

# The American Strategy Towards Iraq During The Trump Era And Beyond

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Ibrahim Harbi Ibrahim**

*Middle Technical University / Director of the Department of Diwan Affairs*  
[ibraheemharbi@yahoo.com](mailto:ibraheemharbi@yahoo.com)

## Abstract

The foreign policy is based on the principle of achieving interests in the external environment through the optimal use of the available sources of power in the internal and external environments, and not neglecting the transformation of the latent power into a new tributary of the available power, and clarifying the objectives that the ruling elites seek to achieve through their political behavior in the international environment, and accordingly be The objectives of foreign policy are limited to the extent of the subjective capabilities, and the political ambition must be within the ceiling of these capabilities. Here it should be noted that political decision makers should not neglect to keep pace with adaptation and political, security and economic changes in the internal and international environment, and the variables of the role and influence of international and non-international players. The process of predicting how the new management of the White House in Washington, led by President Biden, and the legacy left by President Trump in employing the available capabilities, and evaluating the mistakes of President Trump's previous policy towards Iraq in drawing a new policy to rebuild strategic relations in Iraq, will achieve tangible benefits for the United States and compensate The heavy losses incurred by the United States without a corresponding return. Will the management of President Biden succeed in reaping new material and geostrategic benefits in this country in a way that achieves compensation, and the US policy throughout the Middle East is based through its evaluation in Iraq.

## Introduction

Since 1958, Iraq has been the only country in the region in which the United States does not have influence over it, and thus Iraq was considered a non-loyal country to the United States of America in the region, in addition to that, Iraq turned toward the socialist camp at that time, and the situation continued to end with the severing of relations in 1967 due to the positions of the United States of America of the (Israeli) aggression. However, the British presence in the region and the preoccupation of the United States of America with its conflict with the former Soviet Union in Europe and its reliance on British influence to protect its vital interests limited the American orientation towards Iraq, and prevented rapprochement between the two parties, and the gap between the two parties

increased after the revolution of July 17 1968 due to its adoption of a different approach and the objectives of the American strategy in the region in terms of its rejection of the foreign presence in the Arabian Gulf and its nationalization of Iraqi oil in 1972 and the expulsion of foreign companies from Iraq and the demand to use oil as a political weapon in 1973 against the countries supporting (Israel), which contributed to the rise of Global oil prices caused great damage to the economy of the West as a whole, and the Iraqi approach angered the United States until the outbreak of the Iraq-Iran war (1980-1988), where the United States found the appropriate opportunity to contain the two countries as one of the most threatening countries in the region to American interests. The end of the war did not bring results that serve the

American objectives, as Iraq's military and economic capabilities have grown, in addition to its attempt to achieve a strategic balance. He comes with Israel, so the United States of America found Iraq, with its capabilities, capabilities, and tendencies against its policies and influence, as a serious threat to its vital interests in the region and to the security of its strategic ally Israel. Therefore, it was necessary to destroy Iraq's military and economic capabilities, and most importantly is the intellectual construction of Iraqi society, so the second Gulf War 1991 is the right opportunity for that, as that era witnessed difficult outcomes at the level of the international system represented by the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the disintegration of its socialist system, and the United States of America seeking to tighten its control and dominance over the international system.

Indeed, the US strategy came with many means and tools that, on its part, achieve the objectives of the US strategy towards Iraq, represented in imposing economic sanctions through continuous military strikes with unfair measures and policies against Iraq. The situation continued until the September 11, 2001, bombings, accusing Iraq of supporting extremist terrorist groups, as well as accusing it of possessing weapons of mass destruction and violating human rights, and based on these justifications, the United States invaded Iraq in 2003 and then occupied it as a starting point. From defining the strategic interests and objectives in Iraq in an effort to achieve its strategy at the level of the region in reshaping and arranging it according to the American vision and in line with the American strategic interests and objectives, as well as expanding the spot of the American military presence and tightening control over oil and thus strengthening American hegemony over the world.

Since US President Donald Trump announced the basic provisions of the updated version of his management National Security Strategy, he has set a basic determinant on which this strategy is built, which is that the United States is entering a phase of a conflict nature, and in multiple aspects, Trump said: "The world is

now witnessing military and economic confrontations. We have entered a new era of competition." Consequently, his management was interested in formulating policies, plans and programs that deal with this approach it adopted, and perhaps this is what made the US National Security Strategy for the year 2018 take the greatest extent of international attention in an unprecedented way since the first national security strategy announced in 1987 AD.

The US strategy towards Iraq may be described as fixed and changing, as required by the US national interest, as it is affected by the institutions of political decision-making and decision-making. Accordingly, Donald Trump's strategy in Iraq represented a change from the strategy of his predecessor Barack Obama, especially his statements to cancel the deal of the Iranian nuclear program, take a different position on the Syrian crisis, and give priority to fighting ISIS over the departure of the Syrian regime, as well as its relations with Israel, making them more An alliance, as well as the trend towards direct military action by targeting the headquarters of the Popular Mobilization and the assassination of the commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards (Soleimani) and (Al-Muhandis). This strategy towards the region was also based on the doctrine of the bargaining man who followed the mechanisms of supply and demand in dealing with the countries of the region in a way that enhances Washington's position without paying anything in return to protect its partners, but rather they are the ones who pay for protection. Certainly, there are aspects of continuing that strategy towards the Middle East.

### **Research problem and objective**

The problem of the current research revolves around what are the limits of the change in the American strategy towards Iraq during the Trump era? What are the aspects of continuity in that strategy for the aftermath?

