

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Hamma Lakhdar University of El-Oued

Faculty of Arts and Languages

Department of Arts and English Language



An Analysis of the USA Foreign Policy in the Middle East:

Parity or Dominance

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master's Degree in Literature and Civilization**

Submitted by:

DOUCHE CHIKH Hocine
KHOUNI Chaker

Supervised by:

Mr. BOULKHESSEIM Adel

Board of Examiners:

Title. Dr.SAOUD Ammar

President

University of El-Oued

Title. Mr. BOULKHESSEIM Adel

Supervisor

University of El-Oued

Title. Dr. CHOUCHANI A. Mohammed

Examiner

University of El-Oued

Academic year: 2023/2024

Dedication

In the Name of Allah, the most merciful, the most compassionate all praise be to Allah

I would like to take this opportunity to give warm thanks:

To my friends and all my family member each by his name, who have been so supportive .

To the pure soul of my beloved mother god bless her;

To all my beloved friends particularly my best friends and my classmate ChikhHocine.

Love you all

ChakerKhouni

I thank Allah for giving me the strength and patience to accomplish this work .

I dedicate this humble work :

To the light of my life , my Parents , for their love, support , and tenderness.

To my soulmate , my wife , for her help , encouragement , and care.

To my lovely sisters , my brothers and my classmate ChakerKhouni . I wish to see him in higher places.

To my life

Love you all.

Douche ChikhHocine

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would acknowledge our limitless thanks to God for giving us the power and patience to finish this work.

We are grateful to our supervisor Mr. Adel Boukhessaim for his guidance throughout this work.

We extend our gratitude to our teachers at the University of HammaLakhder and elsewhere.

We would to thank the honorable members of the jury for giving time of reading and correcting this dissertation.

Not with standing all the above support for this research, any errors and/or omissions are solely our own.

Abstract

This study investigates the influence of the American foreign policy on the Middle East. Throughout the 20th century and 21st, the US has had global interests to match. U.S has been involving itself toward Middle East by using foreign policy as a diplomatic power to control the region and also to enhance the allies continuously. This study aims at analysing the urges of American intervention, and to discover the impact of U.S. foreign policy in the Arab countries in general and specifically the Middle East. Therefore, the compatible research method is the historical-descriptive. An extensive literature review was conducted ; data collected and analysed from a theoretical perspective. Practically, it is an attempt to trace the main historical procedures and critical issues of the American foreign policy tools in one hand. On the other hand, outcomes of these policies are to impose dominance on the Middle East because of its importance on the Arab region level and the Islamic world. Also, it makes balance between US and Middle East for more stability in the region through combating terrorism. The results obtained in this present work demonstrate that the American foreign policy in the Middle East was for political and strategic interests and economic purposes. Besides, the results discovered that the United States foreign policy had a fundamental role in the Middle East, applying indirect means as the media, religious minorities, and civil society organizations. In a nutshell, suggested recommendations have been reached to make the ends meet; as far as the Middle East is concerned, it is an attempt to resolve their problems which can be treated through the political reform and combat economic corruption for improving separation between the religion and the state as well as getting rid of American and Western domination.

Keywords: Domination, Middle East , Parity, US democracy ,US foreign policy

الملخص

تبحث هذه الدراسة في تأثير السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية على الشرق الأوسط.

طوال ال 20 القرن ال و 21 ش، كان للولايات المتحدة مصالح عالمية لنتناسب معها. لقد انخرطت الولايات المتحدة في التعامل مع الشرق الأوسط من خلال استخدام السياسة الخارجية كقوة دبلوماسية للسيطرة على المنطقة وأيضا لتعزيز الحلفاء بشكل مستمر. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل دوافع التدخل الأمريكي ، واكتشاف تأثير السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية على الدول العربية بشكل عام وخاصة الشرق الأوسط. لذلك ، فإن طريقة البحث المتوافقة هي الوصفية التاريخية. تم إجراء مراجعة شاملة للأدبيات ؛ البيانات التي تم جمعها وتحليلها من منظور نظري. عمليا ، إنها محاولة لتتبع الإجراءات التاريخية الرئيسية والقضايا الحرجة لأدوات السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية من جهة. من ناحية أخرى ، فإن نتائج هذه السياسات هي فرض الهيمنة على الشرق الأوسط لأهميته على مستوى المنطقة العربية والعالم الإسلامي. كما أنه يحقق التوازن بيننا وبين الشرق الأوسط من أجل مزيد من الاستقرار في المنطقة من خلال مكافحة الإرهاب. تظهر النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها في هذا العمل أن السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية في الشرق الأوسط كانت لمصالح سياسية واستراتيجية وأغراض اقتصادية. إلى جانب ذلك ، اكتشفت النتائج أن السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة كان لها دور أساسي في الشرق الأوسط ، حيث استخدمت وسائل غير مباشرة مثل وسائل الإعلام والأقليات الدينية ومنظمات المجتمع المدني. شيء صغير ، تم التوصل إلى توصيات مقترحة لتغطية نفقاتهم؛ وبقدر ما يتعلق الأمر بالشرق الأوسط ، فهو محاولة لحل مشاكلهم التي يمكن معالجتها من خلال الإصلاح السياسي ومكافحة الفساد الاقتصادي لتحسين الفصل بين الدين والدولة وكذلك التخلص من الهيمنة الأمريكية والغربية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الهيمنة، الشرق الأوسط، التكافؤ، الديمقراطية الأمريكية، السياسة

الخارجية الأمريكية.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
ME	Middle East
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
US	United States
WWII	World War Two

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	II
Abstract	III
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	IV
Table of Contents	V
General Introduction	1

Chapter One: Foundation of US Foreign Policy: Ideologies, Doctrines, and Theories

Introduction	6
1.1 Underpinning US Foreign Policy	6
1.1.1 Manifest Destiny	7
1.1.2. American Exceptionalism	10
1.1.3. The Monroe Doctrine	18
1.1.4 The American Century	20
1.1.5. The Four Schools of Thought	22
1.1.5.1 Hamiltonianism	22
1.1.5.2. Jacksonianism	23
1.1.5.3. Jeffersonianism	24

1.1.5.4. Wilsonism.....	25
1.1.6. Theories of International Relations	26
1.1.6.1. Real Politics	26
1.1.6.2. Neorealism	27
1.1.6.3. Liberalism and Neoconservatism	28
Conclusion	29

Chapter Two: American Foreign Policy towards the Middle-East

Introduction	30
2.1. Historical and Theoretical Background	30
2.1.1. U.S. Involvement in the Middle-East	30
2.1.2. Brief Overview of Early 20th Century Involvement	31
2.1.3 Importance of the Middle East in the U.S. Foreign Policy	32
2.2 Key Historical Events	33
2.2.1 Formation of Israel (1948) and Initial U.S. Response	33
2.2.2 The Cold War Era: U.S.–Soviet Competition in the Region	34
2.2.3 OPEC Oil Embargo 1973 and Its Impact on U.S. Policy	34
2.3 The George H. W. Bush Doctrine	35
2.3.1 Principles of the Doctrine	35
2.3.2 Emphasis on a New World Order and Globalization	36
2.4. Case Study: The Gulf War (1990-1991)	37

2.4.1 Background and Causes of the Gulf War	37
2.4.2. U.S. Objectives and Strategies	41
2.4.3 Key Events and Military Operations	42
2.4.4 Outcomes and Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy	43
2.5. The Clinton Doctrine	43
2.5.1 Principles of Promoting Democracy and Economic Globalization	44
2.5.2 Emphasis on Multilateralism	45
2.5.3 Case Study: The Oslo Accords	45
2.5.3.1 Background of Israeli-Palestinian Conflict	47
2.5.3.2.U.S.' Role in Facilitating the Oslo Accords	47
2.5.3.3 Key Components and Agreements of the Oslo Accord	48
2.5.4 Impact on the Middle East	50
2.5.4.1 Shifts in U.S. Diplomacy in the Region	50
2.5.4.2 Evaluation on the Effectiveness of the Clinton's Doctrine	51
2.6. Discussion and Result	51
Conclusion	52
General Conclusion	53
References	56
الملخص	59

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study	1
2. Statement of the Problem	2
3. The Aims of the Study	2
4. Research Questions	3
6. Significance of the Study	4
7. Research Methodology	4
8. Structure of the Research	5

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

The United States' foreign policy has evolved significantly since the country's inception. Since 1776, the US government has employed various strategies to protect and advance its interests abroad, foster relationships with other nations, and promote peace around the world. Over time, these policies have been shaped by geopolitics, international law, and public opinion. Despite the long distance between the US and the Middle East (ME), U.S. influence has been noticed in each country within the region. Throughout the 20th century and 21st, the US has had global interests and a global reach to match. In the vein, the U.S. has made itself a necessary player by using its diplomatic, economic, and military superpower to support its national interests. U.S has been involving itself toward Middle East by using foreign policy as a diplomatic power to control the region and also to enhance the allies continuously.

The term Middle East is a newly coined term. It appeared in series of articles published in *The Times* in 1902. The Middle East encompasses three parts of continents: Europe, Asia, and Africa. It is known that the Middle East has been a full reservoir of natural resources such as oil, gas and water abundant in the region. In this context, these unlimited resources have been drawing the U.S to dominate the region by using foreign policy as soft power. After WWII, the word 'Middle East' gained widespread acceptance, especially in academic institutions and government agencies.

Extensive previous research has proclaimed that U.S foreign policy paved the way to U.S spreading its domination in the Middle East. It acted to support its national interests such as preventing threats of an attack of weapons of mass destruction on US and its allies. Moreover,

US hegemony seeking to protect its political , economic and military predominance either regionally or globally. Most importantly, the US action is to fight the Communists in Afghanistan ,Iran ,and Iraq on one hand .In another hand, the in last few year the U.S foreign policy towards Middle East headed in to parity due to several actions happened in the region such as the Arab spring.

2. Statement of the Problem

The U.S. imposes itself as a leading power upon the global stage through its foreign policy. In this vein, this issue is hotly debated among scholars, politicians, thinkers and decision makers. It has long been concerned with promoting the international spread of the U.S. democracy all over the world especially in the Middle East and more precisely in Arab world. In this respect, U.S. has been applying different strategies to execute this policy throughout the region under several excuses such as world peace, freedom, human rights, in which the US Foreign policy plays the most prominent role in changing Middle East domestic conditions . From the aforementioned themes, it has been clearly stated that the US foreign policy fully controls and commands the world stage and specifically the Middle East Region. This study is still researchable, as some emerging questions still arise.

3. The Aims of the Study

This research is undertaken to critically investigate and understand the rationale for the American foreign policy and its underpinnings, roles, major players, tools, competing interests and its motives. Much has been articulated about the credibility of US foreign policy after the incidents of 9/11. It had raised many questions about U.S. attitudes on world stage and whether the military interventions in the Middle East region are based on solid arguments; that these wars on Iraq and Afghanistan were necessary to make the world safer for democracy. Moreover, this

research highlights the reasons of U.S foreign policy intervention in the Middle East Investigating and assessing the involvement of U.S foreign policy in Middle East the Arab countries case study (golf war).

4. Research Questions

The objectives of the study are directed by the following questions:

1. What are the guiding principles of US foreign policy?
2. Has the role of US foreign policy been pivotal in shaping the status-quo of the Middle East?
3. What are the domestic factors that underpin the US foreign policy decision making towards the Middle East?
4. Is American foreign policy in the Middle East parity-oriented or dominance-oriented?

5. Research Hypotheses

These questions seem complex ones and may not have single absolute answers. Therefore, we put the following hypotheses in the light of the present research.

