may use stick (force) or seduction (carrot) to achieve what it desires. However, it may use attraction methods which connotes to achieving the ends by

manipulating the other countries and receiving their active consent. Within this scheme, ends are fulfilled, goals are reached without resorting to enforcement. In order to achieve this, the concerned country should have something worthy of attention and admirable. The role of public diplomacy is of pivotal here. It appears to be a beneficial tool for governments in their 'marketing' attempts. Herein, the media is considered one of the most commonly applied and effective tools to change the convictions of other party (Nye, public diplomacy and soft power, 2008). In order to demonstrate the importance of media as soft power of countries, we may mention about China's current position among the most powerful nation-states throughout the world. China is thought to become a major player in African arena not only because of the economic, commercial, cultural and educational services it has been providing within the area, but also as a result of its massive efforts in media and literary in Africa. Today, China is one of leading countries to spend mostly on foreign media especially in Africa where there are many Chinese media institutions. The Chinese investment in the media yielded a good image of Chinese foreign policy in Africa where China today enjoys a good reputation among the Africans contrary to the negative image held against the Americans and the Europeans (Zhang, Wasserman, and Mano, 2016).

During the last century, countries were used to construct their public policy by governmental correspondence, promotion and communication campaigns with foreign communities. Whereas the new public diplomacy, today, means that any significant country seeks to build strong relationships with effective parties at civil society in other countries. This has been achieved by many factors and the most important of them are civil society organizations and the mass media. Recently, it is known as citizen diplomacy and it connotes to the role performed by famous artists and cross-border societal symbols where these elements appear as important resources of information and vehicles to promote governmental messages at other countries. Also, video games, interactive media, blogs and electronic forums are important tools in achieving the interactive interference between communities where old-fashioned tools such as television, radio and newspapers are no more used as the mode of indoctrination. This contributed in ease of communication and elimination of misunderstanding between communities (Zahrana, 2010).

During the twentieth century, Voice of America was the unique public diplomatic media and it is media agency financed by the American Federal Government specialized to produce the television, radio and digital content with more than 40 languages. It is founded in 1942, its final charter has signed in 1976 by the American president Gerald Ford. Voice of America witnessed weak audience, and it was broadcasted with seven hours a day. The events of 11/9 enforced American administration to review of their media tools directed to Arab and thus, they launched Al-Hurra TV and Radio Sawa in 2002. The ambition was to make Al-Hurra TV directed to whole Arab and Al-Hurra Iraq directed to Iraqi people and Al-Hurra European directed to Arab expatriates in Britain, France and Germany. Unfortunately, in spite of American funds and efforts to market its foreign policy in Arab region, the USA's efforts, in the main, have failed. For instance, the Al-Hurra TV could not gain the hearts and the minds of the ordinary Arab citizens. Al-Jazeera and Al-Arabiya channels which retain anti-American orientations were rather successful in capturing the hearts of the Arab populace (Seib, *Toward a New Public Diplomacy: Redirecting US Foreign Policy*, 2009).

Walter Lippmann pointed out to the importance of media on focusing the interest of audience on few numbers of issues. According to him, that the issue was not restricted on the provision of community the information about what is going on outside. Rather, the audience (readers) paid attention to comparisons during the process of apprehension. In other words, mode of first page, gross headlines and titles and presenting the news in the editorial newsletter were of pivotal importance. Since media is almost the unique resource for audience about what is going on outside, media has the potential to rearrange the importance of events for them. The media agenda had the potential to affect the public opinion positively or negatively. Therefore, it tends to highlight specific issues or accords significance to them (Lippmann, 1991). This is a way to appeal to the instinctive need for guidance already existent within the ordinary citizens. For instance, business agenda can play a significant role in directing and leadership. However, if information is provided, people may make correct decision without interference from media and this matter differs from one person to other where each one has different level of information and education (Mecombs, 2011).

Direct and effective presence of media in life programming of societies appeared to be a well-known phenomenon. Besides, it is recognized that the information reaching to the

population through media may not be completely innocent but may have been designed to steer public opinion towards specific goals. At the time where the totalitarian country (non-democratic country) holds batons and use violence to lead people. Meanwhile, in democratic countries this is unacceptable and unthinkable. Thus, the democratic country turn to use propaganda to lead people. It can be said that people are driven by the government and they only the tool was changed (Zaidan, 2012). The discovery of television brought a fundamental change in the life of individuals throughout the world notwithstanding the USA population. At the beginning of the century, American people began spending much time in watching television where studies have shown that standard American family tended to spend more than 6 hours a day for watching the tv. Television entered approximately to the almost all the houses in USA. Thereby, television became the basic source for reaching to information. In the past, politician was communicating with his constituents directly where he was addressing the public and spreading his messages in front of audience in himself. This has developed to the indirect communication by publishing the thoughts of politician by magazines belonging to his political party or printed in the form of brochures. Within this process, it is argued, the politician and his party were confident that information security would reach to the audience in the form they desired to be (Ansolabehere, Beher and Iyengar, 1993). While currently, television has made radical change in effect equation of public opinion. When a questionnaire was conducted about the relative importance of media for American people and participants asked in this questionnaire: Where do you get news about what is going on in the world? The answer referred clearly to the progress of television and newspapers on the rest of media platforms where ratios were on the following form:

Source of Most News	Ratios
Television	64%
Newspapers	40%
Radio	14%
Magazines	4%
People	4%

While about conflicting news and information about the same subject, they tend to believe the television by 53%, newspapers by 24%, radio 8%, magazines 7% and I do not know by 8% (Zaidan, 2012, 72).

At the beginning of twentieth century, studies about the effect of media in configuring public opinion proliferated. Due to the dependence of audience on TV news and because of ability of politicians on effecting news, media became a vehicle of directing public opinion by many windows. It provided people information and thus, help them build their own opinions concerning the ongoing public events. Besides, in some specific cases, the media tended focus on a specific issue and highlight it in accordance with the priorities it had formerly defined. Its contribution in determination of responsibilities was another mode worth of mentioning. Determination of responsibility is comfort mode and aims to simplify and understand complicated issues. When audiences object specific problems or issues, they automatically start to blame or praise on authority or person as the responsible about what happened. At this point, the media, especially the television, appear to be the strongest factor in the determination of responsibility in political affairs. Finally, persuasion appears to be the last method to be mentioned. Accordingly, the media contribute in the configuration of public opinion where media reshape the audiences' point of view. Furthermore, media has high ability on coding or dropping politicians by arranging priorities of audiences. For instance, through the Gulf War, reports of reporters shed a light on the war. Thus, the war concord on the American's brains .As a result of winning case of the war against Iraq army. Despite was unequal war; United States people was satisfied on President Bush and he was a place of complement and praised. However, as soon as one year passed, the media highlighted the economic crisis and rescission of good instead of Gulf War. At that time, popularity of President Bush has highly decreased and lagging on, he looks like weak and failing to solve the economic crisis. During only one year, popularity of president has decreased from 83% to 46% and the main reason is media just changed their agenda and highlight events without others. This is clearly confirmed the role played by media in directing public opinion (Ansolabehere, Beher and Iyengar, 1993, 7-8). At the beginning of twentieth century, TV was the major source for news around the world where citizen was not able to know what was going on behind the scene. This means the ability of media on publishing political propaganda and governmental point of view by newsletters by focusing the interest on specific events without other which reflect the audience interest of that channel. Besides,

sociologists confirm that audiences tend to interact with bad and scary news more than happy news. Through manipulation policy with people feelings and exploit their fears, American media enabled on motivating people to believe what was not real such as the relationship between Iraq with Al-Qaida organization, Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that all world supported war against Iraq. This had refuted with time (Kazmi, 2012). Importance of media lies in leading public opinion and direct instead of docile it. At the time where media played role in associating audiences with political elites and work on demystifying and facilitating transfer of information between two parties, prevented tyranny of power by enlightening the audiences on what was happening at the local and global levels. It was argued that the media could have a positive contribution on the process of defining the general interest. Therefore, media coverage in some way or other had the potential to affect the public interest while public interest lacked the power not affect intensity of media coverage. This means that there appeared two parties. The first one was to be the conscious, elitist and capable of managing the media operation. Second party with large numbers and inconsistent or organized masses seemed to be the passive recipients. For example, at the time where all media around the world show what was going on in Baghdad's Firdous Square (Down the statue of Saddam), the media in Arab countries such as Syria and Sudan did not display due significance to this issue and simply because political administration at these countries were against the American invasion (Lewis, 2001).

Role of TV is not restricted on what it shows of dry programs and news but even the entertainment materials may contribute in stirring discussions and highlight public policy issues. In 1983 and during amidst of the Cold War, the United States wanted to spread the irradiated nuclear fuel in Western Europe. At this time, a film was screened entitled as (The after Day) by coincidence. The film supposed tension between USSR and USSR and escalated the conflict between Warsaw Pact and NATO that could be quickly turn into a nuclear war. The film focused upon the effects experienced by residents of cities near nuclear missile silos. This motivated the American public opinion to stand against increasing the nuclear abilities under the pretext of deterrence (Serfaty, 1990).

American media is characterized by the intensity and multiplicity of media institutions in addition to its technological development. Special companies control American media. Noam Chomsky mentioned that who media could pass its messages to audiences and thus, that

American media was to be the controller on information sources on the global level. It dominates sources of news, its distributions and industry through international news agencies, international and national editions, western magazines in addition to percentage of high production of books, TV programs, films and others. Statistics refer that out of 10 international media agencies, there are 9 American. Flow of information around the world is controlled by four major news agencies and two of them are Americans which are Associated Press (A.P) and United Press International (UPI) in addition to Reuters and Agency France-Presse (AFP) (Zaidan,2012, 74-75).

Control of these agencies means monopoly of news and information. That is, these agencies collect information by their offshoots around the world and reporters spread everywhere and thus, only they can control whatever they reach. This in turn configures the danger on the freedom of dissemination of the information. In addition, these agencies are always owned by capital owners who associate with questionable relationships with other owners of weapons, oils, economic and industry companies in addition to politicians. At this point the topic of conflict of interest might emerge as a potential danger against freedom of press. There are four to five great American companies control the global communication and production of films, TV programs and own publishing houses. These firms control on TV channels, radio and newspapers, namely Walt Disney, Fayon, Time Warner and Sony America. Time Warner own many channels, namely New York Daily News, CBC, ABC, MBC and CNN. In addition, it owns Time magazine Newsweek, World Report and US Talk magazine. Accordingly, NBC, CBC, CNN and Fox Bloomberg dominate on more than 80% of the industry of news and information which tends to imply control of one a wide slice of audiences. American media by all its types whether private or public most support the American national interests determined by administration and lobbies, security devices and intelligence. For instance, neo-conservatives own or finance many American media channels such as Doukkali Standard which was edited by William Kristol, a former director of the US vice president's office 1989-1993. Moreover, Fox News Channel is owned by Rupert Murdoch who is considered one of the major voices of the neoconservatives (Zaidan, 2012, 75-78). While on the domestic level, news arises out of the complex interaction between media and high number of politicians, federal officials, congress members, pressure aggregates, State governments, research centers, religious organizations and NGOs.

3.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MEDIA AND FOREIGN POLICY:

In the first chapter, we have pointed out to the importance of the views of governments regarding each other in international relations. Those views are highly dependent on how to communicate and convey information among different nation-states. In this regard, we might arrive at the conclusion that, the superiority of the one single nation-state depends on the state-owned media institutions, and capability and potential of those institutions to transfer news and information, and of course, re-wording events in line with their own interests and vision. On the other hand, foreign news is of high importance to governments, because it clearly affects the public opinion. This may seem natural due to the wide spread of information through the media, but what's new is that the impact of these media institutions which has exceeded public opinion and started affecting decision makers and political leaders too. The media today also serves as embassies and diplomatic missions in the transfer of news between countries and have a negative or positive impact on political decision-makers (Craig, 1976).

As a specialist of international affairs and as a former ambassador of Mexico to the United Nations, Adolfo Aguilar Zinser's comments seem to shed light upon the relationship between media and foreign policy. Zinser has stated that the US press has been able to influence the functioning of the Security Council members in a prelude to invading Iraq. This was done through deliberate government leaks of information to the media, which contributed to flooding the media arena with the American view only and marginalizing the anti-war opinion. As well as that the US media was highlighting the formality and secondary problems and avoiding the origin of the dispute between supporters and opponents of the US invasion. The US media has been able to portray the opponents of the war as a personal conflict with President Bush, and that the world stands by the United States in its war, and Saddam Hussein has relations with al-Qaeda and has weapons of mass destruction. All this is only by according importance to the role of the media in running the competition in Foreign Policy (Crossette, 2004).

There have been studies comparing the American audience with the European one. According to those studies, the former usually cares about local news related to everyday life, unlike the Europeans do. This might be an indication of the fact that, mostly the American elites care about international news and what happens outside the borders, and a large proportion of these elites are the ones that have a great influence on foreign policy. The studies show that the

American public and even American politicians would be subject to the influence of the media, led by interest groups that aim to shed light on some issues and avoid others in their own interests (Crossette, 2004, 13-15).

