

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v6i4.1137

Citation: Sabeti, S., & Moghaghnia, H. (2017). Behavioral Pattern in the United States in the Face of Upheavals of Arab Countries. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 6(4), 1160-1175. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v6i4.1137>

Behavioral Pattern in the United States in the Face of Upheavals of Arab Countries

Seyed Moayed Sabeti¹, Hamed Moghaghnia^{2*}

Abstract

Conditions and upheavals, by their characteristics, including people opposition with governments and alteration in regional order, have challenged the US strategic interests in the Middle East region and forced the authorities of Washington to manage and strategize upheavals. The type of US encounter with the trend of upheavals, approach of the ruling regime, the future of people movement and available alternative, interests, and security of Israel and contradiction between strategic interests and democratic principles were amongst the most important issues facing the United States. The present article is seeking to find the answer to this question that what sort of relationship does exist between United States policies in the Middle East from one hand and recent upheavals in Arab countries on the other hand? The assumption of the article is that in the past two decades the one sided role of the US in forming the upheavals of Middle East has changed into a bilateral relationship and the behavior of this country in the process of recent upheavals, affected by the presence of the people of Arab countries in internal politics of their own country in numerous cases has changed into a reaction behavior. Finally, it should be said that contrasts between society and government in Arabic Middle East, is considered as one of the prominent challenges of the US in decision-making process and management of region unrests. On the other hand, the lack of a specified instruction and strategy by Americans is another problem of the US in this region.

Keywords: United States, Security, Arab world, Stability, Middle East, Foreign policy, Power, Arab Countries, Arab spring, Hegemony.

¹ Ph.D student of International Relations, Persian Gulf International Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khorramshahr, Iran.

² Corresponding Author, Assistant professor of political science, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

Introduction

US policy in Middle East region during the past half century has always been one of the most important influential factors on processes and the trend of upheavals in this region. With the incident of 9/11 in 2001 a new stage in the policy of the United States has been commenced in the Middle East which includes two important aspects: first, effort for weakening or if possible regime change in opposed countries such as Iraq and Iran, and second, following the policy of creating gradual controlled reforms in friendly and traditional strategic ally but authoritarian countries. United States did succeeded in regime change in Iraq but couldn't wrap weakening or regime change in Iran during President Bush up to its desired result. However the United States was worried about the future of its own ally authoritarian Arab countries and in order to prevent the sudden collapse of these regimes was trying to encourage Arab rulers to reforms, but some of the regional upheavals and strategic considerations and the unwillingness of Arab rulers caused this approach to fade.

Since the beginning of Arabic wave changes in Tunisia, United States leaders have adopted different approaches towards these changes and tried to manage it by accompanying these upheavals and by this means prevent risking long term interests of the United States in the Middle East. Some believe with regard to American's experience from Islamic Revolution of Iran and its thereafter upheavals, during this upheaval Washington apparently tried by distancing itself from dictatorial regimes, prevent the experience of Iran from repeating. Herein although Americans have in appearance associated with some of the demands of the revolutionaries and uprisings of the Arab, in the strategic thought of this country, this doesn't mean superiority of democratic values on strategic interests. In fact, the depth of protests and a widespread wave of uprisings were making the continuation of support for ruthless regimes while maintaining strategic interests impossible for the leaders of the United States. For this reason, in the past two years, United States adopted multiple and sometimes contradictory policies against upheavals in various Arab countries. These policies include a variety of measurements from trying to manage and harness upheavals in Tunisia and Egypt to appeasement against suppression of government opponents in Bahrain and Yemen and finally strict support of regime change and overthrowing in Libya.