1. The guiding principles of US foreign policy are centered around promoting democracy, protecting national security, and advancing American interests on the global stage.
2. The role of US foreign policy has indeed been pivotal in shaping the status-quo of the Middle East.
3. Domestic factors play a crucial role in shaping US foreign policy towards the Middle East. Public opinion, economic interests, and the influence of special interest groups all play a part in determining the direction of US policy in the region.
4. U.S spreading its domination in the Middle East. It acted to support its national interests such as preventing threats of an attack of weapons of mass destruction on US its and its allies.

6. Significance of the Study

The topic of US foreign policy is an area of research that has grown in importance and relevance over the past few decades. The Middle East is the center of events, because it has strategic location in world and region, Arab and Islamic, , on one hand, also the concern of this research is to highlight and demonstrate the American foreign policy towards Middle East as well as demonstrating the role of U.S. foreign policy in Middle East events. Moreover, if we considered that the result will provide students, teachers and others who have an interest in this topic with answers to their questions about the American role in other hand.

7. Research Methodology

The study attempts to determine the influence of American foreign policy on middle East domestic affairs. One of the approaches to study U.S. foreign policy is the historical approach. This research adopted historical-descriptive method to investigate this issue thoroughly. Interestingly, it arranges facts chronologically and seeks to evaluate and synthesize past events objectively. This method will help achieve an accurate account of U.S. foreign policy in the past so as to gain a clearer perspective of the present. Moreover, this method is also relevant in collecting data about subjects under investigation through a profound observation of the written and official documents or other documents which can provide us with important information.

This knowledge will help to predict and control future developments and/or changes in U.S. foreign policy. The methodological tools used in this study are the historical review and narrative analysis of events which are very important to explore the U.S foreign policy issues and assess the role US decision makes played in the conduct of a complex foreign policy agenda. The aim of historical review is to uncover and explain the issues that Bush has faced and affected his decision making. The narrative analysis is for critically assessing the motives that drives US

foreign policy in the region. Within this methodological framework, the use of the case study approach is essential because it is an appropriate method to better comprehend the intricate factors that influence the events being described.

8. Structure of the Research

The current research is divided into two chapters. The first chapter aims to discuss the foundations and the motives and hidden secrets of the US policy in general, and then we start by describing the US foreign policy, the major players, the competing interests and the tools of these policy. The second chapter looks into American foreign policy concerning the Middle East. In this section, the focus is on how the U.S. approaches its relationships and actions in the Middle East, considering factors like alliances, conflicts, and economic interests. Each chapter provides a perspective on U.S. foreign policy, laying the groundwork for a comprehensive analysis of the topic.

CHAPTER ONE

Foundations of US Foreign Policy: Ideologies, Doctrines, and Theories

Chapter One: Foundations of US Foreign Policy: Ideologies, Doctrines, and Theories

Introduction	6
1.1 Underpinning US Foreign Policy	6
1.1.1 Manifest Destiny	7
1.1.2. American Exceptionalism	10
1.1.3. The Monroe Doctrine	18
1.1.4 The American Century	20
1.1.5. The Four Schools of Thought	22
1.1.5.1 Hamiltonianism	22
1.1.5.2. Jacksonianism	23
1.1.5.3. Jeffersonianism	24
1.1.5.4. Wilsonism	25
1.1.6. Theories of International Relations	26
1.1.6.1. Real Politics	26
1.1.6.2. Neorealism	27
1.1.6.3. Liberalism and Neoconservatism	28
Conclusion	29

Introduction

This chapter delves into the foundational pillars that have guided the course of American diplomacy, exploring a continuum that spans from the bold aspirations of Manifest Destiny to the belief in American Exceptionalism. From the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine to the vision of an American Century, the United States has articulated its role on the global stage through a lens colored by distinct schools of thought – Jeffersonianism, Hamiltonianism, Jacksonianism, and Wilsonianism. Furthermore, the chapter illuminates the theories of International Relations that have informed US policy decisions, ranging from the pragmatic realism of Realpolitik to the structural paradigms of Neorealism and Liberalism, as well as the enduring influence of Neoconservatism.

1.1 Underpinning US Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of the United States of America has been a topic of interest for analysts and researchers alike, due to its significant impact on global politics and international relations. In this chapter, this chapter delves into the core principles that drive US foreign policy to on the global stage. From the historical ideologies of Manifest Destiny and American exceptionalism to the strategic doctrines like the Monroe Doctrine and the concept of American Century, we explore the underlying beliefs that shape US leadership's approach to international affairs. Additionally, we examine the diverse schools of thought, including Hamiltonianism, Jacksonianism, Jeffersonianism, and Wilsonism, each offering unique perspectives on foreign policy. Furthermore, we analyze key theories of international relations such as realpolitik, Neorealism, and the contrasting ideologies of Liberalism and Neoconservatism.

1.1.1 Manifest Destiny

Manifest Destiny is essentially the belief that the United States had a divine mission or destiny to expand and spread across the American continent it was seen as not only justified, but also inevitable, almost like a predetermined fate. This ideology fueled the territorial expansion of the US, driving policies and actions that aimed to fulfill this perceived destiny by acquiring new lands and exerting influence over the continent. The concept of Manifest Destiny played a crucial role in shaping American attitudes towards westwards expansion and the acquisition of new territories during the 19th century. At its core, Manifest destiny was driven by a potent mix of national pride, cultural superiority and a fervent desire for territorial expansion. (O'Sullivan, 1845)

National pride played a significant role in the development of Manifest Destiny, as Americans believed in the exceptionalism of their nation and its unique role in the world. "Our manifest destiny is to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions." (O'Sullivan, 1845, p165) This sense of pride was deeply rooted in the American identity, fueled by the belief that the United States was destined for greatness and had a moral obligation to spread its values and institutions across the continent. "We are the chosen people, the children of the founding fathers, destined to spread the blessing of liberty and democracy to all mankind" (Lodge, 1898, p89) this pride manifested in a strong sense of patriotism and conviction in the righteousness of American Actions.

Cultural superiority was another key component that propelled the concept of Manifest Destiny forward. Americans viewed themselves as culturally superior to indigenous people and other nations, believing that their way of life, governance and values were superior and should be extended to new territories. Theodore Roosevelt perfectly mirrors this idea in *Expansion and*

Peace where he mentions “Our duty is to civilize the inferior races, to uplift them from their barbaric ways, and to enlighten them with the virtues of Western civilization” (1898). This belief in cultural superiority justified the expansion of the United States as a means of spreading American civilization and enlightenment to less developed regions.

The desire for territorial expansion was a driving force behind Manifest Destiny, as Americans sought to acquire new lands and resources to fuel economic growth and secure the nation’s future. The idea of westward expansion captured the imaginations of many Americans, promising opportunities for land ownership, economic prosperity, and a chance for a fresh start. The lure of new territories and the belief in the abundance of land available for settlement fueled the push towards the Pacific coast and beyond (O’Sullivan, 1845).

Debates surrounding Manifest Destiny often revolve around the ethical implications of this ideology. Critics such as Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln argue that the pursuit of territorial expansion under the guise of Manifest Destiny led to the displacement and mistreatment of indigenous peoples, as well as conflicts with neighboring nations. Firstly, the belief in American cultural superiority fueled the idea that it was the country’s destiny to expand westward and dominate the land, often at the expense of native populations. Secondly, the desire for resources and land acquisition drove settlers to encroach on indigenous territories, leading to violent conflicts and forced relocations. Lastly, the doctrine of Manifest Destiny justified the use of military force to secure new territories, resulting in clashes with neighboring nations and indigenous tribes who resisted the expansion. The belief in the inevitability and righteousness of American expansion raised questions about the moral justifications for territorial conquest and the impact of those who stood in the way of American progress. In *Ethics: A Very Short Introduction*. Simon Blackburn delves into how the notion of manifest destiny clashed with the

realities of displacement and violence, prompting critical reflections on the nature of American expansion.

The influence of Manifest Destiny on U.S. actions beyond its borders was evident in its expansionist policies and interventions in foreign territories. This ideology justifies aggressive actions, such as the annexation of Texas and the Mexican-American War, as part of the perceived mission to spread American values and civilization. However these actions were met with criticism both domestically and internationally (O'Sullivan, 1845).

The concept of spreading American values and institutions to new territories and economies reflected the expansionist goals of U.S. foreign policy through various compelling arguments. Firstly, the United States aimed to exert cultural influence over other nations by exporting American values and norms. For instance, President Woodrow Wilson emphasized the U.S.'s mission to spread democratic ideals globally during WWI (Mountjoy, 2009).

Secondly, the U.S. pursued economic dominance by expanding its economic systems into new territories. An illustrative example of this is *The Open Door Policy in China* in late 19th century. Through this policy, the U.S. sought to ensure access to Chinese markets for American goods, reflecting its economic expansionist ambitions. This economic imperialism strategy aimed to secure markets and resources for U.S. benefits aligning with the expansionist goals of U.S. foreign policy (Kevin Barry Bucknall, 2012). Lastly, the U.S. sought to advance its political principles by encouraging the adoption of American institutions in foreign lands. This can be observed in the post-World War II era with the establishment of the Marshall plan through this initiative, the U.S. provided economic assistance to help rebuild Western European countries, promoting democracy and capitalism as essential components of recovery and stability. The

Marshall plan exemplified U.S.'s effort to propagate its political ideals globally, reflecting its expansionist objectives in foreign policy.

1.1.2. American Exceptionalism

Exceptionalism seems like a perfectly unexceptional concept, until one asks what it means. Those who use the term will then either offer definite, but usually conflicting definitions or greet the question with a bewildered stare.

On the most general level, American Exceptionalism refers to the belief “that the United States differs qualitatively from other developed nations, because of its unique origins, national credo, historical evolution and distinctive political and religious institutions” (Koh 2005, p.225). as John Winthrop (1996 [1630]), one of the first settlers of the Massachusetts Bay colony, reminds with the famous phrase of the *City upon a Hill*, the discourse of American exceptionalism goes back a long way, even predating the birth of United State as a nation state. The phrase has ever since held a firm place in the American collective memory exemplified by its more contemporary resurrection in Presidential speeches. The term American exceptionalism is attributed to Alexis de Tocqueville, who noted that the United States held a special place among nations, because it was a country of immigrants and the first modern democracy (Tocqueville 1954). As Debora Madsen (1998) concludes the phenomenon has been with us ever since: “American exceptionalism permeates every period of American history and is the single most powerful agent in a series of argument that have been fought down the centuries concerning the identity of America and Americans.” (p.1).

Winthrop quotes also shows that the Puritan settlers who founded the Massachusetts Bay colony regarded their social experiment not only as “different”, but also as exemplary. Malone

and Khong (2003) describe exceptionalism as “the widely held belief in the United States that its values and institutions are the best yet devised, the conviction that the world needs to adapt itself to American ways rather than vice versa.” (136) The belief in the superiority of the American model is reflected in the perception inside the U.S. of America’s role in the world. The American foreign policy is based on moral principles in a consistent them in the American discourse - a phenomenon recognized even by those who are skeptic of such an assessment.

Liberals have tended to disparage exceptionalism, openly when they dare, more discreetly when they fear a backlash. Liberals would like Americans to think of America as being more “ordinary” and in step with the advanced democracies in the world. In domestic politics, “ordinary” means an expanded welfare state, policies that promote greater income equality, and— it goes without saying—a network of high-speed trains. In foreign affairs, it refers to an America that does not always tout itself as the main world power, that is more solicitous of the international community, and that does not proclaim a universal standard of right deriving from the “laws of nature” or “nature’s god” (expressions that hearken back to America’s founding). Although liberals may not say so directly, they want to take America down a notch—and this very sincerely for its own good. Liberals are anti-exceptionalists, deploring the spiritedness and narrow form of patriotism they see as connected with the concept. Like Stephen Walt of Harvard University, they like to proclaim “the myth of American exceptionalism,” pointing out that the doctrine makes it “harder for Americans to understand why others are ... often alarmed by U.S. policies and frequently irritated by what they see as U.S. hypocrisy.” US foreign policy would be “more effective if Americans were less convinced of their own unique virtues and less eager to proclaim them” (Walt 2011).

