

## **POLITICAL FLUCTUATIONS IN THE US – ARAB RELATIONS**

**DR. Mohammad Salim \***

**.\*Prof. Mohammad Musa \*\* Al-Swailmeen.**

---

### **Abstract**

It is difficult to deny that not just the United States, but also America's worldwide allies, and, most important, the Arab states themselves, have grown weary of wars in this region. Indicative of this reality is a palpable malaise among a core of U.S. strategic analysts. Among them are those that have come to perceive Washington's relations with Arab and Islamic countries as a perennially exhausting enterprise. Included in this group are those that believe the nature and extent of the relationship for the past three decades has been unceasingly difficult to manage and sustain.

The Arab countries have been facing many challenges and threats to their existence, future as well as their cultural identity. That would be the foreign policies of various governments often appear to be confusing or contradictory is because they frequently are. During Barack Obama's presidency, such inconsistency has seemed to characterize aspects of America's relations with the Arab World. Simultaneously, signals from Washington and the mainstream U.S. media before and since Obama's meetings with his counterparts in the Arab World have not always been as clear as the signalers thought would or should be the case.

---

\* **Al-Rawashdeh. (Associated Professor),International Relations, Al-Balqa'a Applied University,Princess Alia'a University College,Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan-Amman**

\*\* **International Law, Al-Balqa'a Applied University,Princess Alia'a University College,Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan-Amman.**

On the positive side, many among the region's strategic analysts and policymakers have been and remain pleased with the continuing high-level of military, security, and intelligence cooperation between the United States and the Arab World.

**Key words: Arab World, American policy, foreign relations.**

### **Introduction**

In the twenty- first century, specifically during the Arab Spring, the Arab countries have been facing many challenges and threats to their existence, future as well as their cultural identity, far more than it was in the twentieth century. These challenges are represented in the great powers tries , especially the United States, from the imposition of projects aimed at consolidating dependency , backwardness , chaos and division on the Arab region to impose its control over them, as USA followed many policies , methods and used many tools to reach the consistent goals and objectives. The United States has sought since the events of September 11, 2001, to create a new world system , and at all levels, returns from which to draw and to identify areas of influence in order to ensure the continuation of its interests and maintain its dominance, as far as its goal behind its policy is to dismantle the Arab region. it has become no secret to the Arab countries that USA aims at re-installing and re- constructing Arab weak states on the basis of sectarian, ethnic, and nationalist, and this is required by the Greater Middle East project, launched by US President George W. Bush, after September 2001, in which he talked about the need for change and reform political and economic events in the Middle East, including the Arab region, as well as the establishment of new standards that are compatible with these goals. New alliances efforts in accordance with democracy in the Arab countries have been formed to be a central idea in the US foreign policy for decades, where the US administration exercises its policy under the slogans of freedom, democracy, human rights, and world peace and other slogans exploited by the US administration as a pretext to interfere in the affairs of states the Middle East, especially the Arab countries to achieve its interests and implement its policy, even though the international community or world opinion opposed these policies. In light of the foregoing, the issue of democratization has become one of the most important concerns of the political action of the United States of America to soak in the Arab region and its problems in accordance with the future of its policies and interests.

United States of America has a long and extensive history in the framework of political intervention to formulate the historical events in the Arab region, since the history of World War II were) and the most important examples of this region's policy defensive alliances to confront the Soviet Union (formerly alliances in the Middle East is the (Baghdad Pact in 1955 (which is one of alliances witnessed by the Middle East region to face the communist threat, and (Iraq, Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, and Britain), joined this alliance so as to form a composition of the wall that stands generally against the Soviet penetration toward the Middle East., it is the US not the United states that planned to create this NATO also promised b and economically help the alliance's military directly involved in the alliance, but with the help of the ally Britain for this role. the idea of the Baghdad Pact began in the spring of 1953 when, (John Foster Dulles) the foreign minister of the United States Department of State visited the Middle East, and held talks in Ankara to form the Eastern Front as a shield against the northeastern region of a possible Soviet attack, it was this alliance as a liaison with NATO, and in January 1954 , he invited the Turkish president Mahmoud Jalaluddin Bayar visit to Washington to discuss the subject of alliance with US President Eisenhower

Since the forties, the political effort of the United States of America focused on the Arab oil regions; also it had a direct role in the management of the Arab-Israeli conflict settlement that ended with the "Camp David" peace treaty between Israel-Egypt in 1978. Since that time the US policy adopted three constants basis that controlled its policy towards the Arab region, Israel is the first basis, second basis oil, and the third basis to protect Arab regimes loyal to its policy in the region.

The US analyst ,Stephen Walt, says that the strategic interests of America in the Middle East has not changed much in decades, despite the United States adopted different policy and methods depending on the circumstances which were clear that there is a preference for the strategic realities on the moral aspirations as evidenced, for example, the tolerance of the United States with authoritarian regimes or support for Israel, which occupied the West Bank are increasingly and suppression of Palestinian rights is at odds with core American values. He adds that the best way to achieve US objectives were the political balance that were adopted by following the

political forces of the United States between 1945 to 1990 by dividing the area into small dispersed that have close relationships and security interests with Washington.

The United States doesn't need immediate domination on the region but it also wants another one else that is trying to do so, where to the Washington relied on local parties and military forces remained outside the region that are ready for short moments and rare intervention. Even after the Iranian revolution and the creation of rapid reaction forces the United States has kept these units on the horizon.

The US grand follies began in 1991 when Washington moved away from this strategy and began to adopt the «dual containment» Strategy toward Iran and Iraq, which is required in turn a large military presence in Saudi Arabia, which boosted hostility Osama bin Laden to the United States and helped in the production of the World Trade Center attacks. The second foolish began with the adopted a policy of US President George W. Bush's policy of «regional transformation» and that led to the disastrous defeat in Iraq. Apart from the direct costs of this policy that has contributed to the emergence of other negative effects of the most important of fueling anti-American terrorism and give some additional incentives for regional powers to follow up the pursuit of weapons of mass destruction.

The only solution that was waiting Obama in line with the tendencies and the desire of the United States to devote more strategic attention to Asia was to return to the previous strategy, and many consider that this retreat or withdrawal, or even isolation while Middle Eastern countries benefiting from the chaos began warning of the credibility of the United States. But the Obama administration insisted that this is their problem, not in the interests of Washington, and most importantly, that a return to the policy of the balance from the outside does not mean that the United States does not care about the region, but it wants to defend its interest's smarter and more cost-effective way.

Analysts says that the United States has struggled to define its position on the Arab uprisings in 2011, especially after the emergence of a new era of competition between the major powers in the region and the emergence of niche moderate Islamic groups such as the «Muslim

Brotherhood» who took power after the uprisings in some countries that plagued countries of conflict and finally the emergence of violent groups like al «Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant», which in turn seeks to break down national borders and the establishment of an Islamic caliphate state.

Experts agree that the Arab Spring sparked a regional competition in the region, which has turned into an arena of the Cold War so that the Middle East and North Africa began in a very multi-polar and dimensions for influence and power struggle, a struggle beyond sectarian divisions between Sunni and Shia, and involves the use of traditional instruments such as military aid and economic, as well as the emergence of new forms of review of the force, including the operations of equities directly in the media and non-state actors and political movements, and in many cases the most stabilizing countries used their agents to participate in the power struggle, just as happens in the cold war.