1- Theoretical Framework

In general, the foreign policy of Obama government can be analyzed according to multilateral oriented patterns. Amongst trans-behavior oriented, James Rozna considers the foreign policy a variable depended on 5 independent variables which the most important of them is the element of the foreign environment. In the space after the cold war, this foreign environment

underwent some changes and marginal actors became more important. Nowadays unlike past periods, it is the peripheral actors who are able to challenge the center by their own behaviors. Therefore position and vital interests of the center are to a great extent depended on the kind of interaction and its relationship with surrounding units. In 90s Clinton assessed the security of the United States in close relationship with the security of the other regional areas. In the same context, James Rozna believes: “displacement of the centers of authority and power and cracking world structures are amongst the sources of chaos. The emergence of the third world doesn’t cause more inflexibility of the hierarchical structure of the government based world, but it has increased centrifugal trends in the multi-center world. From the heart of the ruins of the cold war, a new order gradually emerges, but not in the linear form or with distinct dimensions, the characteristic of this order is an order which forms bit by bit on the sidelines” (Rozna, 2001: 50-80).

In the beginning of the 21 century, the return to pragmatism trends in the field of foreign policy of the United States has been the result of international environment and the kind of the view of the decision makers and political leaders of this country for sustaining the position of “hegemony actor” and preventing the decline of power in the level of international system. In the new space, Americans unlike the past, try according to conditions and the challenges of the international environment, to act through tactical measurements in regional fields in order to inhibit, control and manage global developments. In this framework, sometimes ideological interests and sometimes the goals of national interests are on the agenda. On the other hand, when the structure of the order based on the performance of a hegemon actor weakens and international avoidance in comparison with internal capabilities for active impressment in system level, is decreased (what new realists such as Kent Waltz calls it displacement of capabilities in system level) and the power to manage global upheavals for the hegemon actor weakens, in order to reduce the level of friction and contrast in system level and reduce the costs of interests collision. This situation is, in fact, the effect of conditions and international environment being complicated and the emergence of new actors on the scene of global power and strengthening medium powers and small powers in system level (occurrence of transformation and inner complexity in power relations in system level).

Hedli Bool, a theoretician of English school, with regard to the issue of formation of evolution in the international system, pays attention to the discussion of evolution on the issue of the intervention in Arab countries in the third world. He notes in that the role of evolution in the space of effective legal and moral rules and shows how from one side under the effects of measurements of medium powers and small powers new rules have been formed and on the other hand, old rules, have been obsolete. The result is that old methods of intervention give

their own place to new methods and forms (Moshirzadeh, 2005: 167). Therefore, what we will witness include the change of the rule or the rule of the game followed by the displacement of power in regional and trans-regional centers. In such conditions, new legal, security, value concepts emerge to theorize and legitimize intervening new policies. Here, for example, the Grossian ideal interpretation can be recalled which proposes the concept of “fair war” against “unfair war”. From this view point, fair war can be carried out in the form of intervention into internal war or in order to supply humanitarian purposes (Moshirzadeh, 2005: 160). In new periods, the trend which in Security Council developed titled “support responsibility” in facing with human right, was evident in Libya war.

2- Middle East policies of the United States

At the end of the twentieth century, Americans by declaring new global order doctrine were seeking to supply their own security through promoting the values of capitalism system in the framework of the process of democratization in target countries and developing the policy based on the free market. Security realism is formed on this basis that the United States must selectively follow each of his own strategic and ideal interests with regard to capabilities and capacities of the target region (Dehoshyar, 2008). So priority for Washington is not always establishing a democratic government and sometimes strategic interests are preferred over ideological values.

The policy of the United States in Middle East during several decades have followed four major purposes which include: protecting the Middle East against competitor powers which was mostly followed during cold war period in competition with Soviet Union and its purpose was to prevent intrusion of Soviet Union in Middle East through closing a bilateral and multilateral treaties; direct dominance and dominating on the energy resources of the region and guarantee steady and secure flow of it to west; securing Israel which has always been one of the goals and priorities of Washington in region and in this regard through providing various assistances, has tried to supply military-economical superiority for it in the Middle East region; and war against terrorism that in this regard Americans have exerted a lot of pressure on the countries of this region to cooperate with Washington to fulfill various aspects of this purpose.