From this main question, several sub-questions emerge:

1. What are the objectives of the US strategy towards Iraq?

2. What are the determinants of the US approach to Iraq in the era of Trump?
3. What are the directions of the US strategy towards Iraq after Trump?

### **Research Hypothesis**

The research stems from the hypothesis that the greater the inhibition factors for the US strategy in Iraq, the greater the indicators of thinking about reconsidering its strategy in Iraq and vice versa." Especially after US President Donald Trump has taken many decisions that affect Iraqi sovereignty, such as direct military intervention and the imposition of certain policies that force the government To take decisions in line with American policies, in isolation from Iraqi interests at all levels - politically, economically, militarily / and security - and there are many variables that affect it directly or indirectly, positively or negatively, and at different levels.

### **Curriculum approved in the research**

To prove the validity of this hypothesis, the descriptive analytical method was mainly relied upon to study the US strategic objectives in the era of US President Donald Trump and the means of their implementation, with the analysis and description of the most prominent US, international, regional and Iraqi environment variables (supportive and restraining) for the US strategy in Iraq. The systemic analysis method was also relied upon by studying the course of the American strategy and its analysis towards Iraq during the era of President Trump and beyond. The conditional probabilistic foresight approach was used as one of the future studies curriculum by studying the future possibilities of the American strategy in Iraq. In addition to these approaches, the functional approach and the historical approach were used as auxiliary approaches to achieve scientific research.

### **Research Structure**

The research, in addition to the introduction, was divided into four sections

and a conclusion. The first topic deals with the American strategy, its objectives, means, and the structures that make this strategy. The second topic deals with the American strategy towards Iraq during the era of President Donald Trump. As for the third topic, it deals with the variables affecting directly or indirectly negatively. Or positively in the future of the post-Trump American strategy in Iraq. As for the fourth topic, we dealt with the future possibilities of the American strategy in Iraq, and finally the conclusion, where the most important results reached by the research with mentioning the most important conclusions that have been reached.

### **The first topic: The American strategy, its objectives, means, and the structures that make this strategy**

#### **First: The concept of American strategy and strategy**

The concept of strategy was associated in the past with the military field only, where states use arms force by the state to achieve its objectives.

Thinkers have worked hard who presented their definitions of the concept of strategy, and one of the most famous and most common definitions was the definition of the German military theorist (Karl von Clausewitz) as (the art of preparing and drawing general plans for war), as he stated in his famous book (On War) that it is: (The art of using battles as a means of reaching to the objective of war) <sup>(1)</sup>.

He also gave (Moltke) a clearer definition of the strategy, as he said: (It is a procedure of practical appropriateness of the means placed at the disposal of the leader to the desired) <sup>(2)</sup>.

While the French General (Andre Boufer), who took the concept of strategy out of its military framework into a broader framework, considers arms force as one of its strategic dimensions and fields, as he

defined it, saying: (It is the art of using force to reach policy objectives) <sup>(1)</sup>.

As far as the United States of America is concerned, its reality necessitated that it should follow a global strategy. Given that it has a set of conditions and possesses the necessary will to translate it into building and performance capabilities, especially after the Second World War, when that event that drew its own strategy in keeping with its international reality, and its position after major and influential powers found an opportunity with international changes and their ability to adapt to them, an opportunity To adapt the internal and external environments to their advantage.

### **Second: American strategic objectives**

There are those who classify American objectives and interests into:- <sup>(2)</sup>

- 1- Military and political interests: We can call them geostrategic interests and objectives, and this type of objectives is the military-security importance of a particular region or region - the Middle East.
- 2- Economic interests: which can be indicated in the economic field for the American objectives, namely oil - trade - investments - monetary interests.
- 3- (Israel): Concerning the American objectives in the Middle East, maintaining (Israel) is superior to the Arab countries

Thus, it can be said that the United States has imperial ambitions since its inception, and that its imperial dream was coupled with the constant desire to spread American thought and its beliefs until these convictions became the spirit that breathes life into American politics and political figures for many years. Thomas Paine summed up this spirit, saying: "From just a small spark, a flame glowed in America, which seemed to not be extinguished. Without melting, it ravaged its progress from one country to another, and the country was subjected to silent operations"<sup>(3)</sup>.

These constants continued to govern the American strategic objectives. A committee linked to the Republican Party, comprising experts from politicians and strategists, and research and academic institutes, presented five national interests for America as follows:- <sup>(4)</sup>

- 1- Anticipating, deterring and reducing the threat of nuclear, biological and chemical attacks against America or its military forces abroad.
- 2- Ensuring the cooperation of the allies to rehabilitate an international system that will allow America to enjoy prosperity.
- 3- Avoiding the emergence of hostile forces or countries that cause concern on the borders of America.
- 4- Ensuring the stability of major global systems (trade - financial markets - environmental energy reserves).
- 5- Establishing strong relations based on the agreement of American national interests with countries that could become strategic adversaries, such as China and Russia....

### **Third: Iraq's position within the American strategy**

Iraq was never far from the important events that the world witnessed, especially at the beginning of the last century, as it was present in the First World War, in the Second World War, and in the Cold War through (the Baghdad Pact 1955), and with the end of the Cold War, Iraq was a target and with military force, With the United States settling at the top of the international pyramid, it was one of the most important American objectives to exercise force against it, and the truth is that Iraq has been placed in the crosshairs of the American objective since the nineties of the last century, and with the advent of (the neo-

conservatives), the idea of war and occupation has crystallized <sup>(1)</sup>.

