

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University 08 Mai 1945 -Guelma-

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of Letters and English Language

جامعة 8 ماي 1945 -قائمة-

كلية الآداب واللغات

قسم الآداب واللغة الانجليزية



America's Soft vs. Hard Power toward the Arab Countries
Cases of Jordan and Iraq during: 2001-2008

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of Master's Degree in Anglophone Language,
Literatures, and Civilizations.

Submitted by:

DAOUI Bessma

Supervised by:

Mrs. CHELGHOUM Adila

Board of Examiners

Chairman: Mr. ATY Mourad	(MA/B)	8 Mai 1945/Guelma University
Supervisor: Mrs. CHELGHOUM Adila	(MA/B)	8 Mai 1945/Guelma University
Examiner: Mrs. LAYADA Radia	(MA/B)	8 Mai 1945/Guelma University

2016-2017

Acknowledgement

I would thank everyone who contributed and supported me in the fulfillment of this humble dissertation:

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of my supervisor Mrs. CHELGHOUM Adila. I am grateful for your encouragement, great patience, valuable guidance and priceless advice. I like also, to thank members of the jury, Mr. ATY Mourad, the president, Mrs. LAYADA Radia, the examiner, for their precious time offered to read and improve this dissertation.

Special thanks go to my previous teachers: Ms. Boumella Nedjma at the middle school, and Ms. Fedawi Dounya at the secondary school, who were my source of inspiration to love and learn English language.

I am thankful to my dearest and close friends: Sabah, Latifa, Soumia and Hadjer who have always buoyed me up during difficult moments.

Great thanks to all teachers at the English Department of 8 May 1945-Guelma University.

Dedication

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

I dedicate this work to my beloved family and friends.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my parents, my father Mohamed, and my mother Moulouka who supported me throughout my entire educational path; I would thank them for their love, unending support and guidance. I would to thank my brothers: Djamel, Azou and little Sami.

This is for you Dad and Mom, without you I would not be what I am now.

Abstract

This dissertation intends to explore some perspectives of the two forms of power “hard” and “soft”, and U.S. foreign policy toward the Arab countries. From the one hand, the present study sheds light on U.S. goals of implementing the soft power, which focuses on power of attractiveness driven from American culture, values and foreign policies. From the other hand, the research focuses on U.S. use of hard power. The United States pervasive hegemony hinges its foreign policy toward other countries; it may use either foreign aids to pursue its strategic goals or military coercion. The study probes the question about U.S. implementation of its hard and soft power during the period of 2001-2008 in the following two cases. The first case is the U.S. implementation of soft power with Jordan, the latter has been a close ally for America; their ties were characterized with cooperation on a number of issues. The second case is U.S. use of hard power toward Iraq, focusing on the Iraq invasion of 2003 and U.S. desire to overthrow the regime of the Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein who was threatening the U.S. security. Since the rationales of the U.S. occupation of Iraq were not justified, many Arab, as well as, non-Arab countries condemned the invasion that brought negative effects on U.S. relations with the entire Middle East and decreased U.S. hegemony also.

ملخص

يعنى هذا البحث بدراسة بعض خصائص نوعين من القوة "قوة متشددة" و"قوة لينية", و السياسة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية مع الدول العربية. من جهة هذه الدراسة تسلط الضوء على أهداف الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية من خلال تطبيقها للقوة اللينة. ومن جهة أخرى يركز هذا البحث على استعمال الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية للقوة المتشددة. السيطرة الشاملة للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تتوقف على سياستها الخارجية مع دول أخرى, تستطيع أن تستعمل المساعدات الخارجية لتحقيق أهدافها الإستراتيجية, كما تستطيع استعمال الإكراه العسكري. هذه الدراسة تستقصي الأسئلة المتعلقة باستعمال الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية للقوة اللينة و القوة المتشددة خلال الفترة مابين 2001-2008 في الحالات الآتية: الحالة الأولى استعمال الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية للقوة اللينة مع الأردن التي كانت حليف مقرب لأمريكا, تميزت العلاقة بينهما بالتعاون حول العديد من المواضيع. الحالة الثانية استعمال الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية للقوة المتشددة في العراق مع التركيز على احتلال العراق 2003 و رغبة أمريكا في إسقاط حكم صدام حسين الذي كان يهدد امن الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. أسباب الاحتلال كانت غير مبررة الكثير من الدول العربية و الأجنبية أدانت هذا الاحتلال الذي نتج عنه أثار سلبية على علاقة الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية بالشرق الأوسط كما انه انقص من سيطرة الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية أيضا.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AMRAAMs	Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles
CENTCOM	The United States Central Command
CTBT	Comprehension Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
ESF	Economic Support Funds
FMCT	Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty
FMF	Foreign Military Financing
GID	General Intelligence Directorate
IPC	Iraq Petroleum Company
IR	International Relation
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and Levant
ISIS	Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
KRG	Kurdistan Regional Government
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NNS	National Security Strategy
NPT	Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty

PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
QIZs	Qualifying Industrial Zones
START	Strategic Nuclear Reduction Treaty
UN	United Nations
US	United States
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
W.W. I	World War I
W.W. II	World War II

List of Tables

Table 1: Differences between Soft and Hard Powers.....	10
Table 2: Foundations of Soft Power.....	15
Table 3: Jordan: US Foreign Aid (In \$USD Millions).....	40

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter one: A Background of the American Hard and Soft Powers.....	4
1.1. Context for the Emergence of “Soft” and “Hard” Powers.....	5
1.2. Definition of Soft Power.....	7
1.3. Soft Power Vs Hard Power.....	8
1.4. Resources of Soft Power.....	11
1.4.1. Culture.....	11
1.4.2. Political Values.....	12
1.4.3. Foreign Policies.....	12
1.5. Limitations and Vulnerabilities of Soft Power	16
1.6. Bush Administration and Hard Power.....	18
1.7. Obama’s Administration and Soft Power.....	20
Chapter Two: U.S. Implementation of Soft Power toward the Arab Countries:	
Cooperation with Jordan.....	23
2.1. A Brief History of the United States and Jordan Relations.....	24
2.2. Beginning of U.S. Involvement in the Arab Countries.....	26
2.3. U.S. Interests in the Middle East.....	28
2.4. Jordan: U.S. Relations and Bilateral Issues.....	31
2.4.1. Promoting Peace in the Middle East.....	31
2.4.2. Terrorism.....	33
2.4.3. Nuclear Cooperation.....	34
2.4.4. Economic and Military Assistance	34

2.4.5. Trade Cooperation.....	35
2.5. United States Foreign Policy toward Jordan 2001-2008.....	35
2.5.1. Political Arena.....	36
2.5.2. Economic and Commercial Arena.....	38
2.5.3. Military Arena.....	39
Chapter Three: U.S. Implementation of Hard Power toward Iraq.....	40
3.1. A Synopsis about U.S- Iraq Relations.....	41
3.2. U.S. Invasion of Iraq in 2003: Circumstances and Causes.....	44
3.2.1. The New Middle East Plan.....	45
3.2.2. Iraq’s WMD.....	46
3.2.3. Oil Plans.....	47
3.2.4. Israel Security.....	48
3.2.5. The Persian Gulf War.....	49
3.3.Theories about the Iraq War.....	49
3.3.1. Realism.....	50
3.3.2. Liberalism.....	51
3.3.3. Marxism.....	52
3.3.4. Elite Interests.....	52
3.3.5. Ideological Influences.....	53
3.4. The Impact of Iraq’s Invasion on U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East.....	54
3.4.1. Expansion of Terrorism.....	55
3.4.2. Shift of Power: From Global Actors to Regional and Domestic Actors.....	56
3.4.3. Competition of Power between Iran and Saudi Arabia.....	58
Conclusion.....	60

Introduction

The U.S. has long possessed a superior defense capability, and has long strove to maintain its political, economic and military powers unchallengeable and incomparable. Although America believes in alliances; its central objective is always the maintenance of the U.S. military superiority. A common concept among Arab countries is that Americans pay a lip service to the people of the Middle East while supporting a more self-interested agenda. To manage its international relations, and achieve its goals in the Arab countries, America uses both soft and hard powers which are two sides of the same coin.

To preserve its global hegemony, on one hand America uses its hard power, as it has been exercised in Iraq, in a four-week campaign and toppled Saddam Hussein in 2003. The war in Iraq was anticipated to decisively assert the military dimension of hegemony; smashing Saddam Hussein' authoritarian regime seeking to promote democracy instead. On the other hand, Jordan is a best incarnation of American soft power. Despite conflict on its borders, the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan appears to remain a relatively stable and reliable partner for the United States in the Arab world.

The United States emerged as super power from the destruction of the W.W.II.; it sought to spread its hegemony all over the world. The Middle East is a centerpiece for U.S. global hegemony; foreign relations between the Middle Eastern states vary from cooperation to hostility, whatever the type of relations is, the U.S' main goal is to achieve its objectives and to maintain its control and dominance over the region. In this respect, the present study tries to investigate the U.S. foreign policy toward the Arab countries during the period between 2001-2008, under the presidency of George W. Bush. It focuses on U.S. implementation of its soft power in Jordan, and hard power in Iraq. While the

concept of American soft power is linked to culture attractiveness, political values and foreign policies, this form of power encourages peaceful ties among countries, and economic investments. Hard power is related to the use of military force and coercion.

Through the proposed research we are going to probe the reasons behind U.S. shift from soft power to hard power while conducting its foreign policy with Arab countries. The current research, as mentioned above focuses on shedding light on America's use of a completely two different strategies, the combination and sometimes a shift from coercion to cooperation to fulfill its purposes. The findings obtained from this study, also will help to uncover facts about the exercise of hard power in Iraq that broke Saddam Hussein's regime; meanwhile, the soft power in Jordan and the mutual relationships between the Jordanians and Americans. This research is worth doing in the sense that it makes students understand America's relation to the rest of the world; it is significant as it makes us understand the nature of an aspect of the American power.

This study is divided into three chapters, an introduction and a conclusion. The first chapter entitled "A Background of the American Hard and Soft Powers" is devoted to explore the origins of the two concepts; soft and hard powers, their emergence and contextual use, explore perspectives of United States soft and hard powers. Also, the study is an attempt to differentiate between the two forms of power, their importance in U.S. foreign policies and their vulnerabilities, as well.

The second chapter entitled "U.S. Implementation of Soft Power toward the Arab Countries: Cooperation with Jordan" is devoted to shed light on Americans' cooperation with Arab countries, notably Jordan. It deals with the first case study "Jordan" which is an ally for the U.S. giving a background about relations of the two countries. Also, this

chapter deals with the mutual relations of the two countries, American assistance to Jordan in different arenas and Jordan's support for the United States to keep its hegemony over other countries of the Middle East.

The third chapter entitled "U.S. Implementation of Hard Power toward Iraq" deals with the second case study "Iraq"; it tries to explore U.S. use of military coercion in Iraq. The chapter gives a background about U.S.-Iraq relations and tries to investigate reasons behind U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003; it explores rationales of overthrowing Saddam Hussein's regime, the aftermaths of the occupation and its consequences on U.S. relations with other countries of the Middle East.

Thus, in order to make this research both a credible and a reliable one, it is important to provide original references relying on previous studies, researches and investigations about the current issue. Therefore, the present work relies on literature review which serves to provide further explanations and information about the subject under study.