Among the reasons of wide attention of Obama to the process of peace in the Middle East can be explained through the traditional closeness framework of Democrat Party of the United States with Zionist Lobbies. This issue has caused that Democrats always have more attention and sensitivity towards the security of Zionist regime in the region. Major upheavals in the

process of peace, have occurred during Democrats period. Egypt-Israel peace, Jordan-Israel peace and Oslo agreement, all have advanced during Democrat presidents. Obama as a Democrat requires a great achievement in this ground which this in addition to the legacy of Democrats results from the United States internal problems (Deputy of foreign policy research, 2011: 3-4). He assesses the Middle East region despite its distance from the United States very crucial for economy and security of that country. Yet, Obama believes that shallow pursuing the interests of the United States in the past and not paying attention to internal conditions of the countries of this region has caused dissatisfaction of the people of these countries; which this issue can potentially create some dangers for the goals and long term interests of the United States in region. In explaining the importance of the Middle East for the United States, Obama with a completely implemental look, reduces the main considerations of the people of Middle East about Palestine to the issue of Arabs peace and Israel and notwithstanding wide supports of the United States from Arabic authority-oriented governments, like always introduces maintaining the security of Israel as one of his central priorities in region. In fact, this fact is in clear contradiction with accepting people's power and demands in the region as the main actors (Monfared, 2011: 6).

According to not predicting the upheavals of the Middle East by US intelligence services, Obama planned his center of Middle Eastern policies on Egypt under the leadership of Mubarak. Explaining the importance of Egypt in Middle Eastern policies of the United States causes clarity of this policy and interests which the United States and Israel are following. According to position of Egypt as the most populated Arab country in the world and its being pattern and the effectiveness of it in terms of inborn, ideological and political in region and also its strategic position in the region for the US, recent upheavals have been very critical for Washington and changes its conditions in the Middle East (Deputy of foreign policy research, 2011:3-4). Egypt has four main benefits for the United States and the reason for the importance of this country for the US lies in these four benefits:

1. The role of Egypt as the leader of Arab World; a leader who advances the peace with Israel and in comparison with other countries of the region it provides a suitable pattern (from the perspective of the West), for interacting with the West and Israel
2. The role of the Egypt as a voice in line with the West; a voice which since the peace with Israel in 1979 has been far from the explosion of the period of revolution and mottos and was introduced as the most important country in line with the US for Middle Eastern policies of this country;
3. Maintaining peace with Israel is another reason of the most important reasons of US special attention to Egypt and its upheavals;

4. Wide bilateral military cooperation is also considered as another important factor in the relationships of the US with Egypt.

So with regard to the position which Egypt had under the leadership of Mubarak for Middle Eastern policies of the United States, at first didn't clearly force him to withdraw from the presidency for the following reasons:

- 1- The importance of the survival of Mubarak for Israel and the attention of the US to this issue;
- 2- The US presidential elections and the importance of Jewish Lobby in it;
- 3- The negative effect of open-handed opposition with Mubarak on United States partners and allies in the Middle East;
- 4- The political future of Egypt being unclear and the stand of Mubarak's successor.

All these factors led to the US position change with regard to the upheavals of Egypt. According to the advantages and the position which Mubarak government possessed in Middle Eastern policies of the United States, this country adopted different policies since the beginning of the protests of Egyptian people. So at first by adopting impartial stand, was inviting to sides to peace then by developing the upheavals of the Egypt, gradually proposed the necessity of power transition and afterward, the necessity of starting the power transition process, which meant turning its back on Mobark. But by approaching to the time of Mubarak's resignation, Americans gradually adopted a clearer stand against him and the necessity of power transition as soon as possible (Deputy of foreign policy research, 2010:9-8).

3- The consequence of Arabic upheavals on the policy and interests of the United States

Basically, the root of the most of the anti-government protests occurred in Arab countries has been due to ancient challenges and the depth of discontent and anger of the people from unemployment, tyrannical government and lack of justice and notwithstanding to human dignity in their societies. Some compare this background with Iran's revolution and public protests against Shah's government, with this difference that all protest movements of Arab World lacked a charismatic leader and also the presence of Islamic organizations in giving to movements theoretical and ideological direction in an anti-United States form, as existed in the case of Iran, is not seen. Kaplan believes that in this comparison the Egypt's and Tunisia's uprising shouldn't be equivalent to Iran's revolution; although this doesn't mean that the current diplomacy of the United States in Arab World, is less complicated than what was implemented against Iran at that time (Kaplan, 2011).

