
International Journal of Social, Political and Economic Research

IJOSPER

ISSN: 2667-8810 (Online)

<http://ijosper.uk/>

OPEN  ACCESS

Original Article

Article No: 14_V1_I1_A1

MIDDLE EAST AND USA: ENTERING A NEW PERIOD

MD. SAIFULLAH*

* Asian University of Bangladesh,
Department of Government and
Politics.

md.saifullah83@gmail.com

Abstract:

This article follows the United States in the Middle East, especially after the end of the Cold War. Aims to examine its role. US administration with the end of the Cold War In order to create a new order in the Middle East, he developed a new strategy and it is based on three key elements: Arab-Israeli peace, double siege and political and economic reform. When these strategies ended one after another in the late 1990s, in 2001, he was put in power by changing Clinton's failed Middle East policy 2001. George W. Bush tried to establish a new policy in the Middle East with the claim of rebuilding the weakened leadership of the United States. Basically with the influence of neo-conservatives From the policy of containment created within the framework of as military power and moral openness "The US policy, which shifted to the pre-emptive war strategy, has failed, especially as the Iraq War has shown, and weakened the US role in the region. This article is final and the expectations of the Barack Obama administration and discuss possible developments.

Key Words:

*Middle East, USA, Middle East
Policy.*

1. Introduction

End of the Cold War Almost in the Middle East with the Gulf Crisis simultaneously. These two developments had important implications for the political developments in the region. The most important of these effects redefining the role and relations of the US in the region It has been. In this article, the Middle East policy of the USA, various stages of this policy and the responses of regional actors regarding these policies will be discussed. Finally, all these developments The themes of change and continuity of the Obama administration in the Middle East policy the opportunities and limitations of developing a new policy It will be discussed.

2. The End of the Cold War and the m New Middle East Order

The impact of the structure of the international system and the changes in this structure on the regional policy is controversial. It is clear that the strategic importance of the Middle East region hence, it has historically been overwhelmed by the great states and hence has been affected by the power distribution and balance in the international system.

The USA, which emerged as the most important actor in the global market after World War II, came to the position of chief non-regional actor in the Middle East in a short time. The US-USSR competition and the struggle that emerged globally also affected the Middle East policy. Therefore, the USSR in the Middle East to prevent the possible activity, especially in this context the Gulf and to ensure that it flows at affordable prices, during the Cold War, was one of the most important pillars of the US's regional policy. In spite of the relative superiority of the US, the USSR established alliances in the region and increased its influence in the region with a pro-Arab attitude, which it adopted after the 1960s, especially in the Arab-Israeli conflict. As a result The struggle between the two superpowers influenced the regional policy, and in these years the regional Cold War was experienced in the Middle East.

However, the Cold War is not sufficient to explain all developments in the region. Arab nationalism, the rise of political Islam, the Iranian revolution and even the Arab-Israeli major developments in the region such as the recent analysis of the region formed by dynamics. In this context, such developments affected the system as much as they were affected by the international system. Similarly, although the end of the Cold War had a significant impact on regional policy, this effect led to new results in interaction with regional dynamics. Bipolar World End has a direct impact on Syria and Iraq.

3. Historical Analysis

Beginning from the Gorbachev period, the USSR had to cut its aid to these countries and in particular to press Syria to pay its debts. It began. More generally, the disintegration of the USSR meant that even for pro-Western countries there was no longer any manoeuvring areas available. The effects of the new era in the Middle East have been felt with the Gulf Crisis. Saddam, who does not fully understand the meaning of the end of the Cold War, the crisis that began with the invasion of Kuwait by the regime of the United Nations (UN) legitimacy by the international power created under the US leadership under the umbrella. With the defeat of Iraq, it has moved to a new stage. The Gulf War itself. The end of the Cold War is one of the consequences of the region. The change in the international system was reflected in the UN Security Council and a decision was taken to intervene in Iraq.