The relationship between media and governments often seems unfriendly, as governments seek to withhold information and secrecy. In contrast, journalists break through the isolation of politicians and leak information to public opinion. On the other hand, journalists are the most able to compare what government state with what is already in place, that is, they seek to indicate the compatibility between the statement and the political act. Therefore, the task of the media is to criticize the government's behavior and incite the public against it, which makes the relationship between the two parties seem to be in a negative relationship (Bray, 1974).

The discussion around political media prompts us to think over the ownership of the media and the questions specifically focusing upon who stands behind it and finances it and why? There is no secret that the funding of the media, such as radio stations, newspapers and television channels, might lead the public opinion that follows these media outlets and guide it as it wants. Keeping this in mind, we may arrive at the conclusion that, governments, opposition forces and even political parties are working hard to have their own media platforms through which to market their views and interpretation of events and to provide their public with ideas. All the above can be legally permitted under the name of freedom of expression, and subject to internal laws and regulations. However, the danger is that external parties might use their media and satellite channels to influence the local public opinion and push them to adopt an opinion contrary to the opinion of the government and local authorities. That means dismantling the fabric and internal cohesion by adopting the ideas and opinions of foreign countries and groups that do not want the good of the people of the country, making the government and political elites in an embarrassing situation (Ince, 1976).

All the democratic constitutions underline the right of the individuals to learn and access to information. This has been regarded as a major aspect of individual liberty. On the other hand, it is sometimes necessary for governments to obscure some information that they consider to be a threat to the interests of the integrity and well-being of the state and its national security, especially those related to its foreign policy and relations with other countries. This poses to be a contradiction in terms of the liberal values. As the origin of the media work is that it is seeking

for suspense and excitement, therefore journalists might choose to highlight the negative aspects of government performance, and aspects of default, in order to draw attention and increase viewing rates (Marwan, 1973, pp. 13-14). In order to attract public's notice, media professionals might seek to meet the prominent terrorists, and cover terrorist events, because of the excitement of the audiences of the television channel or readers of the newspaper. There are even cases within which the media belonging to terrorist groups tends to utilize from such sort of tendencies for marketing its work and gain support, thereby getting new members. The Islamic State proved that it mastered media investment through the visual media content it produced throughout its occupation of parts of the Arab countries (Sami, 1991).

As a result of this tense relationship between governments and the media, hostility and mistrust are the basis of the relationship in democratic countries. It may seem at first glance that the media, the public and the government are the main elements influencing foreign policy, but when we get closer, we see that not all the public are interested in foreign affairs except for special cases such as wars and major foreign crises, but only the academic and community elites. The government is not at all interested in it either, and not all politicians are able to interact with external events, like the United States, where usually it interferes only with the President and his advisers, in addition to some active politicians. The United States has more than 1,700 daily newspapers and hundreds of journals, as well as 6,500 radio stations and 900 television channels, but the actors from all these media organizations in the field of foreign affairs are very few and are often controlled by the number of few journalists and professional editors who decide what to publish. Therefore, we find that the vast majority of citizens and political elites are not only outside the equation of influence on foreign policy issues, but are also victims of what the media says to them (Marwan, 1973, pp. 14-16).

Media is no longer just a vector of information between two parties as it was in the past. As we know, we live today in the age of image and technology, and the media has the potential to indirectly affect the unconscious mind of audiences and readers. It draws and shapes the image and looks for recipients around individuals, events and even peoples, and works to enhance them through frequent repetitions, as well as working intelligently to provide audiences with the information they want in order to empower and strengthen their positions which they've adopted in advance. The creators of information materials know the nature of the human soul, which is

always seeking to find who supports her idea and her point of view. This process is not futile, it is intentional and deliberate, and this is what gives it importance, since the influence of the media is not restricted to ordinary citizens but goes beyond that and affects even political elites, intellectuals and community leaders. It is therefore very possible to find a political decision based on an impression based on information obtained by decision-makers through the media. Here we can say that the media today has become a weapon of another kind that can form our stereotype of events, attitudes and peoples, thus can manipulate our political behavior as an advanced step (shaheen, 1985). The media coverage of student protests in China in 1989 put the Chinese government in an embarrassing position, after the media was able to convey details of what is happening in China to all the world. This has encouraged US public opinion to pressure the US State Department of State to take a stand on what is happening in China. Another incident might be cited as follows: Iraqi regime enjoyed greater freedom in dealing with the repercussions of the invasion of Kuwait due to the lack of media coverage of what was going on in that time. Given the ability of the media to generate rapid responses to what governments do, these governments usually put pressure on journalists and are tougher in dealing with them during a crises, by restricting their freedom of movement and giving them just what it's want (Sami, 1991, pp. 90-94).

The Qatari state represents a clear example of the role and importance of the media in foreign policy. Qatar, a small country that has no weight in its Arab and regional environment, is now one of the most influential countries in the region and a difficult figure in almost all the region's sensitive files. The milestone for in Qatar was in November 1996 by founding Al Jazeera, where Qatar ensured that it could not compete in the fields of economy and military, and thus decided to be the first Arab country in the field of soft power, to prove its presence in the international arena. The State of Qatar has set itself a clear course by embracing the dissemination of knowledge through the media, and has been able to market its name, which enabled it to become an acceptable mediator to solve the most complex regional crises. Qatar then took a step further, this is what prompted the axis of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to adopt anti-Qatar policies and explicitly demand the closure of Al-Jazeera as a prerequisite for resolving the crisis that broke out in 2018 between the two parties. All of the above clearly confirms the importance of the role played media today, the media is trying to strengthen the attitude of countries in their external behavior, which requires any country to pay

attention and allocate part of its funds to support the media if it wants to accept the admissibility in its external behavior (Boyce, 2013).

3.4 MEDIA POLICY: WHO MAKES IT AND HOW?

By media policy, we refer to the outlines of the media activity, whether by private media organizations or even the state. These outlines represent the media strategies for what should and should not be done by the media, which in turn directly affects the public opinion that is targeted. Given the importance of the role played by the media recently, we find that there is a close relationship between political elites and media elites, as both sides seek to achieve their interests through cooperation with each other. It has been customary to have this cooperation in different forms, perhaps the most prominent of which is the government to give sensitive media positions to loyal media professionals or by providing financial support to them other than different mass media outlets, which directly affects the quality of the media product. All this results in achieving excellence and superiority, which means more audiences and profit. In the United Kingdom, for example, three major companies dominate the distribution of national newspapers, despite the presence of dozens of other companies. Five companies control the regional circulation of news and information, and only one owns this television field. (BBC) has become a difficult figure in the media environment because of government support to it, which means the impossibility to stand up or even compete with it by other media institutions (Freedman, 2016)

Politicians, whether in legislative or executive positions, are considered the most prominent actors in media policy making and influence, because they have influence and the power. The owners of companies and media interests are working to get close to politicians or pressure them to ensure that the legislation and government decisions (media policies) serve their interests, or at least to ensure that they are not incompatible with or harmful to them. In order to achieve all of this, we see media people practicing the policies of encouragement and intimidation towards government behavior in general, or towards certain politicians and administrators, in order to force them not to interfere with what the media wants. This is usually done by launching or improving defamation campaigns that affect negatively or positively the position of the public opinion of them and thus affect their participation in the upcoming elections (Putnis, 2001).

The formulation of media policies in any country depends heavily on a number of internal data, notably the system of political communication and political economy of the media, as well as the number and diversity of media platforms, and the extent of technological development in that country, in addition to functions and values imposed by the government on the media, which obligates them to commit when dealing with issues of public concern and foreign policy in particular. This means that the ruler controls the ownership of the media and therefore he is the one who appoints the media and journalists within its structure. This matter prevents pluralism and media competition between the news channels. Therefore, the ruler is the only one who has the right in directing media messages, which usually serve only his personal interests, and a single media color expressing the point of view of power. The more democratic the state, the more pluralistic the media and the more honest the competition will be. It should be noted that the role of the media in the decision-making process has evolved through three stages. The first of these stages was the lack of influence and weak effectiveness in political issues. Hence, the media and politics became equal parties in terms of their influence on each other. Today, large media organizations are leading political behavior, especially in democratic countries in relation to foreign affairs. Politicians today rely heavily on media to know what is happening abroad and therefore we see that the starting point for the media and not for the decision maker or the two sides are equally influential in terms of impact at least (Naveh, 2002).

After the government adopts a point of view towards a specific event, whether internal or external, it determines the media policy to deal with this situation, starting by transferring and strengthening its point of view in public opinion through the investment of its own professionals and specialists in the fields of public relations and marketing, deliberately leaking information to the public opinion in order to direct it in the direction it wants. One of the methods used by public figures to direct the public opinion is to appear in television or radio interviews with the emphasis that the journalist is the hubs of the guest supporters and supporters of his position to avoid embarrassing questions. All that has further methods, including holding press conferences and public opinion polls and consulting specialists in the formulation of media content to be all their speeches and words of strong and effective impact. For all of this, politicians usually participate in the preparation and implementation of media policy, so that in some cases media is involved in political decision-making to ensure the best possible impact (Naveh, 2002,pp 8-10).

Media policy-making does not necessarily come from outside the media establishment. It depends on the independence of the institution administratively and financially. This independence from the government side is what enables the media to play its role effectively by transferring events and information to the public, and impartiality as well, which contributes to encouraging public opinion and motivating it to monitor politicians more transparently. The existence of laws that support the freedom and independence of the media does not necessarily mean that the situation is perfect and that things are going well for the media to get what it wants. Politicians are doing everything in their power to tighten the screws on the media, even if the state enjoys high democracy. This restriction is made directly through the imposition of taxes and the failure to grant work permits to media, or indirectly by blocking raw material necessary for the success of any media operation, as well as to determine the area of movement and prevent them from entering the government departments. Therefore, it is possible to say that a real media policy depends to a large extent on the extent of the state's democracy in theory and also on the political leadership's desire to do so, which is not even in the best democratic countries to this day (Leeson & Coyne, 2007).

The US election fraud crisis in 2016 has reinforced the importance of the role ascribed by the media in politics in a democratic state like the United States. It has shown how political entities, led by prominent American political parties, can invest media platforms (especially digital ones) to achieve their own interests, especially in times of elections. Here, Dwyer and Napoli point out that there are articulated outlets through which any party can influence the work of the media, namely the administrative and financial aspects, as well as the method of spreading false news and information in a deliberate manner aimed at drawing political opponents to public opinion or achieving personal benefits, or gain popularity on social networking sites such as YouTube, Facebook and Twitter, which has increased political polarization among US political actors and digital media has been the main battleground (Napoli & Dwyer, 2018).

Media policy is usually linked to the broad lines of the ruling political will. It is therefore concerned with the results, not the mechanism and the means of implementation, given the wide segment of modern media. Therefore, media specialists believe that media policy is the most important pillar of any reform process, especially in societies that suffer from ethnic, multicultural and societal divisions. Perhaps the Polish case is a good example displaying the

importance of media aspect is to achieve social reform. The political leadership adopted a pluralistic media in order to encourage society to move away from the idea of totalitarianism and unilateralism that prevailed at the time of the Soviet Union. In order to achieve this goal, the Polish government legislated a set of laws and regulations and established and allowed the establishment of various media organizations, each of which had its own thought, view and ideology to the events and the surrounding environment. As a result, Poland was able to move from a totalitarian to a multi-democratic society, while the media pluralism in Iraq contributed to the promotion of political and societal divisions, after each group and community component had its own party and its own media platforms which was use it against the other groups and distorting their image in front of others, which contributed to the emphasis on local identity without the national identity of the Iraqis (Klimkiewicz, 2017).

Studies indicate that watching media material directly affects the amplification or diminution of the importance of events and therefore it reflects negatively or positively on the strength of the public interaction with these events. In this respect, it is possible to say that the media policy maker is the one who leads the masses towards what he wants, once he manipulates how to present the news and its chronology within the rest of the news. The impact of the first news item isn't the same as the third or fourth news item, in addition to the body language and the appropriate vocabulary that serves the position of the channel of the event. The martyr, the dead and the victim are all words that describe one case but differ in terms of the political context. All these and other means help greatly to attract the attention of the audience or vice versa. Political elites are also influenced by and sympathetic to the media, but they are usually less affected by the general public because they are more educated, informed and organized, and their personal interests dictate that their responses be more stable and balanced (Cook, Tyler, Goetz, Gordon, Protes, Leff and Molotch, 1983).