Experts viewed the Islamic movements primarily as a matter of the topography of the regional conflict they consider that the removal of the Muslim Brotherhood from power in Egypt was the central event behind this conflict, followed immediately and paradoxically the rise of Islamic extremist groups, which imposed a new political conquests as well as the ongoing conflict in Syria. And the influence of these movements spread to cause confusion within the Syrian opposition and affected the relations between the Palestinian factions and raised the intensity of competition between armed groups in Libyathat has also contributed to the emergence of other Islamicpolitical groups especially in Egypt and Tunisia.

The analyst, Briankults, from the Center for American Progress, said the United States remained dominant in the area of military force but lacked adequate tools diplomatic, political and economic influence on the political and regional trends as the new regional dynamics revealed the limits of the effectiveness of US policy to rely on traditional tools of power such as the army and intelligence.

Kutlsadds that the United States policy approach at present lacks the intelligence and effective involvement of multiple centers of power in the region politically and economically in the

strategies which emphasizes pluralism and prosperity, while engaging the Obama administration with Islamic political organizations such as the Muslim Brotherhood confusion in the area around the priorities of American policy and values .

Here I would like to say that this study tried as much as the available possibilities to clarify the image associated with the US-Arab relations and centered in a single cope which is to serve Israel and Israel's interests first and foremost; therefore, its relations with the Arab states linked to the interests of Israel, service and support for human rights and democracy continue if they match with Israel's interests, and religion has nothing to do with America's policy toward the Arabs unless it affects the American Zionist entity - Israel -. As there are many interests to decision-makers in America's interests to serve Israel and the least of election material that support it .

Therefore, the historical studies showed the point of the development of relations between America and the Arab countries, which justifies the official visits of trade and cultural exchange that America does not need if it doesn't not serve Israeli interests.

This study is an explicit call for the Arab world to the awakening of this hibernate, hopes and Mirage experienced and waiting for from America. Salvation and hope comes from the inside and not from outside. this lesson must be learned even the big price; away from all this cultural distraction experienced by the nation behind the concepts and theories sterile that brought us to our young people in the Arab world up to the modesty of their Arabism and belonging to this nation, which lost all things under that object so as to remain as it is the situation.

*A Historical Overview of the US - Arab relations.*

The writer Bryson says: After American independence from the British colonialists (American Declaration of Independence which was signed in 1776), the Americans found themselves in a hostile world for them that is dominated by European colonial powers, where they have lost the commercial advantages that they enjoyed when they were part of the British Empire, and the foreign trade are essential to maintain the survival of the new US republic, so the founding

fathers of the United States of America it sought actively to find new markets and the Muslim Middle East was one of the first entities that they intended .

In referenceto (Sowmley, John 2001), the Middle East can be a described as poor citizens with poor social services, with poor educationservices, and the absence of democracy, violation of human rights, corruption and widespread, and countries ruled by army soldiers and sometimes domineeringrulers,and norights of peoples to rule themselves.. "What can Thus, make from those people in their relations with America.

In the year1784, America began its diplomatic relations with the Middle East when the Congressappointed a special committee consisting of Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson - to establish business relations and negotiation with the emirates of the Maghreb (Morocco, Algeria now)

In 1786 and under the pressures of American merchant ships lobby , the US envoy to the Arab Emirates to Morocco reached to a trade agreement with the governor of Morocco that was ratified by the US Senate as soon as it was presented in 1787 , and he sent a message of thanks to the governor of Morocco. But the Americans did not get a fare well fortunate similar in holding talks with the rulers of Algeria, theUAE,and Tripoli.

At that time, Jefferson and Adams wanted to start building a US naval fleet to protect America's trade with Morocco, but Congress refused to give them sufficient funds until came up in 1794 when war was broken out between France and Britain, and spread news about the confiscation of British American ships and increase the threat of Algerians to the American ships so the Congress decided in the same year to the construction of six ships to protect America's trade with the Middle East, putting the original current US fleet, and thus - as the author argues - The US-Arab relations, was one of the reasons that led to the founding of the US Navy

In 1795 the Americans reach a commercial agreement with the Algerians, and in 1706 reached an agreement with Tripoli and with Tunisia in 1797.

Unfortunately, relations did not pass without the hassle since the war between America and Tripoli in 1801 - which was the first war declared by the new American republic to protect its national interests, and after a series of skirmishes and negotiations, the Americans regained their relationship with Tripoli in 1805

Since that time and until 1816 America faced similar problems with the rest of the Maghreb countries punctuated by some armed confrontations ended with a peace treaty.

Thomas Bryson says that the US political commitment to the Middle East during the early period of US-Arab relations was mainly governed by national interests of America (economic mostly) and that America has led to the opening up of the Middle East market, and building a fleet and nationally to protect its interests, and to engage in wars sometimes .

The American who lived in that period, the composition and independence from Britain, the stage wasn't easy but went successfully, and with the beginning of 1815 has spread in America, new feelings expressed a new stage in the life of an independent American emerging republic, a US national sentiment that America has led to a new phase of its relationship with the Middle East that had helped America not only on the definition of its relationship towards the Arab and Islamic countries, but only about the world in general.

The Arab world has hoped good intentions after the First World War in the twelfth point of the fourteen principles for the President of the United States, "Wilson," that provides for the decline of the Ottoman Empire, and in the general principles that refer to the freedom of self-determination. The US President had translated these principles in practice to send fact-finding missions in the Arab region. And stand on the masses requirements and their right to self-determination. The report prepared by the fact-finding committee of the Zionist project, which calls for the migration of an unspecified number of Jews to Palestine, and makes it their own state. And most important of all, that the Commission's decision had recommended that Palestine remain part of Syria.

As the United States today is undoubtedly the leader of the world, as the interests multiplied and widened the horizons, the interaction with the American party by choice or by pressing is the case is a must, and some even call it the problem of problems, as the Arab world is a problem in the foreseeable future, especially in the field of national security, the relationship with the United States and its management in practical and efficiency amid with four difficulties or complexities, looked like a closed box.

First: the difficulty of establishing a genuine friendship with the United States, because that opportunity slipped a long time ago, and theoretically in 1945, but these possibilities became manifested and these chances were dashed practically in 1948 and specifically after the first Arab-Israeli war.

Secondly, the seriousness of getting into absolute hostility with the United States, because this degree of hostility reaches up to a violent clash that nation cannot tolerate it, it is at this moment and the visual time overstretched or exceeds its resources.

Third: the danger of entering into a finish hostility without limit, with the USA because it reaches its companions into a state of helpless hatred, hurting them more than it affects others, which is a failure recipe rather than a success.

Fourth: the impossibility of patience if the Arab think that they can ignore the United States and left to the factors of time and break neutralize as happened to empires preceded it because the facts weight does not allow such disregard, the current reality his provisions and waiting suspicions impose difficult to adopt for the disposal of real-time with the United States in terms of authority and their strength in the heart Arab world calling once or by requesting times. In fact, the Arab situation now afford it compact grief in the slayings of the former Mexican President phrase (Vargas) early thirties when he was asked, and his country is soaked in and knock the man for a moment to think and then said (crisis problems (the fact that the Mexican crisis) Question Mexico)? Then the answer "The borders of the United States are very far- in its crisis but it is very close in spirit from God .... And to a degree that is underway on the conditions

of the Arab countries today, mostly (very close to the adhesion of the United States is too far.) To the point of schizophrenia for any reason and do.