The Gulf War has created new parameters for the region. Both in terms of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Gulf equilibrium. Iraq, which is an important actor and has a considerable economic power due to its oil resources, defeat in the Gulf War and the following developments lost weight. Another loser of the war is the Saddam regime. They are Palestinians because of their support, and because of the economic difficulties created by the crisis. Syria reads global and regional developments correctly status has been redefined. Assad regime against the power created against Iraq to join the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991 has decided. On the other hand, the developments for Iran are both positive and has led to negative consequences. On the one hand the enemy of Iraq defeats Tehran while the US influence in the region caused discomfort. In Israel, the balance of powers with the weakening of a significant Arab country they are also pleased with the development in their favour. But the ruling right. The Likud government was uncomfortable with being forced into the peace process. the Labour Party government has been in the balance of new powers. He believed that he established a favourable ground to implement the principle of land for peace.

Within this framework, the US has established a strategy of using its leading role at a global and regional level to create a new Middle East order. This strategy is. George. The Bush administration began in the last period, new elements with the Clinton administration has been developed. The new strategy was sitting on a tripod: Arab-Israel Peace Process; Double Siege policy and political and economic reform. Immediately after the Gulf War, the US administration created the crisis. He believed in the necessity of resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict in order to protect the coalition and create a new regional order. For this purpose, a lot of pressure on the Likud government in Israel was reluctant.

Finally an international conference in 1991, Madrid Conference, gathered. The Madrid Peace Process, consisting of both bilateral and multilateral negotiations, is short time. The United States this time, the Norwegian Liberation in the mediation of Norway Organization (PLO) and the Labor Party government in Israel reached and started the framework agreement began to support the process. In the meantime, he worked on the progress of the negotiations within the framework of Madrid. Therefore, the US's new strategy is important a size is a normal actor of Israel to end the Arab-Israeli conflict and in the region to ensure acceptance.

The second leg of the US's new strategy is the Clinton era It was a double siege policy. This policy would be seen as a source of instability in the region by Washington, which is expected to dynamically enact the Arab-Israeli Peace Process. the two countries targeted were Iraq and Iran. This strategy is the In the post-war period, forces between Iran and Iraq in the Gulf it meant abandoning its policy of ensuring balance. The US is now abandoning its policy of using these two countries against each other and developing a new policy to isolate them both. US new The Gulf policy had two most important reasons. First of all, the disintegration of the USSR and with the emergence of a unipolar system, there was no power to support countries against the US. Therefore, Washington He could isolate Iran. Moreover, the Gulf Cooperation Council after the Gulf War. The member countries were developing military relations with the United States and even began to be less cautious in providing a base for the US. Thus the US military it would have the means to implement such a policy.

The isolation of Iraq was carried out through the policies imposed on Iraq in the UN umbrella after the Gulf War. After the ceasefire agreement, the economic embargo on Iraq continued. The United Nations Specail Commission (UNSCOM) was also assigned to oversee the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Finally, in response to the bloody rebellion of the Saddam regime, the UN Security Council was the first to decide on humanitarian intervention in the north and south of Iraq. With reference to this decision, the north of Iraq's 36th parallel and the south of the 32nd parallel were expanded to 33rd. In this process, the region, which was formed by the withdrawal of the central government from some areas in the north, passed from the control of the central government to the administration of two Kurdish Kurds in the north, the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) led by Massoud Barzani and the Kurdistan Patriotic Union (PUK) led by Jalal Talabani. All these developments limited Iraqi sovereignty. US, Britain and France that create and apply these policies was stationed at the air base in Turkey Hammer Force in Iraq. The policy of the siege of Iraq has been formed within the framework of the UN and the support of other countries in a variety of ways. It has evolved as Washington's policy and in later years stayed. The Clinton administration first decided to sanction Iran in 1995 with an execution order

took. Later in 1997, the Congress extended the sanctions imposed on Iran with the Iran-Libya Sanctions Law. The most important element of the double siege policy is the Gulf the US military presence was unprecedented in the region.