As regards to methodology, the research is not interested in using descriptive and historical comparative methods. Concerning the descriptive method, the study will make use of a description of the emergence of American hard and soft powers and their use in the Arab world. In addition, the research tends to provide some historical events and clarifies the status of America as a hegemonic power. The comparative method is based on comparing Jordan as being cooperated with the U.S. and Iraq as seen as an enemy for the U.S. and has been coerced and invaded. In addition to the qualitative data relying heavily on the contributions of scholars from political science and international relations.

Chapter one

A Background of the American Hard and Soft Powers

Chapter one is devoted to explore the origins of the two concepts “hard” and “soft” powers, shedding light on their emergence, resources and their usage by American Presidents. Power as a key of success for any nation, plays a great role in maintaining control over others using either attraction or coercion, and sometimes both. This is the case for the United States, who in its turn strives all the time to impose its ideologies on other countries in order to keep its position a uniquely powerful; the U.S. military capabilities are unmatched. Furthermore, the United States has shown a willingness to utilize both its military and soft powers in pursuit of its interests in the Arab countries.

In this respect, on one hand, America tends to opt for military intervention. The attitude of its policy makers has been always “can do”; and often it is the military that does the doing. Also, the United States’ most important relationships are expressed primarily in terms of military activities: North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for Europe and the Security Treaty for Japan. On the other hand, America may use its soft power to achieve its goals; in this respect opinion polls concluded that many people like the American values, American culture, and American people, but not necessarily they like American policy. For example, American Hollywood is held up as important source of soft power.

Despite the fact that both forms of power, hard and soft are ways to achieve desired goals, they may be harmful if they are used in unsuitable context. The history of the United States witnessed the advent of many presidents, who opted sometimes for coercion “hard power” and other times chose attraction “soft power” to meet their interests, for

example, the President George W. Bush's administration was based upon menaces, sanctions and spreading a "war on terror", that is to say a hard power administration. Conversely, President Barack Obama has been advocating the use of diplomacy and development aid, beside the treaties that sought nuclear disarmament, specifically his idealistic vision of a "Zero nuclear world".

1.1. Context for the Emergence of "Soft" and "Hard" Powers

In 1970, Robert Dahl has defined power as "the ability to get another actor to do what it would not otherwise have done or not to do what it would otherwise done" (qtd in Brown 91). However, this definition is not complete because it does not address the power of an actor who wants what others want. Another more encompassing definition of power, was introduced by Joseph Nye "the ability to influence the behavior of others to get the outcomes one wants" (Nye 2). In this respect power is divided into various types, as Joseph Nye notes: "there are several ways [successful and unsuccessful] to affect the behavior of others" (Nye 2).

Therefore, the origins of the term soft power can be traced to the Vietnam War in the 1970's, when the United States suffered from an economic decline and its military forces were handicapped. At that moment, U.S. scholars Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye introduced a new concept labeled "Interdependence" stating that if a state wants to obtain its interests, it has not to rely completely on violence and a direct conflict. After that, this concept started to gain more attention and started to emerge and maintain a broader intellectual respectability (Proudman 336-337).

The idea of soft power was first coined by the American Political scientist Joseph Nye in his book *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of the American Power* (1990) then was

adapted by other scholars; such as, Robert Cooper who stated in his article “Hard Power, Soft Power and the goals of Diplomacy” that a society depending only on hard power does not deserve a name of society. He pointed that all kinds of relationships including family relations, would be impossible if they are built upon coercion (169).

The United States was not among the pioneers who used the power of attraction to achieve its diplomatic goals. The Catholic Church is the greatest historical example of soft power, since the Pope was known of his greatest organization, in addition to the loyalty and obedience of a large part of the population. The Pope was a source of legitimacy, because he got the power of pronouncing marriages legal or illegal. Kings at that time went to him to have their cause pronounced just or their marriage invalid. The Pope was the source of all soft power in the feudal world (Held).

The British Empire also is considered as apotheosis incarnation of soft power, or power of attraction, it used that kind of power since the Sixteenth and Seventeenth century. The empire did not depend completely on coercion and military forces to control its colonies, and employing such power usually meant the beginning of the decline. The survival of the British Empire was mainly due to the prestige: the prestige of technology and organization and the belief of the white superiority (Cooper 173-174).

It is concluded that the United States focused on soft power and power of attraction too late in comparison to the British Empire, during the First World War (W.W.I.) the United States founded The Committee on Public Information in 1917 which was also known as the Greel Committee, labeled after its founder George Greel (Snow 4). The Committee used to organize propaganda campaigns for the First World War, besides arranging voluntary censorship for news. Moreover, the Greel Committee members played a role in

training teachers and speakers known as “Four Minute Men”, who were concerned with organizing speeches in schools and acting clubs across the country in order to support the American intervention in W.W.I. Furthermore, the Greel Committee has distributed more than a million copy of Woodrow Wilson Fourteen Speech that attracted people around the world because he had a tendency for peace, and a rejection for the war (Macdonald 53).

1.2. Definition of Soft Power

The concept of soft power has been used as a catchphrase by many political practitioners; also, it is one way in which success can be obtained without the intervention of hard power. This concept is one of new concepts which have been elaborated in the political atmosphere, where political actors use the means and methods to affect others without the direct use of military force. Thus, soft power is a form of power utilized by states to achieve a certain level of international influence (Giulio).

Joseph Nye defines soft power as “the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes, wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment” (94). Also, he defines it as “the capability of a nation to achieve the desired objectives through diplomatic persuasion by employing a deep knowledge of culture and history” (qtd in Syed Arif 1). Hence soft power is the ability to get what you want without using military coercion. Joseph Nye argues in his book *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics* that the United States has a good deal of soft power. He has given various examples from the American history, among them the impact of Franklin Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms Speech in Europe by the end of the W.W.II. The American Bill of Rights is another example of the American soft power.

Nye, also notes in his *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power* that “one can affect other’s behavior in three ways: threats of coercion (sticks), inducement and payments (carrots), and attraction that makes others want what you want” in this respect, soft power does not depend on coercion, but rather on attraction (94).The scholar Giulio Gallarotti notes that “soft power manifests itself in specific contexts and situations—that is, it depends on the relationship between action and policy orientations of particular nations and also the responses to these actions and orientations by other nations.”

1.3. Soft Power vs Hard Power

The United States of America seeks to conduct its foreign policy using either soft power, or hard power, and sometimes both of them. Soft power is usually concerned with seduction and attraction, it is free from all kinds of coercion, however, hard power is the use of military force or economic pressure. The United States uses both forms of power by which it affects preferences and behaviors of others to achieve its desired objectives.

Both forms of power: soft and hard have the same goal which is gaining most of wanted objectives for the United States, but they differ in the resources they depend on when conducting foreign policy. While hard power consists of elements that are related to military and economic powers and which are its main resources, soft power resources are not concrete, they rely on the attraction of country’s culture, political values, besides the legitimacy of its foreign policies. Hard power resources may lead to the change of others’ actions. Conversely soft power resources seek to shape what others want (Zahran and Ramos 17).

The distinction of hard and soft powers is a tricky one; both forms of power are related since they are aspects of the ability of achieving one’s purposes through affecting others’

behaviors. Compared with military power, economic power is soft; however, economic power (aid or sanction) is a hard power. Also, Nye distinguishes between the relationship between the two types of power “hard” and “soft”. He stated that both forms of power are linked to the same goal which is affecting others’ choices and behaviors in order to achieve certain objectives (7). He says, that hard power does not necessarily beget soft power, thus soft power is not the result of hard power (9). The deployment of soft power by one country to another requires a number of contextual variables like historical relations, economic ties, and cultural similarity. Soft power is context specific, i.e. a form of soft power can be relevant only to a certain country or a specific group in that country.

Kurlantzick, in 2006, classifies soft power into two types: high soft power targeted at elites, and low soft power targeted at the broader public. As such soft power is intangible and uncontrolled; i.e. it is difficult to evaluate and measure. Compared with hard power, the effect of soft power is indirect and lasts much longer to produce the desired outcomes, but the impact of hard power is direct, visible, straight and immediate, its outcomes are produced immediately (qtd in Nye 99).

The following table drawn by Harvard’s professor Joseph Nye is the best illustration of the differences between soft and hard power.

Table 1

Differences between Soft and Hard powers

	Hard power	Soft power
Spectrum Of Behaviours	Coercion Inducement Command	agenda setting attraction Co-opt
Most likely resource	* Force * Sanctions * Payment * Bribes	* Institutions * Values * Culture * Policies

Source: Nye, Joseph. *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics*. The United States: Public Affairs, 2004. Web. 22 March. 2017.

From the above table hard power can be linked to the notion of “command” which is one way used to control others’ preferences. Command is a form of authority practiced upon the targeted audiences and it can be achieved through different ways: the use of threat by one nation against the other, the use of economic sanctions, or it can be done through the use of economic power for the sake of payment and making bribes.

While hard power resources are heavily depending on the spectrum of command behavior, soft power resources are based on attraction. Co-optive power which is a way of framing other’s interests relying on the attractiveness of a country’s values, culture, the

legitimate policies, it may refer also to the ability of setting the agenda. This latter, means listing number of topics. One way to set the agenda is to stay on the message by focusing and repeating the same message all the time. Thus, diplomats need to focus on specified issues while communicating with the target people (Pratkanis 113-131)

1.4. Resources of Soft Power

Nye addresses three main resources of soft power, first soft power driven from culture, which is related to attractiveness as a key element to affect others, second the political values of the country, and foreign policies. Hence soft power comes from different resources; soft power can be possessed by any country if its culture is attractive, if its institutions are democratic, and if its foreign policies are multilateral. These resources are seen as complex because they need much time to be created and expanded (Nye 99).

1.4.1. Culture

Culture is a set of shared values and attitudes among a group of people. Educational system, media, business and commerce are all tools to express a country's culture. Soft power results from admiring those cultural values and attitudes by external people. In this respect, culture is consisted of high culture and popular culture which can be expressed through literature, art, music and entertaining programs (Arsenault 135).

The culture of any nation plays a pivotal role in the foundation of its identity. The soft power created by culture is a result of the nation's norms and values. American cultural diplomacy has been influential even before America has put attention on this kind of power. Many non-Americans have acknowledged the accomplishments of American writers. Johan Huzinfa, a Dutch historian, claimed that works such those of Walt Whitman

were a strong means that can carry out America's message. The works of Whitman appreciate the values of equality and individual freedom; he expresses the American principle of equality through his themes (Mellisen 149).

American popular culture plays a major role influencing audience and gaining profits. Peter Van Ham, professor at the college of Europe in Bruges Belgium says that the United States' culture as TV series and products were a salient elements in winning the Cold War (52). Joseph Stalin also confessed that if he could restrain the American motion picture, he would be able to convert the world to communism (Rosendorf 185).

Consequently, according to some scholars, Hollywood and the American popular music are best cultural tools which provide America with soft power. Films that express universal values and aim at spreading dominate cultural norms are participating in creating soft power. The American programs are appreciated by many foreign channels and are recorded on their televisions due to their high quality, and this is a clear sign of the success of spreading soft power.