What that is called “Islamic Awakening” or “Arab Spring”, is in fact to some extent indicating the limits of the power of the United States in the region. The challenge which Americans face at present is the necessity of controlling and managing the various and increasing crisis in a specific regional field. These upheavals have shown that the issue of reducing the power of the US in international system level, is to what extent serious and US lacks the required prestige and possibilities for controlling, managing and giving direction to upheavals in the political scene of the Middle East. However in new political and social space of Arab World one can witness the multitude in streams and Islamic groups and even also inside each of these groups there are intellectual differences and various views, yet, in an overall look into the main streams of Ekhwan Al Moslemin and the stream of Salafi-Wahabi can be distracted from each other (Waezi, 2011: 355).

On the other hand, Middle East witnesses the influence and power seeking of Salafi and extreme groups, its typical example is power obtaining of theses streams in Libya and Syria. In fact the threat of the expansion of extremism in the region has turned into one of the serious challenges for US in the Middle East (Dehoshyar, 2007: 373-382). Attenuation of political rule in Egypt, Syria and Libya has provided a proper opportunity for extreme streams and Al-Qaeda to use it in the direction of strengthening their position in the region.

Now what is definite is that recent upheavals will transform the political array of the region and this issue can cause changes in Middle Eastern policies of the United States. On the other hand, the position of some of the strategic allies of the US such as Israel will face new challenges. What that has occurred in the northern area of Africa, can influence on the conflicts of the Israeli and Palestinian parties and what that is termed “peace talks”.

Next discussion is about intervening policies of the US and some the NATO countries. In the first decade of 21 century, Americans have tried to theorize the intervention policy in the internal affairs of the Middle East countries by using concepts carrying security or legal burdens. At present, Americans by the cooperation of Arabic and European allies of their own try to weaken Bashar Assad’s government and in the long run to collapse the political system and provide the conditions for power transition in this country by managing and directing opposition streams of Bashar Assad’s government. However, the upheavals in Syria and the presence of various actors and extremist elements in an internal scene of this country, have made the decision making for the future of this country very difficult. By divulging new upheavals in the region, this possibility that Americans can still continue their intervention-oriented approaches in the countries of the region, has decreased. Therefore, it seems that the approach of the Americans is more oriented towards reducing costs through applying “soft power” for managing and reconstructing in political arena of Middle East.

In May 2011, Barack Obama made a speech in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the “impact of Arab Spring on the interest of the US” and during that declared: “for decades, United States has followed as a set of central interests in the region. Dealing with terrorism and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons; ensures the flow of free trade and maintaining the security of the region; standing for the security of Israel and following up the peace of Arabs and Israel” (Keiswetter, 2011). From Obama’s perspective the failure of America’s in Arabic Middle East is unbearable, so he points out that the United States for controlling the situation and not losing its position in the region, has to regulate his own relations with the countries of the region according to “mutual interest and mutual respect”. In this framework, Obama emphasizes that America should use this created “historic opportunity” and instead of resisting against changes, support the process of political reforms in Arabic Middle East and north of Africa. In the form of such approach to Arabic upheavals, the government of the America emphasizes that lying beside these upheavals and not standing against them is an important goal. According to this, in the ceremony of the beginning of the second presidential period, Barack Obama clearly talked about ending the “war decade” and military tensions and improving the internal situation of America.

In general, Americans are against creating any power balance between opponent camps and their own allies in regional centers. Therefore any new challenges actor in the Middle East which be in obvious conflict with politics and the interests of the United States in this region would be intolerable. Expansion of the range of the crisis in the Middle East can also lead to intensify the competition between America and Iran in the regional level. Of course, some in West believe that “when Islamic parties are integrated into political order, the cost of governance-compromise, coalition and keeping supporters and contacts, force them to keep a distance from their ideological past (Zahrani, 2011: 160). In other words, they believe that opposition groups in the process of gaining political power, when taking hold of the power, their perspectives and functions affected by new conditions transform. However, all of these upheavals caused a kind of ambiguity in the political future of the region that even can also change the weight and role of the great trans-regional powers.