Finally, the success of any media policy depends on the laws and regulations enacted by the state through which such policies are supported, as well as the loyalty and desire of the directors of these media organizations. In authoritarian countries, media institutions and organizational structures are far from reflecting real media diversity and do not represent the opinion of the average citizen. In Tunisia, for example, a seemingly democratic country due to the legislation, laws and structures that reflect the state of democracy and cultural and

intellectual diversity, the ruling family appears as the key figure presiding over the important media positions. The evidence is that despite the overthrow of Tunisian President Zine El-Abidine Ben Ali in 2011 after the Jasmine Revolution, the former regime remained strong and entrenched in the joints of state institutions. This was a great challenge for the Islamic Renaissance Party, which was created by the Jasmine Revolution and made the task of reforming the environment and the media approach a complex process, because of their negative attitude towards the new Tunisian leadership. Therefore, the existence of institutions and media structures does not necessarily mean the presence of democratic media, since democracy is measured by the results and the extent of expression of the opinion of the citizen (Richter, 2017).

4. THE WAR ON IRAQ 2003

4.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF IRAQ FOR AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY:

In order to evaluate the importance of Iraq for American foreign policy, in the first step, we must understand the historical backdrop specifically centered around the Saudi-American relations based on oil for security. The relations started to deteriorate since the 1970s, amidst the oil crisis of 1973, and the Saudi Kingdoms aims to spread Wahhabi thoughts inside the Kingdom and outside, which resulted in the emergence of extremist fundamentalist groups that view the United States as an enemy and operate to distort US reputation and fight its interests within the region. Keeping in mind that most of the 9-11 attackers were Saudis (15 out of 19), Saudi negative reaction to US might well be conceived of. All these factors have driven the United States to search for an alternative for unreliable Saudi oil, due to the importance of oil as a geological nerve for economy that is necessary to the assurance of the American imperialism within the view of the neo-conservatives, who were working the project of the new American century since 1997. As of 9/11, the neo-conservatives started dealing with it as a geo-political gift, and as a golden opportunity to take control over oil sources in the Middle East, especially after the American Ministry of Energy declared that the Iraqi oil reserves were estimated to be 220 billion barrels, making it the first alternative to Saudi oil (Jhaveri, 2004). Here, we see Iraqi oil becoming the main reason to the invasion. Three reasons or factors had been mentioned: the first was that the United States wanted Iraqi oil for its local consumption; the second was that it wanted it to increase American oil companies' profits. These two explanations stood to be questionable, since the United States has never relied heavily on Middle Eastern oil, where its consumption of oil hasn't increased 1% in the 1940s, and reached 7% in the 70s, though the United States was interested in the Middle East at that time, intervening in its issues and aiming to gain control. The third reason or explanation to the invasion was as such: those that were aware of the matter see that the invasion was a result to the United States wish to take over Iraqi oil in order to control quantity and price of oil flowing the global markets, in addition to guaranteeing that this oil would reach United States partners like the Europeans and the Japanese, and stopping it from reaching its enemies like the Russians and the Chinese, therefore, the purpose of the invasion was heavily linked to the geopolitical aspects (Mercille, 2010).

Some commentators note that, the major motivation behind the invasion was to transfer Iraqi into a country obedient to the United States. That would be implemented through arranging the politics of Iraq in a way that insured running the country by those who worked on settling American forces in it, so Iraqi would be afterwards one for the largest oil reserves in the world, thereby enforcing American imperialism over the Middle East. It might be argued that the removing of Saddam and bringing governments loyal to the United States was a slap to any Arab rulers that would think to oppose American political and economic interest in the region. Therefore, the United States wasn't serious in achieving democracy in Iraq, especially when it felt that this democracy would bring those not in its interest and stopping local electoral procedures and self-ruling in 2003 when it intervened in the appointing of governors and local officials. The committee to draft the constitution which was formed by Paul Bremer didn't include any member opposing American interest. Military-wise, American military presence was considered of the basics for on the ground control to ensure the prevention of any counter activity, so, the United States imposed plenty of permanent military bases which included thousands of soldiers, under the claim of training Iraq forces and providing consolatory services (Stokes, 2009). This all took place after the American Army concluded that reducing the numbers of American forces will mean more violence in Iraq, since Shia government forces weren't welcomed in Sunni states till those areas were liberated, whereas it didn't allow the Shiate oriented government to implement a real Sunni force to hold the ground. All of that implied that the United States didn't succeed in establishing a real national military organization that worked for the interest of the whole of Iraq, and represented all Iraq parties so to take creditability by the people, therefore the Sunni governorates had become more violent and with no stability, which resulted in a public scorning against the Iraq Governorate and the American forces at the same time (Malkasian, 2008).

As for the democratic matter, despite the public scorning, lack of services, and the Iraq being through plenty of political and security crisis, we can notice that the pillars of democracy still stand, where judgment according the constitution still stands and elections happen or regular basis, in addition to the participation of all Iraqi people regularly within the political process, in addition to the availability of possible criticism of the government and showing its wrongdoings. On the other hand, we can notice the role of monitoring institutions like the Commission of Integrity, The High Supreme Court, and the Federal and Local legislative authorities in

monitoring the work of the executive authority and working to implement law and constitution, even though they need more support or involvement. Politically speaking, Iraqi managed to withstand various upper leadership changes, and refused Maliki's third term without bringing down the democratic process within the country, which means that the Iraq people refused returning to the times of tyranny and totalitarian regimes, in addition to their love and will to remain within the new democratic state, which represents a major turning point with the Iraqi political history (Hadad, 2016). In return, the United States overlooked, intentionally or unintentionally, Iran's role in the after Saddam Iraq. Removing Saddam was a free gift to Iran which holds a long history of hatred towards Iraq. Iran, this regionally strong nation, with plenty of sectarian influence in Iraq, this nation which has worked hard since 2003 on exporting its Islamic Revolution regionally, and to expand politically and economically at the expense of Iraq. It was in Iran's interest that Iraq would remain weak and following its lead, while it is not within its best interest that a neighboring country would become a successful democratic experience, and a true and powerful federal system, since it will encourage its citizens to demands the same. In order to achieve this strategic goal, Iran sought to recognize and support Iraqi democracy only when it servers its interests, and the best evidence for that is its' refusal for the establishment of the Basra Federal regions, and participated with the assassination of Sunni and Shia leaderships, which concluded in the weakness of the Iraqi Democracy (Cohen, 2018).

The United States of America has succeeded in invading Iraq through a strategic operation with the help of the media, but failed in proving Iraq's possession of WMDs, and Saddam's relations with AL Qaeda, which removed legitimacy of the war. These forces had intentionally ignored international human laws after it failed in providing public safety, and protection for state's institutions from being looted. The United States has also violated the International Humanitarian Law which has criminalized the design an occupied nations' economy state by external forces, through its aim to convert Iraqi economy to a market-based economy that a liberal free trade one, in addition to the privatization of public properties –with the exception of the oil sector-, which opened the door wide open in front of foreign investment. Under the title of reconstruction, the Iraqi economy was constructed according to the American perspective. This followed the Coalition Forces authority issuing more than 100 administrative orders, especially order 39, in which it drew the foundations of the new liberal economy. The new environment also gave an opportunity for corruptions, forgery, and favoritism, in amidst of

state surveillance, and the limitation of its authority (Welch, 2008). As soon as the resistance operations started against the occupiers by the Sunni parties, the intimidation imposed by the American Army started to wither away, after it was looked upon as something invincible. This was followed by the United States of America losing its stature and creditability among Arab nations and the Islamic world in general. This took place after Iran took over Iraq's potentials and spread its influence over Baghdad, both politically and military wise, thereby eliminating its political opponents of Sunni Arabs, which all proved that the United States didn't hold any control over the Iraq decision, nor any control over the Kurds in Northern Iraq. More than 134000 Iraqis have died directly as a cause of the American presence, public liberties became weak due to killings, intimidation, and organization forced displacement. Baghdad, and the rest of the Iraqi mixed states, became divided in regions based on sectarian and racial bases, due to the absence of the state and the loss of security. All those factors have resulted in loss of trust for the United States of America by its allies globally, in addition to the American Treasury losing more than 2 trillion dollars as a result of the war on Iraq (Blinders, Blunders, and Wars : What America and China Can Learn, 2014). The United States didn't organize matters related to post-war period, since it formulated Iraq in a wrong manner. This was after Paul Bremer resolved the Iraqi Army, and legislated the De-Bathification law, which led to thousands of security forces personal becoming unemployed, and pushed many, in addition to leaders, to look for alternatives outside the framework of state. On the other hand, the United States didn't pay attention to the social fabric of the Iraqi society, where it gave authority and power to one group and withhold it from another. Authorities were distributed and leaders were chosen based on sectarian and racial preferences, with no regard to competence, experience, and integrity. This state led to ministries and government institutions being distributed among political parties, which led to a lack of cooperation between those institutions, due to ideological and sectarian differences, and even to different structures within the same sect. This negligence, in addition to these strategic mistakes, can't be something unintentional due to what the United States has regarding capabilities, which supports the opinion that the aim of the invasion wasn't Iraq's interest, but rather to achieve American interests, and perhaps even personal interest of some of Bush's upper management (Pirnie & O'Connell, 2008).

4.2 THE WAR:

11 September Events were the worst attack exposed ever by the United States in the history. There were 19 members of Al-Qaida organization leading by Osama Bin Laden who hijacked four American planes. They enabled to redirect two of them towards World Trade Center in New York City. Third plane redirected towards the Pentagon. Meanwhile, the passengers of the fourth plane enabled to attack the terrorists and re-run the plane to land safely at that time. The United States announced the war on terrorism. During several months it occupied Afghanistan. Later, US mobilized the attention of American people and world towards Iraq as a rogue country and father of the world terrorism. American president Bush announced clearly about his desire to make change in Iraq and it must be more moderate and abide the decisions of United Nations related to mass destruction weapons. In 19 of March 2003, the Ex American president Bush announced the start of military operations by the participation of wide set of allied countries with the United States including Britain and Australia. Military operations started with a violent wave of concentrated air strikes targeted headquarters, anti-aircraft, squadrons and radar systems, as well as infiltration of Iraqi defense systems by sending electronic warfare. At the same time, the ground forces moved from Kuwait towards Basra and from there to Baghdad. The invading forces were not aimed to street fight war after tasted its bitterness in Vietnam and Somalia. Thus, the military strategy was sieged cities and exhausted by bombing until surrender (Campbell, 2003).

On the other hand, US Special Forces led by Colonel John Mulholland have tightened control on western desert extend from Euphrates River to Iraqi borders with Syria and Jordan. This gave US Special Forces, Britain and Australian forces the ability of maneuver supported by tanks and artillery. The mission of those forces was to prevent Baath Party leaders to escape or smuggle the mass destruction weapons and targeting the surrounding countries. These forces controlled Iraqi airports in western governorates and depended as military bases. American forces worked on exploiting the Kurdish Opposition in the north when Turkey refused to open its doors to invade Iraq. The United States was forced to send ground secret special forces to the north of Iraq. The mission of this group was training the Kurdish militias (they were armed elements belong to Kurdistan Democratic Party). The number of its elements was 45.000 and elements of Patriotic Union of Kurdistan was 20.000. The mission of those forces was to

preserve their lands, work on making Iraqi army busy in Mosul, Kirkuk and Salah Al-Din, and prevent to promote its forces in Baghdad (Murray & Scales, 2003).

Despite of lack of military parity between Iraqi army and invaded forces and despite American forces sought to avoid fighting in cities and take them from the desert as their route; they faced heavy resistance by Iraqi people when they closed from southern cities with the aim of crossing the Euphrates River. The resistance was focused in many southern cities such as Najaf, Nasiriya and al-Kut. Due to the developed military equipment owned by American forces, American forces were able to destroy block wall in Najaf that consisted of thirty vehicles. In al-Kut, marines, forces were able to destroy 10 Iraqi tanks and 10 anti-aircraft and thus, occupied forces were able to move towards Baghdad. At that time, the Iraqi forces started losing control and lost self-trust and then surrendered to the occupying countries where the number of surrendered soldiers reached to 2500 before the arrival of American forces to Baghdad by record period. In Baghdad, forces faced great resistance which is known as “Airport Battle” but the cruelty of aerial and artillery shelling enforced Iraqi army to retreat after losing more than six hundred soldiers, five tanks, three helicopters, twenty-three vehicles and thirty anti – aircraft. Airport battle ended in fourth of April, but the American forces were unable to leave the airport because of the existing of resistance in all sides of Baghdad. However, through many hours, aviation can handle fire sources and in eight of April, the invasion forces entered the presidential palaces on the banks of Tigris (Tucker-Jones, 2014).