The last leg of the US's new Middle East order was the process of political and economic reform in the region. This policy was one of the important pillars of the post-Cold War global policy. In the end, the US's victory in the Cold War was seen as the triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism that the US represented in this war. Now to get rid of the US pressure of regimes There was no other superpower that they could approach. Within this framework as well as in the Middle East, it supported political and economic reform. However, the US support for political reform was very short. As in the case of Algeria, the US decided to abandon the political reform process, as the political Islamists in these countries would benefit. Short economic liberalization has been implemented in a controlled manner. Nevertheless, the US supported the integration of Middle Eastern countries into the global economy in areas other than oil.

By the mid-1990s, however, there were problems in every part of the US's new Middle East policy. As mentioned above, the first limitation of this policy emerged in the foot of political and economic reform. Soon, significant problems were encountered in the other two pillars of the US's new Middle East order. The most important success of the Arab-Israeli Peace Process in Israel in 1994 and Jordan. Jordan became the second Arab country to make peace with Israel after Egypt. However, this was an expected development. The other feet of the Peace Process were facing increasing problems. Yasser Arafat with the agreements signed within the framework of the Oslo Peace Process. He returned to Palestine and was elected President of the Palestinian Authority. A parliament was formed as a result of the elections, and Palestinian-Israeli relations faced major crises in the second half of the 1990s, although the administration in the West Bank and Gaza was transferred to the Palestinian Authority. As a result, the peace process ended in 2000 and the Israeli-Palestinian relations evolved into a more problematic one. Similarly, Israel-Syria talks ended in 2000 as well.

On the other hand, the double siege policy faced serious problems. The US policy on Iraq has been increasingly criticized by its allies. In the mid-1990s, one of the permanent members of the Security Council, France, Russia and China, began to say that the sanctions and inspections on Iraq should now end. These countries signed oil exploration agreements with the Iraqi administration. France is out of Hammer Power. The countries of the region have also started to openly criticize the US policy. On the other hand, various UN agencies have started to reveal

how sanctions imposed on Iraq have harmed the Iraqi people. In short, there was no longer any international and regional consensus on Iraq.

The US's policy of siege of Iran has never received the support of its allies. In contrast to US policy, the European Union (EU) began to implement a seçil critical dialogue “against Iran and a’ constructive link in policy after the election of the reformist Khatami as president. On the other hand, a natural gas pipeline deal with Iran, a country the United States by listening to their protests could play a critical role in the implementation of these policies such as Turkey. Problems in the double siege policy began to be criticized in the United States since the mid-1990s. In particular, the Republicans regarded this policy as one of the failures of the Clinton administration. 11 September and the effort to reshape the Middle East George W. Bush, who took office in January 2001, changed the Middle East policy of the Clinton administration, which he saw as failing he came to power with the claim. Although the Middle East policy of the new administration also carries characteristics related to the region, It was also greatly influenced by the project of building the US leadership. The ideology of the neo-conservatives who took part in the Bush administration the direction of the Bush administration's policies He gave. Believing that the American global leadership was good for both America and the world, the neo-conservatives were in favor of America's use of great military power to build and strengthen the leadership.

Criticizing the policies of the Clinton era, the new conservatives, in order to support lari America's global leadership The, founded the US government in 1997, as part of the New American Century Project (The Project for the New Ameri Can Century). they argued that they should pursue a policy of power and moral openness. The advocates of this ideology increased their weight in the Bush administration after the September 11 attacks, and made it easier for them to provide public support to their policies. Thus the new National developed in 2002. The Security Strategy set out the principles of the Bush administration's new policy. For the establishment of American hegemony, the US was now developing the doctrine of preventive war, not the policy of containment. This kind of war, such as the support of international organizations such as the UN he didn't need it.

4. Significance of Regional Situation

The Middle East region was of particular importance for the Bush administration in terms of new foreign policy and security understanding and policies. Three main reasons for this First of all, this region, which contains more than 60 percent of the world's oil reserves, is the key for the global hegemony of the US as before. It was important. Moreover, the activity of the

