Is U.S. Middle East Foreign Policy Dominated by Neo-Realist School of Thought?

Dr. Lubna Sunawar∗

Abstract

As a formal academic discipline, international relations emerged in 1919, since then the realistic school of thought dominated not only academic debate but also major foreign policy decisions. By emphasizing the actions between states, this school of thought focuses on 'high politics.' This research article aims to demonstrate the significance of 'low politics' when it comes to domestic policy making which has been an under researched area in the domain of International Relations. This article explains the belief that identity and self - perception of otherness play a major role in foreign policy making, and in this regard there is no exception to U.S. Middle East policy. The analysis focuses on the U.S. desires to strengthen its 'global actorness' on the international stage. Through a constructivist approach, the article makes an attempt to explore however, that Self-Other perception explains foreign policy making with reference to Iraq war, Syrian war, Iran's nuclear program, and Israel-Palestine conflict. I argue that, contrary to recent assumptions made by IR school of thought, the challenge facing identity and ideas, such as realism and liberalism, must be assessed in the context of U.S. policy making for the Middle East. These assumptions are being tested to investigate U.S. foreign policy making for the Middle East region by employing a qualitative methodology. The main methodological technique used for interpreting the role of identity and self - perception is Discourse Analysis.

∗ Dr. Lubna Sunawar is Assistant Professor at the Department of Peace & Conflict Studies, National Defence University, Islamabad.

Keywords

Foreign Policy, Political Parties, Terrorist Organizations, Middle East, Policy Making

1. Introduction

Foreign policy of any state is a set of goals which states employ to achieve their respective international goals while statecraft is the way how states implement their respective foreign policies. A nation state can reflect its' foreign policy through actions and decisions. It includes different complexities when it comes to explaining a nation state's foreign policy and remains a daunting task for two main reasons: first, decisions and actions of a state often do not match in the international system; second, overabundance of theoretical approaches makes it impossible to look at foreign policy from different perspectives. At the same time, elucidation of foreign policy is like tempting puzzle, the additional one gets into it the additional engaging it becomes, albeit sometimes it is challenging, this is especially the case with U.S. foreign policy, the policy of the foremost powerful country on earth (Alagha, 2014, pp. 3-4).

This paper provides insight into prominent U.S. foreign policy theoretical approaches, i.e. realism, liberalism, neoclassical realism, constructivism based on understanding the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East region.

Some scholars have attempted to show the significance of external / systematic factors in U.S. foreign policy making. Though I have very briefly touched upon other major dominating International Relations (IR) schools of thought but my basic focus has been on giving comparison between neo-realism and constructivism and finally addressing the loopholes which neo-realism has not addressed and found constructivism approach more relevant and appealing in the post 9/11 era to explain the role of the U.S. In particular, efforts were made on the basis of national identities and ideas to analyze the U.S. policy formulation and implementation in the respective regions.

The basic research question: "Is US Middle East Foreign Policy dominated by neo-realist school of thought?" I have chosen

constructivists school of thought as a theoretical framework and discourse analysis as an analytical qualitative method as a methodology.

I have two main central arguments:

Argument No. 1: In analysing the role of 'identity' and 'self-other perception' the constructive approach is beneficial while shaping foreign policy in the presence of conflict and,

Argument No. 2: The Constructivist approach is different from material based theories as it puts forth the National identities as the basis of national interests that have a major impact on the formulation of foreign policy.

2. Study's Importance

The definition of US foreign policy towards conflict in the Middle East is rarely debated in the context of identity and self-perception. According to my own research, there are limited numbers of studies on this issue. So that the current study become imperative and persuasive. Moreover, the US is a global actor in the Middle East that infrequently discussed in relation to identity and self-other perception. Therefore, in the presence of Middle East conflicts like Iraq war, Syrian war, and Iran's issue and Israeli-Palestinian conflict this study become more vigilant in which the understanding of identity and self-other perception interpreting the behaviour of big power. The foreign policy in the respective reigns is observable where conflict matters remain unresolved. In my opinion the constructive approach is useful while analysing the role of identity and self-perception that shapes foreign policy in this conflict. The new constructive assumption not used in the established International Relations (IR) schools like realism. Constructive approach provides the deepen understanding of conflict in the Middle East that significantly enhances the study's importance. In this view, the study addresses the gap of academic literature about identity and self-other perception in understanding the nature of conflict in the region (Alagha, 2014).