The American leadership was aware that Baghdad was the head of the regime and center of gravity of the enemy. Therefore, the control on Baghdad meant the end of the war because of symbolism of the capital and existing of political and military headquarters. At the beginning, the plan was to occupy strategic locations inside Baghdad and then withdraw and return another time. This was aimed to deplete the Iraqi forces until occupy the capital. However, during the advance of US forces towards Baghdad, the plan was changed, and it was agreed that the attack would be from two sides one of them from the east from Aziziyah and the Diyala River and led by the American marines. The Marines, especially the Airborne Division, handled the other from the west. The forces in eight of April were able to encircle Baghdad from two sides and started aerial targeting to the headquarters, presidential palaces and ministries. At these times, forces were moving slowly towards the heart of the capital in predetermined point. It was expected that

Saddam Hussein would protect the capital tightly. However, the forces approached to Baghdad without real resistance except in the airport and in nine of April, invaded forces were able to meet at the middle of Baghdad after their control on many sensitive locations inside the capital (Reynolds, 2007). Obstacles to going towards Baghdad was not restricted on heavy resistance by Iraqi army but also the coming of heavy sandstorm which closed the Iraqi airspace and hindered the vision. Besides, Iraqi people did not warmly receive Americans as they claimed or expected. Iraqi people did not cooperate with them from the beginning and they were looking to them as occupation forces. This field data enforced American forces to rearrange their papers again as the President Bush mentioned in his speech in 24 of March that the issue might consume a long time and they might face difficult battle. Because of harsh military operations, the United States was able to enter Baghdad in 9/4/2003. Marine forces were able with a set of opponents to Saddam Regime to down the statue of Saddam Hussein in Al-Firdous Square in central Baghdad. Down of statue configured was turning point to the interest of invaded forces where the morals of Iraqi forces collapsed, and fighters began to flee. Baghdad was secured and next target was the north of Iraq. By the support of Peshmerga and US Special Forces, Kirkuk and Mosul were captured in 14 of April. The American forces entered Tikrit Saddam Hussein's stronghold and hometown. In the next day, Pentagon and President Bush announced that basic battle was finished, and that Saddam Hussein Regime did not exist anymore (Miller, 2004). In 1/5/2003, President Bush from aircraft carrier moored in the Arab Gulf announced that “mission is over” and the military operations stopped. Then the United States started in arranging the Iraqi political house. (Donnelly, 2004). The researcher sees that at the time where Shite and Kurdish were happy and collaborating with American occupation and name it as “change”, Sunna in general were refusing to the foreign existence and call it “occupation”. Shite and Kurdish were able to exploit data to achieve their interests while Shite obtained the judge in Baghdad, Kurdish obtained Kirkuk and autonomy with wide powers and regular Peshmerga forces. On the other hand, some Sunni factions took the path of armed resistance against invading forces and opposition to the government. This made Sunni regions a war and unsecure land. This atmosphere was invested by Al-Qaeda and started working by the sectarianism against shite and Kurdish. Also, it started to kill everyone work in security forces and participate in the political operation from Sunna community. Al-Qaeda killed hundreds of political, regional and community leaderships on the pretext that they work with occupier. This had weakened the Sunni community and contributed

in creating bad relationship with other Iraqi communities. Al-Qaeda targeted Shiite religious gatherings and this encouraged Shiite militias to exploit this chance. Shiite militias targeted the shrine of the military imams in Samarra that was a direct reason for outbreak of civil war in Iraq in 2006.

4.3 THE ROLE OF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION:

The Bush administration believed that the media had contributed to the defeat of the United States in the Vietnam War by highlighting the dark and negative aspects of the war. That led to breaking the morale of American soldiers, as well as weakening popular support. To ensure that the same is not repeated, the Pentagon allowed more than 600 reporters and journalists from all stations and international channels to accompany US troops during the invasion. It was the first time the US military had made such a move after the journalist passes through the week-long training camp and lived in an atmosphere very similar to the real atmosphere of war. This step might seem positive and sound, but in fact, otherwise, the embedded journalists would have been forced to sign a contract restricting their freedom, thus not being free to transfer whatever they wanted. They had been directed to the need to focus on the rosy aspects of the war, on the strength and courage of the soldier who was fighting for a noble human cause. The other side of the picture, which reflected the killing, destruction and devastation caused by the war, as well as the civilian casualties of Iraqis, had been blocked. It is worth noting here that the press conference with the US military in 2002 authorized the military to review all media materials before sending them to their news channels, as well as modifying their news reports and complying with a certain number of words. On the other hand, the contract included the right of the US military to end the agreement unilaterally and journalists were forced to adopt a general approach that serves the United States. This program produced very good results for the United States. A large percentage of journalists were sympathetic to the American soldier during and after the war. Soldiers were also used as sources of information by 93% in news interviews, and only 12% reported losses in the ranks. The US military, while independent journalists who did not accompany the army, showed greater independence and a real inclination for the Iraqi side, using Iraqi resources at 75% in their reports and reporting 43% civilian and humanitarian stories (Lindner, 2008).

Pentagon officials wanted to achieve two main goals from the idea of embedded journalists. The first was to ensure that the voice and image of the battle reached to every American family in order to gain material support and moral sympathy with the US military. The second objective was to strengthen the position of the pro-US media against the media that rejects it, represented by Arab media such as Al Jazeera and Al Arabiya, as well as the Iraqi media, which was speaking on behalf of the Iraqi government. The Arab media was working to refute the US view of the war and discuss the pragmatic and real reasons for the war. On the other hand, the task of bringing the media to the front lines of the battle was to respond to the accusation of the United States of violating human rights and the destruction of infrastructure by broadcasting television scenes (Jacobs, 2003).

The US threatened to bomb Baghdad was prompted journalists and foreign correspondents to leave Baghdad for their own safety. Also, the timing of the declaration of war, which was late in the night, contributed to the adoption of television stations, newspapers and magazines on images broadcasted by surveillance cameras, which displayed the severity of the bombing without specifying the number of civilian casualties and casualties. In addition to all of that, reporters that were integrated within the media coverage, who were in large numbers, contributed to highlighting a series of media messages that they wanted to get to the public opinion, including the US military power, how the Iraqi people welcomed the occupying forces, and how they were happy to drop Saddam Hussein's statue in Baghdad's Paradise Square (Keith, Silcock and Schwalbe, 2009).

The US attitude after the occupation was deliberately aborted any successful media project, with the United States disbanding the Iraqi Ministry of Media after the occupation directly, thus suspending thousands of professional journalists who were working in the ministry. The Coalition Authority issued a resolution entitled "Forbidden Media Activity" on 10 June 2003, which if media organizations were prohibited from publishing anything that would incite violence against any ethnic, national or sectarian group or even encroachment on property. The resolution also clearly stated that incitement against US forces is prohibited. Although the resolution appeared to indicate what was good as it seemed to strengthen Iraqi community cohesion, but coalition forces intervened only when US interests were at risk, and US forces had already closed several media platforms, such as Voice of Baghdad radio and Sada al-Umma

journal after they called to take up arms against the coalition forces, and closed "AlMustaqilla" newspaper after it published an article justifies the killing of Iraqi spies (Al-Rawi, 2013).

The United States has worked to support the Iraqi opposition abroad by providing financial support to opposition media organizations and institutions that were run by the National Accord Conference (Al Wifaq) and the Iraqi National Congress (Osgood & Frank, 2010). On the other hand, the United States established the Office of Special Plans of the US Department of State, and the mission of that office has been to form a public opinion in favor of the United States and its position on the war. The office is the one which has contributed to the establishment of the Iraqi Media Network after the invasion (IMN). The United States has recruited five exiled Iraqi dissidents to run new media institutions in Iraq. After the occupation, the Bush administration directed Iraqi channels to discuss specific issues, such as genocide, mass graves, and Saddam Hussein's luxurious life as well as democracy, freedom, de-Baathification, weapons of mass destruction and the oppression of Shiites and Kurds, as well as many of the headlines the United States promoted in the minds of Iraqis through satellite channels. The rapid media response team, established by the coalition forces, confirms and works to have sectarian media institutions, that each sect, whether Sunnis, Shiites or Kurds, has its own media voice and have their own news and independent topics. As well as that contributed to the strengthening of sectarian affiliation and weaker belonging to Iraq and the sense that the other communities are not partners in the country. Therefore, Iraqi community have evolved to be divided on sectarian basis (Al-Rawi, 2013, pp 380-382).

The US military wanted to establish good relations with the Iraqi media, but at the same time was very sharp in dealing with any media organization out of its media policy. As a result, the Army had taken care of certain media institutions and excluded and attacked other institutions, based on their compatibility with US interests in Iraq. One of the media methods used by the US military was to speak to the Iraqi people "on behalf" by using Iraqi journalists to deliver US messages to the Iraqi people. The reason for this approach was the US military's conviction that the Iraqi people would not accept any media message from the US military directly, but if an Iraqi addressed them and talked to them, it would be more credible and closer to accepting and endorsing the media message. Among the media messages that the US military wanted to convey to the Iraqis is linking everything related to the progress and prosperity of Iraq

to the United States and the American presence there. On the other hand, the US-led coalition forces provided the local Iraqi newspapers with media articles, which amounted to more than 100 newspaper articles. They also allocated \$ 400-500 a month for each journalist who helps US forces prepare such articles (Al-Rawi, 2013, pp 382-383)

Since the establishment of the Al-Iraqiya channel, the official channel in Iraq, which was founded under the shadow of the US presence and has been working to represent the Shiite side only from a sectarian point of view, it is still so far broadcasting to Shiite audience and directly transfer speeches and events to the Shiite population and ignore the religious events of other communities and nationalities. On the political level, the Iraqi channel has been raising the crimes committed by the regime of Saddam Hussein against Shiites and Kurds only, suggesting to the audiences that the Sunnis were with Saddam Hussein and supporters of his policies and were not subjected to injustice. The channel also portrayed the Sunni Arabs as terrorists, opponents of the new Iraq and supporters of al-Qaeda, and thus they the cause of the sectarian war in 2006-2007, while it did not address what the Shiite militias were committing sectarian killings against the Sunnis in the geographically mixed areas. In addition, it used to "liberate" and "change" instead of the word occupation in describing the US invasion of Iraq (Al-Rawi, 2013, pp 386).

As soon as US forces entered Baghdad, they quickly targeted the Palestine Hotel, which included many offices such as Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya and the French news agency Reuters. This led to the killing of several journalists, prompting the spokesman for the coalition forces to express regret for what happened, but at the same time pointed out that the only safe place for journalists was the coalition forces. In contrast to the media accompanying the US forces, the Iraqi media was weak and unreliable because it was limited to broadcasting official statements and official dailies, and the Arab media represented by the island and the Arab and Abu Dhabi channel was not as strong and the same as the American media, which made a difference in the media coverage For the supporters of the Iraq war (Ghosh, 2003).

The United States has long pursued a policy of violence against journalists, whereas in 1999 when the United States ordered NATO to bomb a Serbian media establishment, killing 16 of its employees. This is an important shift in the United States' handling of the other opinion. This shift became apparent after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, where many journalists were killed

by US forces. A video by WikiLeaks showing the targeting of a US helicopter to a Reuters employee, killing him on the spot. A UK newspaper "Daily Mirror" also reported that US President George W. Bush had asked to target the Jazeera satellite channel in 2005. The sources mentioned that The US directly or indirectly implicated in 40 hostile operations against opposition journalists in Iraq, except for temporary arrests, harassment and the confiscation of their media equipment (Paterson, 2011).

The United States funded through the Democracy Support Fund more than 27 Iraqi opposition radio stations abroad. The United States also spent 26,000\$ to support media institutions between 1991-2003. And one of the most important media institutions that received US support after the occupation is the institution of free Iraq "IFI" where it received 1.6 million dollars in the same year, while the American Association of the Kurds (ASK) has received 114,000\$ to train Iraqi journalists. On the other hand, the Pentagon has granted 15 million \$ to establish the Iraqi National Broadcasting System and then handed over to the Iraqi media network, which was then administered by the Coalition Provisional Authority. It should be noted here that all members of the Board of Directors of the Iraqi Media Network were the symbols of the Iraqi opposition abroad, especially in the United States of America, who received generous support from the Pentagon. Therefore, we find that the Iraqi media network has been quick to prevent Al-Jazeera and Al-Arabiya channel which was opposed to the US presence in Iraq prevented from working inside Iraq and closed their offices in Baghdad in 2004. The CIA also provided support for Tikrit Radio, which is owned by Dr. Eyed Allawi, along with several prominent newspapers such as Al-Zaman newspaper owned by Saad Al-Bazaz, which described foreign forces as coalition forces instead of the occupation forces, an expression favored by the USA and advocated in the Middle East for its use and promotion. As soon as the US administration announced the start of military operations, the moment US forces began bombing the headquarters of Iraqi state television and turned it into rubble and Iraq and Afghanistan approximately equal in terms of population. Yet, Iraq has received 20 times more media support than the Afghanistan. This is probably due to Iraq's strategic importance through the lenses of American vision. Some commentators argue that, this was also an indicator of the US desire to impose its imperialist cultural hegemony on Iraq's present and future (Barker, 2008).

In addition to media attacks, mutilation and ridicule of those who oppose the war and stand against US administration, what was called popular pressure emerged on the scene and it was as an organized operation and well-funded by organizations chosen by the President Bush, such as Media Research Center (MRC). MRC appeared to be a control organization retaining a conservative orientation with annual budget amounted 7.8 million dollars. The role of this center was represented to encourage its followers to provide compliance against any media personality or even media channels opposite to the government in its war against Iraq. They accused media personality or media channels that they lacked national spirit and they were negatives towards the government in addition to accuse by treason. This meant that opposition media may expose to arrest and close channels. In other hand, American administration participated in restrictions on opposition journalists by sayings that opposition of government at this way may lead in weakening the national unity and help terrorisms on success. They claimed that this work provided high services to terrorisms and enforce nationalists and people of good intent to remain silent in face of wicked (Rampton & Stauber, 2003).