1.4.2. Political Values

The political side of soft power resides in the political system of a state; the American political values are an important resource of soft power. William A. Rugh-U.S. ambassador to Yemen (1984-87) then to United Arab Emirates- States (1992-95) stated that the American political system, the electoral process, democracy, and freedom of speech are all desired values (9). However, political values such as freedom of speech may have a negative effect on the country, and not necessarily contribute in enhancing country's soft power. Speeches of a number of American citizens that offense Islam and

Muslims are widely reported in the Muslim world which make America as notorious rather than famous. Thus, American soft power effects are reduced (Rugh *The Case* 16).

American institutions are not all desired, depending on cultures and regions. For example, the idea that all Americans may have a gun without opposing the laws is not a dominant political value. Americans like this kind of laws and support them, while Europeans consider such institutions as negative aspect and can harm the country's soft power. The racial discrimination of the 1950s against African –Americans that has happened in the twentieth century is another example of undesired institutions, this latter undermined America's soft power in Africa; however, it got support from other cultures who believed in the white men superiority (Nye, *Soft Power: the Means* 13).

Generally speaking, the American culture and political values can be admired by many people who do not necessarily admire its foreign policy. But, they are also considered as double edged sword, in which they may influence a group of people, while they may not let any effect on another.

1.4.3. Foreign Policies

Another fundamental resource of soft power is foreign policy; it is a set of actions and principles adopted by any government to define its relations with other countries. The commitment to address various issues on the regional and universal arenas with the international norms and policies constitute the position and type of soft power. Enhancing an image on the international stage empowers the legitimacy of a nation, which in turn achieves the desired foreign policy goals.

The United States, conducts its foreign policy to achieve its goals and interests. Foreign policies that depend on soft power intended to maintain these interests in a

domestic way by employing cooperation among countries. In addition, the United States succeeded in achieving soft power because of its ability to understand the concerns and the interests of target people before projecting any foreign policy (Rugh *the Case*10). Furthermore, American assistance programs help in enhancing its soft power; in the world, for example, the United States received positive attitudes for helping the victims of Tsunami in Indonesia and other damaged areas (Garcia, Rak, and Yunt 19).

In 2006, the Pew Global Project conducted a poll in different European countries concerning their views toward the United States. Researchers founded that 39% of the populations of Great Britain, Germany, Spain, and France had positive opinions on the U.S. and its policies and 68% of the population of the same countries had favorable attitudes of the American people. The low percentage directed to the American policies was caused by their thought that the War on Iraq was illegitimate policy (Garcia, Rak, and Yunt 19).

In addition to these classifications of soft power, resources introduced by Joseph Nye, Gallarotti Giulio sees that the capability that produces soft power emerges mainly from the values expressed by an organization or a realm in a culture that hook the internal and political practices and in the way it forms its relationships within the international community (20). He claimed that there are two main streams from which soft power stems its sources, domestic sources and international sources.

The following table shows other classification about sources of soft power introduced by Giulio Gallarotti, in which he classified it into domestic and international sources.

Table 2

Foundations of Soft Power

Domestic Sources	International Sources
<p>Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pronounced social cohesion • Elevated quality of life • Freedom • Sufficient opportunities • Tolerance • Alluring lifestyle • Political institutions • Democracy • Constitutionalism • Liberalism/ pluralism • A well-functioning government bureaucracy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect for international laws, norms and institutions • Fundamental reliance on multilateralism and deposition against excessive unilateralism • Respect international treaties and alliance commitments • Willingness short-run national interest in order to contribute towards the collective goals. • Liberal economic foreign policies

Source: Giulio Gallarotti, “Soft Power, What It Is, Why It’s Important, and the

Conditions under Which It Can Be Effectively Used,” *Division II Faculty*

Publications, 2011.

The culture of a nation, as an element included in domestic sources of soft power, plays an important role in the foundation of its identity since the soft power created by culture is due to the norms and values of a nation. The quality of a lifestyle impact may render imitation or appreciation (Nye *The Future* 6). Soft power has also a political side, which resides in the political system of a state. Soft power outcomes are not necessarily created from a democratic regime, since there are governments which are neither democratic nor liberal, and they induce soft power.

Beside culture, another major source of soft power is international sources. The international relation system depends on collaboration, which is a main stream of soft power. Commitments to tackle different issues on the regional and universal arenas following the international norms and policies that constitute the position and type of soft power, improving an image on the international stage makes the legitimacy of a nation powerful, thus the desired foreign policy goals are achieved. Such commitments and legitimacy image presents the primacy sources of international soft power.

1.5. Limitations and Vulnerabilities of Soft Power

Despite the fact that soft power has been regarded as a power of attraction, and had a huge support by many politicians, there are views that oppose it as a strategy in foreign policy and see it as a power of confusion. Many realists prefer hard power over soft power. President Lyndon B. Johnson is well known by his belief that when the United States gets other people by the balls their hearts and minds will automatically follow (Cooper 169). There are many others who believe that soft power does not even deserve to be called power. They argue that the concept of “interdependence” which depends on mutual assistance and shared interests cannot be applied among countries (Proudman 337-338).

The concept of soft power has been misunderstood, misused and trivialized (Joffe, *The*). Soft power definition, sources and limitations are the main aspects that have been criticized. The relationship between the ubiquity of American culture and its actual influence is of a little importance, or it does not exist at all. Many people all over the world are keen of American accoutrements; they eat, drink, wear, watch and dance American. They are also fans of American singers and writers, but they do not relate these preferences and daily activities with America (Joffe, *America*). The form of power being used depends on its context of use; hence there are limits to which soft power could achieve. Hard power considerations may dominate a certain context in which the use of soft power is meaningless (Blechman 680-681).

Nye's notion of soft power is regarded as ethnocentric and condescending since it is based on mistaken assumptions that imply the superiority of American culture, which should be liked and adopted by other nations, and that the culture and values of the west are dominant to control and define the rules of the world ("Chinese"). The U.S. of self-perception of superiority of American lifestyle is seen as a fundamental reason for problems occurring in the world. What happened in Iraq and Afghanistan shows that it is impossible to think that Western style democracy cannot be exported to other countries just like exporting goods. Nye believes that the decline of American's soft power is due to the spread of anti-Americanism; however, the fact is completely the opposite. Anti-Americanism is a result of the ubiquity of U.S. culture; the "over-success" of American's soft power has led to an increase in resentment and heightened the rate of anti-Americanism. This is proved in the European countries which are the traditional allies of America; many of people do not like the idea of spreading American culture (The Pew Research Centre).

The notion of soft power focuses on attraction and seduction, thus if a state admires the values and ideals of another state, it will follow it. But this idea is not absolutely true because there are other considerations for the seduced state, the latter concern more with national interest rather than the amount of attraction (Layne 53). Therefore, the seduced nations will not respond to soft power campaigns unless they recognize their self interests. The process of soft power campaign passes through two important steps. First, they project the campaign, second they wait for the target people to respond. Evidently, foreign policy does not depend on public opinions, but rather on the state decision makers. In this respect, the role of public opinion in affecting decisions is so limited, besides there is no fixed public opinion. So, soft power's impact is not lasting and people's attitudes likely to be changed. In addition, little consideration is given to civil society by many states especially the strong ones, so that the role of public opinion is still arguable (Layne 56).

Despite its utility, soft power still has vulnerabilities and limitations. Power is a double-edged sword, it cuts two ways. The success of American soft power to pursue its interests depends mainly on the context of its use, its ability to achieve the desired goals is limited as the targeted audience and their reaction are the ones who decide whether this power can work successfully or fail.

1.6. Bush Administration and Hard Power

President George W. Bush's foreign policy seemed to be unilateral since the U.S. behaved unilaterally giving less attention to the interests of international community, and focusing more on its national interests. In the early stage of his presidency, Bush implemented the notion of "America First" which gave priority to the interests of America and basically defended them.

After the terrorist attacks on the United States, President Bush saw that the main mission of his administration is to fight terrorism; “I’m here for a reason, and this [the war on terrorism] is going to be how we’re to be judged.” (qtd in Woodward 205). He believed that the United States’ mission is to spread its universal values to the rest of the world; America is chosen by God to lead the world: “. . . our nation is chosen by God and commissioned by history to be a model to the world of justice and inclusion and diversity without division” (Marty 32-33). The invasion of Iraq in 2003, was part of President Bush’s belief of extending liberty to the entire world.

Bush’s beliefs in the United States special role and his tendency towards the implementation of hard power were expressed through the 2002 document “The National Security Strategy of the United States of America” (NNS). The latter addressed an emphasis on terrorism and rogue states. The document declared that the United States would act preemptively in order to defend itself and to prevent any challenges, also it notes that rogue states who own weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and terrorism have made preemption more attractive as a policy option, but it does not specify certain criteria, or the situations for determining when the U.S. should carry out preemptive attacks. Undoubtedly, the NSS emphasizes “preemption” as the policy of choice (Bush 1).

Furthermore, one of the major features of the Bush administration was its exclusion of nuclear disarmament. First, at G8 Summit meetings; however, since the early 1990s there were reference to reduce nuclear arms, CTBT (Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty), FMCT (Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty), START (Strategic Nuclear Reduction Treaty) which had been expressed in the political statements or Chairman’s statements, by the advent of the Bush Administration, there was no mention of nuclear disarmament because the U.S. sought to delete these words from statements. Second, the NPT Review

Conference, held in 1995, adopted the decision on “Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament,” the final document was agreed upon in the 2000 conference, these documents contain various recommendations for nuclear disarmament. Bush administration ignored and rejected the content of these documents; instead it gave more attention to nuclear non-proliferation (Kurosawa).

In spite the fact that the United States signed the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (Moscow Treaty) with Russia in May 2002, which demands for each state to reduce its nuclear warheads to 1700-2200 by December 31, 2012. The Treaty does not conform to nuclear disarmament treaties and lacks important elements such as verifiability, irreversibility, predictability and transparency (Kurosawa).

1.7. Obama’s Administration and Soft Power

President Barack Obama’s doctrine is seen as a new foreign policy strategy, different from the one practiced by Bush, notably in regard with the instruments of power used and precisely the return of soft power.

The first policy statement for Obama’s presidential campaign appeared in the July/August 2007 issue of the Foreign Affairs. He stated: “we must confront the most urgent threat to the security of America and the world . . . the spread of nuclear weapons, material, and technology and the risk that a nuclear device will fall into the hands of terrorists” (Obama 2-16). This statement implies that he intended to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, besides he wanted to secure all nuclear weapons and materials. Besides, he de-emphasized the role of nuclear weapons, talked about the ratification of CTBT, FMCT negotiation and controlling the utilization of nuclear weapons.

In his speech on October 2, 2007, Obama explicitly declared his support to the concept of “a world free of nuclear weapons” he said, “Here’s what I’ll say as President: America seeks a world in which there are no nuclear weapons . . . we will not pursue unilateral disarmament. As long as nuclear weapons exist, we’ll retain a strong nuclear deterrent” (Remarks). In this speech, Obama recognized the threat of such nuclear weapons on the world, and the importance of destroying them in order to prevent an outdated Cold War. In another speech in Berlin, Germany on July 24, 2008, Obama emphasized the idea of a world free of nuclear weapons (Obama Press). His idea was finally accepted at the National Convention in August 2008, the Democrats have adopted a platform that included: “America will seek a world with no nuclear weapons and take concrete actions to move in this direction” (“Report of the”)

President Obama’s address in Prague on April 5, 2009, is considered as a turning point in the U.S. history, he advanced the notion of a “Zero nuclear world,” and it was the first time when an American President recognized the moral responsibility of the U.S. and its commitment to seek peace and security of a world free of nuclear weapons. He stated, “as a nuclear power . . . as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon . . . the United States has a moral responsibility to act” (“The White”).