Arabs realize that the American role in the region is not inevitable and that the different roles and voices and whatever in nature, form and interactions. This goes back to the United States which is today the most effective control over the conduct of international affairs, added its dominance and control of the United Nations component. On the other hand, if the balance of power and ability in favor of the stronger party, which is the United States, dictates that the stronger party has a trade-off on the other side element when the interaction .finally, the weaker party is appointed by the elements, and say to it can be pushing for the stronger party to get some strength and I said to them could be pushing for the stronger party to get some gains?.

In fact, the Arab side actually has some of the elements of the force that hire it; it will form a gateway to answer towards influencing the future of the relationship with the United States. This result is derived from the direction of influence in the future of the relationship with the United States poses a central question here is what the United States wants from the Arab region? And what serves the interests in particular? The answer will be from the perspective of US interests in particular?.

The United States did need to put its hand on the on the GULF area since the day that it was a British protectorate Alley with the British which was firm and tight so it may merely in that era to establish economic relations with the Gulf countries, but the shifts that have occurred after World War II and updates of events in the Arab region such as the establishment (the state) and the emergence of Israel where the Palestine issue became evident , and the direction of the Arab region to be the focus of global polarization, especially the Gulf Arab region. Where the article strategy that constitutes the lifeblood of the modern era, have led Alytgier look at the United States to the region. And the nature of the matter is that the Arab oil that liberation from British protection is no longer safe from the American point of view, so the goal is to protect either by the Allies, or through direct self-protection. Who got it fell ally (the Shah's regime in Iran), which would make the United States forced to play on their own to protect their interests in this region, which is the greatest oil reservoir in the world.

The events to support the opportunity for the United States in the immediate presence starting to enter the forces of the Iran-Iraq war and the occupation of the Soviets down from Afghanistan through Iraq and the Gulf together. Since these events, US President Bush began to incite the world to wage a global war against Iraq, and the purpose is known to control the oil resources.

*It can be said that the US relationship in the Arab region passed in three stages:*

The first stage: the stage of indifference:, especially in terms of security and sufficiency to achieve economic interest as long as the security achieved by the presence of a trusted ally which is Britain. It could be argued that the end of this phase coincided with the beginning of the second phase with the start of British withdrawal from the Gulf in 1971.

The second stage, the stage of filling the gap: since Britain left out of the Gulf, it has seen competition between the United States and the Soviet Union, and continued competition exists until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989.

The third stage, the stage of the absolute control of the United States on the Arabian Gulf region and the Middle, especially after 1991, as it came to an end, the participation of the Gulf countries in the task of internal decisions, but rather to impose its will in these decisions.

As result of all the previous review, we are in front of the parties, a party dominates the world and has a global influence, and decisions implemented. An international community give in, and major countries (imposed) by the corresponding party is very weak.. , Suffering from division and backwardness and decline certainly tip the balance is preponderant, when the two parties contend, if the cuff is balanced by large, the output will definitely be in favor of the strongest. And not only will that, but that even in the case of negotiated access agreements, the Arab side negotiates the reality of the minimum. So how will these problems beshaping the future of Arab-American relations? Here we would like to put forward the fact that a scientific indicators show the superiority of the United States in all areas of the Arab world, in the military side, the United States is expected to spend on military spending in 2015 is spending its size (15-20) state-of-spenders in the world combined with each other.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the intellectual and political literature shows a number of customary interests to the United States with respect to the Arab world and can be summarized as follows:

The care of not to the control of any state for oil, and prevent any foreign or Arab domination of the sources, and to ensure the flow of affordable western industrial world, especially the United States and Western countries including Japan.

Maintaining the status object of political instability, and prevent any progress in the field of political development, economic development may affect destabilize Arab regimes loyal to the United States of America.

Protect Israel as a strategic ally in the Middle East than any other Arab or external danger that could threaten its existence.

Any review process to remarks by US President and decision-makers in recent times with vigorous monitoring of patterns of Arab relations, especially after the Al-Aqsa Intifada refers to the issue of oil is no longer big dream for the United States of America, because they get this oil convenient ways, as the exporting countries cannot survive politically, economically and socially without oil revenues. The issue of maintaining the status object raises a lot of questions about the Arab regimes with the United States relationship. Accordingly, to achieve the first two objectives of the aforementioned hurt in the third goal in ways that directly service, so it must be clear in our minds away from the world wishes we lookfor.

Now, after the US election of 2016, where the Middle East file one of the most sensitive issues for US President-elect Donald Trump-fifth President of the forty-US US-which opposes all the Democratic Party's policies with regard to the region, and say that all the wars and problems that you know the Middle East caused by The Obama administration, particularly with regard to terrorist threats what is known as «Daesh organization » Syrian file, in addition to Iraq, Libya and the Iranian nuclear file.

Experts classify Donald Trump in the mainstream isolationist box, which foreign policy prevailing since the nineteenth century, there is a fear that the United States gives up during the Trump the presidency for its leadership role on the international level. Trump says that is no longer for the United States to be in a position to be the world's policeman, it should reduce its international aid, and during the campaign, which lasted 16 months, the Republican candidate has promised to adopt a different policy for Barack Obama's policy.

Commenting on Trump win headed by the United States, the US former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, said that Trump should submit himself to the world in a way that he is fully aware known to all challenges, and that shows that it follows the nature of its developments, any chairman-in the words of Kissinger - has a fundamental responsibility to develop trends: What do you want to accomplish? What you want to find shelter? And why? To do so, he needs to make analysis and reflection.

It seems to be talking about changing American priorities in the Middle East after the election of Donald Trump has a causal relationship by the region, which sank large parts of them in the swamp paramilitary. And presumably if Trump turned into support Assad in Syria, on the basis of a mistaken belief that this will have to fight al Daesh, it will carry the support of an alliance of paramilitary partners and private armies to another coalition, and the same applies to other third parties, "Russia and Turkey," and the In particular, Iran.

politicians Analysts say that US President-elect several declaimed several statements about the future of US relations with the countries of the region, where he pointed to one of the controversial points also in the electoral theses where the positions of the Arab Gulf states and his statements in something to the effect that the United States would not protect these allies free and that they should pay for their protection, which is the nearest to blackmail in the one hand, and to reduce the United States with the rank of superpower to the state «salaried force» that deal with the world on the principle of « pay the price», knowing that most of the files that are shared between the American side and the Gulf, linked to the fact states and other issues, terrorism, wars and Yemen, Syria and Libya, and there are no differences related to bilateral relations, but on the contrary, the bilateral relations have been good in the era of President Barack Obama.

Chaos spread in the Middle East threatens the world and threaten the security of the United States, it is natural that the Gulf in the coming discourses focus on Tehran is a source of instability, and that the US-Gulf relationship can salutes common old role that rejects military adventures and resisted alliances and diverse efforts, By the end of Obama's presidency , the Iranians are on the verge of domination by military force on four important Arab countries, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and threaten the State of Bahrain as well. This is a worrying situation for Gulf governments, which brings with it more countries in conflicts in the chaos that fuel the sectarian conflict, terrorism circle will grow, that will not be eliminated until after the liberation of the cities of Mosul and tenderness of the grip «Daesh.» Gulf States will be looking to play an influential role with the Government of Trump in addressing regional situations, but as long as the parable in the past decades, without resorting to military solutions.