4.4 THE ROLE OF THE MASS MEDIA:

US media was not neutral regarding the invasion of Iraq. The US media was involved in marketing the invasion of Iraq to the American public, which meant that they were clearly standing by the White House and support the war. That is, that there was no doubt of a flagrant violation of the ethics and professionalism of the press work, which was affirmed by the US Constitution. The First Amendment to the US Constitution emphasized the need for the media to play its role in the accountability of the authority on one hand, and to inform the American public opinion about the reality of what was happening on the other hand. It should be noted that, there is no absolute neutrality in the work of the press, since it must show the tendencies and trends of the journalist or media through the work of the news, regardless whether the subject was purely scientific, the journalist remains a human being which has an opinion and attitude, as well as feelings and orientations that must reach the public. Therefore, it is difficult not to show all of this through the media producer, whether it was a newspaper report or TV news, radio or even just to provide news (Ryan & Switzer, 2009).

The Bush administration's handling of the war had been carefully designed. The administration had done everything to prepare for this huge event through the media. To this end, the mass media had followed six media strategies to convince the American public about the importance of war. The first strategy was to convince the public that there were only two options for war, either to go to war or to do nothing. The media also informed the citizens that the whole world was standing with the United States in its war, and that no one opposed the US will to fight terrorism in Iraq. To achieve this goal, most of the 79 US newspapers, including the top 10 US newspapers, had opened their newspapers with pro-war rhetoric and had used images of the strength of the US military arsenal as well as repetition of certain vocabulary such as war and terrorism. The second strategy was to use general terms that support the war without providing real evidence to prove the validity of these statements, namely, to focus on the general vocabulary with positive connotations without discussing the details. The third strategy was the manufacturing of American symbols such as the president, political and military leaders, firefighters and rescue workers who took part in rescuing the victims of the 9/11 attacks and presenting victims of the attack as martyrs. These symbols had been marketed as heroes by repeating their stories, conveying their news and highlighting what they are saying, especially President Bush. It should be kept in mind that the media, especially the television channels, have hosted political and military analysts who have supported the war and have contributed to the perception of war and its benefits to audiences. The fourth strategy contrasted with the third, within which the aim was to demonize and denigrate those who stood against or opposed the war by linking their state to negative events and symbols, especially French President Jacques Chirac and Chancellor Schroeder. The fifth strategy was based on attributing the other party negative qualities such as terrorists, extremists, fanatics, bad guys, etc. Many of these qualities were attributed to Saddam Hussein, such as the description of crazy, dictator, authoritarian, tyrant, killer and other qualities that leave a negative impression among the recipients of audiences and readers. The sixth strategy was to market the idea that the United States was responsible for the future of the world and must have a positive attitude in eliminating a reckless leader with weapons of mass destruction and could destroy the world at any moment (Ryan & Switzer, 2009, pp 50-59).

The United States has been able to end the mission, relying heavily on the media to win the pro-war crowd. As soon as the war ended, people began to wonder where about was the

democracy? And weapons of mass destruction in Iraq were not able to be found. Within a short period of time, there started negative news about Iraq within the newspapers and particularly within the US and international media. This new data prompted Iraq's interim governor, Paul Bremer, as well as the US administration to criticize the media, stating that the US media was focusing on the darker aspects of what was happening in Iraq, which would lead to the failure of victory and democracy there. In order to avoid this, the US administration sustained the momentum of the war and returned to the charged atmosphere through the presidential speeches in which the president managed to win a second term in 2004. But Despite the president's victory in the elections, opinion polls indicate that the president's popularity has fallen by 40% compared with 2001 elections (O'hanlon & Kamp, 2006). To illustrate the importance of presidential speeches in influencing citizens' attitudes to the war on Iraq, San Antonio's annual public opinion poll on the US public's position on the invasion of Iraq can be cited. The poll was conducted before President Bush's speech on 7/10/2002. Results showed that 56% support the invasion in general and 19% reject it while 10% say "we do not know." Immediately after the presidential speech, the organization conducted the same poll in the same state, Texas, but this time the results showed that there is a higher percentage of positive views towards the war, where the proportion of supporters of the war was up by 6.95% and the proportion of those who answered "do not know" was 9.4%, and the percentage of opponents to the invasion was down by 3.5%. So, it is therefore possible to say that presidential speeches and the intensification of the media spotlight have a great role in guiding and leading the public opinion and convincing it of what the US administration wants (Firestone & Harris, 2006).

Information from Iraq has also begun to embarrass President Bush, as the average US citizen began asking about weapons of mass destruction and the feasibility of continuing in Iraq in the event of an increase in the US military death toll. These changes forced the US administration to redefine the purpose of the US presence in Iraq by adopting a different media policy that called for the goal of the invasion of Iraq to achieve democracy and freedom in Iraq, which will lead to the eradication of terrorism, thereby leading to the safety of the American people. On the other hand, the American media began to highlight the positive aspects and achievements in Iraq, like the first democratic elections in Iraq, the writing of a new Iraqi constitution, and the arrest of Saddam Hussein. The media, under the direction of the US administration, justified the US presence in Iraq and said that these losses of lives and equipment

are a natural and a reasonable price for achieving stability and democracy in the Middle East (Patrick & Thrall, 2007).

One of the most important methods used by the US administration in managing the media war has been fear and intimidation. After the events of September 11, the United States was able to direct the mass media into choosing one of two matters; the first was either to be with the new administration and adopting its position on the war or to be against this opinion. At this point, the media's behavior indicated that it had sided with the US administration as it had transferred this choice to the American public and convinced it to stand up to what the White House had ordered. In order to avoid the impact of Al-Jazeera on American public opinion and its position on the war, the US government directed American businessmen not to advertise on Al-Jazeera as a kind of pressure and boycott. The US military also bombed the headquarters of the channel in Baghdad in order to distort the image of the Al-Jazeera and question its credibility in front of American public. But after the news diversity vanished and the sources of information about Iraqi news disappeared, the American youth began to head to the internet to learn about what was going on in Iraq, even though the Internet was in its infancy and was not available to all, yet it provided a good and neutral space for information (Rao, 2003).

The United States has systematically moved to win the support of the Arab citizens in relation to the invasion of Iraq. To this end, the US administration has called on US-speaking Arabic ambassadors to market the war to Arab countries. In addition, President Bush has directed his ministers to appear on Arab television channels such as Al Jazeera and others in order to justify the military operations against Iraq. It is worth mentioning here that the process of including journalists with the military forces included plenty of Arab journalists. On the other hand, the US Congress allocated \$ 35 million for the establishment of Arabic-language Radio Sawa in 2002, which sought to communicate with the Arab people. As for the Iraqi people, the United States worked to wash their brains. After the United States hoped that the Iraqi people would revolt against Saddam Hussein, and that the US Army would receive flowers, which of course did not happen, it resorted to using leaflets, delivering more than 8 million publications by dropping them from the skies of Iraq, calling on Iraqis to cooperate with the coalition forces and assure them that the Iraqi people are to govern Iraq in the future after the demise of Saddam. It is important to note that the US military had allocated a radio broadcast to the Iraqi people that

was aired from US aircraft carriers. This radio broadcast was very similar to the popular Iraqi radio format in terms of popular songs, ethnic dialect and even the style of anchoring was close to the Iraqi culture and youthful flavor. These radio stations were not innocent, radio broadcasts occasionally sent poisonous messages to listeners. This war was presented not against the Iraqi people, but against the dictator Saddam. There have also been letters addressed to members of the Iraqi army in various ranks calling on them to surrender and warning them that whoever stands by Saddam Hussein and fights the coalition forces will be subject to a trial later, as well as attempts to communicate with field military leaders through the penetration of radio frequencies of Iraqi forces and attempts to contact their mobile phones, sending messages to their personal mail address, the matter reached a point where contact was even made with some of the senior leaders directly by calling their telephones (O'shaughnessy, 2004).

The US media has deliberately highlighted information that suits them and ignored information they did not want the public to see and interact with. For example, when the media learnt that US officials had spied on the representatives of the countries of Pakistan, Guinea, Angola, Cameroon, Chile and Bulgaria in the Security Council before the Council voted on the war resolution on Iraq, despite knowing for this sensitive and dangerous information, the mass media did not take any move, and did not shed light on the issue. While professionalism and media neutrality inform such information should be publicized and published. Some US newspapers such as the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Post have downplayed the impact of these information, after being published by non-US newspapers (Kumar, 2006).

After the US occupation of Iraq and in less than ten years, hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on the media sector in Iraq. The United States has spent more than 10 million \$ within the Democracy Promotion Program to develop and empower Iraqi journalists and media professionals in liberal journalism, based on liberal values and norms such as professional marketing, professionalism and independent work. It has been noted that there has been a distinguishable improvement in the efficiency, performance and professionalism of journalists who took part within these programs and other American developmental programs, but studies have indicated while a sense of sectarianism and aggravation has significantly increased among Iraqi journalists after the US occupation in 2003 (Relly, Zanger & Fahmy, 2015).

News channels are characterized by political nature because they highly depend on official sources of news. Thus, it will show the point of view of power (Bennett, Lawrence, and Livingston, 2007). The American government contributed in continuing the flow of warnings of repeated terrorisms attacks from Al-Qaeda after 9/11 events in order to preserve the mode of sadness and tension in American streets. This motivated media to significantly align with US administration, depended in receiving news, and adopt its opinion in the war. Therefore, even during the time when opposite to US administration hosted, those opposite figures were whether Iraqi or from the United Nations who have not any effect at the American street after the terrorist attacks. In addition, these opinions are deliberately hid in last pages of newspapers and titles of news channels (Nacos, Boch-Elkon, and Shapiro, 2011). For eight months prior the war, media focused on efforts of United Nations in inspecting the mass destruction weapons. Also, they focused on the relationship between Iraq and Al-Qaeda, attempts of Iraq to obtain internationally prohibited weapons, support of intentional society and importance of preparing for it and gathering of troops in Kuwait, in addition to political discussions in congress between political elites who support and oppose war against Iraq without mentioning the objective presentation of the war. All of this highly contributed in grabbing the intention of American citizen and bring him into battle atmosphere and sympathy with before it starts (Hayes & Guardino, 2013).

War against Iraq was a TV program with many interesting events and war coverage was looks like world cup matches. Despite the interference of American administration in media coverage to some extent, media was not obliged but was willing and enthusiastic to cover the war and support. Media sought to support the war in order to reach more viewers and sale more newspapers where war for journalists is the workplace, carrier advancement and make professional achievements. Therefore, American media were not interested by the extent of right or wrong the war decision as they interested on how to invest this opportunity for their own interest (Schechter, 2003).

4.5 THE ROLE OF CNN:

CNN is a cable news network founded in first of May 1980 by Ted Turner. It is one field of Turner organization for broadcasting. This channel is considered the first channel introduced the idea of continuing news (24 hours). In 2004, it was able to access 88.2 million American

house and it has main broadcasting centers in Atlanta, New York and Washington in addition to its website on internet. More than 900 employee works at this channel around the world and it has more than one copy with many languages. In 1991, the reputation of the channel was highly enhanced after covering the first gulf events after its collaboration with American government. This made this channel a source of news for other news channels around the world. As well as, CNN is the first news channel which able to broadcast a news story about 11/9 events where it was reporting what was going on directly (Coban, 2016).

In general, war is described as a mix of three elements, namely popular feelings, operational tools and political goals. More precisely, it is each of persons, army and government and then the role of channels especially CNN come to effect persons and leaders, directed them as they want. Therefore, CNN is not anymore just news channel to transfer information, but it is an important factor in making the political decisions. In a statement, President Bush in the wake of the first Gulf War stated that he has learned from CNN more than CIA. Also, TV photos broadcasted by CNN for Kurdish refugees in north of Iraq were the reason in the United Nations decision about ban aviation above the Kurdish regions. Similarly, the transfer of CNN to tragedy happened to Iraqi army during its withdraw from Kuwait was a reason to terminate the war (Bahador, 2007). Thus, fear of American government from the possibility that media could broadcast undesired photos or information was the reason which motivated American administration to manage the transfer of information. Transfer of negative information contribute in hindering the movement of state externally especially in the highlight of technological development, which allowed media to communicate with audiences and inform about what is going on with high speed. This might not give the government an opportunity to address the situation and take suitable action in addition to arrange media schedule in serving the government interests (Robins, 2002). Mark Harmon conducted a text research about words used by satellite channels during their broadcast of the news of Iraqi war. He found that CNN has used pro-war words by 63% from the total number of words during the period from 11 of September until 11 of October 2002. This means that the channel adopts pro-war view, and this reflected on the audiences of channel (Harmon & Muenchen, 2009).