However what is certain is that the presence and intervention of Western powers and supporting from authoritarian political regimes is a factor for reducing legitimation and public protest in the Middle East. On this basis, in new condition and in order to create lasting stability and order in the region, Western powers and especially United States have to change and transform intervention policies of the past and define their own policies through paying attention to mutual interests and respecting the will and ideals of the people and governments of this region (Waezi, 2011: 451).

4- The Guideline of America in Facing with upheavals of Arabic Countries.

In terms of methodology, the way of crisis management by Obama administration in recent upheavals of the Middle East illustrates signs of advancing the policy of patience and tolerance and dilatory and calculated measurements and not hasty movements, while monitoring political upheavals processes in target countries. It seems that changing the type of the perspective of the Americans to Middle East region from the window of power policy, towards adopting interactional and soft behaviors, be explicable in the form of the process of reducing options and impact mechanisms and reconstructing them in the international system level in the periods of the decline of hegemony power. This has caused an outbreak of change in political-security perspectives of Washington in regional centers such as the Middle East. At present it seems that Americans have concluded that there is no choice in gaining power by Islam-oriented spectrums in Middle East so Washington tries in addition to preventing the gain of power by extremist elements, avoid any action friction with these moderate Islamists currents and through cooperation and getting closer to these groups and also by giving financial assistance to them, reduce the possibility of militarism in target countries (Dehoshyar, 2007: 163). It seems that for Americans, Arabic uprising is a potential security threat. This issue is in close relationship with the behavior of foreign policy of America. Namely, if the government of America doesn't adopt a proper guideline for controlling and managing the crisis and political power is in hands of extremist elements who are opposing West and its allies in the region, it will turn into a potential threat.

In relation to the treatment of America's government with Arabic Middle East upheavals and north of Africa, different criteria can be identified. About adopting different criteria regarding in line and non-line countries, one can point out to the very different positioning of America against violence in Yemen, Libya, Jordan and Syria. This difference in positioning can be assessed as an index for the function of America based on its own interests, and not as Obama claimed mutual interest and respect between America and Islamic countries (Waezi, 2012: 33-34).

Another spectrum of countries with empirical structure does exist. These countries are mainly located in margins of Persian Gulf. In these countries, the modern structure of government-nation has not been formed and the basis of government and relations of society and the head of the power pyramid is based on traditional characteristics of the tribal system. From the perspective of American's, these societies require structuring and following the process of national-government. So in contrast to the first group, basically there is no structure which is required to keep. So trying for keeping the head of the pyramid or gradual, the targeted and controlled transition of power, becomes important for managing scene and structuring. The

main reason of it is that the United States is worried about the intensification of the scope of instability in this region. Arab countries possess more than 54 percent of the oil resources of the world (Dadush and Dunne, 2011: 131). Any factor that causes to weaken the control of the United States on main centers of energy in the world, is considered as a serious threat. Another part of this issue is due to the capacity of the market in these countries. In fact, it must be said that for the United States the continuity of effective presence in geopolitical sensitive centers, dominance on energy, capital, and market in these fields has vital importance as a hegemon actor.

5- Different Approaches in foreign policy of America against upheavals of the Arab World

The difference of foreign policy approaches of America in facing with Arab world upheaval has different reasons that without a doubt the role of existing intellectual streams in America which each one has a different interpretation of events and solutions of providing interests, is very noteworthy. The twofold approach of America toward the issue of Democracy in the Middle East is one of the existing conflicts in the foreign policy of this country in the region. This dichotomy that in authoritarian governments allied with West ‘how democracy should form and advance?’ has always existed among Americans politicians. In this field, different orientations in the foreign policy of America have existed during the course of time which is indicating a conflict that can make trouble for the unity of approach. One of the causing factors of this twofold approach is about the different look of Israel and America to the issue of democracy in the Middle East. Israel is even against the thought of expanding democracy in Arab world. From the perspective of this regime, opening space and promoting democracy in Arab world, result in arrival of radical Islamist groups and these groups by relying on two concepts of corruption and inefficiency of ruling regimes, will grasp power and according to their own priorities, will change the regional tendencies of their countries; so from viewpoint of Israel one should not be seeking democratic development in Arab world (Deputy of foreign policy researches, 2010: 6).