As for the relationship with Israel, there is a bias clearly towards it where it was more lowed and fastest declaration represents the connection of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Tramb and confirmed that «a true friend of Israel» and Trump invited him to visit him in Washington, the Israeli Minister of Education Naftali Bennett said he believed there victory Trump «ended the dream of a Palestinian state », and if implemented Trump electoral promise to move the embassy of Israel and Washington to Jerusalem would be a harbinger of political escalation against the Palestinians, Arabs and Muslims did not dare to do any previous US government.

Trump wrote in October / October 2016 at the expense of social networking site »Facebook« I have said on numerous occasions that in the era of Trump Management (if he became president), the United States will recognize that Jerusalem is the only and the true capital of Israel ». On another occasion, Trump said in a speech to the annual conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in March / March 2016 in Washington, said that if elected president will hold a strong alliance between his country and the 'Israel, and added that any agreement imposed by the United Nations on Israel and the Palestinians would be «catastrophe», accusing the UN organization that it is not friendly to Tel Aviv. In contrast, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas realizes that he will not originate any new peace process in the coming years,

will any hopes in the American horizon appear, as he realizes that the Trump win will not change anything in reality internal of the Palestinians.

As for the Syrian file that has plunged the region at the turn of the risk of a Syrian file, the position of the Russian where to intervene, by analogy with the recent Trump's remarks in which he said «if Vladimir Putin wanted to destroy the Daesh organization, I support him 100 percent, and I cannot understand those who oppose this» and the Trump opposes dropping out Bashar al-Assad's regime, arguing that his successor could be worse, commenting »look at Libya«, in addition to his opposition to US support of the Syrian opposition, because it cannot distinguish between the moderate opposition and terrorist organizations, a position that runs entirely viewpoint Arabia with about the war in Syria, and Iraq.

In an interview with the »Guardian« British earlier in the month of October / October 2016, Trump said »what we focus on is Daesh and not Syria«, pointing out that the US intervention in the Syrian conflict has a dire consequence for the US .in the same interview. He stated that Bashar al-Assad's regime is a minor issue compared to the organization of the Daesh state.

The question now is, Does the wins of Trump resolve the war in Syria, lifting the lid on the armed opposition and accusations of terrorism, and put them in the same crucible «Daesh»? Answer to this question is premature, despite the introductions, and we should not get ahead of time towards the final goals that may take longer. Period was wasted time between today and mid-January 2017 the date of handing the presidency of the elected president of his powers, dramatic developments in the field battle of Aleppo is not clear of what will be the outcome.

Despite the importance of the above, but it would be difficult to build on the scattered remarks of US President-elect Donald Trump on the Middle East issues, to develop a vision of what will be the American foreign policy during his reign, what we know of his positions does not amount to more than the complex populist function incitement Service on rival Hillary Clinton and the policies of his predecessor, President Barack Obama, and exacerbate the anger on them. The question that no one could yet answer: will there be any change come by Donald Trump to the foreign relations of the United States? Change is coming, but to what degree and in what

form and to where? Until Trump formulate policies and the formation of his government, the world will remain vigilant of the surprises of the man who will be a surprise

*Interests and political objectives of the United States of America about the Arab region.*  
the US handling of the Middle East is going according to their interests needs that requires the imposition of the reality of stability in the region, Just was a constant tension in this region, one of the Cold War requirements with the Soviet Union, the stability in the Middle East during the stage of US President George W. Bush ruled Jr. A basic requirement in the interest of America in order to devote its ability to dominate and conquer the world and impose its conditions on key allies in Europe and Japan.

The United States has felt that reliance on the implementation of its political and security in the Middle East, which includes a set of critical priorities of the American association in the region is no longer enough to bring about the desired region of change they do not want to fight the threats that only faces, but desire also include changing the regional dynamics that come with such threats, it was that the additional pillars relay in its policy on the Middle East

The interests and its definition differs from the United States perspective than in the Arab world, where we can say that the Arab world is an independent political unit, or at least a unit with a single foreign policy can talk about it as an independent unit, as is the case for the United States, which showed historical experiments, at least in the contracts that began since the cold war after World war II until now as fixed, since foreign policy in the era of any US president from the other is no different, especially with regard to the Arab world, though some methods vary from time to time and this reflects the continuation of approach American definition of the national interest to them, regardless of the individual found in the White House.

But with regard to Arab interests are divided by these countries classified from the perspective of the United States which will be discussed later in this study, but it remains the main thing in the absence of democracy and the peaceful transfer of power in most Arab countries, that the first and last for the Arab States of the relations with the United States interest or with others is to maintain the status object, in other words, continuity in the government without regard to any

other interests. So the American interests are the interests of the national high while Arab interests are in total in individual interests associated with the prevailing governance systems.

Talk about the concept of Arab-American relations is a contradiction in a series of concepts within Arab culture prevailing in the bilateral relations, it must represent both sides, at least until we call it a relationship, how can we judge the state like the United States do what you want, and the Arab states respond either coercion or force, that such a relationship is called an international relationship with the concept of international relations based on the idyllic image that respects the parties to the relationship.

As for the framework theoretical of American strategy in the Middle East, where the employment of the theory of strength in the US strategy in the Middle East which is based on the actual US strategic behavior in this region, which can be accessed through the features of American targets that seek to achieve in light of the vital interests of it this region because of its advantages of strategy, where the stems of all American interests and objectives of the primary objective of ensuring and confirm the hegemony over the entire world, the United States has justified its interests in this region that has a number of strategic objectives and within the political, economic and security aspects, so were making process. The decision to build these goals through responsible for making the American strategy, which can be divided into: Foundation President - Congress - the national Security Council - the Ministry of Defense - security institutions - the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In regard to the new US strategy in the Middle East, where a series of goals represented that the US administration is seeking to achieve in this region, as a result of the decline in influence of the United States because of the wrong policies pursued during previous administrations, which were imposed on the current administration to take the initiative by asking a set of policies which can handle effectively, and to serve the strategic objectives of the United States in this vital region, and special attention is required on the part of the US administration to how to deal with it, Iran crossed the nuclear threshold and there fragile situation in Iraq, Syria and Yemen, which depletes the armed force US, there are weakness in Lebanon and Palestine under the mounting strength of the armed militias, governments, and of Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in

Palestine, and terrorist movements such as (Daesh) and other militias with high uncertainty surrounds the US administration's policies in the Middle East lines, particularly in the Square of Israeli - Palestinian conflict.

In this context, the US administration has worked to rearrange the priorities of its foreign policy in the Middle East, by not continuing to make Iraq and the Syrian file are two of the key issues as in previous years. That's why the administration creates a progressive image to ease the US military presence in Iraq and the transfer of security responsibility to the Iraqis, and allow Russia to interfere in the Syrian crisis with the help of Iran. But at the same time taking into account that the situation there is still very fragile. So the US administration since the beginning focused on four major issues concerning the political aspect is the Palestinian - Israeli conflict, and in the security aspect, including Iraq and Afghanistan and Iran's nuclear file to the side not to intervene directly in Syria. This created a kind of crisis in the relations between America and the Muslim world and the processes of political development in the Middle East.