In the post-Cold War era, there were many debates revolving around the significance of soft power in achieving the goal of foreign policy. This is after the great role played by CNN in

effecting the population of Eastern Europe and motivate to do without Soviet Union. CNN was able to be news icon by broadcasting breaking news and transfer live photos from locations of crises. The first gulf war and its aftermath were among the of most important events attracting the attention of world media (Bahador, 2011). After events of 9/11, representatives of American government met with chefs of networks media in order to discuss how media help government in war against terrorism. Consequently, before the beginning of the war on Iraq, CNN created a system to agree on texts. The task of operators at this system was that to be a second filter stage after the American army in Iraq. There had been harmony in point of views between each of media and American government. This reflected economic and political interests between the owners of media channels and political elite. Media supported the political goals in exchange for protection inside and outside. Locally, American communication law for 1969 was serving the interests of large media conglomerates. While globally, American government exploited its external influence in order to obtain media consultations at other countries. For example, in case of Iraq, media was supporting the war because this will open the way to control the media market at Middle East (Kumar, 2006).

CNN is considered one of TV channels with huge audiences in the United States. Since the war of Iraq was an important event for American audiences, the channel has removed commercial advertisements at the first two days of war. Similarly, it is covered the military operations during hour and determined a website for Iraq invasion. The number of CNN audiences in March and April 2003 amounted 2.3 million audience. Even after returning commercial advertisements, it was not far from the war atmosphere where it included commercial advertisements with military mode in addition to its attempt to include photos for soldiers and journalists belonging to the channel and photos for President Bush. Furthermore, CNN selected that the voiceover for its website is (CNN puts you forces beside). Besides, it displayed many photos for Iraqis and region map completely. This has contributed in marketing the channel for itself in front of the audiences specially to attract the audience and associate with military operations. At the time when it has not pointed to anti-war views, CNN promoted for media with high commercial relationships and exchange of news. For example, in its advertisements, the channel used logos for New York Times, Time Warner, Boston Club etc. This was in exchange of high amounts of money. On the other hand, CNN channel highly depended on military analysts in order to promote the war. Five military analysts rotated to

interpret the military strategies of war and avoid the political and social dimensions. Moreover, CNN contributed in promoting the war by the promotion of US military arsenal by giving detailed information and photos about the weapons of ally, compared with Iraqi weapons, and demonstrated the progress of military technology to US forces. This was a reason for marketing the American weapons globally especially laser - guided weapons that witnessed long advertisements view periods. News channels medially did not restrict support of war, but it exceed to include video games, production of songs and music. Events of 11/9 motivated many artists to produce art works which simulate what the Bush administration put forward. Songs produced before the war adopted the association between 11/9 and the necessity of military response such as the song of Toby Keith, namely "Angry American" and other song, namely "Did you forget?" by mentioning into 11/99 events. For its part, American government deliberately for more than once to use attractive names for its military operations in order to obtain extreme relationship between citizens and combat forces such as (military operations outside the country) and Ugly War (Video Game Marketing). American army promoted military video games on its website on internet (Jaramillo, 2009).

At the time when all American dead in Iraq are registered accurately by American media and glorify those dead who amounted 42211 American soldiers. At the same time, Iraqi victims were clearly neglected in spite of the gap between the numbers of victims between the two sides. Number of Iraqi victims from civilians amounted 24000 between 2003 and 2005 where 37% of them were killed because of American forces in exchange of 9% because of armed groups. The Britain Lancet magazine refers that number of Iraqi victims during the first eighteen months of the war exceeded 100 thousand. The same magazine conducted another statistic in 2006 and mentioned that the number reached 655 thousand Iraqi martyrs and more than a half of them killed because of American forces. Despite clear variation in number of losses but the American media especially CNN were very biased and didn't touch that and even if they do, they were sought to decrease the importance and confirm that is the mistakes of Iraqi resisters and that civilian losses is natural issue. Thus, American forces did not hold the responsibility and therefore, we get the impression that American media worked hardly in order to avoid the corruption of the United States' image in front of its local and global audiences. In addition, it sought to enhance its image. American death issue in Iraq was considered very important where this subject had been raised by 86% in "This Week at War" program that was broadcasted in

CNN channel. Killing stories had been mentioned regularly, their relatives and families were met, in exchange, Iraqi dead had never been mentioned, and no families had ever been hosted in any program (Dimaggio, 2009).

In an attempt by CNN channel to show something of independently and subjectively in the media, CNN was working on criticizing war on Iraq from time to time. However, at the same time, those critics appeared to be subjective and devoid of any serious analysis. Instead, the orientation of the channel was the openly supporting of the war. Many reporters mentioned the importance of American forces existence to achieve victory and stability in Iraq and that American withdrawal would promote the situation of terrorism groups. Also, they mentioned that Iraqi forces needed the American assistances in training and equipment, and this was called by the American administration. That is, CNN adopted the government's perspective unquestionably in terms of Iraqi war (Dimaggio, 2009, p46).

CNN deliberately used the governmental official sources and preferred them over other resources of information especially those belonging to White House. Those statements, visual texts and Narratives of CNN configured the public opinion in a way which served the war. CNN as other American media channel seemed to be biased in favor of government in its position from the war. CNN deliberately to repeated icon images of the war raise fears and confirmed the necessity of removing "evil" Saddam Hussein as he was representing a danger on American interests and national security. The channel clearly supported the American army and sought to fight the opposite opinions of war. Also, it was confirmed that Saddam Hussein was committed to the international laws, he had mass destruction weapons and he was a leader who prevented his citizens from freedom and democracy. On other hand, CNN did not mention the alternative methods to deal with the Iraqi crisis, but it focused on military solutions only. Besides, it did not refer to anti-war protests and destruction caused by American army and suffering of Iraqi people and their victims of women and children. In exchange, war was provided by showing American military power in a way which simulated Hollywood movie as war was as just a walk (Mhamdi, 2007).

CNN was one of few channels which stayed in Baghdad during the American invasion. When aerial bombardment began, three of its reporters were broadcasting live what had been happening in Baghdad. This issue reached American audiences with live photos about what was

going on within the land of battle. This was also an implicit but influential message to the American masses that CNN reporters were heroes because they exposed their life to danger, and it was necessary to feel sympathy for them and of course for the rest of the US soldiers. In addition, reporters often talked about strength and professionalism of American strikes against the enemy (Iraq) (Kamioka, 2001).

CNN, like the other tv channels, sent its reporters with American army in addition to its reporters already located at the center of the capital city Baghdad. This contributed in adopting the situation of US administration from the war where living of CNN reporters with American soldiers in atmosphere of fear and war inevitably brought about the generation of friendship and social association between journalists and soldiers. Thereby, the atmosphere of sympathy and friendship would inevitably affect negatively on the integrity of journalists in transferring the news where they would subconsciously belong to the accompanying military unit. Then, the goals of the military would turn out be the goals of the journalist, such as the enemies would be. This would clearly undermine the idea of inclusion which has been based on allowing the opportunity for journalists to transfer news objectively and subjectively (Palmer, 2004). A telling incident might be cited as follows: CNN reporters were in Palestine Street where a group of people gathered around Saddam Hussein statue in Paradise Square. This was at 10 am and events at that time were not dramatically enough. The situation continued like this until the interference of marines' forces at 10:30 am. Events began to accelerate dramatically where one of marine's soldiers climbed the statue of Saddam Hussein and covered his face by the American flag and then the Iraqi flag. Then, he tied the neck of the statue by iron chains in order to make the armored corps dropping it. Reporters were broadcasting everything live and in exchange, news providers in studios were excited and guiding the audiences about the importance of these historical moments resembling to the moment of the fall of the Berlin Wall. CNN cameras were able to provide all news channels around the world by icon photos to the collapse of the statue. Moreover, the channel repeated the scene of statue collapse by average of 4.4 minutes from 11 am until 8 pm. CNN supported to the war was not restricted on that only, but it exceeds to include manipulation by the camera corners which imagined the Iraqi people gathered in Paradise Square. The cameraman deliberately used close images to show the gatherings while the broadcast before the fall of statue were wide and they confirmed that number of people existed at this place were few and did not exceed tens of people and most of them were reporters of

American channels. When statue fell, CNN refused to repeat far scenes which showed the whole square in order to carry a message that there were high number of Iraqi people who supported the American invasion which was compatible with desires of Bush's administration. Reporters of the channel tended to dramatize about what is going on in the square. Throughout the day, the fierce battle that took place in Baghdad had not even been mentioned. Moreover, CNN never tended show any photos until midnight and the fall of statue was displayed as the war ended. The ratio of channel coverage highly decreased next week of statue fall as compared with previous week by 29%. Also, ratio to talk about military strategies and tactics decreased by 81% and ratio of military photos decreased by 73%. While in terms of political results to the impact of CNN, it was raised by 28% of people who had seen the end of the war in eight of April to 41% in the week after the statue was dropped. There was a general impression among the people that war was ended and ratio of supporters to the way Bush had dealt with Iraq increased from 69% in three of April to 76%. Similarly, ratio of Bush's supporters had increased from 67% to 73% (Aday, Cluverius and Livingston, 2005).

The following table clarifies the difference of media coverage of war on CNN before nine of April by one week and after one week in an attempt to convince audiences that war had ended, and military mission was completed:

Subject on CNN	Before 9/4	After 9/4
Total war stories	61	45
Total war stories as main subject	36	7
Total war stories as main subtopic	36	4
Total war stories with combat images	41	11

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This thesis addressed the role of media as one of the most important tools for any country to achieve its foreign policy. That is, in contemporary times, the media appears to be an influential and powerful tool. Its influence and its potential to manipulate seems to increase parallel to the power it retains. The US media played a crucial role in serving the goals of foreign policy of USA after 11 of September events especially during the Iraq war of 2003. TV and newspapers are considered the main source of news and information for ordinary American citizen at the end of twentieth century and the beginning of twenty-first century. Statistics have shown that American community highly depend on TVs and newspapers in order to obtain information. Within this process of obtaining information, news gathered from the TV stand with 64% and 40% newspapers and then radio comes by 14%, magazines 4% and finally they trust the ideas of their fellow citizens (neighbors, friends) by 4%. This relatively high dependence on TV and newspapers tends to give clues about the extent of strength for media to control, direct, and manipulate the opinions and decisions of people. Doubtlessly, this has repercussions on the political behavior of the citizens and on their ideological convictions and preferences. Audiences, or to be more precise, the recipients of the events secreted by the media, comprehend the events (read as the 'news') in accordance with the mental or structural boundaries drawn by the media itself. That is, they voluntarily but most probably involuntarily, acquire and adopt the news in the light of the ideological and political convictions of the news-makers which in turn comes to mean adoption of the perspective or even involuntary embracement of the perspective of the tv channel they have been following. This high dependence may imply the ability of media to configure citizens' opinions and arrange their priorities in accordance with the desires and interests of the owners of the tv channels. It is also important to note that, the significance of the media also lies within its the potential to attract citizens' attention to specific issues at the expense of some others. It not only underlines or accords priority to some significant issues, causes or events but also overshadows the others. Through the lenses of (conventional, or mainstream) media, citizens are forced to ignore or even disregard some topics. The impact of the media cannot be confined with the ordinary citizens, but it also exceeds to affect the convictions and beliefs of the politicians themselves, to some an extent at least. The politicians

might appear to be or might be forced to stand as passive recipient of the mainstream media once they fail to be the power holders.

Once the foreign policy and diplomacy has been taken into consideration, media emerges as a crucial factor in a specific country. It turns out to be a soft power that intends to effect other countries on performing a specific issue. In general, diplomatic relationships are considered to exist on a friendly basis and highly depends on technological advancement of media in establishing direct relationships between any single government and people of the other country. That is, the public opinion within the specific country is thought to be directed, or manipulated, in accordance with the strategic priorities of the concerned nation-state utilizing from its own soft-power. The efforts of the Bush administration during the Iraqi war in 2003 might be considered as a telling incident in understanding such sort of maneuver. During his rule, President Bush utilized from the media as one of the pivotal tools to implement US foreign policy priorities. As it has been noted, US administration took the decision of invasion much before the war but the domestic and the external public opinion were not highly integrated. At this juncture, political elites of the Bush administration and the media owners following the route ordered by the neo-conservative politicians, voluntarily or involuntarily agreed upon marketing the war decision and to convince the US populace and to reshape the public opinion of the citizens. Bush administration took a series of procedures with media mode in order to keep pace in the war decision and guarantee its success. Thereby, Bush administration managed to reshape and/or distort the information by using methods persuasion and intimidation. Those methods inherently included applying to some predetermined and obviously loyal media professional at the expense of boycotting the others. More importantly, such sort of methods has also covered delivering media positions to its loyal allies and it is deliberated to leak information and dumping the media scene by information support specific point of view and to eliminate dissenting opinions. Besides, American congress allowed the first-time journalists to escort military combat units. This reflected positively on the coverage of journalists for military operations where this coverage process allowed the existing of friendship between journalists and military combats. Therefore, the issued media reports adopted the point of view of American administration and citing the American resources by high percentage, in addition to the lack of mentioning on civilian victims from Iraqi people and quantity of destruction witnessed by the military operations. The presidential speeches played significant role in convincing the American

audiences by the importance that the United States make clear position from Saddam Hussein and his mass destruction weapons. Surveys referred that the speech of state of union delivered by the president Bush in 7/10/2002 was the reason behind decreasing the percentage of American opponents the war and increase supporters.