3. Objectives of the Research

America's foreign policy is hugely relevant to the Iraq war, the Syrian war, Iran's issue of nuclear program, and the Palestinian statehood. Therefore, the prime purpose of this study is to investigate U.S. foreign policy making in the Middle East using a constructivist approach.

4. Qualitative Methodology

This is a qualitative research which is acceptable for social scientists. Qualitative approach strengthened the research argument of current study that is constructive in nature. It allows for a comprehensive and interpreted understanding of the Middle East as opposed to a general analysis of U.S. foreign policy. The study of identity and self-other perception is suitable for qualitative methodology (Alagha, 2014). Furthermore, qualitative approach has different functions; as Ritchie describes four functions: contextual, explanatory, evaluative and generative. These functions discuss how identity and self-perception influence foreign policy making sense of effectiveness in ways that others cannot do. This approach also helps the researcher to give suitable answers of the research questions related to the social construction of foreign policy along with the context and meaning of its construction.

5. Discourse as an Analytical Qualitative Method

Discourse analysis is among those methods that have gained prominence in qualitative research in the last decade. In IR, discourse analysis offers analytical qualitative method in constructive theory. Thus, current study uses discourse analysis rather than critical discourse analysis, as an analytical qualitative method. The use of discourse in this study is not as a linguistic concept but in the light of Michel Foucault's concept of language and practice. The reason behind the selection of discourse for this study is to interpret and understand the role of identity and self-other perception reflecting how foreign policy making is perceived as socially constructed process. Accordingly, identity and self-other perception are perceived in discourse as actors. Discourse analysis describes how actors display their self and how they present other (Alagha, 2014). Discourse is applicable on spoken as well as written

language. In world politics, language plays an important role and has strong connection between language and power. Gee (2014) mentions that discourse analysis is about the study of usage of language; e.g. in terms of saying (information), doing (action) and being (identity). Different scholars have used discourse analysis for critical thinking in the relationship of text and context. The advantage of doing so is to offer the understanding of the meaning and context of speech and written text. Meaning is not a simple understanding of mixture of words but also to understand the roots of the context in which they produced. Therefore, meanings draw from context. The stress placed on textual meanings and relation to the context is the main focus of discourse analysis. Chilton and Schäffner (2002) argue that a text is political if its context includes producers like politicians. However, discourse analysis is useful to revoke the relationship between text and context only as a meaning or as a construct to be understood within a context i.e., there will be no meaning outside the context. Foucault contended that "a group of statements provide a language to talk about… a specific moment in history" (Alagha, 2014, pp. 38-60). So that, Foucault discusses the use of discourse analysis in terms of meaning; what is say able or thinkable about a particular issue in general.

Thus, in order to test the foreign policy making structuralist, realist, liberal or Marxist paradigms is highly considered. But viewing at US discourses and statements it will expose a diverse political conduct towards the Middle East. The realist, structuralist or Marxist paradigms are not sufficient for interpreting these differences in the discourse of the US identity and self-other perception that create the buzzwords which direct major work in the constructivist school in the making of foreign policy.

6. Theoretical Framework and Discussion

With the release of Kenneth Waltz's book, International Politics Theory in 1979, neo-realism or structural realism emerged as a school in International Politics. The book of Waltz was an attempt to update the classic method of Realism (Kirdim, 2017).

Neo-realists, however, do not agree that in international politics human nature can be a focus, but argue that the system itself determines the state-to-state affairs. Waltz claims that anarchy is based on the international form of government because there is no central authority to control state affairs; and therefore every state within the international system is equally sovereign. Each state is responsible to manage its own affairs and ensures to defend its vital interests. In such like environment, states contend with one another so as to maximise their own gains in one way or other. Waltz says that states could enter into strategic alliances with one another however; the only real purpose remains same to realize most several advantages out of the alliances they form (Waltz, 1979, pp.7-20).