President Obama appeared to embrace views along these lines early in his presidency. Asked by a reporter in Strasbourg, France, whether he subscribed, as his predecessors had, “to the school of American exceptionalism that sees America as uniquely qualified to lead the world,” the president began by observing: “I believe in American exceptionalism, just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism.” His words were a far cry from a “Lincolnian” rhetoric depicting America as “the last best hope of man on earth.”(Madsen, 2009).

Conservatives have rallied around exceptionalism, often passionately so. Conservatives want Americans to think of themselves as special, and they take great pride in pointing to how America is unlike other advanced democracies. In domestic affairs, conservatives prefer a more limited government, which they consider to be the cornerstone of liberty; they favor an economy in which incomes reflect market forces, not government decisions; and they of course champion travel by stagecoach. In foreign affairs, conservatives hold the idea of the nation in high esteem and bristle at the notion of America being governed by diktats of the international community. They regard America as the premier world power and, therefore, necessarily and rightly subject to different rules than other nations. Conservatives are not embarrassed to refer to general concepts of right in the terms used by past American statesmen. “Universal values,” a phrase President Obama now often invokes, are fine, as long as they are anchored in the good old Declaration of Independence.(Obama, 2020)

A rising star in the Republican Party, Senator Marco Rubio made “exceptionalism” the central theme of his 2010 senate campaign in Florida. In his victory speech, he warmed to the task by describing America as “a place without equal in the history of all mankind,” in part because in “almost every other place in the world ... what you were going to be when you grow

up was determined for you” (Beinhart 2010). Other Republicans running for the presidency in 2012 followed in the same vein. Newt Gingrich launched his campaign combined with the release of a new book titled *A Nation Like No Other: Why American Exceptionalism Matters*. The theme was also at the core of Mitt Romney’s foreign policy statements: “America must lead the world. ... I believe we are an exceptional country, with a unique destiny and role in the world. ... This is America’s moment. ... I will never apologize for America.” (Gingrich, 2011, p.5)

It is unclear who cast the first stone in these exceptional wars—whether it was liberals, who wagered that the term might discredit conservatism, or conservatives, who believed that it could rally Americans to their agenda. It hardly matters. More important is the question of which side has gained politically from the emergence of this new political word. The verdict is still out. Conservatives think exceptionalism has worked to their advantage. They can cite survey evidence (from Gallup; Jones 2010) showing that a huge majority of Americans (80%) agrees with the statement “the United States has a unique character because of its history and Constitution that sets it apart from other nations as the greatest in the world.”(Gingrich, 2011, p.14) what such generic findings measure, If anything, is difficult to say. For their part, some liberals believe they have gained ground, at least at the elite level, because of how exceptionalism is conceived in the area of foreign affairs. The more the term is touted, they think, the less attractive it seems, making us look arrogant and beholden to a messianic mission.

How language is employed in politics obeys its own inscrutable logic. Sometimes political terminology manages to clarify matters beyond what one finds in social science (think of “cold war”), but at other times it brings only greater confusion. The introduction of exceptionalism into political discourse has perhaps helped to make clear to all the rank ordering between spiritedness

(favored by exceptionalists) and social justice (important for the antiexceptionalists), but otherwise it is hard to see how the word has promoted more intelligent debate. Consider the following three points.

First, exceptionalism packs different ideas under the same label. Sometimes it refers to matters of domestic affairs, at other times to matters of foreign affairs. John Locke once enunciated the wish—he knew it could never be completely realized—that every general concept should designate something that is clear and distinct. Otherwise people end up heatedly disputing over a word while losing sight of the substance of the issues involved. It is probably a truism of political speech that if one has trouble defining immediately what a term means, someone else is using it a different way. (Lock, 1689)

Second, if people have something they value or oppose, would it not be better for them to speak directly of the particular things themselves—say, the blessings of liberty or the dangers of interventionism—than to get wrapped up in disputes about American exceptionalism? After all, no one really would ever sacrifice himself or herself for the cause of exceptionalism. (Lock, 1689)

Finally, there is that annoying little suffix “ism.” In the political world it often connotes an ideology claiming to have pat answers to all problems, while in the intellectual world it is frequently appended to perfectly comprehensible adjectives to create vast abstractions, as in “perfectionism,” “probabilism,” or “fallibilism.” Exceptionalism constitutes one small step for abstraction, one giant leap for abstractionism. Not much good ever comes from airy concepts of this kind. (Lock, 1689)

American exceptionalism has played a significant role in shaping American identity and influencing its interactions with the world. It has fostered a sense of national pride and a belief in the unique qualities and values of the United States. While fostering national pride and a belief in the U.S.'s unique qualities, American exceptionalism has faced criticism from various perspectives. In his book *The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism*, author Andrew Bacevich (2009) critiques the notion of American exceptionalism, arguing that it has led to overreach and a sense of entitlement in U.S. foreign policy. Bacevich suggests that this belief in exceptionalism has sometimes resulted in misguided interventions that have not always aligned with the values the U.S. claims to uphold.

Similarly, historian Howard Zinn (1980), in his work *A People's History of the United States*, challenges the idea of American exceptionalism by highlighting the darker aspects of U.S. history, such as imperialism, racism, and inequality. Zinn's perspective questions the validity of exceptionalism when considering the country's complex and sometimes troubling past.

While American exceptionalism has instilled pride and confidence in the nation, it is essential to acknowledge and address the criticisms and complexities that arise when examining the impact of this belief on U.S. identity and its interactions with the world. This belief has led Americans to see their country as a beacon of freedom, democracy, and opportunity, setting it apart from other nations.

In terms of interactions with the world, American exceptionalism has influenced how the U.S. engages globally. The belief in exceptionalism has often led to a sense of moral obligation to spread American values and ideals. As articulated by Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America*, the notion of American exceptionalism can create a missionary zeal, prompting the U.S. to see itself as a model for the world. This sense of obligation to share American ideals has been

evident in various foreign policy decisions and interventions. However, as Noam Chomsky discusses in *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance*, this perceived moral duty has also been criticized for sometimes leading to interventions that prioritize U.S. interests over genuine humanitarian concerns. This tension between the moral imperative to spread American values and the practical implications of such actions underscores the complex interplay between exceptionalism and global interactions. This has manifested in various ways, including interventions in other countries to promote democracy, human rights, and free-market capitalism (Chomesky, 2003)

Moreover, American exceptionalism has shaped the U.S.'s perception of its role in the world as a leader and a defender of liberty. As noted by Henry Kissinger in his book *Diplomacy*, the belief in exceptionalism has influenced the U.S.'s self-perception as a nation with a unique responsibility to uphold democratic values and defend freedom worldwide. This perception has shaped U.S. foreign policy decisions and interventions, often framed as efforts to promote democracy and human rights. However, critics like Chalmers Johnson, in *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*, caution against the potential pitfalls of this exceptionalist mindset, warning that it can lead to unintended consequences and resistance from other nations. The tension between the U.S.'s role as a leader guided by exceptionalism and the complexities of global power dynamics underscores the multifaceted nature of America's position on the world stage. (Chomesky, 2003)

This belief has influenced foreign policy decisions, such as alliances, trade agreements, and military interventions, with the underlying notion that the U.S. has a unique responsibility to uphold its values on a global scale. This belief in exceptionalism has led the U.S. to form

strategic alliances with countries that share similar democratic principles and values. For instance, alliances like NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) are not only based on security concerns but also on the shared belief in democracy and freedom. These alliances serve as a way for the U.S. to extend its influence and promote its values on an international level, reflecting the exceptionalist perspective that the U.S. has a special role to play in shaping the global order(Lock 1689).

Moreover, the concept of American exceptionalism has influenced the negotiation of trade agreements, with the U.S. often seeking to incorporate its values into these economic partnerships. Trade agreements are not solely about economic benefits but also serve as a means to export American ideals such as free-market capitalism and individual rights. The U.S. has historically viewed trade agreements as opportunities to spread its values and influence, reinforcing the belief that it has a responsibility to uphold its principles beyond its borders. This approach underscores how exceptionalism permeates various aspects of U.S. foreign policy, including economic relations with other nations. (Lock, 1689)

Furthermore, the belief in American exceptionalism has been a driving force behind military interventions carried out by the U.S., under the premise of defending liberty and promoting democracy. Military interventions, such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan, have been justified by invoking the idea that the U.S. has a duty to spread its values and protect human rights globally. This exceptionalist perspective has been a guiding principle in shaping military strategies and decisions, reflecting a belief that the U.S. uniquely bears the responsibility to act as a guardian of freedom and democracy on the world stage. (Lock, 1689)

1.1.3. The Monroe Doctrine

The Monroe Doctrine, established by President James Monroe in 1823, is a key cornerstone of American foreign policy. This doctrine proclaimed that the Western Hemisphere was off-limits to further European colonization and intervention. It essentially warned European powers to refrain from interfering in the affairs of independent nations in the Americas. The doctrine aimed to prevent European powers from establishing new colonies or extending their influence in the Western Hemisphere, asserting that any such attempt would be viewed as a threat to the United States.

Moreover, the Monroe Doctrine also conveyed the idea that the United States would not interfere in existing European colonies or in the internal affairs of European countries. In return, it expected European powers to respect the sovereignty of nations in the Americas. This policy reflected the growing sense of American nationalism and the desire to assert the young nation's independence and influence in the international arena.

The Monroe Doctrine had significant implications for U.S. foreign policy, setting the stage for America's role as a dominant power in the Western Hemisphere. It laid the foundation for the U.S. to assume a leadership position in the Americas, positioning itself as a protector of the region against European encroachment. The doctrine also underscored the principle of non-intervention, emphasizing the United States' commitment to upholding its own interests while seeking to prevent external interference in the Western Hemisphere. (Sexston, 2011)

Historians like Walter LaFeber, in his work *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad* since 1750, view the Monroe Doctrine as a pivotal moment in U.S. history, highlighting its role in shaping American foreign policy. By delineating the doctrine's historical context and the prevailing international dynamics of the time, LaFeber underscores its

role in shaping the United States' approach to global affairs. He likely delves into the motivations behind President Monroe's proclamation, such as safeguarding American interests and asserting independence from European powers. Moreover, LaFeber probably explores how the Monroe Doctrine set a precedent for the U.S. as a dominant force in the Western Hemisphere, showcasing the nation's growing confidence and ambition on the world stage.

Additionally, Harry Elmer Barnes ,(1926), in *The Genesis of the World War* delves into the broader implications of the Monroe Doctrine on global power dynamics, illustrating its lasting influence on international politics. These historians present varying viewpoints on the Monroe Doctrine, showcasing its complexity and enduring significance in shaping American identity and foreign policy.

Barnes' perspective on the Monroe Doctrine likely emphasizes its role in not only asserting American power in the Western Hemisphere but also influencing broader global power dynamics. He may delve into how the doctrine set a precedent for the United States as a dominant force in the Americas and how it shaped the nation's perception of its role in international affairs. Moreover, Barnes may scrutinize the doctrine's implications for U.S. interventions in Latin America and its reverberations on diplomatic relations with European nations.

The Monroe Doctrine has played a pivotal role in shaping U.S. foreign policy decisions throughout history. Various works, books, and articles offer new ideas and interpretations regarding the impact of the doctrine on American foreign relations.