Usually, people tend to interact widely with negative events during wars and crises. As the case with media and newspapers where they look to those events as an opportunity to achieve the media superior, scoop and personal glory which positively reflect on increasing the percentage of audiences, followers and readers. At the end, this means more of profits. We do not deny that American administration was pushing towards adopting a decision of war by media. At the exchange, media was enthusiastic on their own to the war in order to achieve their own interests. So, media followed many modes such as customize pages, thousands of magazines, terms and articles support the war. As well as, TV channels hosted politicians, military and analysts support the decision of war. Media customized high period's editorial newsletters for news support the point of view of government and repeating such news and adopt what is rumored by the American administration of lies about mass destruction weapons and the relationship of Saddam Hussein with Al-Qaida organization. In other hand, media focused on notifying the extent of technological and military progress for American forces in addition to high ability combat for American military arsenal and US Air Force. American media deliberated to distribute everything support the war and neglect opinions of oppositions to the war where CNN Channel covered the war completely and stopped commercial advertisements in the first two days of the war. When the advertisements returned back, it announced everything associate with war such as military equipment, advanced American weapons and military video games in order to attract the attention of American citizens and associate them with the war until the end. War on Iraq was look like TV program which through satellite channels were able to convenience audiences that the war going well in spite of that invading forces witnessed fierce resistance. When American forces entered Paradise Square in order to down the statue of Saddam Hussein, there were few numbers of people around the statue but media deliberated to use the mode of videoing with narrow angle in order to show the high number of people. This serves and supports the opinion of American administration which claimed that American forces will be received with flowers and welcome.

From the discussion held within this rather limited study it might be possible to arrive at the conclusion that within the dawn of the twenty-first century media has appeared with a tremendous potential to shape and reshape the public opinion. In that respect, recently, the politicians and the administrators or the foreign policy specialists have tended to accord crucial significance to media within the course of defining and materializing of the national (foreign) interests of the country. The media, is thus, considered to be an integral part of a country's soft power and a pivotal pillar of its public diplomacy. In some significant cases it even emerges as important as the solid factors connoting to political, economic and military tools.

This study has attempted to shed light upon one specific question: why do the powerful countries, although they retain tremendous superiority in military, political and economic fields, need to resort into means to gain the support of its own public? More specifically, why do some powerful states necessitate to utilize from soft-power mechanisms such as the media? The study has tended to bring about convincing and satisfactory explanations to such provocative questions in the light of the policies of the Bush administration pursued during the Iraqi war in 2003. Media appeared to be one of the most effective tools within this process. Bush administration granted highest degree of importance to the media in shaping the public opinion just before entering a war in Iraq in 2003 and during the 2003 Iraq war. In this study, I have sufficed to present significant cases epitomizing the role of media as a tool of foreign policy. As I had indicated in the introduction chapter, the question that inspired me during this dubious work was to be summarized as follows: What is the role accorded by the US media in 'marketing' the war and orienting the American public opinion to provide support for the policy makers in their decisions? Throughout my studies, I have arrived at the conclusion that, at least in the light of the Iraq war in 2003, we may argue that, media have accorded a tremendous role in achieving the foreign policy interests of any given role as important as the conventional means such as the economic, military and political (in the limited sense of the notion, 'political' of course). Throughout the study, I have pinpointed at some significant cases as such: the US military allocated a radio broadcast to the Iraqi people that was aired from US aircraft carriers. This radio broadcast was very similar to the popular Iraqi radio format in terms of popular songs, ethnic dialect and even the style of anchoring was close to the Iraqi culture. This seemingly brilliant invention appeared to be a mechanism and maneuver of manipulation. Another issue might be clarified as regards to the presentation of the war. The war was presented against the dictator

Saddam Hussein, not against the Iraqi people. That was how media presented displayed the invasion as a rescue operation. A brief look at the functioning of the TV channels also serve to provide ample evidence for the process. For instance, the CNN, like the other tv channels, sent its reporters with American army in addition to its reporters already located in war zones, particularly of the capital city Bagdad. Within this atmosphere of fear and war it was inevitable for the soldiers and journalists to cooperate and to build networks and solidarity which in turn shape their ways of thinking and apprehending. All in all, the 2003 Iraqi war has proved to be a catalyst to understand the role of media in foreign policy.



REFERENCES

- Al-Rawi, A. k. (2013). The US influence in shaping Iraq's sectarian media. *The international communication gazette*, vol. 75, no. 4, 375-376.
- Aydin Aydin and Oguzhan Tekin. (2016). realist, liberal and constructivist approaches to the war on terror in Iraq. *Turkish studies, the international periodical for the languages, literature, and history of Turkish or Turkic*, vol.11, no.2, 119-121.
- Aysha, E. E.-d. (2005). September 11 and the Middle East failure of US "soft power": globalization contra Americanization in the "new" US century. *International relations*, vol. 19, no. 2, 196-197.
- Bahador, B. (2007). *The CNN effect in action how the news media pushed the west toward war in Kosovo*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bahador, B. (2011). Did the global war on terror end the CNN effect? *Media, war & conflict*, vol. 4, no. 1, 40-41.
- Balli, T., Bayat, O., & Gursoy, G. (2013). *Graduate Thesis Writing Template*. Needed çıktı bu degree, 1-2.
- Barker, G. (2012). Cultural influences on the news: portrayals of the Iraq war by Swedish and American media. *The international communication gazette*, vol. 74, no. 1, 15-17.
- Barker, M. j. (2008). Democracy or oligarchy? US-funded media developments in Afghanistan and Iraq post 9/11. *Media, culture & society*, vol. 30, no. 1, 118-122.
- Barkin, S. (2003). Realist constructivism. *International studies review*, vol. 5, no. 3, 326.
- Baroudi, S. (2007). Arab intellectuals and democracy: the case of the greater Middle East initiative. *Middle East journal*, vol. 61, no. 3, 392-396.
- Behraves, M. (2011). *Constructivism: an introduction*. E-international relations.

Blinders, Blunders, and Wars: What America and China Can Learn. (2014). In H. B. David C. Gompert, *Blinders, Blunders, and Wars: What America and China Can Learn* (pp. 161-162). Santa Monica, Calif: RAND Corporation.

Bonn, S. a. (2011). How an elite-engineered moral panic led to the U.S. war on Iraq. *crit crim*, vol. 19, no. 3, 240-242.

Boyce, S. G. (2013). Qatar's foreign policy. *Asian affairs*, vol. 44, no. 3, 367-377.

Brain a. Patrick & Trevor. Thrall. (2007). beyond hegemony: classical propaganda theory and presidential communication strategy after the invasion of Iraq. *Mass communication & society*, vol. 10, no. 1, 110-113.

Brainard, L. (2017). Insecurity by other means foreign assistance, global poverty, and American leadership (pp. 17-19). Washington: Brookings institution press.

Bray, C. w. (1974). Opinion: the media and foreign policy. *Foreign policy*, no. 16, 109-112.

Brigette Nacos, Yaeli Boch-Elkon, and Robert Shapiro. (2011). *Selling Fear: Counterterrorism, the Media, and Public Opinion*. Chicago and London: the University of Chicago Press.

Calabresa, A. (2005). Casus belli U.S. media and the justification of the Iraq war. *Television & new media*, vol. 6, no. 2, 153-155...170-171.

Campbell, J. T. (2003). *Desert war the new conflict between the U.S. and Iraq*. New York new American library.

Chafee, L. (2007). President Bush's road map to Middle East peace: a promise unfulfilled. *The brown journal of world affairs*, vol. 14, no. 1, 211-214.

Charap, S. (2016). Russia's use of military force as a foreign policy tool, is there a logic? *Ponars Eurasia policy memo*, no. 443, 1-2.

CLAES H. DE VREESE HAJO G. BOOMGAARDEN. (2006). Media Effects on Public Opinion about the Enlargement of the European Union. *JCMS Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 44, no. 2.

- Coban, F. (2016). The role of the media in international relations: from the CNN effect to the Al-Jazeera effect. *Journal of international relations and foreign policy*, vol. 4, no. 2, 51-55.
- Coe, K. (2012). Television news, public opinion, and the Iraq war: do wartime rationales matter? *Communication research*, vol. 40, no. 4, 500-502.
- Cohen, R. a. (2018). Challenging the anocracy model: Iran's foreign policy in Iraq as an obstacle to democracy? *British journal of the Middle Eastern studies*, 7-14.
- Craig, A. (1976). The media and foreign policy. *An international journal*, vol. 31, no. 2, news and nations, 319-320.
- Crossette, B. (2004). The media and foreign policy. *Great decisions, eat decisions*, 10-11.
- Daniel Deudney and G. John Iken Berry. (2017). realism, liberalism and the Iraq war. *The international institute for strategic studies, survival global politics*, vol. 59, no. 4, 22-24.
- Daniel v. Dimitrova & Jesper Stromback. (2005). mission accomplished? Framing of the Iraq war in the elite newspapers in Sweden and the United States. *Gazette: the international journal for communication studies*, vol. 67, no. 5, 409-412.
- Danny Hayes and Mmatt Guardino. (2013). influence from abroad foreign voices, the media, and U.S. public opinion. *NewYork Cambridge university press*.
- Das, R. (2009). Critical social constructivism: "culturing" identity, (in) security, and the state in international relations theory. *The Indian journal of political science*, vol. 70, no. 4, 964.
- Dimaggio, A. (2009). When media goes to war hegemonic discourse, public opinion, and the limits of dissent. *NewYork monthly review press*.
- Donnelly, T. (2004). Operation Iraqi freedom a strategic assessment. *American enterprise institute*.
- Dunu, D. H. (2005). Bush, 11 September and conflicting strategies of the 'war on terrorism'. *Irish studies in international affairs*, vol. 16, 26-27.

- Ebaya, S. (2010). The utility of military strategy as an instrument of foreign policy. *A foreign policy research review, an international multi-disciplinary journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, 217-220.
- Edwards, A. (2014). In "dual containment" policy in the Persian gulf the USA, Iran, and Iraq 1991-2000 (p. 28). USA: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Farkas, E. (2003). In fractured states and U.S. foreign policy: Iraq, Ethiopia, and Bosna in the 1990s United States (pp. 23-24). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Fay Lomax Cook Tom r. Tyler Edward g. Goetz Margaret t. Gordon David Protes Donna r. Leff Harvey I. Molotch. (1983). Media and Agenda Setting: Effects on the Public, Interest Group Leaders, Policy Makers, and Policy. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 47, Issue 1, 25.
- Freedman, D. (2016). Media policy norms for a Europe in crisis. *Javnost-the public*, vol. 23, no. 2, 122-130.
- Freedman, R. (2002). The bush administration and the Arab-Israel conflict. *Israel studies forum*, vol. 17, no. 2, 14-15.
- Fried, A. (2005). Terrorism as a context of coverage before the Iraq war. *Harvard international journal of press/politics*, vol. 10, no. 3, 125-131.
- Fuente, E. D. (2011). ALBA: a political tool for Venezuela's foreign policy. *Western hemisphere security analysis center*, vol. 4, 1-2.
- Gardner, L. C. (2008). In the long road to Baghdad a history of U.S. foreign policy from the 1970s to the present (pp. 62-92). New York the new press.
- Ghosh, A. (2003). Iraq: media challenge. *Economic and political weekly*, vol. 38, no.20, 1933-1934.
- Gray Hufbauer and Jeffrey J. Schott. (1985). economic sanctions and U.S. foreign policy. *PS*, vol. 18, no. 4, 227-228.
- Griffin, M. (2004). Picturing America's 'war on terrorism' in Afghanistan and Iraq photographic motifs as news frames. *Journalism*, vol. 5, no. 4, 393-397.