In terms of US economic strategy in the Middle East, where it is believed that the American political leaders, that the extension of US control worldwide is the main security key to driving leadership and dedicate it continues, especially after dispel feelings of fear of threats that were posed by the former Soviet presence as a great power rival, and after entering the era of globalization rising under the leadership of the United States, Americans have considered that economic strength, not military force is the only important measure to determine the extent of the fullness of their comprehensive global power, especially with the attempts to reduce competition in the international arena, whether in Europe or in Asia.

The fact that the US economy depends mainly on the giant companies (oil companies, arms companies) and these companies have an impact on the course of US policy and the US decision, because of their strong arms extended all over the world and multinational companies (transnational). For example, equivalent to five companies sales, namely, (General Motors, Wal-Mart, Exxon Mobil, Ford, DaimlerChrysler) exceed the gross domestic product's (182), and entered the US Exxon Mobil oil equivalent a group of Arab Petroleum Exporting OAS income (OAPEC), the economy of General Motors Corp. beyond Denmark's economy, among the five

biggest oil companies in the world there are three US They (Chevron, Exxon Mobil, Amoco), and that Halliburton is one of the world's biggest oil equipment, and began to concern the oil sector since drilling the first well in the United States and specifically in 1859 and accomplished Colonel Drake, and began growing interest since the oil in Pennsylvania, but with the time and the global oil production in 1900 of about 400,000 barrels per day. The increasing interest in oil production to be arrived at the end of the twentieth century to 76 Million barrels per day.

As for the US security strategy in the Middle East, where the shape of the end of the Cold War, the disintegration and demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, the opportunity to the United States of America to revive its hegemony on the world, through the establishment is subject to have an international political and economic order, after it was legitimate entices American politicians after the end of world war II in 1945 in the belief that things were suitable to achieve that after the departure of the United States as the biggest military and economic power of a monopoly on nuclear weapons, in exchange for the weakness of the major military and economic capabilities to European countries and non-European as a result of the war . this world domination was based on US strategy on twobasis: the first is based on amplifying elements of national power and bringing it to the highest echelons of power, according to the proposals of some intellectuals, including realistic thinker Hans Morgenthau, and the second focuses on the work to establish political and economic order, as reported by the US ambassador George Kennan in his book "containment strategy".

Either on the military side and corporate arms, the military-industrial complex is considered the second most important pillars of the US economy and comprises the compound from three sides, namely, (owners of military production companies, figures in the US government have an interest in the military sector and selling arms , deputies from the states benefiting from military spending). US arms companies in control of the arms trade in the world because of its great importance in the United States, where the worker out of every sixteen workers proportion of US workers who are working in the military sector. The California based on functions related to the military sector, and the US Department of Defense employs a quarter of Engineers and US scientists, in addition to that of the 15 largest arms company in the world, nine of them American, for instance (Boeing Co., the first in the world, Northrop Grumman, the second

worldwide, Lockheed Martin is the third in the world, United, General Dynamics occupies sixth place globally Raytheon occupies the fifth largest in the world, Silk company occupies twelfth ranked Tyson Group Technologies occupies the eleventh ranked worldwide (128 computer Siannas Group occupies fifth rank globally.

*Keeping the unipolarity of the United States through a strategy of domination.*

Under this international environment, the American orientation in which to dominate the world, it was natural that the strategically important regions affected, particularly the highly sensitive to any effects of the strategy shifts the Middle East in the restructuring of the international system, being associated with a relationship of mutual effect with the international system since the end of World war II, the global balance affect regional balances and vice versa, were shifts in the global balance of the disappearance of one of poles must affect the results strongly in this region at the heart of Iraq through lack of margin of independent maneuver in front of some Arab countries, especially the so-called countries of the confrontation, the Soviet Union was in the bilateral balance era is one of the alternatives in front of some Arab countries, at least to reduce the Western hegemony space, as well as the decline of the Arab role, the Arab and the ability to influence the international pattern, resulting in a decline in the level of interest in their issues because of the increased dependency of the United States on The international environment after the collapse.

Thus, we find that the differences witnessed by the regime since the early nineties, have led to a favorable international positive for the implementation of the goals of American policy in the Middle East.

In the end, despite all the above, I think it cannot be decisive on the ongoing conflict in the Middle East, and determine winners and losers in it, not international poles, nor of regional actors, this open conflict on the time, place and issues, that kind of historical conflicts. It can determine the shape of the region, and the formation of societies for decades to come.

In this sense, we fear that the Arabs deals with water battle as they dealt with the battle of petroleum oil , where they lost the oil battle and will win the water battle , knowing that who controls the water and controlled, it can be controlled land and human together.

*US policies in the region after the Arab Spring and its views of the Islamic movements.*

Over the past four decades, and so far, the United States believes that the survival of its interests in the Middle East, linked to the persistence Arab-Israeli conflict, and therefore USA sided to Israel in this conflict, and remained this vision a constant feature of US foreign policy, since the end of the American competition - Soviet, but it has increased in fact by the end of this competition.

It came in a meeting with Chas Freeman, US ambassador in Saudi Arabia, the former assistant and former defense minister, in his article that he did not believe that the American people are about to elect a president who can govern effectively end the imbalance in Washington. Whatever the president, who will be chosen, it will be considered as illegal by the supporters of the rival candidate, where Freeman sees it as did the Republicans of trying to discredit President Obama over 8 years, the opponents will try to overthrow the next president.

Freeman said that after a careful analysis of the volatility of the opinion of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump on the Middle East and others he felt that Trump seems as five people share the same body, different views, and at a time when Clinton presented herself as a god of air strikes and the war drones also sees Freeman, but Monday represent the nation's traditional policies that are supposed to led approach which makes them resemble each other to the degree that makes Hits discussing together better than discuss each of them separately.

Freeman believes that the candidates want to isolate Iran, and loved economic war more than trade and investment, and agreed the two on the Iraq war before they reject him, and would prefer to intervene in private matters in the Middle East more than an attempt to understand, and do not see that terrorism of an act that is normal as a result of the humiliation and social marginalization and believe that the bombing is the best way to respond to what they see religiously offensive, and do not like Egypt and wish Saudi Arabia will be wiped out. If elected

to either of them, they will give Israel what you need to fend off a bout of political anger. In short, Freeman believes that the next president will focus on the coverage of the chaos caused by the former presidents in the Middle East.

Arab-Israeli conflict the United States has caused considerable tension, with respect to internal or external interests, especially during times of crisis, where the major problems arising in the field of foreign policy, and in the periods that are free of crises, tension eased due to the formulation of US policy toward the Arab conflict Israeli. It has brought about the end of the Cold War and the Gulf War II in 1990 changes in US policy, in many respects. \ the United States after the end of the Cold War, is commencing confiscation of its results to its advantage, by installing itself as the leader of the world from end to below, it was decided behavior rules and the formulation of international relations, individually in the foundation of a global system of single-polar, and was the starting events in Kosovo and the subsequent reminded of the occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the door is open for new wars, and thus make a powerful jolt every few rules of international stability, and embark on starting a new era, characterized by the abolition of state sovereignty for the big interests of international peace and security.