The Prague Speech emphasized the role of the U.S. to reduce its nuclear weapons in its national security and strategy, urging other nations to do the same. In addition, President Obama mentioned some concrete measures that may foster the process of nuclear disarmament. First, he spoke about a future negotiation of a new strategic arms reduction with Russia to reduce U.S. warheads and stockpiles. Second, he talked about the U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) as a major step to achieve a global ban of nuclear testing. Third, the U.S. strives to seek a treaty that ends

fissile materials production, so that building blocks needed for a bomb will be cut off. Moreover, the speech came with some principles to strengthen the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). (1) The need for more resources and authority to strengthen international inspections. (2) Building a new framework for civil nuclear cooperation including an international fuel bank. (3) Countries that break the rules or leave the Treaty without obvious causes should be punished. (4) The use of threats and illegal weapons by North Korea is not the suitable way for seeking security and respect. (5) Obama's administration engagement with Iran will be built upon mutual interests and respect ("The White").

The issue of nuclear terrorism has also been tackled by President Obama in the Prague Speech, ensuring that terrorists will not be able to acquire nuclear weapons. In this respect, he suggested some measures such as; the announcement of a new international effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear materials around the world within four years, in addition to the breakup of black markets, and initiating a Global Summit on Nuclear Security that the U.S. will host ("The White").

In a nutshell, the use of both forms of power hard and soft by America does not occur randomly, the United States is careful to choose the right form while conducting its foreign policy. Along its history the United States strove to maintain its position as unmatched, and sought by all means to achieve its interests regardless to the aftermaths it may cause to others. It does not matter the kind of power employed, whether it is a hard one or soft, what matters more is obtaining what is wanted.

Chapter two

U.S. Implementation of Soft Power toward the Arab Countries:

Cooperation with Jordan

Historically, the United States and countries of the Middle East have had close relations; regional states as Egypt and Jordan have benefited from the American economic and military assistance in order to enhance their growth and security. The U.S. has also maintained strong ties with the Persian Gulf region, this latter supplied the United States with essential energy supplies besides being a major market for America's military equipment. For a long time, a network of organizational relationships, bilateral economic and military commissions, commercial endeavors besides personal contacts have been created by these relations between the U.S. and countries all over the region.

Actually, America's use of "soft power" in the Arab world traced back only to the W.W.II. Before 1945, the U.S. government's involvement in the Arab world was limited. There were few contacts with Arabs carried by private missionaries and oilmen. Some of those missionaries were educational; for example, Daniel Bliss, who was in Beirut in the middle of the nineteenth century, started what later became the American University of Beirut. Other medical missionaries were undertaken in the early twentieth century, such as Donald Bosh, who opened the first hospital in Oman. Those missionaries were respected and appreciated by Arabs since they brought to them both education and modern medicine.

Over decades, Jordan remained a key partner and a close friend for the U.S. Diplomatic relations have been shaped between the two countries since 1949, following the independence of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in 1946. Jordan and the U.S. share

mutual interests and both cooperated in a number of issues that reinforce their bilateral issues.

2.1. A Brief History of the United States and Jordan Relations

Jordan witnessed the arrival of several settlers and invaders like Egyptians, Israelites, Assyrians, Hittites, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arab Muslims, Ottoman Turks and the British were the last ones. The British established the Emirate of Transjordan in 1922 which has been reigned by the Hashemite Prince Abdullah. On May 25, 1946, Britain recognized the independence of Transjordan and became the independent Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan. In 1950, King Abdullah I annexed some parts of Palestine and renamed the country the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (International Business Publications).

History of the United States and Jordan relations can be traced back to 1949, when Amman founded diplomatic relations with Washington, yet the U.S. did not involve in Jordan until 1957, when it became a major source of foreign aid and political support instead of Britain. The U.S. assisted Jordan during the Civil War of 1970-1971 and provided aids to King Hussein. By October 1973, war relations between Amman and the U.S. evolved; Jordan was an important element in the peace process after that conflict, it joined with the United States in support of UN Security Council Resolution 338. This latter is concerned with parties involved in the October 1973 War, calling them to stop the conflict and to implement UN Security Council Resolution 242 of 1967 providing that Israel will from the occupied territories (Metz).

After U.S. did not succeed to convince Israel to give up the West Bank to Jordanian control, King Hussein was disappointed since he wishes America would help Jordan to

reunite the East Bank with the West Bank. Yet, he still appreciated the U.S. support for Jordan's stability and economic growth. During the 1980's, for the United States, Jordan kept being an important key in resolving the West Bank issue which has been a remarkable element for King Hussein and stability of his regime; he aimed at persuading Washington to deal with the PLO as one of his policy goals. From 1982 until 1988 Hussein was assigned to serve as an intermediary between the U.S. and the PLO (Metz).

By 1980s, King Hussein wanted to develop relations with U.S. to include military ties, he started a plan of creating a Jordanian strike force which gives assistance to Arab countries, the Persian Gulf was targeted by this plan since it contains allies of both U.S. and Jordan. The United States approved to provide them with necessary weapons. The plan was abandoned after the disclosure of the Reagan administration in 1984 which provoked criticism from Syria and Palestinian guerrilla groups opposing King Hussein, and caused dissatisfaction in Amman, in addition the disapproval of U.S. Congress to fund the strike force (Metz).

During the 1990s' U.S.-Jordanian ties evolved friendly, Jordan supported U.S. aims in the Arab-Israeli peace process; in October 1994, King Hussein signed a formal peace treaty with Israel witnessed by President William J. Clinton. Moreover, Jordan helped in the enforcement of United Nations sanctions against Iraq. Issues of tourism and trade started to develop between the United States and Jordan. After King Abdullah II claimed the throne in 1999, Jordanian relations with the U.S. remained good; Abdullah sought to maintain peaceful relations with Israel, trying to promote reconciliation between Israel and Palestine notably after the second intifada in 2000 (Hahn).

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, King Abdullah condemned the attacks and aided U.S. in the invasion of Afghanistan, also Jordan supported U.S. in the Iraq war in 2003, this support resulted in Jordanians' resentment and made the country vulnerable to terrorist attacks remarkably the bombings of hotels in November 2005. Throughout the 21st century, Jordan approved various U.S. initiatives aiming at settling the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. U.S.-Jordanians ties continued to be characterized by cooperation; for example, during the Obama administration Jordan funded U.S. to combat terrorism in the Middle East (Hahn).

2.2. Beginning of U.S. Involvement in the Arab Countries

For decades, the Middle East has been a pivotal area for American interests; the area which stretches from North Africa to Afghanistan is considered a great challenge for U.S. foreign policy. America maintained strong ties with many Arab and non-Arab states; such as, Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Jordan (Casey 1). The U.S. major interest in the Middle East is its natural resources especially oil; the Persian Gulf has two-thirds of the world's oil reserves. Saudi Arabia has more than a fourth of world reserves, in addition to Iraq which possesses the second largest reserves (“United”).

The Middle East continues to face different problems, besides many domestic socio-economic challenges like poverty, unemployment, population growth and so forth. In this respect, the United States seek to advocate for political and economic reforms in order to treat such challenges (Casey 1). Thus, relations between the United States and Arabs generally and the Middle East particularly can be traced back to the establishment of America; to the signing of the treaty between the United States and Sultan of Morocco during George Washington's Administration. American involvement in the Middle East

was quite limited until the period after the W.W.II., when the role of America became substantial (Sanford).

During the nineteenth century, relations between the United States and the Middle East were restricted to a limited amount of commercial interests besides Protestant missionaries, American political and strategic goals and concerns were not involved; thus, the main target of the United States in the region was to found educational institutions such as the establishment of Istanbul Women's College in 1871, American University of Beirut in 1866, and the American University in Cairo in 1919. Such institutions participated in the betterment of the area. After that by the twentieth century and after the end of the W.W.I., American involvement in the region has evolved to identify international developments and diplomatic discussions. American political ideas and principles started to appeal to the Middle East. Although, the U.S. did not interfere in issues of security and policy of the region, it was concerned by commercial and economic matters significantly "oil" (Sanford).

After the W.W.II., the American role in the Middle East has been strengthened and its political presence has been intensified in the region. An increase in American interests in the resources of the area notably oil. The Gulf started to produce an important share of the world's oil: 17 percent in 1950, 25 percent in 1960, and 27 percent in 1990. In fact, the British were the first who stepped in the Gulf region and developed the Persian Gulf oil, this latter was the most significant industry. The U.S. required the application of the "open-door" policy to its companies, so that it assisted them to get access to the region. In the early 1920s, Britain, America and France formed the Iraq Petroleum Company (IPC). In 1944, also, a consortium of different American oil companies established the Arabian-American Oil Company (ARAMCO) to exploit Saudi oil ("United").

Prior to 1945, few contacts were undertaken between Arabs and the U.S. and few Arabs had little knowledge about America, Washington strove to maintain good relations while communicating with Arab public. Thus, Arabs had positive attitudes concerning the American image (Rugh). Following the period after the end of the W.W.II., American attention was focused on the question of Palestine. Yet, nothing official was done concerning the Palestinian issue until the administration of President Harry Truman in 1945. Such motives of securing oil access and the Palestinian issue reinforced the U.S. presence in the region (Rugh *American Encounters*).

2.3. U.S. Interests in the Middle East

American attention to the Middle East and its interests in the region is driven by political and strategic incentives, these interests varied according to administration and historical era. The United States and the Soviet Union were the World's superpowers competing to impose their control on the Middle East. After the end of the Cold War a bi-polar world has emerged; the U.S. remained the only superpower and its interests in the region grew rapidly. Interests in the U.S. include: the geographical location of the region, securing access to oil, nuclear proliferation, and securing Israel's sovereignty.

The Middle East is characterized by its significant location; it is situated at the crossroads of international commerce besides its closeness to the Soviet Union. In addition, it contains necessary waterways that help in shipping different goods. Being close to the Soviet Union gives the region another privilege since it helps external powers to control the Soviet changes and developments. The establishment of western bases in countries of the Middle East is considered as important assets for western allies; they help in monitoring Soviet activities (Sanford).

Securing oil access is a cornerstone of U.S. Middle East policy. Middle East countries, notably the states of the Persian Gulf present significant key oil producers. The Gulf Cooperation Council states (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain), Iran, and Iraq have 64% of the world's oil reserves. Saudi Arabia alone possesses 27% of the world's oil supplies (Fandy).

After the W.W.II., an idea of joint concessions emerged among many Western companies in the Middle East, especially in Bahrain, Kuwait, Iran and Saudi Arabia. The United States in its turn has made economic demands for such concessions with countries of the Middle East including Bahrain (1929), Kuwait (1934), and Saudi Arabia (1947). In 1948, several companies were created to exploit these concessions. The ARAMCO, Texaco, Standard Oil of California (Sacol), such boom helped the post-war American economy to grow. Middle Eastern concession started to increase, thus the U.S. oil production decreased gradually. Following the W.W. II., the U.S. started to search for alternative sources of oil in order to satisfy its future demands. The Middle East was the best choice for American petroleum companies; the Arab oil reserves hold 60% of the world's oil reserves (Sarhan).