The dominant international relations paradigm has been, and is now, realism-specifically neo-realism for a long time. The theory of neo-realism gives primacy in the international system to state actors, arguing that non-state actors have little or no impact on the state. However, in such states, this state-centered analysis of inter-state relations and specifically foreign policy analysis leaves much to be discussed in the post-9/11 era. The current state-centered view of international relations thus gives an incomplete picture of the reasons behind current and past policies and events (Olsen , 2017, pp. 2-3).

There have been on-going efforts to combine external / systemic and domestic / internal determinants to create a more explanatory theory of foreign policy. One of the best examples of this endeavour is the emergence of neoclassical realistic theory. Neoclassical realists argue that visually examining the interactions between both systematic and domestic factors is the best way to understand and expose U.S. foreign policy. However, according to neoclassical realism, systematic factors can play a consequential role in explaining the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. The distribution of power in the international system cannot provide a clear and convincing explanation in a neo-classical, realistic notion. In other words, it is necessary to take into account domestic factors to understand how the systemic factors are predicted by the U.S. policymakers.

This research article uses the intellectual weaknesses of realist theory as the start of a path leading to an argument that realist school of thought shows loopholes and does not give a convincing explanation of U.S. power projection in the Middle East. Realism, however, is an absolute international relations theory. Rather, if they recognized the role of non - state actors, realism, and neo - realism, they would face fewer issues — such as state conflict — centric analysis and terrorist study.

Finally, the events on 9/11 persuaded the U.S. leaders to revise their foreign policy at international level generally and for the Middle East in particular. The leaders of the U.S. have redirected their foreign policy to the Middle East and to Iraq and Afghanistan in particular. I argue that not only did these operations remain highly unsuccessful, but the deployment of ground troops in Iraq and Afghanistan also did not serve the great strategic interests of the U.S. This leads to inquire what the very rationale of U.S. presence in the Middle Eastern region is (Tellis & Eggers, 2017).

While the Middle East was considered a "manageable" region, the 9/11 attacks prompted U.S. leaders to revisit their Middle East foreign - policy agenda (Olsen , 2017, p.14). U.S. methodology, as delineated by the 2002 National Security Strategy was really a challenged business as usual to address the "axis of evil." The new spotlight on military intrusions in Afghanistan and Iraq incited immense increments in U.S. barrier spending plans. In 2000, the protection expenditure plan totalled USD 382 billion and expanded to a total of USD 433 billion in 2002 and USD 630 billion by 2008 (Olsen , 2017, p.14).

The neo - realists see the democrats' view of a whole different world. For them, the anarchic idea of the worldwide framework, portrayed by the world government's non - appearance, shows the universal framework as a Hobbesian wilderness. Neo - realists swing to confirm their philosophical foundation is to this English logician and not to Kant. Hobbes (1894) portrayed the anarchic global framework in *The Leviathan*, distributed in 1651, as itself prompting struggle. States ended up in the wilderness without any central authority, where they tried to survive. Power was the intention of the universal framework of Hobbes (1894) because in a rebellious world a state could guarantee its survival. States should continually think about their rapid welfare in order to

survive. Neo - realists still see the advancement of the prompt narrow - minded interests of a state as their incomparable goal in external strategy (Hulsman, 1996, pp. 90-107). Once again, the idea of national intrigue is evident here in the state's own survival and insurance. Neo-realists feel that U.S. national interests have driven the U.S. to see that no hegemonic opponent appears to be countering American power since 1945. Neo-realists and democrats contrast sharply with American aid to pleasant oppressive governments along these lines, with neo-realists struggling to uphold them as long as they are friendly to American interests (Hulsman, 1996, pp. 99-105). John Gray echoed this neo-realist view. He believes that a successful post-Cold War foreign policy involves recognizing American power's limits as well as judging where American vital interests are at stake (Hulsman, 1996, pp. 99-105). Many neo-realists are confident that the U.S. should take on a functioning job in the world while perceiving that the U.S. power has confined itself and should be used when it comes to U.S. interests that are truly fundamental.