US here before and Japan's extreme dependence on Middle Eastern oil, now it was added that the United States would be increasingly dependent on this region. In the second week the Bush Administration came to power Developing a National Energy Policy led by Deputy Dick Cheney The group had created. The report prepared by the Group is the need for Gulf oil will be one of the most important sources. Second, the Bush administration US hegemony He believed that the basic resistance came from the Arab / Muslim world. In this context, the new administration seemed to be acting within the parameters of the 1 War of Civilization "proposed by Samuel Huntington. 11th The September attacks strengthened these theses. On the other hand, countries such as Iraq and Iran The policies were disrupting the US's projects to redesign the Middle East. Indeed, after the Cold War, US-led leadership The new Middle East order was faced with problems. As described above The Arab-Israeli Peace Process has ended, and challenges to US policy in Iraq and Iran have increased. Finally, for the neo-conservatives Israel's security was of particular importance. For those who represent the Christian right and the pro-Likud Jews within the neo-conservatives, the elimination of threats to security and the restructuring of the region was essential in this respect.

5. Middle East Policy Analysis from different Cases

The following elements of the new US policy created within this general framework. First, it was necessary to rebuild the American leadership, which was thought to be weakening in the Middle East, and to break the resistance against the new Middle East order. The Bush administration claimed that the policies of the Clinton era were showing weakness in America and failed in both Iraq and Iran. In this context, new policy-making efforts the administration favored the policy set against these countries as a source of instability in the Middle East. As mentioned above, this opinion was already supported by the neo-conservatives within the administration. September 11 2001 attacks strengthened these views, obliterated the differences within the administration and provided public support. Bush administration launched after September 11. In the framework of the "war on terror", he declared war on Iraq. Furthermore, in his "State of the Nation Speech" January 29, 2002, George W. Bush declared Iran the "axis of evil" accusing Iraq and North Korea of supporting terrorism and trying to develop Mass Destruction Weapons. Although Syria did not enter this list, Washington, unlike the Clinton period, demonstrated that it would pursue a policy of exclusion of Syria in this new period. The second characteristic of the Bush administration's policy is that Arab-Israeli conflict resolution in terms of regional security and stability it wasn't important. Bush administration in Israel Sharon government in Palestine accepted his approach to the problem as a matter of

terror. In this context, he gave weight to the issues of reform in Palestine and Israel's security. On the other hand, unlike Clinton, he made no effort to revive the Israeli-Syrian leg of the Peace Process. On the contrary, as mentioned above, it has a policy of isolating Syria. He blamed the Syrian regime for supporting Hezbollah and Hamas, which he described as a terrorist organization, and for supporting resistance fighters in Iraq. The US condemns Syria's custody of Lebanon, while in the period of Bush, Syria was withdrawn from Lebanon.

The last leg of the Bush administration's Middle East policy was the democratization and economic reforms, using military force, in the Middle East, called the Great Middle East Project, if necessary. As mentioned earlier, Clinton had the idea of supporting political and economic reforms. In fact, the foundations of this policy were a continuation with the liberal discourse that became dominant in the international system in the 1980s. The liberal international politics, which believed that liberal democracy and the free market economy should be extended for international peace and prosperity, developed the doctrine of liberal interventionism, especially with the weakening of the USSR and the end of the bipolar world. In this period, this understanding dominated by international organizations is overwhelmed by authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. The Bush administration has further developed this rhetoric and made it part of the war on terror strategy launched after 9/11. Thus the neo-conservatism and liberal interventionism ideologies in the Bush administration meet came. The doctrine of the United States in the Middle East for years to stabilize stability he criticized the fact that the anti-American contingent of peoples and social movements, which had been affected by authoritarian regimes in the region due to this policy, formed. This view believes that democracy and freedoms are the antidote to terrorism, and thus advocate regime change in the Middle East.

6. Significance of those Policies

The first and most important application area of the Bush administration's new Middle East strategy was Iraq. Important names of the new conservatives Charles Krauthammer he argued that just before the war, Iraq would provide both a practice site and a springboard to the basic concepts of the doctrine. Really Iraqi The war turned out to be meaningful in terms of achieving the fundamental Middle East policies discussed above by the Bush administration. USA one hand Iraq heal his reputation in the Middle East through mending he would show the enemy and reestablish his dominant role. on the other hand "Free and democratic Iraq' which will be created after Saddam, the whole Middle East to create a domino effect and to ignite the transformation in the Middle East, which is the most resilient region in the world. From this