Furthermore, in Walter Russell Mead's *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*, Mead (2009) may provide insights into how the Monroe Doctrine reflected America's evolving sense of exceptionalism and its perceived role as a guardian of

democracy and freedom. Mead's interpretation might delve into how the doctrine influenced subsequent foreign policy decisions, guiding U.S. interventions and engagements with other nations based on the principles outlined in Monroe's proclamation.

1.1.4 The American Century

The American century refers to the period post-World War II. It is an expression used to characterize the political, economic, and cultural dominance of the United States during the 20th century.

At mid-twentieth century, when the second great world war ended, the United States enjoyed wealth and prosperity unknown in foreign lands and rose to a summit of power. The interests and influence of Americans extended far from home. Their commerce was carried by merchant ships and aircraft to distant cities. The dollar was the standard of international finance and the credits of American banks flowed everywhere. Food, clothing, movies, machines, and science made the American name known throughout the world. The people shared their fortune by distributing charitable aid abroad in quantities without precedent. As after earlier wars in their history, their citizen-soldiers were disbanded and sent home. Yet the government pledged to defend friendly states and kept units of its undefeated army in strategic outposts, sea power that patrolled the oceans, and an air force that guarded the sky. It was a time of general peace and faraway local conflicts; no third world war erupted. The United States kept an order favorable to its allies and demonstrated its art of trade and ways of culture and modern living to aged societies (Evans et al., 2000).

Through treaties, commitments, and unilateral declarations, the United States made allies with far-flung countries in areas where the interests of American trade, philanthropy, culture, and

security were often greater than those of any other power, and the boundaries of some distant lands became the frontiers of these interests. These foreign affiliations first covered the Western Hemisphere. As early as 1823 President James Monroe proclaimed influence over both North and South America by opposing European control or meddling. Here the frontiers stood, for the most part, until around the end of the nineteenth century, when in a burst of expansive energy the United States consolidated its hemispheric interests by taking colonies in the West Indies: Puerto Rico, occupied by troops in the Spanish-American War in 1898, and the Virgin Islands, purchased from Denmark in World War I. The Panama Canal Zone came under the jurisdiction of the United States in 1903. To the west the United States extended its possessions deep into the Pacific Ocean, from Alaska, owned since 1867, to the Hawaiian islands and the Philippines in 1898. To connect the American mainland with the Far East, the United States quickly gained as outposts the islands of Guam and Samoa (Mason, 2010).

To the allied states along this frontier, the promise of American aid and defense reached, and from those lands this influence was never to retreat under coercion of aggressors. On the European frontier the American pledge had no foreseeable end: “continuous,” declared the treaty that united under American protection the Western European empires of Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Denmark. In the Pacific, to the Philippines, and later to Australia and New Zealand, the American commitments would remain in force “indefinitely.” As for Japan, no change in its deference to the United States for its defense or to America’s exclusive right to bases could take place without American consultation. In Southeast Asia, too, the Americans promised not to yield, and again the term “indefinitely” applied. American treaties were open to review by sovereign nations, but those commitments implied, no less than respect for the sovereignty of the allies, that the Americans intended never to surrender a foot of territory to

aggressor nations. The Americans had never lost a war; the United States would not retreat. Where the strategic frontier lay at its farthest extent, in Southeast Asia, President Dwight Eisenhower compared the borderland to “a leaky dike, and with leaky dikes it’s sometimes better to put a finger in than to let the whole structure be washed away.”(LaFeber et al., 2015).

1.1.5. The Four Schools of Thought

The development of the four schools of thought in America, including Hamiltonianism, Jacksonianism, Jeffersonianism, and Wilsonianism, was influenced by various historical contexts and political ideologies. Each school emerged as a response to specific challenges and debates in American political philosophy, shaping distinct approaches and perspectives in the country’s governance and foreign policy. These schools of thought represent different traditions and principles that have played significant roles in shaping the political landscape and policy decisions in the United States.

1.1.5.1 Hamiltonianism

Hamiltonianism emphasized a strong central government, a national bank, and an industrial economy. The historical context of post-Revolution America, with economic challenges and the need for financial stability, led to the promotion of Hamilton’s ideas. His vision aimed to strengthen the federal government’s power to ensure economic growth, national unity, and international competitiveness. These factors contributed to the rise of Hamiltonianism as a significant political ideology in early American history (Stratton, 2020).

It was a reaction to the economic challenges faced by the newly formed United States after the Revolutionary War. Hamilton believed in a strong central government and the establishment of a national bank to address the country’s financial instability. The debates surrounding the

extent of federal power, the role of the government in economic development, and the balance between state and federal authority were central issues that Hamiltonianism sought to address (Stratton, 2020).

1.1.5.2. Jacksonianism

Jacksonianism, as a school of thought, emerged as a political movement in the United States during the presidency of Andrew Jackson. It emphasized the expansion of democracy and the empowerment of the common man in American politics. Jacksonianism was characterized by a belief in the strength of the executive branch, a focus on individual liberty, and opposition to aristocracy and privilege. This school of thought gained prominence in the 1820s and 1830s, shaping the political landscape by advocating for increased political participation, particularly among white male citizens. The historical background of Jacksonianism is rooted in the era following the War of 1812, marked by a growing sense of nationalism and a desire for broader political inclusion (Pessen, 1985).

Jacksonianism, as a school of thought, was characterized by several key features that shaped American politics during Andrew Jackson's presidency. One prominent characteristic was its emphasis on expanding democracy and empowering the common man. Jacksonianism sought to increase political participation among white male citizens, promoting the idea that the average person should have a voice in government. For instance, Jackson's belief in the importance of the common man is captured in his inaugural address in 1829 when he stated, "The people are the government, administering it by their agents; they are the government, the sovereign power." Additionally, Jacksonianism displayed a strong executive branch, with Jackson asserting his authority in ways that some critics viewed as exceeding constitutional limits. This characteristic was exemplified during the Nullification Crisis when Jackson famously declared, "Our federal

Union: It must be preserved!” Overall, the emphasis on democracy, the empowerment of the common man, and a robust executive branch were defining characteristics of Jacksonianism(Pessen, 1985).

1.1.5.3.Jeffersonianism

Jeffersonianism, as a school of thought, emerged as a political ideology during Thomas Jefferson’s presidency in the early 19th century. It emphasized democratic ideals, agrarianism, and a strict interpretation of the Constitution. The historical background of Jeffersonianism is rooted in the era following the American Revolution, marked by a desire for individual liberty, limited government, and the protection of states’ rights. Thomas Jefferson’s presidency was characterized by his commitment to reducing the power of the federal government and promoting the interests of the common farmer. Jeffersonianism reflected a vision of America as an agrarian society with an emphasis on rural independence and self-sufficiency (Walters, 2012).

Jeffersonianism, as a school of thought, was marked by several defining characteristics that shaped American politics during Thomas Jefferson’s presidency. One key feature was its emphasis on democratic principles and individual liberties. Jefferson believed in the importance of protecting personal freedoms and limiting government intervention in people’s lives. His famous quote, “The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only object of good government,” encapsulates this belief. Additionally, Jeffersonianism promoted agrarianism, valuing the role of farmers and rural communities in society. Jefferson envisioned America as an agrarian nation, emphasizing the virtues of agriculture and the independence it brought. This vision is reflected in his statement, “Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens.” Furthermore, Jeffersonianism advocated for a strict interpretation of the Constitution, asserting that the federal government should only exercise powers explicitly

granted by the document. Overall, the characteristics of Jeffersonianism encompassed a commitment to democracy, individual liberties, agrarian values, and a limited government role in citizens' lives (Walters, 2012).

1.1.5.4. Wilsonism

Wilsonism, merged as a political ideology during Woodrow Wilson's presidency in the early 20th century. It focused on the principles of internationalism, democracy promotion, and idealism in foreign policy. The historical background of Wilsonism is rooted in a period marked by World War I and the aftermath of the conflict, where Wilson played a significant role in shaping the Treaty of Versailles and advocating for the League of Nations. Wilsonism reflected a vision of global cooperation, collective security, and the spread of democratic values as a means to prevent future conflicts and promote peace on an international scale (Galambos&Urofsky, 1970).

Woodrow Wilson's vision included advocating for the League of Nations and the principle of self-determination for nations. One of the key characteristics of Wilsonism is its belief in collective security to maintain peace globally. Wilson famously stated, "The world must be made safe for democracy," reflecting his commitment to spreading democratic values. Additionally, Wilsonism prioritizes diplomatic solutions and multilateral agreements to resolve conflicts peacefully, as seen in Wilson's efforts during World War I and the Treaty of Versailles negotiations. Overall, Wilsonism's characteristics encompass a strong belief in international cooperation, democracy, and idealistic principles to foster a more peaceful world (Galambos&Urofsky, 1970).

1.1.6. Theories of International Relations

This section about theories of International Relations will delve into real politics, neorealism with its branches of offensive realism and defensive realism, as well as liberalism and neoconservatism. These theories offer distinct perspectives on how America interacts on the global stage, shaping policies and strategies in international affairs. Each theory provides unique insights into the motivations and behaviors of states, influencing decision-making processes and the dynamics of power relations among nations. This exploration will illuminate the diverse approaches to understanding and addressing key issues in the complex landscape of international relations.

1.1.6.1. Real Politics

Realpolitik, often referred to as real politics, is a theory in international relations that focuses on practical and pragmatic considerations rather than ideological or moral principles. It emphasizes the pursuit of national interests, power, and security as the primary drivers of foreign policy decisions. Realpolitik suggests that states should prioritize self-interest and power dynamics in their interactions with other countries, often leading to a more realistic and sometimes cynical approach to international relations. This theory acknowledges the complexities of the global arena and the importance of strategic calculations in shaping diplomatic strategies and alliances (Jean Bethke Elshtain, 2000).

Realpolitik has played a significant role in shaping American foreign policy by influencing decisions based on practical considerations rather than purely ideological motives. In U.S. history, this approach has been evident in various instances, such as the pursuit of national interests in negotiations with other countries, strategic alliances to enhance security, and the prioritization of power dynamics in international relations. Realpolitik has allowed the U.S. to

navigate complex global challenges with a pragmatic outlook, making decisions that align with its strategic objectives and security concerns. This theory has provided a framework for American policymakers to engage with the world in a way that balances idealistic goals with practical realities, ultimately shaping the country's foreign policy approach over time (Schindler, 2021).

1.1.6.2. Neorealism

Neorealism, also known as structural realism, is a theory in international relations that focuses on the distribution of power among states as the key determinant of their behavior in the global arena. Neorealism asserts that the anarchic nature of the international system, where there is no overarching authority, leads states to prioritize their own security and survival. This theory emphasizes the importance of power dynamics, military capabilities, and strategic interactions between states in shaping international relations. Neorealism distinguishes itself by highlighting the impact of the structure of the international system on state behavior, offering insights into how states navigate the complexities of the global landscape based on power considerations (May et al., 2010).

Offensive realism and defensive realism are two branches of neorealism that offer distinct perspectives on how states pursue their security interests in the international system. Offensive realism, associated with scholars like John Mearsheimer, posits that states are primarily driven by a relentless pursuit of power and security to ensure their survival. In this view, states are inherently insecure and must seek to maximize their power relative to other states to prevent potential threats. Offensive realists believe that states should adopt aggressive strategies, including expansionism and the pursuit of hegemony, to secure their position in the global hierarchy (Cardullo, 1991).

On the other hand, defensive realism, often linked to scholars like Kenneth Waltz, argues that states are motivated by a more defensive approach to security. Defensive realists assert that states aim to maintain a balance of power to ensure their survival rather than seeking dominance over others. They advocate for strategies focused on self-preservation, such as forming alliances and enhancing defense capabilities to deter potential aggressors. Defensive realism emphasizes stability and the avoidance of conflict as crucial elements in maintaining the international order (Tang, 2010).