In general, there are conflicts in Middle Eastern policies of the America which the most important of them, in the conflicts between principles and interests of America in the Arab world that the existence of doubt around consequences of these upheavals, is among the main reasons of oscillation in the foreign policy of America during these events. The approaches of the United States against upheavals of Arab World has been accompanied with up and downs. In general, this difference of approaches can be considered as caused by two main factors of establishing a balance between principals and interests from one side and selection and

codification of the best policies for the most probable scenario of the next of these countries from the other hand:

A- Conflict between principles and interests in Arab World

The conflict between strategic interests and democratic values is an issue that American politicians have been facing with it for more than 30 years. In fact, this conflict is one of the basic problems of the United States in Middle East region which has put it in the oscillation between supporting democratic changes in Middle East countries or supporting authoritarian regimes of the region which in some ways seems more compatible with interests of the America. The typical example for this conflict is the support from despotic regimes of Arab countries in the Middle East in spite of suppressing civil society activists and opposition.

The existing differences in Arab countries which have been faced with public protests have challenged foreign policy of America in sustaining a balance between interests and its own declared principals. Barack Obama in one of his speeches on upheavals in Arab World emphasized on principles such as political, religious freedoms and human rights and introduced it deeply depended on political-economic reforms in the Middle East and north of Africa and fulfilling ideals of ordinary people in the region. He considers religious freedom as part of “the set of universal rights” such as the right to select leaders that in his opinion forms the core of the foreign policies of America against the Middle East. Obama in his famous speech in June 2009 in Cairo not only considers such freedoms as American ideas but as human rights which America is committed to supporting it in any place of the world. These statements during recent upheavals of Arab World was incapable of being realized, but in contrast, increased the level of expectations from America in order to defend political, social and religious freedoms or what Obama called “The set of universal rules”. Increasing expectations in case of not receiving the proper answer can always have undesirable consequences and this is the same challenge that the current foreign policy of America in the Arab world is affected with it more than before.

David Ignatius, Washington Post columnist, in an interview and in response to the relationship between principles and interests in foreign policy of the America in Arab worlds such as Bahrain and Yemen, in addition to emphasizing differences in approaches, points out: “America should act within framework of the limitations, this doesn’t mean setting aside principles, but it means coordinating principles and interests in the form of part of the national security strategy” (Maurse, 2011).

B- Doubts around consequences

Although the current uprisings in the Arab world seem completely identical, this issue that ‘where do they end?’ might be completely different. So in spite of the similarity in protests, the difference in destinies is indicating the distinction between political, social and economic structures of these countries and their position in the region and international system. The existence of these differences from country to country and also the existence of concerns and worries from the future of these countries and their possible consequences on the region and the world, is one of the non-negligible factors in codifying America’s foreign policy against recent upheavals of the Arab world. It seems that it is the look at the future and the concern of the future of the countries and their effects on the interests of the other countries that move the foreign policy of great powers such as America through soft and hard diplomacy. As an example keeping the stability of energy market and ensuring the flow of its transfer in the countries undergone upheavals in Arab world, is an issue that can and has been able to change the positioning of some the great powers from the level of soft diplomacy to the level of hard diplomacy; in this regard the upheavals of Libya can be pointed out.

5- Foreign policy of America, supporting “change” or “keep stability”

Change and hesitation in positions of the foreign policy of America are rooted in impressive intellectual currents in the political body of that country. While some consider changes and upheavals promising of a better future and require America to support it, another spectrum advises keeping stability. Charlz Kratmer neoconservative thinker oriented to realism and Washington Post columnist, defend a position which many are an advocate of it in Israel. This group is among the people who instead of welcoming the incidence of change, are afraid of instability in the region. Instability and the possibility of abdicating power to radical Islamists is the most concern of this spectrum that finally puts it in the position of keeping stability.