The importance of Iraq is due to its distinguished location and its material and moral capabilities that its enemies are aware of, and according to the words of (Anthony Lake), the former National Security Adviser, who says: "The strategic importance of Iraq lies in the oil, the geopolitical location, the population composition and the historical depth, and these are factors that cannot be changed in the short and long term, And they will remain effective and influential factors that give Iraq a great strategic value, and this value will increase with the depletion of oil resources for most of the countries that produce it. For this importance, Iraq was considered the starting point in implementing the American strategy in the region<sup>(2)</sup>, so the military occupation came as an American tool of change to transform Iraq, like the tip of the spear in changing the entire<sup>(3)</sup>

region, and this was clearly stated in President George W. Bush's speech in February 2003, when he said: The role that freedom can play in changing this region shows its great strategic importance.

The importance of Iraq lies in the US strategy through:

- 1- Geographical location and its importance.
- 2- Economic importance.
- 3- The security-military importance.
- 4- political importance.

### **1- Geographical location and its importance**

With regard to the strategic importance of Iraq in the American strategic perception, we see it has increased since the end of World War II, because it mediates the arc extending from the center and the Anatolian peninsula to the Arabian Sea in the south of the Arabian Peninsula, on which the American strategy was based to link the Atlantic defense area and the presence in the Horn of Africa. On the one hand, as well as being located in the area of

land geographical extension from the Caucasus region to the eastern edge of the Indian Ocean, meaning that it controls the land that separates the Persian Gulf from the Russian region, on the other hand <sup>(4)</sup>. Many researchers and those interested in international strategy also stressed the importance of Iraq's geographical location, perhaps in the forefront of which are the pioneers of modern strategy, such as (Spicman, Mackinder, and Sversky), according to the theory of the specialist (Spicman), Iraq is located within what he called (the ground framework), which is of strategic importance, as it forms a crescent that surrounds the Russian heart, and gave the Scientist (Mackinder) a special importance in the theory (the heart of the world) and predicted to him since 1904 the future of Great, as is the Russian scientist (Sversiki) in the theory (air power is the key to survival) that Iraq is located within the region of destiny, which is the most strategically important region in the world, so that whoever controls it becomes able to control other parts of the world, so Iraq has the importance significant in terms of its position in the map of international strategies <sup>(5)</sup>. The strategic importance of Iraq is illustrated by what the US decision maker confirms. This is (Bruce Riedel), the Special Assistant to the former US President (Clinton) for Middle East and Southeast Asian affairs, in his statement to a Jewish group, saying:

"The reasons that make Iraq so important to the United States of America, the region and the world at large are that it enjoys a strategic

geographical location, as it is located on the borders of Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait... This geo-strategic importance is still today as it was in the past. ..." <sup>(6)</sup>. Through the foregoing, it can be said that the distinguished geographical location of Iraq gave it great strategic importance, and then the American interest increased due to the importance of the effective strategy at the regional and international levels alike.

## 2- Economic importance

The strategic economic importance of Iraq stems from its resources and wealth, especially oil, which is a strategic element in times of peace and war alike, in addition to the presence of large markets that absorb goods and the continuous increase in consumer demand in them. With regard to oil, Iraq is one of the richest countries in the world with its oil wealth, and the strategic importance of Iraqi oil is represented by many factors, as it comes in second place after Saudi Arabia in the list of countries that contain the largest proven reserves of crude oil. The proven Iraqi reserves of crude oil amount to (115) billion barrels, which is equivalent to (11%) of the total world reserves in 2003, While other estimates indicate a much higher number, and it may reach (300) billion barrels as an uncertain reserve, because oil exploration in Iraq has stopped since 1980, and that (50%) of the oil fields have not yet been evaluated, including The Western Desert region, which is believed to contain (100) billion barrels of untapped oil reserves, in addition to that, the northeastern region of Iraq holds new oil reserves <sup>(1)</sup>.

The most important characteristic of the Iraqi oil fields is that they are multiple reservoirs in one field, and they are located on land and not deep, and most of them are very large, and do not contain complex geological structures, and the cost of exploration and development is very low in Iraq, as estimates indicate that the cost of extracting a barrel Oil in Iraq ranges between (2 - 5) dollars<sup>(2)</sup>, while the cost of Caspian oil is (17) dollars per barrel, and what reinforces the strategic importance of Iraqi oil is that it is fully amenable to export through pumping lines extending to the eastern coast of the Mediterranean, That is, the possibility of avoiding the Gulf and the Strait of Hormuz. In 1975, Iraq established the strategic pipeline that connects the fields of the south with the north, which gives Iraq great flexibility in the ability to export through the Mediterranean or the Arabian Gulf according to need. Iraq also

has lines that pass through Syria, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. Hence, the multiplicity of Iraqi oil export outlets, and the availability of a network of pipelines and ports, makes it possible to market Iraqi oil to all major global markets at a reasonable cost.

And the American interest in Iraq is not limited to oil interests, but extends to include most other economic fields (markets and investments). At the level of markets, the issue of absorbing markets is one of the American strategic economic objectives. Therefore, the growth of the capitalist American economy stops, as it can work with all its energies to raise the level of profits to fantastic numbers that help move the American economy on a growing basis. <sup>(3)</sup>

And as (Naomi Klein) described in her article Iraq after the occupation that there is a system of economic perceptions whose final operative says: Iraq is the jar of honey in the Middle East, and if this jar could be destroyed so that the honey flows chaotically and randomly on the ground, the flies will gather in an unexpected way, and flies here are the code name for businessmen and transcontinental companies <sup>(4)</sup>.