These two branches of neorealism offer contrasting views on how states should navigate the anarchic international system, with offensive realism advocating for a more assertive and power-maximizing approach, while defensive realism promotes a more cautious and defensive stance to safeguard national security.

1.1.6.3.Liberalism and Neoconservatism

Liberalism and neoconservatism are two distinct political ideologies that have influenced American foreign policy in different ways.

Liberalism, in the context of international relations, emphasizes cooperation, diplomacy, and the promotion of democracy and human rights as central tenets of foreign policy. Liberals believe in the importance of international institutions, multilateralism, and economic interdependence to foster peace and stability in the world. They advocate for dialogue, negotiation, and the use of soft power to address global challenges and conflicts. On the other hand, neoconservatism is characterized by a more assertive and interventionist approach to foreign policy. Neoconservatives prioritize the spread of democracy and American values worldwide, often advocating for military intervention to promote regime change and confront

perceived threats to national security. They emphasize the use of hard power and unilateral action to advance American interests and values on the global stage (Farer, 2008).

Both liberalism and neoconservatism have played significant roles in shaping American foreign policy, with liberals focusing on diplomacy, cooperation, and international institutions, while neoconservatives advocate for a more proactive and sometimes military-oriented approach to advancing American ideals and security interests.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the exploration of the underpinnings of US foreign policy reveals a complex interplay of ideologies and historical doctrines that shape America's approach to global affairs. Manifest Destiny, American exceptionalism, the Monroe Doctrine, the concept of the American Century, and the diverse schools of thought such as Hamiltonianism, Jacksonianism, Jeffersonianism, and Wilsonism all contribute to the fabric of American foreign policy. The theoretical frameworks of Realpolitik, Neorealism (including Offensive and Defensive Realism), and the ideologies of Liberalism and Neoconservatism further elucidate the diverse perspectives that inform US foreign relations. These concepts not only serve as guiding principles for policymakers but also play a significant role in shaping American identity on the international stage.

CHAPTER TWO

American Foreign Policy towards the Middle-East

Chapter Two: American Foreign Policy towards the Middle-East

Introduction	30
2.1. Historical and Theoretical Background	30
2.1.1. U.S. Involvement in the Middle-East	30
2.1.2. Brief Overview of Early 20th Century Involvement	31
2.1.3 Importance of the Middle East in the U.S. Foreign Policy	32
2.2 Key Historical Events	33
2.2.1 Formation of Israel (1948) and Initial U.S. Response	33
2.2.2 The Cold War Era: U.S.–Soviet Competition in the Region	34
2.2.3 OPEC Oil Embargo 1973 and Its Impact on U.S. Policy	34
2.3 The George H. W. Bush Doctrine	35
2.3.1 Principles of the Doctrine	35
2.3.2 Emphasis on a New World Order and Globalization	36
2.4. Case Study: The Gulf War (1990-1991)	37
2.4.1 Background and Causes of the Gulf War	37
2.4.2. U.S. Objectives and Strategies	41
2.4.3 Key Events and Military Operations	42
2.4.4 Outcomes and Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy	43
2.5. The Clinton Doctrine	43
2.5.1 Principles of Promoting Democracy and Economic Globalization	44

2.5.2 Emphasis on Multilateralism	45
2.5.3 Case Study: The Oslo Accords	45
2.5.3.1 Background of Israeli-Palestinian Conflict	47
2.5.3.2.U.S.' Role in Facilitating the Oslo Accords	47
2.5.3.3 Key Components and Agreements of the Oslo Accord	48
2.5.4 Impact on the Middle East	50
2.5.4.1 Shifts in U.S. Diplomacy in the Region	50
2.5.4.2 Evaluation on the Effectiveness of the Clinton's Doctrine	51
2.6. Discussion and Result	51
Conclusion	52

Introduction

This chapter focuses on U.S.'s involvement in the Middle East covering the Cold War Era's competition with the Soviet Union and key events like the OPEC oil embargo. It explores how U.S. foreign policy has evolved in the region, including case studies, like the Gulf War and the Oslo Accords.

2.1. Historical and Theoretical Background

2.1.1. U.S. Involvement in the Middle-East

American involvement in the first and second World Wars, had broken the United States traditional policy of isolation. The end of World War II, however, ended practically the colonial era. Historically speaking, Britain and France left their colonies in the Middle-East, with a set of unsolved problems. The people looked, with hopes, to the newly emerged superpower to help them solve those problems. Instead, the people of the Middle East became the battleground of the Cold War. The United States and the Soviet Union, each with different sets of interests and policies, were trying to secure their own interests in a highly complicated region. The Soviet Union regarded the nearby Middle East as an extension to the Soviet security belt around its borders. Admittedly, the United States regarded the same region as a remote region. Until the late 1940s, when the United States became more interested in the Middle East with the application of the Truman Doctrine which included support for the creation of the state of Israel and to Turkey. (Geoffrey, R. Waston 2000).

When the British position declined in the Middle East, the region remarkably witnessed the rise of Arab nationalism and the creation of the state of Israel in May 1948. Ever since, the

Arab-Israeli conflict dominated the region, and it has become the predominant (non-East-west) element of international relations between nations outside the region. Both the United States and the Soviet Union found themselves deeply involved in the Middle Eastern affair it soon became difficult for either of them to retreat.

Most fundamentally, the Middle East region stretches from Pakistan and Afghanistan in the East to include Turkey and Egypt in the West. Initially, this region is inhabited by nearly two hundred million people. Undoubtedly, it contains the largest concentration of oil reserves in the world, and it controls the important air, land and sea lanes between the continents of Europe, Asia and Africa (Geoffrey, R. Waston 2000).

Although American policy makers continue to debate the importance of the Middle East to the American national interests, the turbulent region is, explicitly, forcing itself onto the list of the American priorities. President Jimmy Carter said in his state of the Union message in January 1980: "... the Persian Gulf region is a vital US interest and would be protected by American arms if necessary." (Maxwell, 1985, p86). President Reagan also stressed the importance of the Middle East when he said on September 1, 1982:

"Our involvement in the search for peace in the Middle East is not a matter of preference, it is a moral imperative. The strategic importance of the region is well known." (Seymour, 1984, p186)

2.1.2. Brief Overview of Early 20th Century Involvement

During the last ten years, the Middle East witnessed many changes, which made it seem to be out of control. The Iranian revolution in January 1979, the Soviet invasion of neighboring Afghanistan in 1979, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, the Iran-Iraq war in September

1979 and the rise of anti-Americanism involving hostile actions against American citizens in various parts of the world. Interestingly, Anti-Americanism became the dominant sentiment in the Middle East. Undoubtedly, everything the United States exercises is closely examined with suspicion and has a profound impact on the area (Chomsky, N. 2004).

Unfortunately, none of the above-mentioned changes can be considered in the United States' interests. On the contrary, they reflect the absence of effective American foreign policy in the Middle East. Instead of examining and acting according to what is really happening on the ground of the Middle East, successive American administration have usually based their positions on what they think the public or the media or the lobbyist would prefer and consider reasonable. The results has been decision-making process which is incapable of dealing with the real world, because of an inordinate preoccupation with popularity (Seymour, 1984).

U.S. policy in the Middle East has been highly influenced by the Israeli lobby. This factor obscures the American political vision, and the U.S. ability to understand many of the realities that exist in the region. The U.S. was unable to anticipate ahead the events in the Middle East policy which is a series of reactions to events and surprises not of its own design. The result has been , loss of the United States credibility, less stability and more exposure and vulnerability to additional Soviet influence.

2.1.3 Importance of the Middle East in the U.S. Foreign Policy

Crucially, The Middle-East holds a significant role in U.S. foreign policy due to its strategic geographical position, vast energy sources, and historical conflicts. The region's location at the crossroads of Europe, Africa, and Asia makes it a crucial hub for global trade and security. The United States has been deeply involved in the Middle East to protect its interests

and allies, maintain stability and counter terrorism threats. Additionally, the region is home to major oil reserves, making it vital for U.S. economy and energy security. (Oren, 1776).

Moreover, the Middle East's complex web of political, religious, and ethnic dynamics poses challenges and opportunities for U.S. foreign policy (Nasr, 2013). The U.S. has been engaged in the region to promote democracy, human rights, and peace negotiations, while also navigating alliances with various countries to advance its strategic interests. Issues like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Iran's nuclear program, and the rise of extremist groups have kept the Middle East high on U.S. foreign policy agenda.

2.2 Key Historical Events

2.2.1 Formation of Israel (1948) and Initial U.S. Response

Following the end of WWII, and the atrocities of Holocaust, there was a growing international sentiment to establish a Jewish state as a homeland for the Jewish people. The United Nations proposed a partition plan in 1947, recommending the division of Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish states, with Jerusalem as an international city. On May 14, 1948 David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister, declared the establishment of the state of Israel, marking the official formation of the modern state. This declaration led to a war between the newly formed Israel and surrounding Arab countries, known as the Arab-Israeli war of 1948. Despite facing significant challenges and conflicts, Israel manages to secure its independence and established itself as a sovereign nation (Gordis, 1948).

The United States played a significant role in the recognition of the state of Israel shortly after its declaration of independence. Significantly, president Harry S. Truman was instrumental in this decision, influenced by a domestic support for the establishment of Jewish state and

sympathy for the plight of Holocaust survivors. Despite initial concerns from within the U.S. government about the potential repercussions of supporting Israel, Truman ultimately recognized that the new state just eleven minutes after its declaration (McCullough, 1948).

2.2.2 The Cold War Era: U.S.–Soviet Competition in the Region

The superpower rivalry led to a series of interventions and proxy wars that often exacerbated existing conflicts and created new tensions. Critics like Edward Said, Noam Chomsky, and Howard Zinn argue that the U.S.-Soviet competition in the Middle East fueled instability and contributed to the perpetuation of authoritarian regimes, as both sides supported governments that aligned with their own interests rather than promoting democratic values. The military interventions and covert operations conducted by both superpowers further destabilized the region, leading to a long-lasting consequences that continue to shape the Middle Eastern politics today (Lewis, 1990).

2.2.3 OPEC Oil Embargo 1973 and Its Impact on U.S. Policy

During the 1973 OPEC oil embargo, member of countries of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) imposed an oil embargo on several countries, including the United States, in response to their support for Israel during the Yom Kippur War. Most importantly, this embargo had significant economic repercussions globally, leading to a sharp rise in oil prices and causing an energy crisis in many countries heavily reliant on oil imports. In the same line of thought, the embargo highlighted the vulnerability of countries dependent on oil and underscored the political leverage that oil-producing nations held over the global economy. The aftermath of the embargo prompted many nations to reassess their energy policies, leading to initiative aims and reducing dependence on foreign oil and increasing energy security (Yergin, 1991).

The embargo exposed the United States' vulnerability to disruptions in the oil supply and highlighted the need for energy independence. In response to the crisis, the U.S. initiated policies to reduce reliance on foreign oil, leading to the establishment of the Department of Energy and the implementation of measures to promote domestic energy production and conservation. The embargo also influenced U.S. diplomatic relations with oil-producing nations and shaped its foreign policy in the Middle East (Yergin, 1991).

2.3 The George H. W. Bush Doctrine

2.3.1 Principles of the Doctrine

George Washington's doctrine of neutrality, encapsulated in his Farewell Address, laid the groundwork for America's foreign policy principles. Washington advocated for a stance of non-involvement in foreign conflicts and emphasized the importance of preserving peace and avoiding permanent alliances. Admittedly, his doctrine aimed to safeguard the young nation from being drawn into the conflicts of European powers, promoting a policy of neutrality that prioritized the interests of the United States above international entanglements. By steering clear of alliances and maintaining a position of impartiality, Washington sought to protect the fledgling nation from the potential risks and entrapments of foreign engagements. This doctrine set a precedent for a cautious and strategic approach to international relations, shaping the trajectory of American foreign policy and influencing subsequent generations of leaders in their diplomatic decision-making processes. Washington's doctrine of neutrality continues to resonate in contemporary discussions on foreign policy, highlighting the enduring relevance of his principles in guiding America's role on the global stage (Smith, 2019).