Mettemich believes that events that cannot be avoided need to be directed in the light of the specific policy prescriptions of the neo-realist. While some neo-realists see the U.S. as the world's only great power left, with the Soviet Union's demise, none consider it possible for the U.S. to exercise domination. Many neo-realists argue that if the U.S. wants increased burden sharing, a portion of its preponderant power must be willing to give up. Former State Secretary Lawrence Eagleburger, an outspoken neo-realist, criticized American foreign policy's democrat tendency (Hulsman, 1996, pp. 99-105).

In January 2003, Mearsheimer and Walt published "An Unnecessary War" in the magazine Foreign Policy, invalidating neo-traditionalist battle struggles in Iraq. This article spread the realistic evidence against the war in Iraq by belligerence that regulation and prevention were a superior choice of strategy than intrusion. Without an unmistakable post - Cold War enemy and without noticeable positions with the Bush administration, after the 9/11 attacks, the realists were not very well positioned to win the "Clash of Civilizations." Since realists kept on review states as the essential performing artists, the risk of non-state actors, for example, al-Qaeeda was missing in quite a bit of their

examination and arrangement systems. Numerous realists stayed worried about the growing strength of China as an economic giant. Many were unable to influence their ideas along these lines and present a strategy or offer solutions once after 9/11 the "war on terrorism" broke through the political discourse. (Boettner , 2009, pp. 59-67). The constructivist theory used in the context of the Middle East to study U.S. discourses; while there are several approaches to foreign policy making, this study limits its discussion to realism and social constructivism by briefly discussing neo-realists, liberalists, neo-classical schools of thought. First, realism indicates that the most important using forces behind foreign policy selections are materialistic factors for a state which include military power and economic power and other resources which are vital to live in an anarchic environment; second, constructivism argues that ideational factors are the first-rate manner to provide an explanation for the conduct of friendship / enmity amongst states (which includes the function of culture as a tool of social mobilization or perception of threats) (Al Toraifi, 2012, pp. 32-33). Use of constructivist theory does not mean that other theories are not helpful or are wrongheaded. With regard to the US global actorness, those political entities are objects in the realm of foreign policy making, as global actors in the international milieu (Alagha, 2014, p. 44).

In order to explain and interpret the patterns and processes of foreign policy by states, non - state actors and other policies, identity is a "central" approach to constructivism. The role of identity is considered at the centre of competition over action for Jackson and McDonald (2009), attempts to justify or consent to specific policy preferences. From a constructivist point of view, the evaluation of the function of identity in foreign policy making starts with the question that how do international actors see and outline themselves, different actors and the surroundings wherein they live? That is, self-other perception by global actors plays an important role in determining the foreign policy towards issues like Iraq and Syria war, Iran's nuclear program, and establishing Palestinian statehood (Wendt, 1992, pp. 1-10).

Alexander Wendt asserts essential principles of constructivism. The primary is that human association systems are broadly speaking

determined by way of shared ideas, and not by material forces. Second, 'those shared ideas build the identities and interests of practical actors in place of being given by using nature' (Wendt, 1992, pp. 1-10). The identity of state or actor is built by shared ideas, beliefs, and values, according to Wendt. Wendt emphasizes the importance of understanding the making of foreign policy in the international milieu through a lens that gives central importance to the role of identity which is constructed by shared ideas. Therefore, the prime focus is given to the socially constructed character of foreign policy making in which the guiding actors are shared ideas, values, beliefs, norms and knowledge. We can say that constructivism is a theoretical approach interested in how shared ideas, values, beliefs, norms and knowledge define the internal structure that construct the states' identities and 'self-other' perception which then affect their foreign policy making (Wendt, 1992, pp. 1-10).

The constructivist assumptions should provide a better understanding of how the identity and perception of the U.S. are constructed in the course of its relation with the Middle East conflict. Thus, it is important to determine what sources and bases they draw upon for deriving their identity and self-other perception as well as in which explanatory traditions and ideas they ground their discourses in addressing on-going political issues, for instance, the Iraq and Syrian war, the emergence of ISIS, the question of Iran's nuclear program, and Palestinian-Israel conflict (Wendt, 1992, pp. 1-10).