Another central interest for the U.S. in the Middle East is prohibition of nuclear weapons' pervasion; nuclear proliferation is at the core of United States concerns. America seeks to prevent hostile states from obtaining such power and use it to endanger interests of U.S. with regard to oil security. For the United States, Israel however, possesses nuclear weapons; it does not represent a threat because it is an ally. The most dangerous source of risk of proliferation is Iran; this latter developed a nuclear program besides enriching uranium to twenty percent. In 2015, the United States convinced Tehran

to go to the negotiating table, they signed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action in order to disband Iran's nuclear weapons program (Jeremy and Benjamin).

“Reactive” proliferation is another concern for the U.S.; this type is concerned with rivalry among states to produce nuclear weapons. When one country acquires such weapons automatically it will affect its neighboring countries, thus there will be a competition besides an accrument in number of nuclear weapons. In this respect, countries like Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt are viewed as potential reactive proliferators triggered by Iran's nuclear weapon program. Therefore, the United States continuation to prevent nuclear proliferation, in addition to the use of chemical and biological weapons, during Bush administration in 2003; as a result, America succeeded to prevent Libya from developing such weapons. Moreover, during the Obama administration Syria dismantled its chemical weapons programs (Jeremy and Benjamin).

Security of Israel is at the core of the United States' major concerns in the Middle East, since the mid-1980s relations between Israel and Palestine witnessed confrontations and instability. The United States role in resolving the tension is important because Israel is a significant ally for America (Looney). On May 14, 1948, Israel announced itself as an independent state; the U.S. was the first country which recognized it. American Presidents have undertaken some arrangements, treaties and agreements with different Arab states and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in order to secure Israel. The most important agreements are the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty (1979); Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (Oslo I) (1993); The Jordan-Israel Peace Treaty of (1994); and The Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement (Oslo II) in 1995 (Sarhan).

The United States and Israel have the same enemies in the Middle East; both they opposed Nasser's regime in Egypt and regime of Saddam in Iraq in addition to some recent terrorist groups. American role in assisting secure Israel is nuclear weapons; Israel helped the United States to stop Iran's nuclear program (Jeremy and Benjamin).

2.4. Jordan: U.S. Relations and Bilateral Issues

Jordan is considerably beholden to the United States, in spite the fact that U.S. and Jordan have never been connected by any formal treaty; they treated various regional and international issues. Because of its small size and shortage of main economic resources, Jordan depended on Western and other Arab support. U.S. was a pivotal source of support for Jordan maintaining diplomatic relations since 1949. Many factors helped the Jordanian state to be important ally for the United States and they cooperated on a number of issues including: promoting peace in the Middle East, terrorism, and nuclear cooperation, economic assistance, military cooperation and trade.

4.1. Promoting Peace in the Middle East

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is among the most important issues for the Jordanian government. Peace with Israel is at the core of Jordan's interests because Israel holds a great military power besides Jordan fears the emergence of an independent Palestinian national movement that presents a primary threat for Jordan's and Israel's security. Jordan participated in a number of conflicts opposing Israel during the period between 1948 and 1973; King Hussein believed that resolving the conflict of Israel and Palestine is pivotal; though, on October 16, 1944, king Hussein and Israel signed a peace treaty, besides a number of bilateral agreements were arranged between 1994 and 1996 aimed at developing economic and cultural relations (Dralonge).

Furthermore, it was not any task for the Jordanian government to normalize relations with Israel, although King Abdullah the Second made great efforts to reach peace with Israel, he faced resistance within Jordan, remarkably the Islamic fundamentalist groups who oppose the idea and called for boycotting Israeli's ties. King Abdullah the Second continued his trials and in 2007 attempted to persuade U.S. to become an active intermediary between Palestinians and Israelis (Dralonge).

Moreover, King Abdullah II supported the "Arab Peace Initiative" which was initiated by Saudi Arabia; the initiative implies the foundation of a Palestinian state and calls Israel to withdraw its forces completely from the occupied territories. Jordan's King planned to visit Israel in order to treat the Arab Peace Initiative unfortunately no date was set. In May 2007, Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert visited Jordan, he and Abdullah met in Aqaba negotiated Palestinians' issues; Jordan's King tackled subjects relating to the betterment of Palestinians' life status (Dralonge).

Israel made another visit to Jordan in July 2010, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu met King Abdullah and tried to improve relations between the states since it has been worsening at that time, Netanyahu sought Jordan's aid in arranging a direct talks between Palestinians and Israel. When U.S. launched peace negotiations between Palestinians and Israel, King Abdullah II visited Washington, DC. After his visit to the United States King Abdullah II told Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu that all kinds of actions that which may cause a threat to peace must be stopped, especially the construction of Israeli settlements (International Business Publications).

2.4.2. Terrorism

Jordan plays an undeniable role in combating international Islamic terrorist groups, its major intelligence organization, the General Intelligence Directorate (GID), helped to infiltrate jihadist networks. Jordanian GID cooperated with U.S. to kill the fugitive Jordanian terrorist Abu Musab al Zarqawi who was the head of the organization Al Qaeda in Iraq, Because of this incident Jordan was vulnerable to external terrorist attacks especially from Iraqi organizations. Famous terrorist attacks had been carried out on November 9, 2005, targeted three hotels in Amman; the Radisson, Grand Hyatt and Days Inn; Al Qaeda organization claimed the responsibility of the attacks (International Business Publications).

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 on the United States, Jordan sought to support the Bush Administration's War on Terrorism. Jordan helped in combating terrorism by making investigations and giving information about terrorist groups and organizations like Al Qaeda in Afghanistan in 2001 and in Iraq in 2003. Jordanian government cooperated with U.S. to fight ISIS after its emergence, seeking to maintain stability and national security interests. Also, U.S. in its turn showed a tangible aid for Jordan during the Syrian refugee crisis, it gave Jordan an economic aid estimated over \$467 million. During the Syrian Civil War the United States provided more than 1.500 military personnel in order to secure northern borders of Jordan (Sarhan).

The Arab Spring of 2010-2011 raised U.S. apprehension about the future of Jordan's regime and about its security, the United States was certain that the overthrow of Jordan's regime will necessarily lead to an anti-Western government. Thus, it worked hard to

maintain the Jordanian monarch secure. Jordan's stability is among U.S. main priorities in making its main foreign policies (Sarhan).

2.4.3. Nuclear Cooperation

Relations between the United States and Jordan have been strong and close for six decades, they both cooperated on a number of issues, and the U.S. provided Jordan with economic and military assistance besides it helped to maintain its stability and prosperity. Jordan; also, is a technical and financial supporter for U.S. nuclear projects.

The Jordanian government sought to develop mined uranium which is a rare natural resource; it can be; also, used to produce weapons-grade materials. However; the United States opposed this action, both Obama and Bush administrations sought to limit uranium enrichment technology in other countries in order to limit the production of nuclear weapons. Jordan insisted on enriching its uranium according to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968. Negotiations between Jordan and U.S. remained for several months. Finally, in September 2010, both sides agreed on that Jordan can mine its uranium, but not enrich it (International Business Publications).

2.4.4. Economic and Military Assistance

The United States has provided economic and military aid to Jordan since 1951 and 1957. Through FY 2011, the U.S. aid to Jordan was estimated around \$12.47 billion. On September 22, 2008, the U.S. and Jordan reached a deal know for the Five-Year Deal which required the United States to provide \$660 million in annual foreign assistance to Jordan over a period of five years (FY2010-2014); therefore, the agreement required the U.S. to provide \$360 million per year in Economic Funds (ESF) and \$300 million per year

in Foreign Military Financing (FMF). The agreement reinforced U.S.- Jordanian cooperation (International Business Publications).

2.4.5. Trade Cooperation

In 2010, Jordan ranked 78th among U.S. trading partners, also in 2010 according to the United States Trade Commission Jordan's exports to the U.S. reached \$973.8 million; however, the U.S. imported \$1.13 billion from Jordan. Ties between the two countries expanded more especially by the signing of the Free Trade Agreement and the establishment of Qualifying Industrial Zones (International Business Publications).

On October 24, 2000, President Clinton and King Abdullah II signed U.S.-Jordanian Free Trade Agreement, which required no duties and commercial barriers between the two countries while exporting or importing goods and services. In addition to the establishment of Qualifying Industrial Zones (QIZs) that resulted from the Jordanian-Israeli peace treaty, it implies that goods manufactured in Jordan and Israel can enter the U.S. duty free. QIZs helped Jordan's economy and developed the commercial relations between Israel and Jordan (International Business Publications).

2.5. United States Foreign Policy toward Jordan 2001-2008

The United States formed its foreign policy toward Jordan after the Cold War. In 1949, the U.S. shaped its diplomatic ties with the independent Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, relations were close and both U.S. and Jordan shared common interests and goals like promoting peace and modernization in the Middle East. The pro-western regime of Jordan helped it to be a major partner of the U.S. who worked to maintain Jordan's stability and security. Besides the economic, military aids that U.S. provides to Jordan.

2.5.1. Political Arena

President George W. Bush's first term as president of the United States witnessed the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the attacks were carried out by members of Al-Qaeda and targeted the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon (Spring and Packer). The U.S. started building its military coalition on September 12, 2001. President Bush responded to this event, his administration gathered a multi-nation task force to fight this global terrorist attack. Around 69 nations cooperated with the United States besides the military support of the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) Area of Responsibility, supporting the global war on terrorism (Fact Sheet).

On September 13, 2001, President Bush called several foreign leaders, including King Abdullah II of Jordan in order to gain international support for his campaign of retaliation against the terrorist attacks (Department of State). King Abdullah expressed the condolences of the Jordanian people to President Bush, as well as, to the American people; also, he promised his support and cooperation in fighting terror (Bush).

On September 28, 2001, King Abdullah II visited Washington DC. in a joint press conference, he was the first Arab leader to travel there after the attacks of 9/11. King Abdullah pledged full support for the United States to counter terrorism. President Bush stated in the press conference that: "Jordan is a strong, strong friend of America. And right after September 11th, one of the early messages I received was from His Majesty, expressing the condolences of the Jordanian people, as well as his own personal condolences", in addition, King Abdullah assured his backing to the U.S. he stated; ". . . we will stand by you in these very difficult times . . . true friends must stand with each other, and we'll be by your side and we'll be there to support you" ("Remarks...").

Jordan stood by the U.S. during the attacks of 9/11, it expressed its readiness to cooperate with the international community to combat terrorism, and also Jordan saw the chaotic event as an opposition to the religious values of civilized human ideologies (Ayasrah). On November 8, 2001, King Abdullah delivered a speech in which he condemned all kinds of terrorism notably the 9/11 attacks on the United States, affirming Jordan's attitude towards the incident. He stated; "As a human being, as a father, as a Jordanian, and most of all as a Muslim what happened on that day was evil. As human beings, we condemn that attack absolutely. And as a civilized nation, Jordan stands shoulder to shoulder, with the world community in the fight" ("Jordan").