As a result of the foregoing, it can be said that one of the factors that led to the increasing strategic importance of Iraq at the economic level is the presence of strategically changing oil at the global level, as well as the availability of markets that absorb foreign investments, and thus Iraq entered into international strategies, especially the strategy of the United States of America.

## 3- Military-security importance

From a military point of view, Iraq before 1968 was not important in this field, but this importance took on a gradual qualitative and quantitative development after 1968, in a way that made Iraq in 1980 the third largest Arab military force in terms of numbers and the third Arab country in terms of spending Military <sup>(5)</sup>.

Since 1968, Iraq has sought to develop its military capabilities on new scientific bases and develop its training and mobilization methods and combat capabilities as quickly as possible. At first, it required relying first on its friends who were able to provide it with weapons and military experience, so the Soviet Union came to the fore, as the Soviets provided Iraq in 1971 with one hundred and ten (Mik-21) and (SU-7) fighters, more than twenty helicopters and training, and between (100-150) tanks, as well as other equipment, and after the signing of the Iraqi-Soviet treaty in 1972, the Soviet Union helped build bases (SAMIE-M) missiles in Iraq, and after 1973 the Soviets continued to supply Iraq with the latest types of military equipment, including: (Scud) missiles, (ground-to-ground) missiles and (Mic-23) aircraft, which were among the most modern fighters produced by the Soviets - at that time Its speed is more than twice the speed of sound and at the same time it has the operational characteristics of (Phantom 4) planes. Thus, the contribution of Soviet weapons in 1975 amounted to (75%) of the total weapons of Iraq, while France occupied the second place <sup>(1)</sup>.

Despite the continuation of the war with Iran for eight years, the level of Iraqi armament reached large levels, reaching (12) billion dollars in 1987, then Iraq's military power developed to the point where it was considered a change in the balance of regional powers. Iraq came out with more than fifty military divisions and is not supported Absolutely on Soviet equipment and has the ability to move huge numbers of troops over long distances within a short period of time, as well as the development of its military industry <sup>(2)</sup>.

More importantly, Iraq constitutes a state of severance and interruption of the American military presence in the region. To the north is Turkey, and the large American presence within the Atlantic system, and the American bases are not far from the Iraqi border, and they have always formed a starting point for striking Iraq throughout the period from 1990 until 2003, and in the

south, where the presence and extensive American presence in the Gulf, and there is no interruption in the American military presence between the two regions except what Iraq constituted for such a situation before April 9, 2003 <sup>(3)</sup>.

The occupation of Iraq achieves two strategic advantages: <sup>(4)</sup>

The first / control militarily the Middle East region all the way to the Far East of Asia.

The second / presence in the region in the form of military bases.

In summary, it can be said that Iraq's military capabilities and its security role have given it a strategic importance that has been the focus of American attention and the threat it poses to its vital interests in the Middle East region, just as the occupation of Iraq and the destruction of its military power is an American strategic objective because it secures the rebalancing of power in the region in favor of its allies. It gives it a broader opportunity, such as expanding regionally to reach other regions.

#### **4- Political importance**

The United States of America realized the strategic political importance of Iraq's role in the Middle East from an early age, especially after World War II and the beginning of the Cold War. It announced the fourth point program. The idea of the program was based on if it was possible to provide those developing countries (Iraq, Egypt) with aid. This will support development efforts in it and achieve political stability under the control of governments friendly to America, and the result is that communism will lose its attractiveness to those countries, which will create better conditions to meet the requirements of American national security in this important part of the world, and states (John Foster Dulles), US Secretary of State The former: "Iraq, as an Arab country, is clearly concerned with the Soviet threat." He suggested allocating ten million dollars to Iraq out of the thirty million dollars allocated by the US Department of Defense to militarily assist the countries of the region, and this reflects the extent of the

importance it attaches to Iraq's role in the region <sup>(1)</sup>.

But the prominent turning point in the development of American interest in Iraq is the outbreak of the October 1973 war, and Iraq's adoption of the policy of using oil as a means against the countries supporting Israel, and it was actually able to crystallize an Arab position in this direction during that war, and it was among the most important effects. On that policy, the world's oil prices rose at the time, which was called "the oil shock." Iraq's policies and stances during that war produced many results, the most important of which are: <sup>(2)</sup>

1. Iraq's ability to influence practical policies towards putting pressure on Western and American interests.
2. Iraq is practically the strategic back-up for the Arab states of confrontation against (Israel).
3. The danger of Iraqi policies on Western and American interests in particular.

After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the global strategy of the United States of America emerged as the leader of the international system, and then it seeks to impose its control and hegemony on the world, and to confirm the continuity of this control, it created the Gulf crisis in 1990, as a result of Iraq entering Kuwait and thus cut off diplomatic relations between Iraq and the United States, Iraq was considered the greatest threat to American interests in the Arab Gulf region, so the necessity of containing Iraq and ideologically stabilizing it according to the American model came in line with and ensuring the vital interests of the United States of America <sup>(3)</sup>, and as a result the United States sought to: <sup>(4)</sup>

1. Preventing Iraq from becoming a regional power by any means.
2. Preventing Iraq from influencing the global market.
3. Canceling any role for Iraq with regard to the Arab-(Israeli) conflict.

4. Removing Iraq from influencing regional arrangements, such as the Middle Eastern system.

5. Protection of pro-US regimes.

In fact, the US management deliberately occupied Iraq and contained its capabilities and development, and thus contained its political role in the region as a way to achieve its interests, including containing regional parties with anti-US political philosophy.