#### *The main challenges facing US policy after the Arab Spring*

- declining hegemonic stability and policies gain of one party theory.
- The shift in the Middle East is not commensurate with the political theories it prevailed supporting dictatorships as long as they serve the interests of America.
- The biggest shift in power is the power of political Islam movements that have the attitudes and policies that are contrary to a number of US policies in the region.
- Increased security risks on the Israeli entity because of the rise of radical political currents have an ideological position of the Zionist project, which is leading the campaign against it in the region, and support the Palestinian resistance and the Palestinian people's rights.

With regard to the political transformations in the Arab countries, with regard to the popular revolutions even topple regimes, protests and demonstrations, lobbying or political reform process where American policy and its strategic vision has received a strong blow out its capabilities and its dynamics and its outskirts for accounts with the thinking and intelligence centers, where the monitor initial responses of the American reaction to the these transformations

and analyzes the academy gave the impression that there is a shock suffered by the US administration's mind, which is trying to look for a helper and direction to interfere one way or another in the transformation processes, or at least in the interim outputs, as a prelude to maintain its vital interests in the region at some point after revolutions and transitions, and despite the divergence American behavior toward each Arab country on the other, the ruling factors were mostly local factors both in terms of time disposable, or in terms of the ability of friends on the formation of attendance and participation in the transformation or beyond, or at the level of the vital interests America where, or at the state level weight and shift in influence on US policy and these interests, hence the quick administration US-despite the setback, which affected a lot of institutions and personalities funded with its Arab allies - the initiative to adopt and promote support for any democratic transition, including pressure on its allies in states that did not reach it ,the winds of fear for change of bringing it down or uprooted, but it was unable to control the path of transformation by a large margin in most of this country, while assigned to the European allies and others taking a greater role until the heightened security risks to the Israeli entity, and because of the rise of political currents have a radical ideological position of the Zionist project, which is leading the campaign against it in the region.

Taking the subject of research for the role of the USA in the revolutions and beyond, and after discussions of the United States officially with the Islamic movements, particularly the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Al Nahdain Tunisia, a large area of the dialogue in the Arab media, and there were a lot of analysis and rumors and leaks, and given the importance of this shift in the district administration on the one hand and in the international deal with them on the other hand, the recollection and study of American policies in light of the Arab revolutions, trends and challenges is a useful issue to mature dialogue and expand the scope and depth by researchers, politicians, journalists and Arab experts, and so it was this analysis center at this time , which will address the main US policy properties, and highlighted the challenges faced after the Arab spring, and shifts in the sources of the real threat to American interests in the region, and the problem of the US attitude towards the Arab region, and the available options to the United States to deal with the region after the Arab spring.

US policy in general has characteristics of private properties based on theories derived from the geo-strategic and vital interests in the region or geographically, and most important of these characteristics it depends on the regional and local in securing its interests allies, and it depends on the regional allies which may leave the they are turning to the intractable cases, and they have become a burden it either because they have lost their role or because they are at risk of projection .. as happened !, which abandon its allies in favor of the new alternates mightly quickly, when you can secure most interests if a certain stage, as important to the United States local and regional interests to a certain degree but it does not cry over the loss of an ally whatever and however long the duration and type of services provided by, which is also grown armies in geographically allies as advanced armies as a standby force used when the collapse of the existing system in other countries, and depends on the individual leadership of the world and control the global trade and owning a global military power politics, and ensure an alliance with Europe in international policies and Exceptions in some details, even the economic and policy toward some European countries.

Here we see that there is almost changesthat may look like in the future political approved by the United States, where the I mentioned is that most governments around the world to see all of this on their own, although this will not stop itfrom harassing its diplomats in Washington and New York non-stop, in order to get it hint for the dimension that Trump remarks that are restricted in being more outrageous attempts aiming to dominate the news agenda for a few hours. Fortunately, his comments were too vague to the point where it would be easy to evade them between now and the date of his inauguration. Will the real foreign policy positions appear only with the formation of the Council of Ministers of Trump when it becomes clear who will be in a position of responsibility?But if future policy remained unknown, it is likely to be chargedby US national strength, along with economic populism and isolationism, are determined by the general mood. The Trump has described the Americans invariably as they are the victims of foul machinations hatched in foreign countries, which has not faced in the past any real resistance from the elite American incompetent anda maid of theself.

This type of aggressive nationalism is not unique and is limited to Trump. In all parts of the world is undergoing re-nationalism remarkable resurgence in several countries, from Turkey to

the Philippines. And successful way to protest in Britain, France, Germany, Austria and Eastern Europe has become. Although filming Trump from time to time as a distinctive American phenomenon, the populist nationalism of the shocking amount in common with those of the supporters "Brixt" campaign in Britain -or even with chauvinism of President RecepTayyipErdogan in Turkey. It is possible to be overlooked for much of this and consider it a national ornate rhetoric, but there is a current undershirt under threat of racism and the demonization of the other, whether it is directed against illegal immigrants in the United States or refugee seekers in Britain, or the Kurds in southeast Turkey.

In fact, Trump did not provide only as much as very few suggestions to bring about a radical change in American foreign policy during the election campaign, except for saying that he will cancel the agreement with Iran on its nuclear program -ally despite the fact that his staff are now less decisive on the subject; where only say that the deal must be implemented properly. No one really knows whether Trump would deal differently about Obama with countries blocks stretching from Pakistan to Nigeria, where there are seven wars raging at least At Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Somalia, southern Sudan, in addition to four serious insurgencies.

Perhaps the most wars in which the United States is engaged militarily dangerous, is the war that is raging in Iraq and Syria, and here suggests Comments Trump during the campaign that will focus on the destruction of "Daesh," and the realization inherent in excessive entanglement military threat and looking forward to some kind of cooperation with Russia as the largest player in the next conflict. This is something similar to what happens already.

Hillary Clinton's intentions were in Syria, even if shedid not find herway to express them at all, always seem more inclined to interventionist intentions Trump. It was one of her advisers are the senior has explicitly proposed to grant a lower priority to attack the "Daesh" and give greater priority to get rid of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. To this end, it was scheduled to form a third force of moderates, militant supporters of the United States to fight and defeat in the end to "Daesh" and Assad regime alike. Perhaps this perception fantasy did not come true, but the fact of thinking about it refers to the extent to which Clinton had it ready to undergo a foreign policy establishment in Washington.

President Obama has developed a sense of a much more intelligent what he can or what USA cannot do in the United States, the Middle East and beyond, without causing crises transcend political and military power. Its strength may have become less than it was before the failed interventions Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan in the wake of 9/11, but it is still far greater than the power of any other country. At the moment, the United States, which coordinates with the successful counter-offensive against the last strongholds for the organization "Daesh" in Mosul and tenderness, which waged a stubborn multiple parties in Iraq and Syria? It was not at all clear how seriously should one has to take Clinton's proposals to establish "safe areas," and try to fight, "Daesh" and the Assad at the same time. But the provisions of the developments in the Middle East since the invasion of Iraq in 2003 involved a flawed idea about what can be achieved.