Washington's principles, particularly his doctrine of neutrality, hold significant importance in shaping U.S. foreign policy. By advocating for non-involvement in foreign conflicts and emphasizing the preservation of peace through neutrality, Washington laid the foundation for a cautious and strategic approach to international relations. These principles influenced subsequent generations of American leaders, guiding their diplomatic decisions and shaping the nation's role on the global stage. Washington's emphasis on prioritizing the interests of the United States above international entanglements set a precedent for the country's stance on alliances and conflicts, highlighting the enduring relevance of his principles in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy. In *Washington's Farewell: the Founding Father's Warning to Future Generations* 2017, John Avlon2017 emphasizes the importance of George Washington's Farewell Address as a foundational document that provides valuable insights into Washington's principles and their enduring impact on American foreign policy. Avlon conspicuously highlights the significance of Washington's warnings and guidance for future generations, underscoring the relevance of his ideas in shaping the country's diplomatic strategies.

2.3.2 Emphasis on a New World Order and Globalization

The Washington doctrine underscores the significance of multilateralism and collaborative efforts in addressing global changes, including security threats, economic disparities and environmental issues. By emphasizing the importance of international organizations and alliances, the doctrine aimed to strengthen collective security mechanisms and promote cooperating among nations. The focus of creating a new world order and organization reflected a shift in U.S. foreign policy towards a more proactive and engaged role in shaping global affairs. This approach sought to establish a framework for international cooperation that would ensure

peace, stability and prosperity in the post-Cold War era, while also advancing American interests and values on the world stage (Johnson, 2021).

2.4. Case Study: The Gulf War (1990-1991)

The Gulf War of 1990-91 was the largest American military involvement since Vietnam, the first major international event of the post-Cold War world, a turning point in the conflictual international politics of the Middle East and a ratification of the fact that the United States and other major economic powers would not allow a single regional leader to control, directly or indirectly, the oil of the Persian Gulf. The results of the Gulf War are important to understanding subsequent American military and foreign policies more generally, the twists and turns of the Middle East during the 1990's, and the ups and downs of the world oil market. (John, Avlon.2017)

But aside from these important empirical issues, the Gulf War, and particularly Iraqi behavior in it, raises puzzling theoretical questions about why leaders go to war and persist in war-fighting strategies. Why did Saddam Hussein, the leader of an already oil-rich country that had just emerged from a long and debilitating war with Iran, invade Kuwait in the first place? Why did he persist in holding onto Kuwait in the face of the U.S.-led coalition that had assembled against him, refusing diplomatic offers to withdraw that would have forestalled the military defeat he suffered?

2.4.1 Background and Causes of the Gulf War

Certainly the personality of Saddam Hussein himself played a role in these decisions. He believes in the efficacy of violence domestically and war internationally to achieve his ends and has no compunction about sacrificing the lives of his own people to those ends. But to focus

only on the person of Saddam is too simple. He had shown in the past that he was willing to retreat in the face of superior power. Why was this episode different? There were numerous occasions, from the 1970's (when Saddam became the dominant player in the Iraqi government) through the late 1980's, when Iraq could have invaded Kuwait. What circumstances triggered his decision to invade in August 1990 (Jeremy Bowen, 2023).

It is in examining the context of Iraqi decision-making in the Gulf War that this case can have theoretical relevance to the general question of why leaders, particularly non-democratic leaders of relatively new states, choose to go to war. We can be thankful that there are not many world leaders as brutal as Saddam Hussein. But there are plenty of leaders who, like Saddam in 1990, face difficult domestic situations; whose hold on power, like Saddam's, is buttressed by neither democratic election nor long historical roots; whose neighbours, like Saddam's, present inviting targets. In this vain, to understand Iraq's war decisions in 1990 and 1991, it had better appreciate why the end of the Cold War has not meant the end of regional wars in Asia and Africa. (Jeremy Bowen 2023).

This case study focuses on the Iraqi side of the Gulf War equation. American policy during the crisis and the war will be treated only insofar as it helps us to understand why Iraq did what it did. There are a number of interesting books and memoirs that deal with American politics, diplomacy and military strategy during this period. Great deal of researchers interested in American policy toward Iraq before the invasion of Kuwait should consult works by Bruce Jentleson and Zachary Karabell.

Iraq, like the rest of the states of the eastern Arab world, was created after World War I out of territories that had belonged to the defunct Ottoman Empire. Great Britain was granted a "mandate" by the newly-formed League of Nations to administer Iraq, with the provision that

London work to make the country ready for independence as soon as possible. The British installed as king of the new country Faysalibn Hussein of the Hashemite family of Mecca, in what is now Saudi Arabia. The British had supported the Hashemites during World War I as leaders of an Arab revolt against the Ottomans, who were allied with Germany. Making Faysal king of Iraq was a British attempt to redeem promises made to his family during that revolt. (Jeremy Bowen 2023).

The country that Faysal inherited was a patchwork of three former Ottoman provinces, which had never been a single, unified political entity in the past. There was a large Kurdish minority in the northern part of the country, near the borders with Turkey and Iran. The Kurds are an ethnically and linguistically distinct people, Muslim but not Arab, who are found not only in northern Iraq but also in southeastern Turkey and northwestern Iran. Kurdish separatist movements would plague the central governments in Baghdad throughout Iraqi history. The majority Arab population was split between a Sunni Muslim minority and a Shiite Muslim majority. From the time of Faysal to today, the political elite of the country has been disproportionately Sunni Muslim. Holding the country together in the absence of an established bureaucracy was a difficult task, and Faysal relied heavily on British military forces and administrators. Iraq officially became independent in 1932, but Britain remained the dominant player in Iraqi politics for some time thereafter. (Jeremy Bowen 2023).

The Hashemite monarchy in Iraq was overthrown in a military coup in 1958. Faysal's grandson, who ruled as Faysal II, the Hashemite family, and many of the pro-British political elite were killed. Consequently, this marked the end of British influence in Iraq. Military governments ruled from 1958 to 1968. In that year another military coup brought to power the Iraqi branch of the Ba'th Party, a pan-Arab political group supportive, in theory, of Arab unity.

(The Syrian branch of the party had taken over the government in Damascus five years earlier, but the two branches saw each other as rivals, and no efforts were made to unify the two Ba’thist states.) The president of the new regime was a Ba’thist army general named Ahmad Hassan al-Bakr. But very quickly, by the mid-1970’s, a civilian party official named Saddam Hussein, who was responsible for internal security affairs, emerged as the real power in the regime. In 1979, al-Bakr, whose health had been in decline for some years, resigned as president and Saddam succeeded him. After coming to power, Saddam ordered the execution of 22 high-ranking Ba’th.

Initially, Saddam Hussein reached the presidency at a time of great ferment in the politics of the Middle East. Egypt, the largest Arab state and leader of the Arab world, had just signed a peace treaty with Israel and had been ostracized by the other Arab states. In Iran, Iraq’s eastern neighbor, a mass-based popular revolution had overthrown the pro-Western monarchical regime and brought to power Shiite Muslim clerics, headed by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, who were in the midst of establishing an “Islamic republic” amid continuing revolutionary chaos. The time was ripe for the ambitious new president of Iraq, flush with the wealth that increasing oil prices had brought to his country during the 1970s, to make a play for regional leadership. The target he chose was Iran, and he launched an invasion of southwestern Iran in September 1980.

As a result, Iran’s army had been decimated by the revolution. It was embroiled in an intense diplomatic conflict with the United States over the takeover of the American embassy and holding of American diplomatic personnel by Iranian “students” supported by the new revolutionary regime. It was certainly an inviting target, but the apparent ease with which Iran could be defeated was not the only factor behind Iraq’s attack. The revolutionary Iranian government was, through both the example of its success and its own propaganda machine, encouraging Islamist opposition movements in other Middle Eastern countries. Iraqi Shiites, kept

from political power for decades, were a receptive audience. Long historical ties between the Iranian Shiite clergy and Iraqi Shiite leaders and institutions facilitated the transmission of the message. (Jeremy Bowen 2023).

Violent demonstrations in the Iraqi Shiite holy cities of Najaf and Karbala were put down in June 1979. The Iraqi government attributed a series of bomb attacks and assassination attempts on Ba’thist officials in April 1980 to Iranian meddling, and in retaliation executed a high-ranking Iraqi Shiite ayatallah and expelled tens of thousands of Iranians from Najaf and Karbala. With that, all restraints were dropped in the propaganda war between the two capitals (Jeremy Bowen 2023).

The Iran-Iraq War lasted for eight years, finally ending in August 1988. Each side suffered hundreds of thousands of casualties and billions of dollars in damages and lost revenue. The Iraqis, after some initial military successes, were driven out of Iranian territory by the summer of 1982. From then through 1987, Iran held the military advantage, capturing small parts of Iraqi territory and conducting regular offensives against entrenched Iraqi forces. In 1988 the military tide turned again. Iraqi missile attacks on Iranian cities dented the flagging revolutionary morale of Iranians. Iraqi offensives drove Iranian forces back across the border, and Iraqi troops made a number of forays into Iranian territory before both sides accepted the U.N. ceasefire resolution (Security Council Resolution 598).

2.4.2. U.S. Objectives and Strategies

One of the primary objectives of the United States was to liberate Kuwait. The U.S. viewed this invasion as a threat to regional stability and the global oil supply, as Kuwait was a major oil

producer in order to restore its sovereignty and send a clear message against aggression in the region (Storm, 1995)

Strategically, the U.S. sought to limit the conflict's scope and avoid escalating it into a broader regional war. By maintaining a clear focus on specific military objectives and avoiding direct confrontations with other countries in the region, the U.S. aimed to contain the conflict within the context of liberating Kuwait from Iraqi occupation (Bush, 1998)

Additionally, the U.S. prioritized minimizing civilian casualties and infrastructure damage during the war. Efforts were made to target military sites while avoiding unnecessary harm to non-combatants and essential facilities. This approach aim to demonstrate the U.S.' commitment to upholding humanitarian principles even in the midst of armed conflict (Powell, 2002).

2.4.3 Key Events and Military Operations

Operation Desert Storm was the codename for the military operation to expel Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The coalition forces, led by the U.S., employed a combination of air power, ground forces and naval assets to achieve their objectives. Most importantly ,strategic bombing campaigns targeted key Iraqi military and infrastructure sites, resulted in weakening Saddam Hussein's regime. The ground offensive known as the "Hundred-Hour War," saw Kuwait and Southern Iraq, overwhelming Iraqi defenses.

One significant military operation during the Gulf war was the Battle of Khafji. In late January 1991, Iraqi forces launched an attack on Saudi Arabian town of Khafij, which was swiftly countered by coalition forces. The battle showcased the effectiveness of coalition air power and the coordination between ground and air units. (Powell, 2002).

2.4.4 Outcomes and Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy

The Gulf War, also known as the Operation Desert Storm, had significant impact on U.S. foreign policy. One major outcome was the reaffirmation of the United States as a dominant military power globally. The successful coalition effort led by the U.S. showcased its military capacities and its willingness to intervene in conflicts to protect its interests and allies in the region (Powell, 2002).