Therefore, from the multi-faceted importance that Iraq enjoys in geostrategic, economic and political terms, its input comes from the American interest in Iraq. Controlling it means controlling a vital geographical joint in the region and its surroundings, and controlling its wealth, especially oil, means controlling a strategic economic variable that influences the arrangement of the structure of the international system. In addition to its own economic need, containing Iraq means containing its active political role in the region.

The second topic: the American strategy towards Iraq during the era of President Trump

The source of predicting the emergence of a new US policy towards Iraq is the result of the accumulation of setbacks suffered by the old policy of the management of President Barack Obama 2009-2016 towards Iraq, and in the Middle East region, so we find that confirmation of this issue in the speech of the electoral program of Donald Trump throughout 2016. , and we find in the United States and its traditional friends in the world attentive ears to these criticisms, and we find attentive ears at the American strategic research centers to develop strategic visions to reformulate the objectives and means of achieving them in the Middle East region, and that the method and timing of presenting these visions, at a time when the whole world is watching the development. The expansion of Russian global influence in return for the decline in the areas of American influence, as well as the way Donald Trump succeeded in the election stages of his first round in a



dramatic and surprising manner, in which he amazed most opinion poll centers. These variables clearly indicate a high desire for change in the objectives and means of foreign policy in the region, whether What is attached to the Iranian nuclear file, and the results of the fight against international terrorism that led to the Russian-Iranian-Syrian-Hezbollah alliance making gains at the expense of Decline in the position of the US alliance in the region.

### **American strategic orientations toward Iraq in the era of Trump**

The orientations of the US strategy towards Iraq cannot be separated from the vision adopted by the Trump management for the world, which was based mainly on the principle of "America First," and Trump's talk that with every decision and every action his management will take, it will put the interests of the United States at the fore.

Trump's strategy toward Iraq focuses on a number of major issues, some of which were present in President Trump's speeches and speeches during his tenure, such as the war on terrorism and ISIS, the Iranian nuclear program agreement, relations with the Gulf states and Egypt, the issue of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the deal of the century. And the strategic alliance for the Middle East, and as those positions showed a tendency towards making changes to the American strategy towards the issues and files of Iraq, what are the features and limits of this change?

**1- War on Terror:** The United States considers jihadist terrorist organizations to pose the most serious terrorist threat to the American nation and the American way of life. Iraq has become the fertile environment for the most dangerous terrorist organizations in the world, and the American national security strategy has adopted the objective of defeating ISIS as a major objective among its priorities. And Trump's opinion that the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 was the reason for the emergence of the "ISIS" organization, pointing out that the withdrawal from Iraq

in 2011 was also a big mistake on the part of America, because it did not leave any soldiers in Iraq, and that one of America's mistakes in Iraq is also Leaving it for oil, which is the source that the terrorist organization relied on to provide financial sources of funding. Therefore, Trump proceeded from a principled position against terrorism and ISIS, and accused both Obama and Hillary Clinton of supporting ISIS, and expressed a different position from the American approach, as he proposed a radical solution to eliminate ISIS <sup>(1)</sup>.

But Trump did not put forward a comprehensive strategic vision, and specific mechanisms to combat terrorism. His position on Islamic extremism is also general, lacking a specific vision, and represents a repetition of the strategy of George W. Bush. There are also challenges facing the Trump management in fighting ISIS. The air raids did not succeed in eliminating the organization once and for all, and this requires sending ground forces to fight it on the ground, and through the strategy of guerrilla warfare and cities, which places a limitation on the possibility of the United States sending ground forces, which it announced in its electoral platform, and it will be reliance on forces from countries This means that Trump's strategy on fighting terrorism and ISIS in Iraq and Syria will be an extension of the Obama management strategy, with slight differences in allies, where Trump will rely more on Russia and Turkey <sup>(2)</sup>.

At the end of 2018, President Trump announced the objective of eliminating ISIS had been achieved, and accordingly he issued his decision to withdraw American forces from Syria. Hence, the United States' interest in the issue of combating terrorism in the region decreased in 2019, especially with the increasing American sense of security from terrorist operations at home, and the belief that ISIS had been defeated after being expelled from the majority of the lands it controlled in Iraq and Syria. (ISIS) by the coalition forces led by the United States of America, the involvement of armed groups that are

accused of Iran, with the help and air cover of the international coalition, and under the direct supervision of the commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards (Qasem Soleimani), he was coordinating the movement of these groups between Iraq and Syria, it has actively contributed to the process of eliminating the organization (ISIS), and American policies during the era of President Trump, especially after the cancellation of the Iranian nuclear agreement, led to the emergence of anti-American activity by armed groups affiliated with Iran, which was represented by the firing of missiles at the American embassy and the rest of the world. American camps and interests in Iraq. The United States has sensed that there is a great danger of the increasing influence of these groups, so it targeted the commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards and Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis in Iraq near Baghdad Airport, with a military operation and on the direct order of the American President (Trump) in the beginning of the year (2020). And the dramatic events that followed through the Iranian response by targeting the Ain al-Assad base with medium-range missiles, which opened the door to open confrontation at any moment at that time <sup>(1)</sup>.