Trump instincts seem generally less well-informed, but they are often clever, nothing to do with its priorities in the Middle East. The leaders of the United States, the former has felt the same thing, but eventually ended up in the habit to be dragged to the crises in one way or another, and then become the way in which they have carried out there real test of their quality and their quality as leaders. That area and were a political graveyard for three of the last five US presidents: destroy Jimmy Carter because of the repercussions of the Iranian revolution; and Ronald Reagan's weakness is largely due to the Iran-Contra scandal; and will remember the years of George W. Bush's presidency mainly disasters brought on by the invasion of Iraq. Barack Obama was luckier and more rational, but he underestimated the rise of "Daesh" until the group was able to seize Mosul in 2014.

#### *America and the new project in the Middle East.*

The "Arab Spring", is supposed to be as promoted by some Arab nationalists and leftists, conspiracy to complete the project, the US deferred to create what is known as the "New Middle East." The fact that there is an American role, stressing undeniable in the eruption of this spring, specifically the pressure that the United States exerted on Arab regimes following the terrorist bombings in the 11th of September 2001. these pressures revealed to the people the size of the fragility and vulnerability of these systems at every level only tyranny, and to the extent that "reluctance and resistance," such as Libya, Gaddafi and Syria's Assad, to be salaried with the

arch-enemy, the United States, whereupon it behalf to perform the task dirtiest, the "torture by proxy" for the accused of terrorism in accordance with the American definition alone.

Otherwise, a supporter of tyranny in the Arab world does not offer any real indicators implausible about American conspiracy recruited for her whole peoples from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf! Indeed, the indicators available to those who did not have access to the unseen show quite the opposite.

It is expected that US President-elect Donald Trump adopt a different policy towards the Middle East for the current administration's policies, headed by Barack Obama... Not this difference is merely the difference between the Republican and Democratic policies in the ruling, but that it comes more different approach that Trump did not hide during his election campaign... in general, Trump believes that his country is the cause of the chaos in the Middle East because of its invasion of Iraq, he said in a debate during the preliminary race in February.

*Conclusion and scenarios about the future of US relations with the Arab world.*

What the United States wants in the Middle East based on the policy that looks to some sometimes it passes in a state of confusion or disorder revealed by successive US administration for a change in US policies toward the Middle East pronouncements, has become the answer to the intuitive and well-known questions to everyone and do not require much effort to determine what the aim of the result of policies that seem troubled at times and a changing at another time, the truth is a consistent policy not merely change that undergo or what seem to some that trouble only tactical actions that do not affect the core of American foreign policy, in Palestine , Lebanon , Iraq , Afghanistan or toward Iran and the issue of nuclear weapons and the whole Middle East region where many exotic questions are raised around, where I see that the ethical dimension claimed by US foreign policy toward the Middle East fell down , whether in Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq, Syria or Sudan Somalia , Yemen or Libya, and even Tunisia, as a New Middle East enjoys security, stability, peace, development , freedom and democracy sought by the US foreign policy is nothing but a false slogan covers on the real objectives of seeking to American foreign policy.

Where there is no agreement between the experts and analysts, Americans and non-Americans alike, on the characterization of the "new shift" in the US strategy toward the Middle East; while some argue that "isolation" or "withdrawal" from the area, others believe it is moving away from traditional allies (Gulf countries, for example) and move closer towards new allies (Iran), while a third party believes that the United States is just re-directing its strength, its accounts and tools to achieve the goals and interests of the American with evidence that it did not withdraw military forces in the region, or even re-deployed them.

In addition, I see that the United States is seeking, through its policy that looks troubled in the Middle East to sustain its issues, problems and crises that may give it the right moment to tighten control over it and to keep its blatant interference in the internal and external public affairs, the US policy is well aware that the key to security stability and lasting peace for the countries and peoples of the Middle East is to:

1. Develop a just and lasting end to the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of international legitimacy and activate its uncompromised on both sides of the conflict.
- 2.
2. End its military occupation and withdraw its armies and fleets and military bases that have surrounded the area and control it
- 3- Stopping its interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East, which exacerbate the phenomenon of political and social stability across the stir ethnic and sectarian strife and in many other countries?

*The most important outlooks of the US relations in the Middle East:*

First, the US strategy in mostly long-term is not linked to the President or one department, but there is no agreement among observers and analysts on whether the orientations of President Obama will remain private, managed approach or whether it will continue to represent the next administration strategy.

Second, with respect to trends next US administration towards the region, it's historical experience and can be expected to Hillary Clinton - in the event of winning the presidency - will play a more active role in the region more than Obama, and will be a strong partner of the Gulf States.

Third, is the US position on Iran is uncertain, and there will be a period of fluctuation in the relationship with Iran to see whether Iran would change its policies or not. In all cases, it is not possible for Iran to become a strategic ally of the United States, as it is unlikely that the United States accept the dominance of capital is friendly to the Gulf region; what means the continuation of the policy of the balance of power in the region.

Fourth, in an attempt to predict the future scenarios of the Gulf region, it is through the reality of Arab policy analysis, and the Gulf in particular, rather than relying on US policy, there are three possible scenarios:

The first scenario is optimistic of the construction of Gulf system of self-reliance at first and then depending on the alliances, as well as the solution of regional problems and the rehabilitation of Iran at the same time.

The Second scenario is pessimistic, which may include a regional solution problematic without building a new regional security framework, anticipating the intervention of other powers in order to protect the security of the Gulf, including Israel, Russia, China and India. This scenario is the most likely.

The third most pessimistic scenario is the failure to build a new security system, as well as the failure to solve the regional problems and the failure of the national transformation policies, and the growing problem of extremism and terrorism, growing poverty and unemployment problems. The nations and peoples of the Middle East are more knowledgeable of their priorities and needs than the United States and more capable than it to find appropriate policies that will lead them to the stability, security and peace, and the trend towards economic and human, cultural and political development, but direct colonial policy by the United States and its ally Israel that

exercises ,is responsible for perpetuating the crises in the Middle East and raised and diversity, so the criteria of the United States and Arab countries to classifying radical states and moderate again, is only the unrealistic and disingenuous rating aimed at driving a wedge between the Arab countries and makes an excuse and a cover for policies deceptive and evasive and that tiptoe through benefits that oblige them to put an end to its policies and its ally Israel policies that based on the aggression and domination and wasted Arab rights individually and collectively, Arab countries identified national and national priorities and they are not unable but there are a lot of Arab initiatives towards drawing unity policies and find ways of democracy to be capable of lifting the Arab peoples level for the better development and prosperity.

A lot of American interventions that fired the Arab-confidence at all levels towards the American administration's policy in Arab affairs. Where the United States has sought to perpetuate the Arab-Israeli conflict and to maintain certain levels of the stress granted permanence and continuity and to keep it under control at the same time and was manifested in the empty foundations of the peace process launched in Madrid in October / 1991 of the content and marginalize the role of the United Nations and international legitimacy, while we find the United States coveted international legitimacy and frameworks UN to justify its intervention in many countries, especially the Arab countries such as Lebanon's case or Sudan or Iraq or Syria or Yemen or Libya .. etc. as looming frameworks of international legitimacy and using them to interfere in Iran's open case and its repercussions on all probabilities of diplomatic, political, economic and military, it all comes in the context of its policy of tearing the Middle East region through its drive to blow more conflicts so it looks including the Arab-Israeli conflict like a minor conflict of the region's conflicts that this case of spiral permanent violence and instability to the Middle East an ideal situation for US policy to maintain a presence and intervention and tighten its control over the entire Middle East and keep its ally Israel is strong and a free hand in the exercise of its aggression on the Palestinian people and on any country deemed interests or the interests of the United States that, as happened last summer with Lebanon or waving Israel toward Iran as it did in the Iraqi nuclear reactor in July 1981 and the actual participation of US troops in the occupation and destruction of Iraq in 2003. Not to mention the nuclear deal with Iran and firing the position, which led to a flagrant threat to Arab national security?