- Griffiths, M. (2007). In international relations theory for the twenty-first-century introduction (pp. 21-23). Routledge.
- Gursoy, G., Bayat, O., & Balli, T. (2013). Graduate Thesis Writing Template. Istanbul: Kemberburgaz Publishing.
- Hadad, H. (2016). Has democratization in Iraq failed? Al-Bayan Center for Planning and Studies, 35-39.
- Hassan, O. (2015). Constructivist-institutionalism and the innovation of Iraq: crisis, learning and the national interest. Horizons in humanities and social sciences: An international refereed journal, vol. 1, no. 1, 66-71.
- Hayat Nader, Chris Yalonis, Katy Milton, Abdulhamid Alzaidi, Sami Al-ramyanand. (2006). Arab perception of the west a study of policy opinion, foreign policy and the role of media in the Middle East. The communique partners.
- Heinze, E. A. (2008). The new utopianism: liberalism, American foreign policy, and the Iraq war. Journal of international political theory, vol. 4, no. 1, 115-117.
- Hill, C. (2003). What is to be done? Foreign policy as a site for political action. International affairs (royal institute of international affairs 1944) vol. 79, no. 2, 233-239.
- Hirsh, M. (2002). Bush and the world. Foreign affairs, vol. 81, no. 5, 18-19.
- Hopf, T. (1998). The promise of constructivism in international relations theory. International security, vol. 23, no. 1, 175.
- Ince, B. a. (1976). The media and foreign-policy formation in small states: Trinidad and Tobago. An international journal, vol. 31, no. 2, news and nations, 280-281.
- Jacobs, A. (2003). The way we live now: 3-02-03: process; my week at embed boot camp. The New York Times magazine.
- Jaramillo, D. L. (2009). Ugly war, pretty package: how CNN and fox news made the invasion of Iraq high concept.

Jeannine Relly, Maggy Zanger & Shahira Fahmy. (2015). News Media Landscape in a Fragile State: Professional Ethics Perceptions in a Post-Ba'athist Iraq. *Mass Communication & Society*, vol. 18, no. 4, 471-479.

Jhaveri, N. j. (2004). Petro imperialism: US oil interests and the Iraq war. *Antipode*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2-5.

Juanita M. Firestone & Richard John Harris. (2006). support and opposition for invading Iraq: did the president's speech make a difference? *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 29, no. 10-11, 897-899.

Kalayci, R. (2019). Gent-structure relations in foreign policy: an analysis of turkey-Syria relations during the Arab spring on dynamic foreign policy analysis. *dokuz eylul university the journal of the graduate school of social sciences*, vol. 21, no. 2, 538-541.

Kamioka, N. (2001). Support our troops: the U.S. media and the narrative of the Persian Gulf War. *The Japanese journal of American studies*, no. 12, 77.

Kazmi, I. Z. (2012). Media influence on public opinion and the perceptions of media owners and consumers about its effects. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 2, 14-19.

Keith Crane, Andreas Goldthau, Michael Toman, Thomas Light, Stuart E. Johnson, Alireza Nader, Angel Rabasa, and Harun Dogo. (2009). oil as a foreign policy instrument. In *imported oil and U.S. national security* (p. 25...37). RAND Corporation.

Kellner, D. (2004). Media propaganda and spectacle in the war on Iraq: a critique of U.S. broadcasting networks. *Cultural studies > critical methodologies*, vol. 4, no. 3, 330-336.

Kenneth Osgood and Andrew K. Frank. (2010). in *selling the war in a media age the presidency and public opinion in the American century* (pp. 237-240). Florida: university press of Florida.

Klimkiewicz, B. (2017). State, media, and pluralism: tracing roots and consequences of media policy change in Poland. *Publicist*, vol. 63, no. 2, 197-212.

Kumar, D. (2006). Media, War, and Propaganda: Strategies of Information Management During the 2003 Iraq War. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, vol. 3 no. 1, 58.

Kumar, D. (2006). Media, War, and Propaganda: Strategies of Information Management During the 2003 Iraq War. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 51-53.

Larrabee, S. (2002). US middle east policy after 9\11: implications for transatlantic relations. *The international spectator*, 45-47.

Lauterbach, T. (2011). Constructivism, strategic culture, and the Iraq war. *air and space power journal-Africa and Francophonie*, 61-66.

Leigh-hippard, H. (1995). In *Congress and US military aid to Britain interdependence and dependence, 1949-56* (pp. 158-159). Palgrave MacMillan.

Lewis, J. (2001). *Constructor public opinion how political elites do what they like and why we seem to go along with it*. New York Colombia university press.

Lindner, A. m. (2008). Controlling the media in Iraq. *Context*, vol. 7, no. 2, 33-38.

Lippmann, W. (1991). *Public opinion*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Lock-pullan, R. (2006). In *U.S. intervention policy and army innovation from Vietnam to Iraq* (p. 166). London: Routledge.

Louis A Picard, Robert Groelsema and Terry F Buss. (2008). in *foreign aid and foreign policy lessons for the next half-century* (pp. 319-320). London: m.e Sharpe.

Malkasian, C. (2008). Did the United States need more forces in Iraq? Evidence from al Anbar. *Defense studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, 99-100.

Mark Harmon and Robert Muenchen. (2009). Semantic framing in the build-up to the Iraq War: Fox V. CNN and other U. S. broadcast news programs. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*; Jan2009, Vol. 66, no. 1, 18-19.

Marr, P. (2012). *The modern history of Iraq*. USA: west view press.

Martin Griffiths, Terry O'callaghan and Steven C. Roach. (2008). in international relations the key concepts (pp. 24-26). USA: Routledge.

Mecombs, M. (2011). The agenda-setting role of the mass media in the shaping of public opinion. University of Texas at Austin, 1-10.

Media's Role in Shaping Foreign Policy. (1991). great decision, eat decision, 90-94.

Mercille, J. (2010). The radical geopolitics of US foreign policy: the 2003 Iraq war. Journal, vol. 75, no. 4 new directions in critical geopolitics, 330-332.

Mhamdi, C. (2007). Framing "the other" in time of conflicts: CNN's coverage of the 2003 Iraq war. Mediterranean journal of social sciences, vol. 8, no.2, 101-102.

Michael O'hanlon & Nina Kamp. (2006). is the media being fair in Iraq? Washington Quarterly, vol. 29, no. 4, 7-8.

Michael Ryan & Les Switzer. (2009). propaganda and the subversion of the objectivity: media coverage of the war on terrorism in Iraq. Critical studies on terrorism, vol. 2, no. 1, 47.

Miller, D. (2004). The war against Iraq. The lucent terrorism.

Miyagawa, M. (1992). In doing economic sanctions work? (p. 6). London: the MacMillan press.

Morgan s. Johansen & Mark r. Joslyn. (2008). political persuasion during times of crisis: the effect of education and news media on citizen's factual information about Iraq. Journalism & mass communication quarterly, vol. 85, no. 3, 591-604.

Muller, M. M. (2015). Analytical approach: an interdisciplinary analysis of foreign policy. In a specter is haunting Arabia how the Germans brought their communism to Yemen (pp. 47-57). Transcript Verlag.

Naveh, C. (2002). The role of the media in foreign policy decision-making: a theoretical framework. Conflict & communication online, vol. 1, no. 2, 1-2.

Nugroho, G. (2008). Constructivism and International Relations Theories. Global & Strategies, 89-93.

- Nye, J. (2006). Transformational leadership and U.S grand strategy. *Foreign affairs*, 139-142.
- O'shaughnessy, N. (2004). Weapons of mass seduction. *Journal of political marketing*, vol. 3 no. 4, 84-86.
- Palmer, H. T. (2004). *Media at war the Iraq crisis*. London: sage publications.
- Pirnie, O'Connell, Accounting for Success and Failure. (2008). in *counterinsurgency in Iraq (2003-2006)* (pp. 66-71). Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- Paterson, C. (2011). Government intervention in the Iraq war media narrative through direct coercion. *Global media and communication*, vol. 7, no. 3, 181-183.
- Peter t. Leeson & Christopher J. Coyne. (2007). the reforms' dilemma: media, policy ownership, and reform. *European journal of law and economics*, vol. 23, no. 3, 241-243.
- Philip m. Napoli & Deborah I. Dwyer. (2018). U.S. media policy in a time of political polarization and technological evaluation. *publizistik*, vol. 63, no. 4, 583-596.
- Putnis, P. (2001). Newspapers as political instruments in media policy debate. *Agenda: a journal of political analysis and reform*, vol.8, no. 2, 105.
- Quackenbush, S. L. (2011). In *understanding general deterrence theory and application* (pp. 1-3). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Rao, M. (2003). New media. *Media Asia*, vol. 30, no. 3, 134-135.
- Reveron, D. S. (2004). *America's viceroys the military and U.S. foreign policy*. New York Palgrave, MacMillan.
- Reynolds, N. E. (2007). *U.S. Marines in Iraq; Basrah, Baghdad and beyond*. History division united states marine corps.
- Richter, C. (2017). Media policy in time of transition Tunisia's bumpy road to democracy. *publizistik*, vol. 62, no. 3, 326-333.
- Robert Huthchings and Jeremi Suri. (2015). In *foreign policy breakthroughs cases in successful diplomacy* (pp. 167-168). USA: oxford university press.

- Robins, P. (2002). *The CNN effect the myth of news, foreign policy, and intervention*. London: Routledge.
- S.Nye, J. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, vol. 616, no. 1, 94-96.
- Sanchez, N. D. (1989). Covert military operations and American foreign policy. *Harvard international review*, vol. 11, no. 3, 5.
- Schechter, D. (2003). *Embedded: Weapons of mass deception how the media failed to cover the war on Iraq*. Canada: cold type.
- Sean Aday, J. C. (2005). As Goes, the Statue, So Goes the War: The Emergence of the Victory Frame in Television Coverage of the Iraq War. *Journal of broadcasting & electronic media*, 321-327.
- Sefano Guzzini & Anna Leander. (2006). in *constructivism and international relations Alexander Wendt and his critics* (p. 96). London: Routledge Taylor and Francis group.
- Seib, P. (2009). Public diplomacy and journalism, parallels, ethical issues, and practical concerns. *American behavioral scientist*, vol. 52, no. 5, 773-777.
- Seib, P. (2009). *Toward a New Public Diplomacy: Redirecting US Foreign Policy*. MacMillan.
- Serfaty, S. (1990). *In the media and foreign policy* (p. 147). London: MacMillan.
- shaheen, j. g. (1985). Media coverage of the Middle East: perception and foreign policy. *Political and social science*, vol. 482, changing patterns of power in the Middle East, 161-171.
- Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber. (2003). in *weapons of mass deception the uses of propaganda in bush's war on Iraq* (pp. 166-167). USA: penguin group.
- Spegele, R. D. (1996). In *political realism in international theory* (pp. 14-20). London: Cambridge university press.
- Stephen Ansolabehere, Roy Behr, and Shanto Iyengar. (1993). in *the media game: American politics in the television age* (pp. 7-8). MacMillan.

Stewart, D. (2005). The greater Middle East and reform in the bush administration's ideology. *Geographical review*, vol. 95, no. 3, new geographies of the Middle East, 405.

Stokes, D. (2009). The war gamble: understanding US interests in Iraq. *Globalizations*, vol. 6, no. 1, 108-111.

Susan Keith, Bill Silcock, and Carol Schwalbe. (2009). visualizing cross-media coverage: picturing war across platforms during the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, vol. 17, no. 1, 12-16.

Taehee Whang, Youngman Kim, Jung Taek Han & Hannah June Kim. (2019). US foreign policy aid and economic policy concessions. *Policy studies*, vol. 40, no. 1, 62-72.

Taffet, J. F. (2007). *Foreign aid as foreign policy the alliance for progress in Latin America*. New York Routledge.

The Mass Media and Foreign Policy: What Limits on the Public's Right to Know? (1973). *Great Decisions, eat Decisions*, 13-14.

Tucker-Jones, A. (2014). *Modern warfare the Iraq war operation Iraqi freedom 2003-2011*. Great Britain: pen & sword military.

Vande, E. (2009). In *classical liberalism and international relations theory Hume, Smith, Mises, and Hayek* (pp. 19-20). USA: Palgrave MacMillan.

Vucetic, S. (2006). Why did Canada sit of the Iraq war? One constructivist analysis. *Canadian foreign policy journal*, 133-134.

W. Lance Bennett, Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. (2007). in *when the press fails political power and the news media from Iraq to Katrina* (pp. 28-29). London: University of Chicago Press.

Weber, C. (2005). In *international relations theory a critical introduction* (pp. 14-17). London: Routledge Tyler and Francis group.

Welch, M. (2008). Ordering Iraq: reflections on power, discourse, & neocolonialism. *Critical criminology*, vol. 16, no. 4, 261-263.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *The international organization*, vol. 46, no. 2, 96-97.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge university press.

Wendy m. Christensen & Myra Marx Ferree. (2008). cowboy of the world? Gender discourse and Iraqi war debate. *qual social*, vol. 31, 287-288.

Williamson Murray and Robert H. Scales. (2003). *the Iraq war military history*. The Belknap Press of Harvard university press.

Xiaoling Zhang, Herman Wasserman, and Winston Mano. (2016). In *China's media and soft power in Africa: promotion and perceptions* (pp. 79-80). London: MacMillan.

Zahrana, R. (2010). *Battles to brides US strategic communication and public diplomacy after 9/11*. London: MacMillan.

Zaidan, S. F. (2012). In the thesis of the clash of civilizations and the American media employment of September 11th events 2001 (pp. 63-75). Mosul: University of Mosul College of political sciences.

Zehfuss, M. (2002). *Constructivism in international relations the politics of reality*. United Kingdom: Cambridge university press.