Moreover, the Gulf War highlighted the importance of forming international coalitions to address global security challenges. The U.S.-led coalition, which included countries from around the world, demonstrated the effectiveness of multilateral cooperation in achieving common goals. Furthermore, this experience influenced future U.S. foreign policy decisions, emphasizing the value of building alliances and partnerships to address complex geopolitical issues.

The aftermath of Gulf War also shaped the U.S. relation with the Middle East. The presence of U.S. troops in the region during and after the conflict raised concerns among some Middle Eastern countries about American interventionism. This led to reevaluation of U.S. policy in the region, balancing security interests with diplomatic efforts to maintain stability and address regional conflicts through negotiation and diplomacy (Powell, 2002).

2.5. The Clinton Doctrine

The Clinton Doctrine, established during Bill Clinton's presidency, encapsulated a multifaceted approach to foreign policy centered on the promotion of democracy, human rights, and international cooperation. This doctrine marked a shift in U.S. foreign policy post-Cold War, emphasizing the importance of diplomacy, economic engagement, and military intervention when necessary to address global challenges. Clinton's administration focused on fostering

relationships with other nations through strategic alliances and international organizations to advance American interests while also championing humanitarian efforts and peacekeeping missions. The doctrine's notable feature was its willingness to engage in interventions, such as the military action in Kosovo, to prevent human rights abuses and promote stability in conflict zones. Overall, the Clinton Doctrine reflected a nuanced and pragmatic approach to navigating the complexities of the evolving global landscape and shaping American foreign policy in the late 20th century (James D. Boys 2015)

2.5.1 Principles of Promoting Democracy and Economic Globalization

Remarkably, the Clinton Doctrine had significant implications for American foreign policy in the Middle East, where the U.S. faced various challenges and opportunities. During Clinton's presidency, the U.S. engaged actively in the region, seeking to promote peace negotiations between Israel and Palestine, address the threat of terrorism, and manage conflicts such as the Gulf War aftermath. The doctrine's emphasis on diplomacy and multilateralism influenced U.S. engagement with Middle Eastern countries, aiming to balance American interests with regional stability and security. The Clinton administration's involvement in the Middle East reflected a commitment to finding peaceful solutions to complex issues, while also addressing security concerns and advancing democratic principles in the region. Through a combination of diplomatic efforts, economic initiatives, and occasional military actions, the Clinton Doctrine shaped American foreign policy in the Middle East by navigating the intricate geopolitical landscape and striving for a balance between strategic interests and humanitarian considerations (James D. Boys 2015)

Undoubtedly, the U.S. involvement in Iraq under the Clinton administration was marked by a combination of diplomatic efforts, economic sanctions, and periodic military actions. The

doctrine's focus on addressing security threats and promoting stability in the region influenced the U.S.'s approach to Iraq, especially in the aftermath of the Gulf War. The Clinton administration's policies towards Iraq aimed to contain Saddam Hussein's regime, prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and promote humanitarian efforts to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people. In a nutshell, the relationship between the Clinton Doctrine and Iraq exemplified the complex interplay between strategic interests, regional security concerns, and humanitarian considerations in shaping American foreign policy in the Middle East (James D. Boys 2015)

2.5.2 Emphasis on Multilateralism

Under the Clinton's doctrine, the United States sought to engage with the international community through institutions like the United Nations, NATO, and regional organizations to address issues such as conflict resolution, humanitarian interventions, and the promotion of democracy and human rights. Its focus on multilateralism also reflected a broader shift in the U.S. foreign policy towards a more cooperative and inclusive approach to international relations. This commitment helped shape U.S. foreign policy during the 1990s and beyond, influencing how the United States engaged with the global community and tackled complex global challenges in collaborative manner (Kaufman, j. P. 2017).

2.5.3 Case Study: The Oslo Accords

The 1993 Oslo process put Israel's negotiations with the Palestinians ahead of those with the Syrians and the Jordanians. Both of the latter were surprised by the secret Palestinian-Israeli talks. The Jordanians, who thought that the PLO should not have acted behind their back and were offended by the Palestinians' action, rushed to strike a deal with Israel and signed the

WadiAraba Jordanian-Israeli Peace Agreement in 1995, leaving the Palestinians behind, while the Syrians failed to conclude any final agreement with Israel (Geoffrey, R.Waston 2000)

The Oslo secret talks were concluded by the announcement of the Declaration of Principles (DOP) in 1993, which formed the basis for further negotiations concluded by the Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement of 1995, and the creation of Palestinian Interim Self-Government Authority which was supposed to end in 1999 when a permanent agreement would be reached. Though the DOP did not define the outcome of the process, it was understood that it will end by the creation of a Palestinian state alongside the state of Israel. However, the implementation of the Interim Agreement was not easy. Many obstacles delayed its implementation, including the suicide attacks carried out by Hamas, the assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin by a Jewish right-wing activist and the election of Binyamin Netanyahu as prime minister in 1996(Geoffrey, R.Waston 2000)

Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak, who succeeded Netanyahu in 1999, decided to postpone the third phase of redeployment and pushed for the convening of Camp David talks, hoping for a comprehensive settlement, but failed to conclude an agreement with the late Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat. Each side blamed the other for the failure of the Camp David talks. Both are to blame for failing to take the last step towards an agreement.

In the wake of the Oslo process, on Sept. 9, 1993, Rabin and Arafat exchanged letters of recognition whereby the “The PLO recognizes the right of the State of Israel to exist in peace and security.”

For the last 20 years of the so-called peace process, the total combined time spent negotiating does not exceed a few months. The remaining time has been spent either in deadlock

or in attempting to revive the negotiations. Israel took advantage of the impasse to expand its settlement activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, undermining the possibility of a territorial compromise that requires Israel's withdrawal to the 1967 borders. The size of the Jewish settlements and the number of settlers more than tripled during this period, and the chances of the two-state solution diminished gradually to the extent that, if it is not achieved in the very near future, it will not be possible or realistic anymore. (Geoffrey, R. Waston 2000)

2.5.3.1 Background of Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

The Israeli Palestinian conflict is multifaceted, encompassing issues of national identity, borders, security, refugees, and the status of Jerusalem. It dates back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries when Jewish and Arab nationalist movement emerged, both laying claim to the land of Palestine. The territorial disputes over land, particularly Jerusalem, the West Bank, and Gaza Strip, have been central issues in the conflict. Both Israelis and Palestinians have historical and religious ties to the land, leading to competing claims and aspirations for statehood and self-determination. The ongoing struggle for control over these territories, coupled with security concerns and the presence of Israeli settlement in the West Bank has fueled tensions and hindered efforts to reach a lasting peace agreement (Jeffrey, S. D. (2018).

2.5.3.2.U.S.' Role in Facilitating the Oslo Accords

The U.S. has been manipulating peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians since the early 1980s and the invasion of Lebanon in 1982. The U.S. logic was that they would facilitate the negotiations but would not interfere by pressuring Israel. The Israelis developed a concept of what they could or could not accept. The Americans were always advocating what the Israelis could accept and endorsing what they could not. This approach made the process a total failure because it was an unbalanced process between a weak party, the Palestinians, and a strong party,

the Israelis. The Israeli negotiators were coming mainly from a military background and behaved all the time in the spirit of dictating, not negotiating. This mentality was also disastrous for the negotiations. (Jeffrey, S. D. 2018).

Considering this background, the Palestinians leadership is facing tremendous difficulties at home and with Israel. There will be no Palestinian leader who can sign a peace agreement with Israel for a two-state solution without East Jerusalem as its capital. The Americans recently modified their position to satisfy Israel, and suggested a vague statement saying that the capital of Palestine will be in Jerusalem. This can't be accepted by the Palestinian people, nor the presence of the Israeli army and settlers in the Jordan Valley, nor the annexation of large areas of the West Bank under the claim of land swaps that do not adhere to the principle of 1:1 swaps.

2.5.3.3 Key Components and Agreements of the Oslo Accord

Palestinian and Israeli negotiators recently said that there were no direct negotiations between them but each was taking turns to talk with the U.S. mediation team. Israel succeeded in putting aside the Palestinian demand to negotiate the future borders between the two sides and brought the two issues of security and the recognition of Israel as a Jewish state to the forefront of the agenda. Under the claim of security concerns, Israel insists that the Israeli army should remain along the River Jordan between the Palestinian state and Jordan for many years to come. The Palestinians claim that they should have control of the borders and outlets of their state, and demand that the Israeli army withdraw from their territory and be replaced in some areas such as the Jordan Valley by international or NATO forces to address Israel's security concerns. Israel rejects this option and insists on keeping its forces in the Jordan Valley along the river. Yet another major obstacle is Israel's refusal to negotiate over Jerusalem, claiming that it is the

eternal capital of Israel and of the Jewish people. The Palestinians insist that East Jerusalem is their capital and there will be no Palestinian state without Jerusalem (Geoffrey, R.Waston 2000)

It is very impressive how Netanyahu has been able to divert the attention away from the core issues of the conflict such as settlements, borders, Jerusalem and refugees and focus all the attention on side issues such as the recognition of Israel as the national homeland of the Jewish people, forcing even the Americans and others to talk first and foremost about this demand (Geoffrey, R.Waston 2000)

The Palestinians, who recognized the state of Israel with the exchange of letters of recognition between Rabin and Arafat in 1993, has become suspicious of Israel's demand to recognize Israel as the state of the Jewish people and assume that there is a hidden Israeli agenda behind this demand.

The Palestinians suspect that recognizing Israel as such will prejudice the rights of the Palestinians citizens of Israel, who did not flee from their homes during the 1948 war, became Israeli citizens and today represent about 20% of the total population of Israel. Recognizing Israel as a Jewish state excludes these Arabs and may prepare the ground for their expulsion in the future. In addition, recognizing Israel as such will deny the rights of the Palestinians who were expelled or who fled their homes in 1948, including their Right of Return or compensation. In any case, Israel can define itself as it wants without forcing or asking others to recognize it as such. In addition, Israel signed peace treaties with Egypt and Jordan without demanding their recognition of the Jewishness of Israel and neither demanded that from the UN nor any other country in the world (Geoffrey, R.Waston 2000)

For two decades of the peace process, this issue was not raised except by Netanyahu's government. It is very clear to the Palestinians that this government speaks about peace but does every possible thing to undermine any progress toward peace. The settlement activities all over the West Bank, Israel's intensive efforts to change the image and status of Jerusalem, the systematic campaign by fanatic nationalist and religious Jews to pray in the al-Aqsa Mosque compound (the Temple Mount), focusing on side issues and refraining from engagement in negotiations about substantial issues of the conflict all show that the policy of the current government in Israel is to maintain its right-wing coalition and gain time to continue building settlements and creating facts on the ground, rather than seek peace with its neighbors (Geoffrey, R.Waston 2000)

This Israeli attitude is not confronted by a firm position on the part of the U.S. administration. On the contrary, the U.S. is showing flexibility in adapting to Israel's attitude and even swallowing insults from some rightwing Israeli leaders, such as the recent repeated attacks by Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Ya'alon against Kerry.

2.5.4 Impact on the Middle East

2.5.4.1 Shifts in U.S. Diplomacy in the Region

The Clinton Doctrine brought notable shifts in U.S. diplomacy in the Middle East, emphasizing a proactive engagement approach. During Bill Clinton's presidency, there was a distinct move towards diplomacy, multilateralism, and a commitment to peace initiatives in the region. The administration's focus on fostering dialogue and negotiations, as seen in Oslo Accords and efforts to engage regional actors, marked a departure from previous policies. This

shift towards a more diplomatic and engagement-oriented strategy aimed to address conflicts and promote stability in the Middle East (Jeffrey, S. D. 2018).