**2- The agreement on the Iranian nuclear program:** Trump announced, more than once, his rejection of the nuclear program agreement with Iran, and considered it a threat to the security of the United States and the security of Israel, and promised to cancel this deal, and to search for a new deal on better terms for the United States, as he saw that American companies It did not benefit from the lifting of sanctions on Iran, especially in the field of oil extraction, but European and Russian companies benefited from it <sup>(2)</sup>. But it became clear that there are also restrictions on canceling the Iranian program deal, represented in the fact that it was carried out under the auspices of the United Nations, and the ratification of the UN Security Council, within the "five + one" deal, and the other five signatories to the agreement

announced their reservations about Trump's intention to cancel it. On the other hand, the intersections of politics, and Iran's prominent role in Syria may push for contacts and understandings between the two countries regarding ISIS. Trump is also not able to build an international consensus to confront Iran, even if he endorses the cancellation of the nuclear agreement, unlike President Obama, who was able to build an international coalition that supports his policy toward Iran with regard to the nuclear file, and to reach this agreement, as Trump accused Iran of supporting and sponsoring armed organizations In the region, he confirmed the re-tightening of economic sanctions on Tehran. Therefore, these positions will lead to an increase in tension in the US-Iranian relations, after they witnessed a state of cautious rapprochement during the Obama era, after the signing of the nuclear agreement <sup>(3)</sup>.

In this context, the American exit from the nuclear agreement with Iran, and the return of the United States to implement strict economic sanctions against Iran, including placing strict restrictions on its oil exports with the aim of depriving it of its main source of income. In any case, the relations between the two countries will remain in a state of tension and attraction, according to the calculations of interests and regional interactions, the files and crises of the region in Iraq and Syria, and the equation of relations between America and the Gulf states on the one hand, and America and Iran on the other.

The third topic: The variables affecting the future of the post-Trump American strategy in Iraq

The Middle East region is going through a historical stage that involves violent and dramatic changes to the foundations and components of this region, which had been established, stabilized, and on the basis of which life's political, economic and social interactions took place since the end of the First World War. It is likely that the labor contractions that are currently taking place in the region, which are nine to build democratic systems, establish rules of

justice and sustainable development, which will lead to large-scale changes in the features of the region politically, economically and socially. It has become certain that the political boundaries of a number of countries in the region have become adjustable with the collapse of the state in countries such as Syria, Libya and Yemen and the failure of the state in most Arab countries in the region and the increase in the size and effectiveness of the regional influence of non-Arab states in the internal interactions in the region, and the presence of the United States as a practical leadership. The de facto power of direct military intervention operations at the regional level. It opened the process of conflict or competition between Turkey and Iran and the creation of a suitable environment for them by the United States of America as a result of what he did in the region, he made these countries interfere and create a kind of confusion in controlling the pace of interventions by the United States of America, out of a view to achieving their own benefit and away from the flock led by the United States of America, and then The latter will become subject to certain restrictions in its movement in the region, especially when these countries (Turkey, Iran) make some of their weapons in the region to serve their own projects that did not fall under the project led by the United States of America. Likewise, the Russian variable in the implementation of the American strategy cannot be overlooked, as the Russian position rejects the formation of the coalition against the fight against the Islamic State. From the beginning, Russia criticized the coalition and pointed out that its work and formation should be within the framework of international legitimacy, and that the use of military force in Syria and Iraq be conditioned by rules International law, and from within the corridors of the United Nations and the Security Council. The Chinese silence does not mean that it is in a neutral position, but rather it is with the Russian position. China has stated, as has Russia, that they are ready to provide support to the Iraqi and Syrian governments to fight terrorism outside the strategy of the

international coalition led by the United States of America.

Where the impressive qualitative development of the Russian strategic power, regardless of the rest of the elements of the Russian comprehensive power, "economic, political, and scientific," has an important role in drawing determinants and steps within the framework, extent and results of implementing the new American strategy. As for the Chinese obstacle, here we take the Chinese strategic power from the angle of its harmony with the strategic forces of the international parties opposed to the new American strategy in the Middle East, West Asia and the rest of the world. During the global vision of the United States, China poses a definite challenge to competing with its global position, especially in the element of economic and scientific power and cyberspace warfare, whose features began to appear during the first decade of the twenty-first century with the United States. Although the Chinese military capabilities in the region do not exist now, its possession of the so-called intercontinental logistical military capacity, which qualifies it to maintain or even defend its interests outside its geographical regional surroundings, such as owning advanced military satellites, and the Chinese superiority in electronic warfare, such as the use of electronic systems and means in reconnaissance of the enemy's electromagnetic radiation, stealing its contents and influencing its activity in order to paralyze its effectiveness.<sup>(1)</sup>

The United States has been subjected to many serious cyber-attacks. What makes the matter more suspicious is that the Chinese army has not announced statistics about the size of its fleet of drones, but according to a report prepared by the Taiwanese Ministry of Defense, it indicated that the Chinese Air Force alone possessed 280 drones in mid-2017, in addition to the branches of the military. The other, which owns thousands of aircraft. The strategic conclusion from mentioning the most important details of the Chinese strategic power is to indicate the presence of a distinctive Chinese ability in unconventional weapons, which is leaking

to its allies in the region, and hinders the implementation of the new American strategy.<sup>(1)</sup>

Thus, we can say that the US management, when dealing with the Iraqi issue, the US strategic plan to contain the Russian and Chinese alliance will put before it these data related to their power, which could constitute an obstacle to the implementation of any plan, and this indicates that the Middle East space was not completely flat before the return of The penetration of American influence, and the American planner should strive to contain these obstacles. The display of strategic power exercised by Russia in Syria after 2015, in addition to the current threat to invade Ukraine confirm this meaning.

Therefore, it can be said that the expected US policy to deal with the Iraqi issue bears four possibilities, and the realization of one of them depends on two factors:

1. Iraq's priority in relation to the United States of America in the Middle East.
2. The extent of the US management control over the regional actors.