The US administration should realize that being disregard for the countries and peoples of the Arab region will not only lead to more violence and instability, this underrated manifested recently in the new old policy toward Iraq, which was summed up by the US Defense Secretary Robert Gates ((rehabilitation of Iraq to become a bulwark against Iranian ambitions in the Arab region)) this American policy comes after Iraq destroyed the state and the people and institutions were completely destroyed and after it developed under the effective control groups and militias loyal to Iran !!! Can any sane person believe such a policy heralded by Robert Gates?! It is US policy that ignores the mind of the peoples and governments of the Arab Middle East region.

This US policy toward the Arabs in all their countries, whether in Iraq or in Palestine, Sudan, or in Lebanon or to Afghanistan and Iran, which some analysts and observers believe that it is characterized by flop turmoil, the fact that it does not flop, but moving towards one specific which perpetuate this crisis and make it hatch or give birth to new crises to become the region's crises complex, intertwined, difficult to understand and disassembly. the crisis gives birth to the crisis and give birth with a new reason for the continuation of direct US hegemony on the region of the Middle East, and such a policy achieves the interests of the United States and its ally, the only one in the region which is Israel, when will the Arab peoples and governments be aware of the fact of that policy risks of USA in the region's crises management.

It is a policy that lacks any ethical dimension and does not hold any weight to any Arab interest, it is investigating the American-Israeli interests only and that it is based only on the legitimacy of power, domination and influence. It is one direction policy, and it is not floundering as some people of us may think, even that Americans politicians showed some frivolity and disarray in the performance of their political duties.

### *References*

- Gauzzone, Laura., ed. (2010,) *The Middle East in Global Change: The Politics and Economics*.
- Feldman, L. *The Impact of Bush linking 9/11 and Iraq*, 14th March 2003. *Iraq in Transition*. Accessed on 10th February 2005.

- Feldman, N. (2004) *The Best Hope*. In Abou El Fadl, K. (2004) *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy*. Princeton University Press, USA.
- Dr. Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *American Diplomacy towards the Crucial Issues in the Iranian Nuclear Crisis*, *British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 99 September 2011, Vol. 1 (2).
- Pilger, J. (2003). *The New Rulers of the World*. Verso, UK & USA.
- Dr. Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *THE FUTURE OF ARAB SPRING, REALITY AND AMBITION*, *G.J.I.S.S.*, Vol.3(4):136-146 (July-August, 2014).ISSN: 2319-8834.
- Abou El Fadl, K. (2004) *Islam and the Challenge of Democracy*. Princeton University Press, USA.
- Chomsky, N. (2004). *Hegemony or Survival? America's Quest for Global Dominance*. Penguin Books, USA.
- Barry, T. *On the Road to Damascus? Neo-Cons Target Syria*. *Global Policy Forum*. 8th March 2004. Accessed on 10th January, 2004, *Interdependence versus Fragmentation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Hammond, Paul Y. and Alexander, Sidney S., eds. *Political Dynamics in the Middle East*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
- Wells, Samuel F. and Bruzonsky, Mark A., eds. *Security in the Middle East: Regional Change and Great Power Strategies*. Boulder: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1987.
- Yezid, Sayigh and Shlaim, Avi, eds. *The Cold War and the Middle East*. Oxford-Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh, *THE IMPACT OF THE INFORMATION REVOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS*, *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration* Vol.2, No.5, pp. 1-22, December 2014 Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK ([www.eajournals.org](http://www.eajournals.org)).
- Khalidi, Rashid. *Resurrecting Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.
- Hinnebusch, Raymond A., and Anoushiravan Ehteshami. *The Foreign Policies of Middle East States*. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002.

- Chomsky, Noam."A Modest Proposal." Last modified December 3, 2002. <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20021203.htm>.
- Dr. Al-Rawashdeh Mohammad Salim, Gulf Cooperation Council States (GCC), Military power, between temporary alliances and Permanent joint Mechanisms. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714 [www.ijhssi.org](http://www.ijhssi.org) ||Volume 4 Issue 8 || August. 2015 || PP.71-88.
- Dr.Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh,The Regional competition for the leadership of the Middle East region (Yet “leadership” is a highly subjective word. What kind of “leadership?” and from whose perspective?) Mohammad Salimal-Rawashdeh.; Sch. J. Arts.Humanit. Soc. Sci., March 2016; 4(3A). Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences ISSN 2347-5374 (Online) Sch. J. Arts Humanit. Soc. Sci. 2016; 4(3A):176-192 ISSN 2347-9493,(SAS Publishers) (An International Publisher for Academic and Scientific Resources).
- U.S. Foreign Aid After September 11th: <http://search.npr.org/cf/cmn/cmnpd01fm.cfm?PrgDate=03/26/2002&PrgID=5>  
Talk of the Nation discusses the Bush administration's proposed increase in U.S. aid to foreign countries. It is a part of a broader campaign in the war on terrorism to fight poverty.
- Dr. Mohammad Salim Al-Rawashdeh ,The Impact of the Secular Traditions on the Development of the Turkish Political System, Research on Humanities and Social Sciences [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org) ISSN (Paper)2224-5766 ISSN (Online)2225-0484 (Online) Vol.4, No.6, 2014.
- Looking for Answers: Why Is America the Target of Militant Islam?: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/terrorism/saudi/whyus.html>  
U.S. policymakers and Saudi and Iraqi dissidents talk to Frontline about the reasons for anti-U.S. hatred in the Islamic world.
- 50 Years of US Policy in the Middle East: <http://www.csmonitor.com/2001/0927/p25s1-wome.html>
- A Middle East History: <http://www.theworld.org/archive/mideast/mideast.htm>  
The World tells the history of the Middle East in an effort to understand the current conflict and tension.
- DR. Al-Rawashdeh Mohammad Salim,The Security Strategy Crisis in the Middle East, International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS) A Peer-Reviewed Bi-

monthly Bi-lingual Research Journal ISSN: 2349-6959 (Online), ISSN: 2349-6711 (Print)  
Volume-II, Issue-IV, January 2016 <http://search.npr.org/cf/cmnmn01fm.cfm?PrgDate=04/01/2002&PrgID=5>

Talk of the Nation asks experts what the U.S. strategy should be towards the ongoing conflict in the Middle East.

- Islamic Revolution:  
[http://www.pbs.org/visavis/islam\\_rev\\_mstr.html](http://www.pbs.org/visavis/islam_rev_mstr.html)

Vis à Vis explores why the '79 Revolution took place and what has happened since then.

- The international politics journal, Egypt, Cairo.
- Al-Rainews paper , Jordan Amman.
- Albayian news papr. UAE.
- Aldostoornews paper . Jordan –Amman.
- Alahramnews paper ,Egypt-Cairo.
- Al-qudosnews paper, Kuwait.
- Jordan Times, Jordan-Amman.
- Al-sharqal-awsat .Lebanon.