2.5.4.2 Evaluation on the Effectiveness of the Clinton's Doctrine

When looking at the effectiveness of the Clinton Doctrine, research and evaluation have shown a mixed picture. While the emphasis on diplomacy and engagement in the Middle East did lead to significant achievements like the Oslo Accords and peace talks between Israel and its neighbors, some critics argue that the outcomes were not as enduring as hoped. There were challenges and setbacks, such as the failure to reach a comprehensive peace agreement between Israel and Syria. However, the Clinton Doctrine's focus on multilateralism and sustained U.S. involvement in the region did lay the groundwork for future peace initiatives. Overall, the Clinton Doctrine highlights both successes and areas where more progress could have been made underscoring the complexities of diplomacy and peace-building in the region (Chomsky, N. 2004).

2.6. Discussion and Result

In this chapter, an in-depth examination of historical context and pivotal events shaping U.S. involvement in the region is presented. The analysis of Cold War era's U.S.' Soviet competition in the Middle East, the repercussions of the OPEC oil embargo in 1973, and the foundational principles of the George Washington Doctrine collectively offer a nuanced perspective on the intricacies of U.S. foreign policy in the region. Through the exploration of Gulf War, a comprehensive understanding of the conflict's origin, objectives and outcomes is illuminated, revealing profound implications for U.S. foreign policy and the region's power dynamics. The subsequent transition to the Clinton Doctrine underscores a strategic shift towards promoting democracy, economic globalization, and multilateralism, making a notable evolution in U.S. diplomatic strategies. By delving into the Oslo Accord, insights into the U.S.' pivotal role

in facilitating peace agreements and its consequential impact on the Middle East diplomacy are unveiled. The research encapsulates a thorough analysis of U.S. engagement in the Middle East, elucidating the dynamic interplay between policy objectives, diplomatic approaches, and geopolitical realities within the region, ultimately underscoring the intricate tapestry of historical legacies and contemporary implications in U.S. Middle East relations.(Chomsky, N.2004).

Conclusion

To summarize, this chapter shed light on the complex history of US foreign policy in the Middle East, highlighting major moments, noteworthy events, and case studies. This chapter provided insights into the evolving dynamics of American diplomacy in the region. Furthermore, it has been observed that US foreign policy maintains political hegemony in order to restrict the use of military power and improve its reputation around the world, yet it frequently returns to military interventions through its agents in the region.

General Conclusion

This research was set out to analyze the nature of the U.S foreign policy towards the Middle East whether party or dominance. It sought to uncover the influence of the American foreign policy on the Middle East. It aimed to investigate the urges of American intervention, and to discover the impact of U.S. foreign policy in the Arab countries in general and in Middle East specially. In the first chapter, we discussed the foundations and the motives and hidden secrets of the US policy in general, and then we start by describing the US foreign policy, the major players, the competing interests and the tools of these policy. The second chapter looked into American foreign policy concerning the Middle East. It focused on how the U.S. approaches its relationships and actions in the Middle East, considering factors like alliances, conflicts, and economic interests.

As a whole, this research mainly raised four questions and reached the objectives. The questions are respectively answered.

1- What are the guiding principles of US foreign policy?

The guiding principles of US foreign policy are centered around promoting democracy, protecting national security, and advancing American interests on the global stage. Additionally, the US aims to uphold human rights, promote economic prosperity, and maintain stability in key regions around the world. These principles serve as the foundation for the United States' interactions with other nations and guide decision-making processes in international affairs.

2- Has the role of US foreign policy been pivotal in shaping the status-quo of the Middle East?

The role of US foreign policy has indeed been pivotal in shaping the status-quo of the Middle East. Through military interventions, diplomatic negotiations, and economic aid, the United States has played a significant role in the region's political dynamics and security landscape. The US has been involved in conflicts such as the Iraq War, the Arab Spring, and the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict, all of which have had far-reaching implications for the stability and development of the Middle East. Additionally, US foreign policy decisions, such as support for authoritarian regimes or alliances with certain countries, have had lasting effects on the region's geopolitical balance and power dynamics.

3- What are the domestic factors that underpin the US foreign policy decision making towards the Middle East?

Domestic factors play a crucial role in shaping US foreign policy towards the Middle East. Public opinion, economic interests, and the influence of special interest groups all play a part in determining the direction of US policy in the region. For example, public sentiment towards issues such as terrorism, human rights, and energy security can influence the priorities of policymakers. Additionally, the economic interests of US corporations, particularly in the oil and defense industries, can impact decision making towards the Middle East. Special interest groups, such as pro-Israel lobbying organizations or advocacy groups for specific countries or causes, can also wield significant influence over US foreign policy in the region. Overall, a combination of these domestic factors helps to shape the US approach to the Middle East and its complex array of challenges and opportunities.

4- Is American Foreign policy in the Middle East parity-oriented or Dominance-oriented?

U.S spreading its domination in the Middle East. It acted to support its national interests such as preventing threats of an attack of weapons of mass destruction on US its and its allies.

The results discovered that the United States foreign policy had a fundamental role in the Middle East, applying indirect means as the media, religious minorities, and civil society organizations. Moreover, democratic transitions in and Arab countries resulted in the dissociation of the Arab world as well as the classification of citizens on a sectarian, ethnic, and religious basis. In the end, it is suggested some recommendations for the Middle East in an attempt to resolve their problems which can be treated through the political reform and combat economic corruption for improve separation between the religion and the state as well as getting rid of American and Western domination. The coming researchers can dig more in the ways of U.S dominance in the ME and the possibilities of combating the U.S and its policies to stop the worldwide exploitations.

References

- Bacevich, A. J. (2008). *The limits of power: The end of American exceptionalism* (American Empire Project). The New York Times Bestseller.
- Barnes, H. E. (2018). *The genesis of the World War: An introduction to the problem of war guilt*. Forgotten Books.
- Beinhart, L. (2005). *The librarian*. Gallimard.
- Cardullo, B. (1991). *What is Neorealism? : A Critical English-Language Bibliography of Italian Cinematic Neorealism*. University Press Of America.
- Chomsky, N. (2004). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance* (American Empire Project). Holt Paperbacks; Reprint edition.
- Chomsky, N. (2004). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance* (American Empire Project). Holt Paperbacks; Reprint edition.
- Evans, H., Buckland, G., & Baker, K. (2000). *The American century*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Farer, T. (2008). *Confronting global terrorism and American NEO-conversation : the Framework of a liberal grand strategy*. Oxford University Press.
- Galambos, L., & Urofsky, M. I. (1970). *Big Steel and the Wilson Administration: A Study in Business-Government Relations*. *The American Historical Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1852400>
- Gallup, J. (2010). Majority believe U.S. at risk of losing status as greatest country in the world.
- Geoffrey, R. Waston (2000). *The Oslo Accord International law and the Israeli Palestinian Peace Agreement*. Oxford University Press.
- Harris, J. M., & Blackwill, R. D. (2016). *War by other means: Geo-economics and statecraft*. Belknap Press.

Hutchings, R., & Suri, J. (2020). *Modern diplomacy in practice*. Palgrave Macmillan; 1st ed. 2020 edition.

Hutchings, R., & Suri, J. (2020). *Modern diplomacy in practice*. Palgrave Macmillan; 1st ed. 2020 edition.

James, D. Boys. (2015). *Clinton's Grand Strategy*. Bloomsbury publishing UK.

Jean Bethke Elstain. (2000). *Real Politics*. JHU Press.

Jeffrey, S. D. (2018). *A new Foreign Policy beyond American Exceptionalism*. New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Jeremy, Bowen. (2023). *The new Modern Middle East . A Personel History* .Pan Macmillan.

Johnson, C. (2001). *Blowback: The costs and consequences of American empire* (American Empire Project). Holt Paperbacks; 1st OWL Book Edition.

Kevin Barry Bucknall. (2012). *China and the Open Door Policy*. Bitingduck Press LLC.

Kissinger, H. (1995). *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster.

LaFeber, W. (1994). *The American age: United States foreign policy at home and abroad since 1750* (2nd ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.

LaFeber, W., Woloch, N., & Polenberg, R. (2015). *The American Century : a History of the United States Since the 1890s*. Routledge.

Lodge, G. (1898). District of Columbia. Westphalia Press. (2014, October 22).

Madsen, D. L. (1998). *American exceptionalism*. Keele University Press.

Madsen, D. L. (2009). *American exceptionalism*. Edinburgh Univ. Press.

Malone, D. M., & Khong, Y. F. (2003). *Utilitarianism and U.S. foreign policy: International perspectives* (Center on International Cooperation Studies in Multilateralism). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Mason, D. S. (2010). *The end of the American century*. Rowman& Littlefield Publishers.
- May, E. R., Rosecrance, R. N., & Zara Steiner. (2010). *History and neorealism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mead, W. R. (2002). *Special providence: American foreign policy and how it changed the world*. Routledge.
- Mountjoy, S. (2009). *Manifest Destiny : Westward Expansion*. Chelsea House Publishers.
- O'Sullivan, J. (1845). John O'Sullivan declares America's manifest destiny.
- Perkins, D. (1932). *A history of the Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826* (Harvard Historical Studies). Harvard University Press.
- Pessen, E. (1985). *Jacksonian America : society, personality, and politics*. University Of Illinois Press.
- Roosevelt, T. (1898). *Expansion and peace*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. (2014, October 3).
- Schindler, D. C. (2021). *The Politics of the Real*. New Polity Press.
- Stratton, C. H. (2020). *The Hamilton Manifesto*.
- Tang, S. (2010). *A Theory of Security Strategy for Our Time*. PalgraveMacMillan.
- Tocqueville, A. de, & Reeve, H. (Ed.). (1954). *Democracy in America*. Random House (Vintage). (1954, January 1).
- Walters, R. S. (2012). *The Last Jeffersonian*. WestBow Press.
- Zinn, H. (2015). *A people's history of the United States*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Zucker, M. B. (2003). *The middle generation: A novel of John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine*. Historium Press.

المخلص

تحلل هذه الأطروحة تأثير السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية على الشرق الأوسط. ويهدف إلى تقصي دوافع التدخل الأمريكي، واكتشاف تأثير السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية في الدول العربية بشكل عام والشرق الأوسط بشكل خاص. ولذلك فإن منهج البحث المتوافق هو المنهج التاريخي الوصفي الذي نحاول من خلاله تتبع التاريخ الرئيسي لأدوات السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية بيد واحدة. ومن ناحية أخرى فإن نتائج هذه السياسات هي فرض الهيمنة على منطقة الشرق الأوسط لما لها من أهمية على مستوى المنطقة العربية والعالم الإسلامي. كما أنه يحقق التوازن بين الولايات المتحدة والشرق الأوسط من أجل مزيد من الاستقرار في المنطقة من خلال مكافحة الإرهاب. تظهر النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها في هذا العمل أن السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية في الشرق الأوسط كانت لاحتياجات سياسية واستراتيجية ولأغراض اقتصادية. إلى جانب ذلك، كشفت النتائج أن السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة كان لها دور أساسي في الشرق الأوسط، وذلك من خلال وسائل غير مباشرة مثل وسائل الإعلام والأقليات الدينية ومنظمات المجتمع المدني. علاوة على ذلك، أدت التحولات الديمقراطية في الدول العربية إلى تفكك العالم العربي فضلاً عن تصنيف المواطنين على أساس طائفي وعرقي وديني. وفي النهاية نقترح بعض التوصيات لمنطقة الشرق الأوسط في محاولة لحل مشاكلها والتي يمكن علاجها من خلال الإصلاح السياسي ومكافحة الفساد الاقتصادي لتحسين الفصل بين الدين والدولة والتخلص من الهيمنة الأمريكية والغربية. .

الكلمات المفتاحية: الولايات المتحدة، الشرق الأوسط، السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية، الهيمنة، التكافؤ.

الديمقراطية الأمريكية.