However current upheavals are occurring in a place where there are a series of security consideration regarding Israel and America can’t ignore it. At present, Hamas leaders seek new relationships with Egypt in order to strengthen their own power levers. Mahmood Zahr, in an interview with New York Times, says: “Israel is the loser of recent events. This is a new era and they should be afraid” (Heilbrunn, 2001: 4). Also the possibility of pressure contagion to other countries such as Jordan, in order to adopt a less friendly policy with Israel, is of other existing concerns that besides fear from gaining power by extremist Islamic groups, strengthen the attitude of keeping stability and existing condition.

On the other side, some experts including Robert Keygan believe that America should push Middle East regimes towards the democratic condition. In his opinion “America should move in direction of reaching authoritarian regimes to approach higher levels of democracy and support from democracy voices in this societies; even if it means instability in some regions” (Heilbrunn, 2001: 4).

Kristol in a writing titled “supporting freedom” in Weekly Standard, objugate those who conservatively with their own negative predictions consider the uprisings of the Islamic fundamentalists as inevitable and believes that peoples of the region use their own potentials for applying the sovereignty and the United States should accompany them in this path (Kristol, 2011). In another place, he criticizes the passivity of Obama towards current upheavals. Paul Wolfowitz in Wall Street Journal writes: “America should be beside Libyan people... and also its own principles and values. The more this bleeding continues, the worse the aftermath will be” (Wofowitz, 2011).

Generally, experts believing in change and accompanying of America’s government with people movements, consider the foreign policy of Obama administration to be passive. Delay and cunctation of Obama’s administration in supporting people’s front and keeping a distance from tranny rulers, had become the stuff of feel for attacks and criticism of a wide range of neoconservatives and Democrats. However creating a balance between national interests and idealism, has always made the path of the foreign policy of America slippery. It seems that the diplomacy of America in the Arab world will be more complicated. Addressing the affairs just by one phone call to any country won’t be possible anymore, hereinafter Washington must talk with a large number of political figures in order to do some affairs that already was done through a phone call with a leader, so in current conditions the process of democracy will have more complexity (Kaplan, 2011).

Among intellectual currents believing adopting more active foreign policy from Obama administration, there are some quarrels on the manner of practice. Yet the dominant attitude, with regard to continuity of the presence of American forces in Afghanistan, don’t consider the reign of America allowable. In this attitude as Barack Obama emphasized on it, the military intervention must be defiantly avoided. As Richard Has says: “overthrowing a regime is easier than to help replace something better. Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya are all a warning in this same direction” (Hass, 2011: 2).

Some of the experts consider the best option as negation with all the active groups and believe that in this direction moderate Islamist groups shouldn’t be ignored. Commitment to primary principles of civil society, non-violence and human right is what that according to the beliefs of this group, Obama has against the upheavals of the Arab world in his own policy (Kaplan,

2011). In fact it seems that the recommendation of this policy is somehow considered as gravimetric forces in new condition: sequence and sometimes synchronization of Arab world events has created a new stage of complexities in the foreign policy of great powers especially America.

Conclusion

The approach of Americans in the Middle East is mainly based on balance oriented patterns; such that control centrifugal forces in the scene of regional political equation and categorize regional relationships in the form of centrifugal processes (Motaqi, 2009). But the important problem is the issue of power transition in international system level and is in regional and trans-regional centers which at present has turned into an inevitable affair. According to complexity and velocity of the Arab world, what Americans face with it now, is the decline of power and capacity of predicting the scene and managing the current of power transition.

Although the approach of the America in relation with regional upheavals is based on sights of crisis management and Washington tries to prevent the power transition to elements that are in obvious conflict with goals and interests of the America in the region by supporting the formation of a scholar, liberal and non-identity oriented. Another important issue is complexity and diversity of upheavals that somehow affects the behavior of foreign policy of America in the region. The lack of political system structure based on nation-government and the existence of authoritarian regimes and the lack of free rotation of power in society has caused the deepening of the split between society and government and finally formation of the ranged political crisis in these countries. In fact, political leaders and the nature of the traditional tribal system in these countries don't have the required capabilities and capacities for accepting political tolerance and limiting power through a partnership of other groups.