Jordan has opposed and denounced the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, it was afraid of an outbreak of a Civil War in Iraq. Jordan was obliged to cooperate with the United States since this latter is its financial supporter; besides, Iraq was no longer exporting oil to Jordan while other Gulf states still supplying it for the coming years. Jordan supported the U.S. in its campaign to throw Saddam Hussein's regime (Dougherty and Edmund).

In 2002, Jordan has provided a training unit to Yemen in order to help the U.S. in training Yemeni military to fight terrorist groups (Ayasrah). The Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) requested Jordan to a training program for Iraqi military and police from 2003 to 2007. During this period Al-Zarqawi carried out attacks against Jordan, one targeted the Jordanian embassy in Baghdad in 2003, and another attack in 2007 targeted hotels in Amman (Dougherty and Edmund).

In September 2005, the Jordanian Court sentenced Omar Jamil Nazzar al-Khalayleh, (cousin of Al- Zarqawi) to six months in prison for his recruitment of fighters in Syria to

fight against the U.S. and Iraq. In February 2006, the State Security Court killed nine men who carried out an explosive attacks against the U.S. and Iraq. Furthermore, Jordanian security and intelligence authorities helped the U.S. forces to trace Al-Zarqawi by providing valuable information about him, later he was killed on June 7, 2007 (Ayasrah).

2.5.2. Economic and Commercial Arena

During the Bush administration economic relations between the United States and Jordan evolved, the U.S.-Jordanian free trade agreement which was signed during President Clinton's administration in October 2000 remained active. Since the mid-1990s the United States' aid to Jordan increased reinforcing its economy and maintaining its domestic stability. Annual U.S. economic and military aid to Jordan reached about \$150 million and \$75 million between FY 1998 and FY 2002 (Prados).

In FY 2002, U.S. provided Jordan with \$250 million in economic and \$198 million in military aid. In FY 2003, Jordan received \$250 million as an economic aid and \$406 million in military assistance. Also, the Bush Administration in FY 2004 provided Jordan with \$250 million in ESF (Economic Support Funds) and \$206 million in FMF (Foreign Military Financing). In FY 2005, Jordan received from the U.S. \$250 million in ESF and \$206 million in FMF. The Bush Administration requested \$100 million in ESF and \$100 million in FMF for Jordan as a reward for its support in the war on terrorism and reconstruction of Iraqi forces (Prados).

Furthermore, on FY 2006, the administration provided the same amount of FY. In FY 2007, Jordan received \$245 million in ESF and \$206 million in FMF. In addition, during the Bush Administration trade issues evolved too. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, Jordan's imports from the U.S. increased from \$317 million to

\$531million between 2000 and 2004, and Jordan's exports to the U.S. increased from \$73 million to \$1,093 million. U.S. main imports included machinery, aircraft parts, cereals and vehicles, whereas main Jordan's commodities exported to the U.S. consisted of accessories, precious stones and metals (Prados). In 2008, Jordan and the United States signed a non-binding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) providing Jordan with aid over a period of 5 years. The MOU reinforced U.S.-Jordanians' ties and broadened their cooperation (Fact Sheet).

2.5.3. Military Arena

The United States helped Jordan in the modernization of its armed forces; a U.S.-Jordanian Joint Military Commission has been formed since 1974. In 2003, Jordan received three Patriot anti-missile batteries from the United States. Also, on November 19, 2004, the U.S. Defense Department announced a sale of 50 U.S. Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs) to Jordan in order to reinforce its defense capabilities (Prados).

Jordan in December 2001 deployed two military hospitals, one in Afghanistan treated over 500,000 patients since its deployment, and another hospital in Iraq treated over four million people and around 1,638 operations were undertaken by surgeons (Prados).

Table 3

Jordan: US Foreign Aid (In \$USD Millions)

Year	Economic	Military	IMET*	Total
1996	7.2	200.0	1.2	207.4
1997	112.12	30.0	1.7	143.9
1998	151.2	51.6	1.6	204.4
1999	151.5	46.6	1.6	199.7
2000	150.02	76.6	1.6	228.2
2001	149.7	75.0	1.7	226.4
2002	150.0	75.0	2.0	227.0
2003	250.0	198.0	2.4	450.4
2004	248.5	204.8	3.2	456.5
2005	248.0	204.4	3.2	455.4
2006	250.0	206.0	3.0	459.0
2007	255.3	251.0	3.1	509.4
2008	561.4	248.3	2.9	912.6
2009	413.5	385.0	4.1	802.6
2010	463.0	350.0	3.8	816.8
2011	362.0	299.4	3.7	655.1
2012	460.0	300.0	3.7	763.7
2013	443.5	284.8	3.6	731.9
2014	700.0	300.0	3.5	733.5
2015	615.8	385.0	3.888	1003.8
2016	812.35	450.0	3.8	1,266.55

Source: Prados, Alfred B. Jordan: U.S. Relations and Bilateral Issues. CRS, the Library of Congress. 14 Mar. 2006. Web.

The table above shows U.S. assistance to Jordan since 1996 to 2016, it is concerned with economic, military fields. Seemingly Jordan is a significant recipient of U.S. aids, Jordan's independence on U.S. foreign aid increased through years. Economic assistance is of primary importance for Jordan's development, it helped in improving Jordanians' lives, betterment of health care, building roads and water networks, building schools besides assistance for communities that hosted Syrian refugees.

Overall, through history U.S.-Jordanians' bilateral relations are characterized by cooperation; although, both countries never signed a formal treaty they still share mutual goals including Jordan's key role in advancing peace process, combating terrorism, and nuclear cooperation. Jordan's pro-western regime, its ideology and geopolitical position helped in shaping strong and close relations with United States. The Jordanian government dependency on U.S. economic, political, military, commercial assistance aided the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to grow and improve its status. Also, Jordan's support for the U.S. is undeniable markedly its financial aid after the attacks of 9/11 on the U.S.

Chapter three

U.S. Implementation of Hard Power toward Iraq

U.S. Foreign policy has shifted significantly after the 9/11 attacks, the new policy under George W. Bush has changed its direction from nation-building efforts to embrace a full- scale nation- building adventure in Iraq. “The Bush Doctrine” was characterized by preemptive wars against imminent threats and the emergence of neoconservatives in the Bush Administration.

Taking “war on terror” as a cloak and buoyed by the post 9/11 support the U.S. involved itself in a bombing campaigns in Iraq followed by an invasion in March 2003. Actually, the invasion was driven by some intensives including: accusing Saddam Hussein of being accomplice in the events of 9/11 attacks on the U.S. and the threats of WMD.

After years of supporting authoritarian regimes, the Bush administration’s view changed and focused on democracy as an alternative to troubles in the Middle East, notably the rise of terrorism. Thus, the invasion of Iraq was built upon the claim that by overthrowing Saddam’s regime, democracy would prevail in Baghdad. Iraq was considered as an example of democratic shift and transformation in the Middle East.

In this respect, this chapter is devoted to shed light on U.S. implementation of hard power in Iraq from 2003 to 2008. Focusing on U.S.-Iraqi relations, circumstances and causes of Iraq invasion, in addition that it tackles some theories that were concerned with giving justification for the U.S. invasion of Iraq using different perspectives and differing

ideologies. Finally, this chapter analyzes the impact of the Iraq war on the Middle East and its aftermaths.

3.1. A Synopsis about U.S.-Iraq Relations

Before the W.W.II., the U.S. involvement in Mesopotamia, or the modern Iraq, was very limited; it had limited interests in the region. Evangelical Christian missionaries were pioneers who encountered the region in 1830. They started constructing schools, churches and medical facilities during the twentieth century (Hahn).

In 1928, U.S. Oil Corporation began to search for trade opportunities in Mesopotamia, and it gained a share of 23.75% in the Iraq Petroleum Company (IPC). During the W.W.II., America supported the British to restore the monarchy of Baghdad, which was vulnerable to threats of Nazi Germany. Following the war, the U.S. political relationship with Iraq evolved, during the Cold War the U.S. sought to protect Iraq from Soviet expansionism and communism. Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949 outbreak, emergence of western nationalism and Britain's weakness and disability to keep its imperial position and control in the region destabilized Baghdad (Hahn).

In 1940s and 1950s, the U.S. intended to restore Iraq stability, America encouraged oil production of the IPC and gave an economic and military assistance to the Iraqi government, and by 1955 Iraq has been enlisted by the U.S. as a charter member of the Baghdad Pact, an anti-Soviet defense partnership connecting Iran, Pakistan, Britain, Turkey and Iraq with informal U.S. support. U.S. relations got worst after the Iraqi revolution of 1958, when the U.S. failed in aligning Iraq on the Western axis in the Cold War (Hahn).

Following the revolution of 1958 Baghdad witnessed other revolutions in 1963, 1968, and 1979. Although Iraq remained unstable, it emerged as an independent power. It followed neutralism in the Cold War. During the 1958-1979, the United States shared common goals and interests in Iraq; U.S. strove to maintain political relationship with Baghdad aiming at preventing the spread of communism (Hahn).

After the six Day War of June 1967, U.S.-Iraqi ties declined, since the U.S. was considered as an ally with Israel in those conflicts. After Saddam Hussein seized power in Baghdad, U.S. renewed its relations with Iraq. Tensions rose between Iraq and Iran and led to a war in September 1980. The U.S. involved in the Iran-Iraq war during President Ronald Reagan administration. U.S. has backed Iraq and provided it with economic assistance, restoring diplomatic relations (Hahn).

In the aftermath of the Iran-Iraq war, Saddam Hussein wanted to gain economic profits and more territories at the expense of Kuwait. Conflicts rose between the two countries during the 1989 and 1990. The George H. W. Bush administration interfered to resolve the conflict. On August 2, 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait, however, the U.S. proved its failure to prevent the invasion. Bush sought to resolve the problem; he positioned American soldiers in Saudi Arabia fearing another Iraqi military move to the region, he also put pressure on Hussein to abandon Kuwait by gathering military forces along Iraqi Borders. The United States persuaded a containment policy to prevent other conflicts; this policy lasted until the U.S.' invasion of Iraq in 2003 (Hahn).

3.2. U.S. Invasion of Iraq in 2003: Circumstances and Causes

The Iraq war was a watershed in modern U.S. military history. The war was a decade in the making; the idea of eliminating Saddam Hussein prevailed since the 1991 Gulf War.

President George W. Bush was persistent to wage a war against Iraq, he and his administrative officials gave some justifications and reasons for the invasion. Main arguments for the invasion concerned the Baath regime of Iraq which presented a dangerous threat to the U.S. and the world. The American policy-makers stated that their main objective was to overthrow Saddam's regime since it was developing the WMD, harboring and supporting terrorist groups and opposing the UN's humanitarian demands. Additional rationales for the Iraq War included: quest for reshaping the Middle East and promotion of democracy, access to oil, Israel security and the Persian Gulf War.

3.2.1. The New Middle East Plan

One of the main pillars of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East is its protectorate over the "world" oil reserves concentrated in the Persian Gulf (Hinnebusch). Iraq is considered as an important key in achieving U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. The first objective for the U.S. is to ensure an unrestricted access to Middle Eastern oil for U.S. and its allies. The Yom Kippur (Ramadan) war of October 1973, made Americans afraid of a potential oil shortage, they experience rise of oil prices a gas rationing during that period (Mockaitis).