The future possibilities are based on the rise and fall of the above factors, and the measurement of the current indicators is what outweighs which of the four possibilities that we will mention is closer to happening, as follows:

**The first possibility:** the return of American influence in line with the Iraqi national interest and harming the Iranian forces. It is possible that the new US management will return to rearrange the political, economic and security conditions in Iraq by increasing the US military presence under the framework of fighting terrorism, activating the security agreement, defending Iraqi national security, and rehabilitating and arming the Iraqi armed forces, especially after the successes it achieved in combating terrorism and gaining the confidence of opinion. The world is in the areas controlled by ISIS after these forces were a source of anxiety and instability led by

successive Iraqi governments, and we infer from this what Trump said by saying, "We were against the war on Iraq in 2003 because we believed that it would destabilize the Middle East, and that Iran would occupy The Middle East, therefore, we have to restore stability and the balance of power in the region. If we notice the extent to which the regional actors in the American axis turn to the American management, and this is likely to increase the ability of the American management to control relative to the regional actors. On the Iraqi side, we believe that this possibility, if it is achieved, is the possibility. The best for the Iraqi national security and its supreme interest."<sup>(2)</sup>

**The second possibility:** Iraq is an American card to achieve regional balance, and this possibility leads to the low priority of Iraq in relation to the American management after the war and its withdrawal in conjunction with the high extent of its control over regional actors, as we mentioned in the first possibility, and that one of the causes of American neglect of Iraq is President Trump's emphasis on more than one occasion on Considering Iraq a "university of terrorism" and saying that Iraq is not sovereign, and there are no Iraqis, but rather there are groups divided against themselves, and if we know that what is happening in the Middle East is complete chaos according to the American point of view, this possibility tends to be used by the American management. Iraq to resolve other regional files in terms of the balance of power with Russia and the limitation of Iranian influence, albeit at the expense of the Iraqi interest, and current indicators push this possibility to be considered the most fortunate, which requires the Iraqi government to move urgently to draw the attention of the US management to important issues such as the Iraqi role in the fight against terrorism, which helps to distance Race from engaging in regional files, which will necessarily reflect negatively on the Iraqi national interest.<sup>(3)</sup>

**The third possibility:** Iraq between the American push and pull the Russian alliance in the Middle East this possibility assumes that Iraq will be a top priority for the United States of America in exchange for weak American control over regional actors, and this means that the Biden American management will work with all its capabilities in order not to completely move Iraq to the Russian-Chinese axis, especially if we consider that Iraqi cooperation with Russia and China It has reached its highest level since 2014, and that the Obama management has abandoned a large part of its interests with Iraq in favor of Russia, China and Iran, and that the new management will work to restore the great influence that Iraq represents as an important priority, especially if we consider that the ability of the United States of America to control with regional actors It will be weak. This possibility is considered a golden opportunity for Iraq, because both global poles, the United States of America and the Russian Federation, will use all their capabilities to include Iraq in their axis, and that the Iraqi decision-maker will have options to benefit from security and economics, but this depends on arranging the Iraqi house politically and overcoming the crises and disputes that led to the difficult security and economic collapse that Iraq has reached.

**The fourth possibility:**

American isolation from the Middle East region and its repercussions in Iraq, and this possibility assumes that the United States of America is on the verge of international isolation in the event, and this comes from the principles adopted by President Biden at the level of foreign policy, and that the most prominent of these principles is the policy of disassociation from oneself in the East The Middle East and the world, as Biden considers that the United States has spent trillions of dollars in order to defend the Middle East and Asia, and it is time for these countries to pay the costs of defense or to defend themselves by themselves. In addition to giving priority to the state, this policy is an extension of the policy of President Trump, who believes that

international alliances have harmed the United States and that the United States should recalculate in alliances that reduce its ability to manage its internal affairs. Reconciliation with Russia and China is another indication of isolation, as Trump points out that dealing with Russia from a standpoint of force is futile, that the cycle of hostility must end, and that the United States will cooperate with Russia to combat radical Islamic terrorism in exchange for allowing Russia greater influence in Eastern Europe. Finally, raise the slogan of America first. It is very likely that the adoption of such a principle by the United States will push the world into more complexity and the outbreak of conflicts in areas that were considered under American authority. On the other hand, it will give more space for the emergence of international powers to compete with unipolarity and a legal framework for the Security Council than political employment, but at the same time it may restore the balances of global and regional powers, and that any conflict does not arise unless the balance of power is disturbed, and this possibility, with weak indicators of its occurrence, is seriously reflected on the Iraqi national interest, as it puts Iraq in front of Russia and China in the region, and increases the continuity of its survival as an arena for regional conflicts, especially since the Iraqi political scene is still, albeit relatively, suffering from the same crises that contributed to the occupation of large lands by ISIS.

**Conclusion**

The Trump management foreign policy has not been clear and that President Biden has inherited through present-day Russian and Chinese insurrections, in part because he brought in a heterogeneous national security team. Although Trump is expected to bring about major changes in the approaches to American foreign policy, in a way that has led to some international turmoil, the American bureaucratic establishment, including in the field of national security and foreign policy, is so large that it is difficult to change it quickly, but it can be said that The personality factor of the president plays an important role in

influencing foreign policy, especially if this is coupled with broad powers granted to the president in the field of foreign policy.