Another of the main dimensions of the politics of America is the lack of specific instruction and strategy by Americans and moving according to result oriented patterns. The way of facing with Arabic upheavals has caused the incidence of a series of quarrels inside America; such that two main attitude regarding the kind of encounter with Arabic upheavals in America; the first attitude belongs to a group who are willing to cooperate with America in the public process of changes in Arab World, in contrary with this perspective, another group are but worried about the current changes and its future consequences for Middle Eastern interests of America and its regional allies. Meanwhile what is important for Washington, is the establishment of power balance in favor of the United States and its traditional allies in the region and preventing the formation of emerging conflicting actors and amplifying the opposing camps of the presence of this country in the Middle East.

References

Dadush, Uri & Dunne, Michele (2011). "American and European Responses to the Arab Spring: What's the Big Idea?". The Washington Quarterly.

Dehoshyar, Hossien (2007). Foreign policy and grand strategy of the United States. Tehran: Qumes publications.

Deputy of foreign politics researches (2011). "The approach of America to the conflict of Middle East". Middle East and Persian Gulf Studies group, strategic researches center, conclusion of the meeting, number 160.

Hass, Richard N. (2011). "The Arab Spring Has Given Way to Long, Hot Summer". Council on Foreign Relations.

Heilbrunn, Jacob (2001). "Neurons and the Revolution". Foreign policy.

Hormozi, Shani (2011). Upheavals of the Arab World and different approaches in foreign policy of the America, strategic report, No 357. Deputy of foreign policy researches, strategic research center, Mordad.

Kaplan, Robert D. (2011). "The New Arab world order". Foreign policy.

Kegoli, Charls W. & Witkof, Ojin R. (2009). Foreign policy of America; pattern and trend, (3rd ed.). Translated by Asqar Dastmalchi. Tehran: International and political studies office.

Keiswetter, Allen (2011) "The Arab Spring: Implications for Us policy and Interests". Middle East Institute. Accessed at: <http://www.mei.edu>

Kristol, William (2011). "Stand for Freedom". The Weekly Standard, Vol.16, No. 21.

Maures, Tim (2011). "Ignatius: US Must Re-Prioritize Foreign policy Objectives to Assure Arab Spring Transforms the Region". Belfer Center programs or projects: the future of Diplomacy project.

Monfared, Sey Qasem (2011). America and the dimensions of the plan of military withdrawal from Afghanistan, strategic report. The center of the strategic researches, number 386.

Moshirzade, Homeyra (2005). Evolution in international relation theories. Tehran: Samt.

Pew Research Center (2011). Arab Spring Fails to Improve US Image, Global Attitudes Project.

Rozna, James (2001). Security in a chaotic world, inserted in the critical assessments in the field of international level. Translated by Alireza Tayeb. Tehran: Ney publications.

Terrill, W. Andrew (2011). The Arab Spring and the Future of US Interests and Cooperative Security in the Arab World. Army War College.

The Deputy of foreign policy researches (2011). Egypt upheavals and foreign policy of America, the group of Persian Gulf and Middle East studies. Strategic research center, meeting conclusion, No 153.

The Deputy of foreign policy researches (2011). The internal and external consequences of the Egypt movements for freedom, the group of Persian Gulf and Middle East studies. Strategic research center, meeting conclusion, No 150.

UN Report (2002). Arab Human Development Report.

Waezi, Mahmood (2011). Obama's administration approach to Islam World: change or continuity of America's policies. Foreign relations journal, strategic studies research institute, 4th year, No 1, Bahar.

Waezi, Mahmood (2011). Political crisis and social movements in Middle East; theories and processes, international and political studies office. Tehran.

Wofowitz, Paul (2011). "The Case for Backing Libya's Rebels". The Wall Street Journal.

Zahrani, Mostafa (2011). Realistic idealism: the base of the Obama's administration action in Middle East uprisings. Foreign relation journal, strategic researches center, 3rd year, No 4, Winter.