The second goal is Israel's security, being a superpower; the Jewish state had a technological superiority and nuclear arsenal. The third goal of U.S. Middle Eastern policy is preventing any country from controlling Iraq. Thus, Iraq is proved to be significant in achieving U.S. goals. Iraq could control oil prices and its supply; also it has the ability to threaten Israel with acquiring nuclear weapons. After the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran, Iraq figured prominently in balancing power equation, with a U.S. military aid, Iraq waged a war against Iran in 1980 (Mockaitis).

Democratization of the Middle East becomes a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy; thus, the invasion of Baghdad has been perceived as the first step in the promotion of democracy to the entire Middle East. The U.S. saw that the spread of democracy is the best solution for all problems in the Arab world, especially terrorism. So, overthrowing Saddam Hussein's regime will allow democracy to prevail in Iraq and throughout the Middle East (Kabalan).

The 9/11 attacks had a great impact on the U.S. following the event the issue of democracy in the Middle East was tackled by U.S. officials. They declared that terrorism must be fought in the Middle East using democratic institutions. A new diplomatic approach has been adopted by the U.S. that implies a political reform in the Middle East, and invading Iraq was the first stage of the new Middle Eastern reform (Kabalan).

In this respect, replacing authoritarian regimes in the Middle East with democratic regimes ensure stability; democratizing the Middle East was significant for the spread of American political and economic hegemony.

3.2.2. Iraq's WMD

One of the most salient rationales for the invasion of Iraq was that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of destructions that represent a real threat for America and its allies. This justification was the most essential for the U.S. since it focuses on the threat of developing such weapons by Iraq. Following the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the U.S, invading Iraq became more convincing (Kabalan).

The spread of fear among Americans helped to persuade American public that Iraq possessed WMD. President Bush and his administration launched a campaign in order to convince Congress and American people of the necessity to invade Iraq. Bush in his 2002

State of the Union address; he described Iraq as a part of an “axis of evil” giving support to terrorism throughout the world (Kabalan).

Besides accusing Saddam Hussein of possessing WMD, another justification claimed the existence of ties between Iraq and terrorist groups, notably al Qaeda. Washington claimed that there was an alleged link between Saddam Hussein and Abu Moussab al-Zarqawi. Thus, Iraq was considered an accomplice with al-Qaeda in the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the U.S. The Bush administration’s decision of invading Iraq initiated the new plan of “war on terror” (Kabalan).

3.2.3. Oil Plans

Oil is another major rationale for the U.S. invasion of Iraq. The United States interests in oil and energy resources had been linked to its military power through history. U.S. decision to invade Iraq was driven by its desire to control Iraq’s oil reserves to ensure future energy supplies. Thus, U.S. wanted to gain control of Iraq’s oil in order to decrease its dependency on Persian Gulf oil, unlike European and East Asian countries (Amin).

U.S. hegemony primarily hinges on oil and other energy resources, the domination of U.S. hegemony since the Second World War depended on its companies’ control of the world’s oil resources in the Middle East. Besides, this natural resource is significant in the provision of military power. Consequently invading Iraq was pivotal for the U.S. to monitor oil supplies in the region as well as in the Middle East (Amin).

It has been concluded that the primary rationale for the U.S. for invading Iraq was neither fighting terrorism nor preventing the spread of WMD, but rather to gain more energy sources from external supplies to U.S. markets. By ensuring reliable energy

resources U.S. would lessen its dependency upon Saudi Arabia. In short, oil was one key driver of the Iraq war, and it is a major factor in all war in the Middle East (Amin).

3.2.4. Israel Security

The U.S. and Israel shared common objectives in the Middle East, their partnership to oppose any potential threats in the Middle East serve both parties. The Bush administration gave great importance for the security of Israel. U.S. supported Israel since the 1990s; both countries cooperated to eliminate terrorism that originated in the Arab as well as Muslim World (Amin).

Like the U.S, Israel sought to overthrow Saddam's regime, in 1996 Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu founded a grand strategy for Israel in the Middle East, entitled "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm", the document pointed that the U.S. should concentrate on breaking up Saddam's regime as a major goal for Israel (Kabalan). Security of Israel and its geopolitical supremacy can be perceived by the United States as a vital motive for invading Iraq. Since Saddam Hussein represents a threat to the security of Israel in the Middle East, thus by removing his regime the U.S would protect one of its significant allies, who share common strategic interests in the Middle East (Amin).

Israel is deemed a lobby that might change Iraq's regime during the Bush administration because the U.S had supplied Israel since the Second World War with economic, military and diplomatic assistance. Moreover, neoconservatives considered Israel's location in the Middle East significant. As a result, security of Israel had an

impact on the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq regarding the threat it posed on Israel (Amin).

3.2.5. The Persian Gulf War

The Persian Gulf War is considered another justification for the U.S invasion of Iraq, scholars deemed the war on Iraq as a continuation of the First War of 1990-1991. After the First Gulf War, Iraq was seen as a threat to its neighboring countries and a peril that endangered world peace. The United Nations wanted to prevent this threat thus, following the First Gulf War the Security Council had imposed UN Resolution 678, which entailed Iraq to destruct and remove all its WMD (Amin).

Consequently, the United States and its allies were allowed to use force in Iraq if this latter developed chemical and weapons. The UN Resolution has been violated by Saddam Hussein many times, so his regime was regarded as menace to both the U.S and the United Nations. Thus, in order to eradicate to threat posed by the dictator Saddam Hussein, the United States found waging a war against Iraq as its last resort (Amin).

3.3. Theories about the Iraq War

The Iraq war was a military invasion that lasted seven years (2003-2011). The invasion has become the largest, longest and most costly use of armed force by the United States since the Vietnam War. The invasion cost U.S \$ 1.6 trillion. The Bush administration launched this invasion in order to eliminate the danger from Iraq's Sunni leader Saddam Hussein. The Iraq war was a part of war on terror; different theories concerning the causes of the invasion have emerged and gave different explanations and justifications to the U.S decision of invading Iraq. The analytic perspectives include: Realism, Liberalism,

Marxism, Elite interests and Ideological influences. Each of these theories uses a differing ideology according to their beliefs and perspectives.

3.3.1. Realism

The realistic perspective supports government (or “states”) to be dominant in making decisions, they believe in the superiority of the state and its credible power; states’ involvement in taking actions is compulsory. Furthermore, they believe in that the international system is mere an anarchy, in which the use of power by states, is necessary to survive. Moreover, realists consider national and international securities as personal priorities, thus states have the right to wage wars against adversaries to protect its priorities and reinforce its power (Danju et al).

In this respect the U.S. decision to wage a war against Iraq was driven by its apprehension about its national security which was threatened by Saddam Hussein’s policy that supports terrorism. Iraq’s regime was a dictatorship opposing U.S. foreign policy of democracy, besides its possession to WMD and ties with Al-Qaeda, these rationales were convincing enough to invade Iraq (Danju et al).

Furthermore, the realistic perspective explained why Iraq was targeted and not other countries like Iran, North Korea or Libya which are more dangerous. They argued that since President Bush declared his will to change Iraq’s regime and this was U.S. priority, war on Iraq was inevitable driven by Bush’s and U.S. reputation motive. Also, realism addressed the location of Iraq as a key driver, its position is significant, and it helped U.S. to exert its power into the Middle East through military bases in Iraq (Danju et al).

Consequently, from a realist perspective U.S. invasion of Iraq was a means to obtain its objectives and reinforce its power, especially after the 9/11 attacks. Besides, U.S. sought to disarm Iraq and prevent it from using WMD and its oil resources as a means of threat against U.S. and its allies. It intended to prevent any Iraq's cooperation with anti-United States terrorist groups (Danju et al).

In realist terms, bipolar distribution of power permitted U.S. to invade Iraq, it allowed the U.S. to oppose any potential challenges, maintaining its military and political hegemony, the 9/11 attacks was considered a rationale for Iraq invasion. Also, realism believes that Israel security necessitates the overthrow of Iraqi regime. In addition to that, realists stated that by invading Iraq, Syria's stability will be threatened, and Syria is deemed as a foe for the U.S. and Israel. In a nutshell, realism's rationales for Iraq invasion concerned keeping U.S. dominance and maintaining its hegemony over other countries, preventing potential challenges by prohibiting development of weapons of mass destruction and putting pressure on hostile states that may endanger U.S. superiority (Danju et al).

3.3.2. Liberalism

Liberals' beliefs address the issue of harmony existence among humankind, they argue that wars are not a result of human actions but rather they are the result of imperfect political institutions. Also, they believe in democracy states to be less aggressive than authoritarian ones. Liberals states live in peace, once they are menaced or attacked by non-liberal states, they defend by waging wars. Thus, U.S. invasion of Iraq was a defensive war opposed a non-liberal and authoritarian state in order to achieve a universal peace (Danju et al).

Liberal theories believe in the spread of democracy as a key element in maintaining global security, and fighting liberals who are dictators by replacing them by democracies promotes peace. In addition, another argument states that a democracy state fear from a non-democracy one, this latter is not controlled by government and it is permitted to use force. Hence, democracies may use deception and attack first. In this respect, U.S. invasion of Iraq is explained by its fear from potential attack from Iraq who possessed WMD (Danju et al).

3.3.3 Marxism

Marxist theory is an economic approach which emphasized class conflict rather than state conflict; it focuses on its tendency for change and betterment of societies using socialism. Thus, from a Marxist perspective U.S. invasion of Iraq is explained in terms of desire for control of natural resources, notably oil and access to new markets reinforcing its power. Moreover, Marxist scholars consider that invading Iraq was not driven by rationales of Iraq's Possession of weapons of mass destruction, promotion of democracy, liberating Iraq (Danju et al).

This theory argues that U.S. invasion of Iraq was stemmed in its desire to gain more power, asserting its hegemony; U.S. wanted more new markets seeking a broad global corporate capitalism. Since capitalism implies seeking profits and expansionism, U.S. invasion to Iraq was explained by its tendency (as a liberal state) toward search for profits and expansion in the Middle East, remarkably in Iraq. The United States invaded Iraq for the sake of its own national interests (Danju et al).

3.3.3. Elite Interests

Some institutions and interest groups have a role in decision making as well as waging wars. Wars can be used by officials in order to mislead public opinion as well as media's attention from administration's deviations and mistakes. President Bush saw war on Iraq as his best solution and last resort to avoid blame for the 9/11 attacks and to mislead opposition attention from his mishandling of terrorism during his first months of presidency (Danju et al).

War on Iraq can be justified in terms of seeking interests by specific faction of government. Bush's decision to wage a war on Iraq was driven by his military interest in ceasing the policy of containment founded by first Bush toward Iraq (Lieberfeld).

3.3.4. Ideological Influences

Leaders' personal psychologies ideological influences have an impact on their decisions. President Bush's decision to invade Iraq was affected by his advisors and decision-makers who probably share the same ideologies, notably neo-conservatism, anti-communism and Zionist ideologies, in addition to the defensive nationalist sentiment among officials and public. All these motives had an influence on the decision of the invasion (Lieberfeld).

Ideologies of conservatism believe in fighting liberalism and communism since the Cold War. Neoconservatives have relation with lobby groups like the Committee on the Present Danger, the Project for a New American Century, and the American Institute, they are convinced that the U.S. should use its power in order to keep its hegemony and promote democracy. They believe in war on terror as a way to maintain U.S. security stable (Lieberfeld).