The constructivist approach is particularly effective in determining the role of identity and perception of self-other in foreign policy making. Actors' identity and the self-other perception are constructed through discourse. This is based on language as a system of social communication. This leads to a deep understanding of the meaning between text and context in the course of studying foreign policy making. In regard to this view, Checkel argues that constructivism has succeeded in expanding the theoretical contours of IR by exploring identity issues and leads to a new and meaningful interpretation of international politics. The second strength of constructivism is due attention to process, and thus to social construction as an element in any social process (Checkel, 1998, pp. 320-327).

Due to these strengths constructivism seems an appropriate approach to theorise about foreign policy making by the U.S. in the Middle East conflict. It provides an alternative understanding of the neorealist and liberal central assumptions of state interaction on the international level, including the meaning of security and the anarchic nature of IR and interdependent relations between states. Constructivism emphasizes the social aspect of states' interaction which is influenced by shared ideas, beliefs, values and norms. Thus, the respective foreign policy of the U.S. towards the Middle East is influenced by perceptions of the self and otherness rather than being restricted to a security agenda, or accumulating material capabilities (Alagha, 2014, p. 48).

The more regularly social interactions became, the greater geared up humans used social platforms like Facebook, twitter, and messenger blackberry to reconstruct their social identities; as Dodge wrote, the needs for complete citizenship, for the popularity of man or woman political rights were a powerful topic of unification at some stage in the Arab revolutions. (Dodge, 2012). This human cognizance changed into one of the maximum powerful equipment for structural change, where the connection between material forces and thoughts led people to question the origins of what they accepted as universal truth of their lives, main to the idea of making an alternative path, in fact an alternative world an opportunity global inside the Middle East (Jhon et al., 2011). To apprehend the civil warfare inside the realm of a constructivism, a few aspects of Syria and its struggle needs to be unpacked. For generations, Assad's circle of relatives has dominated Syria; they are Alawites, a branch of non-extreme Islam. The Syrian civilians were initially angry at the put off in delivering lengthy — the authorities promised economic and political reforms whilst the government answered violently to people uprising in opposition to president Bashar al-Assad. The civil conflict commenced as a result, more than one party have joined the revolution with their personal agendas— and lots of them are religious. Rebellion businesses use the unrest to help fight a conflict that eventually was a chaotic cultural conflict (Hale, 2016, p.1).

President Barack Obama delivered a 2013 speech on Syria's role in which he expresses, quite properly, Syria's national failure to obtain shared dreams. "Faced with such carnage, many withdrew to their sectarian identity – Alawites and Sunni, Christian and Kurd, and the situation spiralled into a civil war". For this purpose, constructivism gives an explanation: this religiously and culturally diverse state is making an attempt to perform without a convergent ideal framework. Consequently, there has been such confusion among actors between conflicting goals and miscommunication. So, if these actors had identities based on their own different beliefs, stories, etc., constructivists explain the conflict logically (Hale, 2016, p.1).

Consistent with constructivist principle, actors in disagreement must look beyond their differences to discover ability mutuality that could then act as a platform for resolving the conflicts. This idea is applicable to the warfare in Syria as it's now far beyond the conflict for justice of Syrian people; it's intertwined with religion, tradition, and justice. However, the theory can only explain the causes of the conflict and why it continues (Hale, 2016, p.1).

Politicians and professionals from the U.S. and Israel are suggesting an ever-wished preventive strike since Iran's nuclear improvement has dire effects for regional and international stability. Iranian leaders suggest that any foreign incursion into Iran's soil will cause relentless and determined navy retaliation, a severe risk to Iran's big conventional army and international components of petroleum. Then again, realistic and constructivist scholars recommend that Iran's pursuit of nuclear guns is anything but irrational. As a substitute, its overseas coverage is a logical reaction to regional insecurity due to an increasing U.S. military presence in the Middle East and a slew of unfriendly nearby nuclear-armed neighbours not begun to ratify the NPT.