perspective, it can be said that the Bush administration's policies have been largely unsuccessful for the United States, such as those in the Clinton era. In other words, these policies are in the region as what the Bush Administration intended. He did not consolidate Iran's position, nor neutralized Iran. Provided a transformation that the US wanted in the region. The only success for the US was the destruction of Saddam's regime in Iraq, as intended. But this success has been very great. A large number of war it is clear that it cost the lives of civilian Iraqis and US soldiers. Also war and The American occupation has destroyed Iraq's infrastructure and institutions. US invasion It has also been a huge burden on the American economy, and it has been suggested that this burden is one of the major causes of the ongoing economic crisis.

American occupation has caused a great turmoil and instability in Iraq and Iraq has become the base of radical groups, as anti-war activists have previously warned. The new political structure built on identities in Iraq created political instability and fueled sectarian and ethnic hostilities, and the country witnessed Sunni and Shiite sectarian conflicts. Contrary to the expectations of the Bush administration, Iraqi oil still could not enter the world market due to this situation in the country. In general, the Iraqi policies of the US have fueled anti-Americanism both in Iraq and the region.

In addition to the problems in Iraq, the regional policy has developed in opposition to the new regional policies of the United States. Iran and Syria, which the Bush administration announced after the Iraqi target, increased their activities in the region. Especially Iran is not only in the Gulf region but also in the Middle East. He has been struggling with the US. Recognizing that the US's vision of the Middle East is against its own interests, Iran and its allies, such as Syria and Hezbollah and Hamas, have done their best to prevent this vision from happening. Iran and Syria have become active in both Iraqi politics and in Lebanon and Palestine. This activity is the policy of the US in Iraq. In the Arab-Israeli front, Israel also turned into a military weak. The theme of the Shiite-Sunni conflict, which the United States and its allies emphasized to break the increasing Iranian influence in the region, further increased instability in countries such as Iraq and Lebanon.

7. Conclusion

The democratization project was shelved in a short time. In Iraq as the Bush administration argued, the challenges faced were once again challenging the democratization of the country. Once again, it was once again understood that a democratic opening in the other Arab countries would bring political Islamist parties to power, and the Bush administration completely disappeared from the discourse of democratization, especially in its second period. In Palestine,

reform is a key element in its policy and for elections to be held the Bush administration, who continuously put pressure on these elections, won this election when Hamas won applied various policies to isolate.

8. References

Conry, Barbara, "America's Misguided Policy of Dual Containment in the Persian Gulf," CATO Foreign Policy Briefing, No. 33, CATO Institute, 10 Kasım 1994, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefts/fpb-033.html>

Dalby, Simon, "Geopolitics, the revolution in military affairs and the Bush doctrine", International Politics, VOL: 46, No: 2 & 3, ss. 234-252.

Dodge, Toby, "Coming face to face with bloody reality: Liberal common sense and the ideological failure of the Bush Doctrine in Iraq," International Politics, VOL: 46, No: 2 & 3, 2009, ss. 253-275.

Hinnebusch, Raymond, "The American Invasion of Iraq: Causes and Consequences," Perceptions, Special Issue on the Middle East, VOL: 12, No: 1, Bahar 2007, ss.9-27.

Hinnebusch, Raymond, "Defying the Hegemon: Syria and the Iraqi War", International Journal of Contemporary Iraqi Studies, VOL 2, No. 3, 2009, ss. 375-390.

Hoff, Joan, A Faustian Foreign Policy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Karathamer, Charles, "Coming Ashore," Time, 17 Şubat 2003.

Kerr, Malcolm The Arab Cold War: Gamal abd-al Nasir and His Rivals, 1958-1970, London, New York, Published for the Royal Institute of International Affairs by Oxford University Press, 1971.

Patnam, Robert G, "Out of sync: Bush's expanded national security state and the war on terror" International Politics, VOL 46, No: 2 & 3, ss. 210-233.

Scherman, Harvey, "America's Alliance Anxieties: The Strange Death of Dual Containment," Orbis, VOL 41, Issue 2, Bahar 1997, ss. 223-240.