Like his predecessor Presidents of the Cold War, President Bush continued the implementation of “appeasement” policies in the invasion of Iraq. In an Oriental perspective, “Arab” and “Muslim” countries are deemed as inferior, backward and primitive, they denote barbarism and otherness. Thus Arab states are opposed by American Orientals’ ideologies and such personal beliefs and stereotypes about Arab countries have an impact on President Bush as well as his advisors and administrative policymakers, since they scornfully despised and underestimated Arab peoples, thus they decide to use confrontation and force to improve U.S. policy in the region (Lieberfeld).

Ideological considerations and personal preferences may be used by elites who are always greedy to empower their positions, wealth and fame. The 9/11 attacks resulted in the spread of fears among Americans and a strong desire to retaliate, a national desire for vengeance rose among them, that pushed the U.S. to invade Iraq. Another explanation argued that the impetus for Iraq war stemmed in Bush’s relationship with his father, Bush did not want to follow his father’s steps, and rather he wanted to prove himself a self-made man. While his father was seen as a weak person, President Bush opted for overthrowing Saddam Hussein’s regime to ameliorate his image among public (Lieberfeld).

From a feminist perspective, women’s presence in governance and their role in decision making is crucial in decreasing violence and wars. Consequently, the decision of the invasion may be related to the absence of women who make such decisions. U.S. decision to lead-up a war against Iraq had plenty motives driven by ideological preferences: Orientalist attitudes toward Arabs, the desire of elite to gain reputation, a need for revenge after the 9/11 attacks, and masculinity of administration’s members (Lieberfeld).

3.4. The Impact of Iraq's Invasion on U.S. Foreign Policy in the Middle East

The invasion of Iraq is considered one of the main events after the Cold War that had substantial impacts on the Middle East. The war which reasons were unjustified and unconvincing and which was supposed to promote democracy to Iraq and the entire Middle East, failed to achieve its goal. Democratization has not been achieved; instead Iraq and the Middle East faced negative effects including: expansion of terrorism, shift of power from global actors to regional actors and domestic actors, competition of power between Iran and Saudi Arabia.

3.4.1 Expansion of Terrorism

The Iraq war was opposed by theorists in the International Relation (IR), the Bush administration did not gain their support since realists argued that what matters more in relations among states are power and interests, thus they declared that wars against Iran and Kuwait were rational and justified, since Saddam Hussein in his war against Iran sought security, and has invaded Kuwait because he searched for economic interests. Consequently these rationales are considered justifications for preventing terrorism expansionism in the Middle East (Hasan).

Iraq war seemingly had influenced the Middle East, IR scholars argued that the war affected Arab countries resulted in Arab spring, because after Saddam Hussein was expelled, many other authoritarian Arab countries revolted against their regimes. So, the primary impact of Iraq was expansion of terrorism in the Middle East (Hasan).

Ties between United States and Arab societies were affected too; there was an increase in anti-Americanism sentiment among Arabs and Muslims. In this respect President

Bush's decision to invade Iraq was inappropriate as it had a great influence on U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East, the U.S. was no longer seen an ally for Arab states, its reputation was affected too (Hasan).

Terrorism expanded after Iraq's occupation, thus U.S. troops launched campaigns to counter terrorism attacks operating notably in Sunni areas between 2006 and 2011.

Tensions rose between Sunni and Shia, Al Qaeda seized the opportunity to exploit the tension and attract Sunnis convincing them to join the organization. This latter operated several terrorist attacks against Iraq in 2006 and 2007 (Hasan).

The United States killed Zarqawi, leader of Al Qaeda organization, after him Abu Ayyub al-Masri became the new leader and founded a new terrorist group was labeled Islamic State of Iraq (ISI), and this organization continued provoking conflicts between Shia and Sunni groups. Violence continued to increase; during the period of 2011 and 2013 around 8000 Iraqi civilians were killed. The Arab spring and tensions in Syria resulted in the emergence of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) which represented huge threat to Iraq, Syria and the whole world (Hasan).

3.4.2. Shift of Power: From Global Actors to Regional and Domestic Actors

Iraq invasion had a significant impact on shifting power from global actors to regional and domestic actors. The Gulf war of 1991 was supported by the United Nations and UN Security Council, US decision to resolve the tension between Iraq and Kuwait has been supported, unlike the Iraq war in 2003, the U.S. decision was not supported from some U.S. allies such as France and Germany who opposed the war (Hasan).

Concerning regional actors, the impact of Iraq war changed regional power, before the war countries share regional supremacy among them and they were supported by the U.S.

and USSR in order to keep the balance of power, preventing wars and maintaining peace. Thus, the principle of power balance among countries of the Middle East is crucial notably among countries which produce oil, once this balance in power shifts; it will cause a threat of stability and security in the region, besides it will affect U.S. hegemony (Hasan).

U.S. hegemony has decreased after the Iraq war, this was due to several reasons, first it was hard for the U.S. to prevent violence and conflicts in the region, especially between Israelis and Palestinians, also the U.S. found it difficult to unite Iraq and democratize it since the country is vulnerable to violence caused by internal factors. Second, U.S. hegemony was rejected by some factions, such Iran, terrorist groups and Islamic organizations in Iraq and Syria. Third, U.S. involvement in global actors like France, which required a huge engagement in the region. Besides the increase in anti-Americanism movements in the Middle East after the occupation of Iraq (Hasan).

Regarding domestic actors, many of new domestic actors appeared after the Iraq war, Iraq's diversity makes it vulnerable to tensions caused by both internal and external factors. After the Iraq war tensions between Sunnis who ruled the country and Kurds as well as Shias. Before the war Iraq has been ruled by Sunni minorities, after the war other identities have emerged like Kurdish and Shia, thus Iraq became a pro-Iranian government (Hasan).

The Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) has appeared as a new domestic actor in Iraq after 2003, and it was officially recognized by the new constitution of Iraq in 2005, which gave more power and privileges to regions and provinces producing oil notably for KRG and has deprived Sunni regions from getting access to oil fields. In short the Iraq

war resulted in a shift of power from global actors to domestic actors, Kurds as a new emerging group they established new ties with neighboring countries like Turkey (Hasan).

3.4.3. Competition of Power between Iran and Saudi Arabia

The invasion of Iraq has influenced both Iran and Saudi Arabia and led to a power competition between the two countries. On one hand, before the war Iran sought to expand Islamic radicalism to the Middle East, but Iraq was a hurdle for Iran's efforts and ambitions. Iran was seen as "axis of evil", after the war Iran benefited from the invasion of Iraq since it was able to change its power and expand in the Middle East, because of its impact on other countries of the region such as: Palestine, Bahrain and Lebanon (Hasan).

On the other hand, Saudi Arabia took into consideration Iran's expansion and its growing influence. Saudi Arabia asked the U.S. not to wage a war against Iraq and Afghanistan. But the U.S ignored Saudi Arabia's warning and invaded Iraq and Afghanistan. Iran represented a threat for Saudi Arabia because it had a great impact on regions of the Middle East like Iraq. Thus, Saudi Arabia competed with Iran in increasing its power in order to prevent Iran from expansion and to reduce its dangers in the whole Middle East (Hasan).

As a conclusion, the Iraq war is the third unnecessary war into which the U.S. has engaged in since 1945, after the war with China (1950-1953) and the Vietnam War 1965. the invasion was unjustified, explanations for the war were unconvincing. U.S. invasion and occupation supposed to expel a brutal and dictator from power, opening the door to the possibility of enduring positive political and economic change in Iraq. Theories provided justifications for the invasion; most of them concerned keeping U.S.

hegemony and superiority, Iraq's interests were excluded, the alleged democracy to be promoted because of the war also evaporated. The war was mere a means of destruction rather than construction, the Iraq war has influenced negatively the whole Middle East, it was the reason for the uprising terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda and ISIS, besides the emergence of anti-Americanism sentiments among Arab and Muslim countries, U.S. relations with Arab states have been spoiled, many of them condemned the occupation hence the U.S. failed to maintain good ties with Arabs who considered American as an evil and a threat. Also, the Iraq war resulted in following revolutions among Arab countries known as Arab Spring, in which they declare the change of their authoritarian regimes and replace them by democracies.

Conclusion

The United States involvement in the Middle East did not start until the outbreak of the Second World War, by the end of the Cold War the United States and the Soviet Union appeared as two superpowers, thus the Arab countries were divided into two parts; the first sided with the Soviet Union like Syria and Egypt (till 1976 it became supporter of the U.S) while the second part sided with the United States including Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iraq (which became a supporter for the Soviet Union in 1959). By the end of the Cold War the U.S. has emerged as a sole superpower and an important international actor; the U.S. had a wide history with the Middle East and Arab countries, traditionally it sought to ensure its core interests in the region using either cooperation or coercion.

Throughout the twenty-first century the U.S. has attempted to seek a long-term transformation in the Middle East by promoting democracy. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks marked the beginning of the U.S. new policy in the region. The notion of promoting democracy was the ideological basis of U.S.' opposition of its enemies who were imperialists, communists and fascists. Thus, the war on Iraq in 2003 was driven also by a rationale of democratization of the region and the whole Middle East; the U.S. justified the occupation by Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction and the alleged involvement of Saddam Hussein in the terrorist attacks of 9/11 with Al-Qaeda organization. Ties between Iraq and the United States and Iraq under George. W Bush administration was characterized by hostility, since Iraq was seen as a threat of U.S' stability and opposed its interests in the Middle East.

U.S.-Jordan diplomatic relations were established in 1949, U.S. foreign policy toward Jordan depended on a number of factors; mainly the strategic position of Jordan, its pro-western regime, its significant role in the Arab-Israeli peace process and its ideologies. During the cold war countries had the same negative attitudes concerning the Soviet Union, their relations have been evolved and they cooperated on plenty issues economic, military and political. Their relations elaborated more and continued till present time.

The study shows that the United States' main objective in the Arab countries is to spread its hegemony and to achieve its objectives as getting access to oil, the U.S. may use two form of power in conducting its foreign policy, either hard power or soft power and sometimes both of them. U.S. soft power is embodied in its ties with Jordan, this latter is an ally for America; both of them share the same interests and ideologies. Also, Jordan's location is significant for the U.S. to achieve its objectives and interests in the Middle East, Jordan is deemed as a buffer between the Arab countries and Israel as well. Besides, Jordan-U.S. ideologies are compatible, and important in their partnership.

The study reveals that U.S. hard power is implemented in case of its hegemony and stability are vulnerable to potential threats, Iraq is the best example of U.S. implementation of hard power, when the U.S. felt that Iraq would constitute a threat and menaced its security, president Bush decided to invade Iraq in order to secure his country.

To sum up, U.S. relations with Arab countries though vary from cooperation to hostile, America still looks for its own objectives regardless to what kind of power it implement or what kind of foreign policy it conducts. War in Iraq was one of the unnecessary wars in American history, their causes are unjustified and even the Bush administration gave justifications like advancing democracy in the region, they still unconvincing. Jordan's

cooperation with the U.S sometimes is due to the shared interests of the two countries, other times Jordan is obliged to do so because of its dependency on the U.S. in promoting the country.