The collective identity shaped by the past glory of Iran and its subsequent history of marginalization, the Shah's mutual distrust among the U.S. and Iran's domestic political dynamics all make contributions to the repeated failure to remedy the present day crisis (Hale, 2016, p.1). Efforts to pressure Iran to change its foreign policy have failed due to a lack of knowledge of the quantity to which Iran's national identity affects

its attitudes towards nuclear development and openness to cooperate with Western powers. In this sense, the mutual animosity and confrontational commitment still prevent any meaningful diplomatic development. In an effort to deepen the role of societal norms, values, and beliefs in dictating Iran's foreign policy, other scholars analyse the conflict among the U.S. and Iran from a constructivist point of view (Hale, 2016, p.1).

It is the perception of a foreign issue or entity that explains attitudes as well as interaction between national and state. Constructivism challenges the validity of using rationality to explain the conduct of states in place of the underlying standards of sensible wondering. The belief of an Iranian nuclear crisis is consequently flawed because fact cannot exist, given the subjective nature of every actor's notion. Instead, the ideologies and identities of the nation make contributions to their ideological shape, which in turn affects their interactions with different states. Foreign policy of Iran regarding nuclear development can be seen as the product of a search for security and ideological thinking. The international response to the modern crisis and the on-going diplomatic deadlock between Iran and the rest of the world stems from Iran's complex interactions with the west since the Islamic revolution (Hale, 2016, p.12).

This attempt focuses to investigate how US become a global actor and article tries to explore the process of achieving global actorness of US by the help of a model presented by Bretherton and Vogler. The model describes that, the global actorness is based on three factors: presence, opportunities and capability. Presence means the relationship between internal developments and external prospects beyond borders, while capability means the internal perspective of external objectives which make actorness. It is the capability of foreign policy instruments to play a global role within the external environment which accommodates the desire of actorness (Bretherton & Vogler, 2005, pp. 10-35).

By this approach we can easily understand the foreign policy making by global power that appears to be meaningful and better to understand in process of constructing the self as a global actor. The adopted model emphasise the temporal nature of global actorness in the context of identity and self-other perception that construct and maintain

this identity to re-negotiate with others under limited influence of internal and external developments. In the constructive approach, it is the main focus to understand the construction of identity within internal and external contexts. The creation of identity infuses with contest over building capabilities of global actorness (Alagha, 2014, pp. 38-50).

Security, power and national interests are the main factors to understand the foreign policy of any country. Waltz as neorealist argued that, the state is a dominant actor in an international system. Thus, in radical world the state's foreign policies are determined by the aspiration to maximize its material capabilities. So that, the state's natural position in international system can be taken on the basis of recognition as 'a state of war' (Alagha, 2014, pp. 38-50). Wendt argued that, the neorealist debate is based on commitment to 'rationalism'. Schonberg stated that, essential identities for a state are sovereign, self-interested and to view the power competitors I world politics (Alagha, 2014, pp. 38-50). Thus, the realism places the 'self' in the context of national interest, power and security. It also reflects a broader to emphasise on otherness. Realism states that a state can exist in an anarchic international system. In this scenario, Tsygankoy argues that, realists perceive other states as 'threatening and recommend that they (state) self-prepare to defend their security (Chebakoyo, 2009).

7. Conclusion

At the end of the debate we can say that, by applying constructive approach; the results about interpretation of the US discourse empirically show the self-perception defines actions at external levels. Finding related to US intervention as an actor promoting good governance is the reason of self-perception as a normative power by creation of foreign policy characterised by good governance and democracy. Furthermore, self-perception as an economic power shows the world's largest financial donor which reflects the US foreign policy towards its neighbours (Chebakova, 2009). These international developments highlight their role how US is playing in constructing self-perception. This constructed dynamic cannot be reduced to a static variable as assumed by realism. Actors and states make their policies according to their opponents and by realising their position. However, internal developments underscore the

reality that constructs realities which play key role in enhancing their presence in related contexts (Chebakova, 2009).