President Biden's personality pattern plays from a set of distinct needs such as the need for achievement, the need for power and control.... It plays an important role in determining the behavior of individuals and, consequently, the behavior of the external decision-makers of states. Today, with President Biden's tenure and what he inherited from President Trump, the same question arises strongly: Will the US policy be embodied in one of the previously mentioned images, or will it take a new form that is commensurate with the new international issues, especially those related to the Middle East, the rise of Russia and China, and the entry of the region into an axis International competition and conflict, extending the influence of the dominant power, which will determine the state's hegemony over the region, and taking Iraq as a starting base, whether to spread the model of peace or destruction in the region and the spread of international terrorism. This will become clear in the coming days.

### The References

1. Abdul Qader Muhammad Fahmy, Introduction to the Study of Strategy, College of Political Science, University of Baghdad, 2015.
2. Andre Boufer, Introduction to Military Strategy, translated by Akram Deiri and Al-Haytham Al-Ayoubi, Dar Al-Talia, Beirut 1978.
3. Khalil Ibrahim Al-Samarrai, The Evolution of American Strategic Concepts towards the Arab World, from the book: The Arabs and the Great Powers, The Arabs and the United States of America, Bait Al-Hikma [Free Table Series 19]. Baghdad, February, 1998.
4. Saeed Al Lawandi, The Death of the United Nations, The Crisis of International Organizations in the Time of American Hegemony, Nahdet Misr for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Cairo, 2014, p. 156.
5. Saad Ali Hussein, The Neoconservatives and the American War on Iraq: The Neoconservatives and Their Role in the American Strategy, Al-Nahrain University Journal, No. 2, Iraq.
6. Salah Al-Mukhtar, The Double Containment between Illusion and Reality, A Transgressive Study of American Policy towards Iraq, Al-Jumhuriya Center for International Studies, , Dar Al-Hurriya, Baghdad, 1995.
7. Ahmed Youssef Ahmed, Results and Implications for the Arab World, from the book of the Symposium on the Occupation of Iraq and Its Repercussions at the Arab, Regional and International levels, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, 2015.
8. Hamid Rabie, Iraq and the Game of Nations: On the Development of the International Function of Iraq in the Coming Years, Publications of the Iraqi Association for Political Science, Baghdad, January, 2008, pg. 40 and beyond.
9. Kazem Hashem Nehme, Al-Wajeez in Strategy, first edition, from the National Library Publications, Baghdad, 2013.
10. Nabil Jaafar Abd al-Ridha, Privatizing the Oil Sector in Iraq: Dimensions and Risks, from the book: The Strategy of Destruction, Mechanisms of the American Occupation of Iraq and Its Consequences (Sectarianism - Identity - National, Economic Policies) Arab Future Books Series (49), Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, 1st Edition, 2006.
11. Fadel Al-Rubaie, The American Occupation of Iraq, The Tactic of Escape from the Nightmare in the Middle East, from the book: The American Occupation of Iraq, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, 2005.
12. Nagham Nazir Shukr, The Military and Security Importance of Iraq from the American Perspective, American Papers, Center for International Studies, Issue (110), 2012.
13. Fikret Namiq Abdel Fattah Al-Ani, The United States of America and the Security of the Arab Gulf, A Study of the Evolution of American Policy in the Gulf since the Eighties and Future

- Prospects, Al-Izza Press, Baghdad, 2001.
14. Bradley A. Tyre, American Peace and the Middle East, America's Great Strategic Interests in the Region after September 11, translated by Dr. Imad Fawzi Shuaibi, Al-Dar AL-Arabia for Science, Beirut, 1st edition, 2004.
  15. Dari Rashid Al-Yasin, The future of the US military presence in Iraq, from the book: Occupation of Iraq: objectives - Future Results, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, May 1, 2004.
  16. Issam Sharif Al-Tikriti, Iraq in American Documents (1952 - 1954), The General House Of Culture Affairs, Baghdad, 1995.
  17. Dari Rashid Al-Yasin, Iraq and the United States in the light of the events of the Arab Gulf, 1990-1996, from: Strategic Studies, Center for International Studies, University of Baghdad, No. (3), 2009.
  18. Muhammad Ayoub, an American study calling for a good division of Iraq. For more, see: The illustrated report in "Washington Today" magazine, issue four, volume three, 2020.
  19. Saad, Ibrahim, Politics towards Iraq: Right-wing extremism and security obsession, International Policy magazine, October 2020.
  20. Hussein Salloum, A Perspective on the Evolution of the American Vision towards Iraq, International Politics Journal, Issue 165, July 2020.
  21. Muhammad Al-Sharqawi, Trump, The Iranian Nuclear: Security or Strategic Justifications, Al Jazeera Center for Studies, Qatar, May 21, 2018.
  22. Jawan Jabbar Al-Masoudi, Al-Kharga Al-Kharga, Fifth Stream, The Military Revolution in Iraq, Journal of the College of Information / Al-Nahrain University, No. 6, 2020.
  23. See: The Stratford Foundation's 2015 Predictions, The Arab Future, Issue 429, November.
  24. Jamal Al-Suwaidi, The American Era, "The Most Important Issues That Constitute the New International Threat," United Arab Emirates / Abu Dhabi, PO Box 4567.
  25. Muhammad Ayoub, an American study calling for a good division of Iraq. For more on the topic: Topic: Part Two  
<http://www.taqrir.org/showarticle.cfm?id=711>
  26. Claus Witz. On War, edited by anatol Rapopot, peuguin book, U.S.A. 2007 .
  27. Official Riedel May 27 speech on the future of Iraq, PP 1 – 4 -  
<http://www.whitehouse.org>.