Perception of otherness is one of the main premises of constructivist theory that varies in kind, most of which inform the making of foreign policy. In order to understand America's making of foreign policy towards the Middle East, the perception of otherness beyond the traditional way of defining one's own self, not just in terms of differences and similarities is applied. Perception of otherness can be perceived in the course of opportunities or challenges and to the extent it serves the U.S. interests and the contexts in which it serves. Thus, U.S. discourse towards the Middle East conflict and the peace process in a variety of contexts are analysed and interpreted which helped to study the reasons and motivations behind their involvement, and the extent of its important. Therefore, studying the U.S. perception of the Middle East in a variety of contexts helps in understanding contextual factors influencing their policy making as well as sheds light on spatio-temporal contexts in which the U.S. formulate their foreign policy, which surely shapes the nature and characteristics of their involvement in peace making, and how and what it should be. Thus, the foreign policy making varies and differs in accordance with different contexts (Chebakova, 2009).

On the other side, US self-perception as trader of energy also formulate their foreign policy strategies towards Middle East due to its geographical centre of gravity of the world's fossil fuels that make the global energy trade highway by Mediterranean Sea. In addition, the discoveries of hydrocarbons in the East and South of the Mediterranean Sea promote U.S. focus on Middle East region. U.S.' role in Middle Eastern politics developed in the context of the energy crisis that emerged in the course of the 1973 oil crisis as energy remains one of the main issues concerning the U.S. independence. The U.S.'s desire to diversify its energy sources to minimise its dependence on importing oil has become more active in Middle Eastern politics. It is worth mentioning that the more active role the U.S. plays in the Middle East, the more the U.S. expands to secure additional energy sources (Chebakova, 2009).

References

Alagha, M. A. E. (2014). *Identity and foreign policy-making: a comparative analysis of self-other perceptions in EU-Russia peace-making towards the Palestinian statehood, 2000-2012: an analysis of the role of identity in the process of peace-making in the Middle East* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Exeter).

Al Toraifi, A. (2012). *Understanding the role of state identity in foreign policy decision-making: the rise of Saudi-Iranian rapprochement (1997-2009)* (Doctoral dissertation, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)).

Boettner, T. (2009). *Neo-conservatism and foreign policy* (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire).

Bretherton, C., Vogler, J. (2005). The European Union as a Global Actor. London: Routledge, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203022672

Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (Eds.). (2002). *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (Vol. 4). John Benjamins Publishing.

Chebakova, A. (2008, September). Theorizing the EU as a global actor: a constructivist approach. In The Maturing European Union–ECSA-Canada Biennial Conference *Paper* (pp. 1-16).

Checkel, J. T. (1998). The constructive turn in international relations theory. *World politics*, *50*(2), 324-348.

Dodge, T. (2012). From the 'Arab awakening'to the Arab Spring; the post-colonial State in the Middle East. *After the Arab Spring: Power Shift in the Middle East*, 5-11.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.

Hartmann, S. (2013). Can constructivism explain the Arab Spring. *E-International relations news Print. Available at: http://www. e-ir. info/2013/06/19/can-constructivism-explain-the-arab-spring*.

Hale, S. (2016). *Syria through the lens of a constructivist*. Workiong Paper, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.11372.16005 Retrieved September 2016, from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Samantha_Hale3/publication/

Hobbes, T. (1894). *Leviathan: Or, The Matter, form and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil*. George Routledge & Sons Limited.

Hulsman, J. C. (1996). *A paradigm for the new world order: a school of thought analysis of American foreign policy in the post-Cold War era* (Doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews).

Jackson, R., & McDonald, M. (2009). Constructivism, US foreign policy and the 'war on terror'. New directions in US foreign policy, 18-31.

John, B., Steve, S., & Patricia, O. (2011). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.

Kirdim, Ş. E. (2017). Failed efforts to reform humanitarian intervention system in the United Nations. *Journal of Economics & Administrative Sciences/Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *19*(1).

Olsen, N. (2017). Blurring the Distinction Between "High" and "Low" Politics in International Relations Theory: Drifting Players in the Logic of Two-Level Games. *International Relations*, *5*(10), 637-642.

Tellis, A. J., & Eggers, J. (2017). *US Policy in Afghanistan: Changing Strategies, Preserving Gains*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Waltz, K. (1979). Theory of international politics Addison-Wesley. *Reading MA*, 252

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International organization*, *46*(2), 391-425.