

# THE STRATEGIC CONSTANTS OF USA FOREIGN POLICY (COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE OBAMA AND TRUMP ADMINISTRATIONS)

**HARMAN SIDQI MOHAMMED**

## **Abstract**

The strategic structure of USA in terms of foreign policy was primarily motivated by the principle of pragmatism - utilitarianism. Accordingly, the overall strategy of the US foreign policy focused on the supreme strategic interests, protecting national security, and perpetuating hegemony over international politics, which are among the strategic constants of US administrations, especially during the post-World War II phase, regardless of the president's backgrounds and the government that holds the reins of power in the White House, whether it is a republic or a democracy. This study is based on an attempt to observe the most significant and prominent pillars which are strategic constants of USA, and also that these constants serve as a reference and a structure that proceeds through the external political behavior of America. Despite the convergence and the transfer of power between the Republican and Democratic parties, and despite the differentiation of leadership style among presidents inside the White House, all of this has not changed from the priority of strategic goals, especially in the field of international politics, and in connection with that, the margin of change at the level of foreign policy which is almost non-existent except in specific cases and tactical situations, which basically do not symbolize fundamental changes within the framework of the overall strategy of the United States of America.

**Key words:** Strategy, USA Foreign Policy, USA Strategic Constants, International Policy, Hegemony, Protecting National Security, Obama Administration's Orientations, Trump's Policies, The Future of USA Strategy

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1. Introductory introduction to the subject of study**

The strategy was accompanied at the beginning of its emergence as a term in the literature of international politics in the military field, but soon its uses expanded and expanded with it the framework of its implications, and therefore in its contemporary sense, began to contain political dimensions and aspects, economic, social, cultural and media, where the term strategy is used in many areas of life and the organization of society, it will be used by associations, parties, companies and others, as for the strategy of the state, we mean the ways and the way the state deals with the international environment and interacts with other international units, there is economic planning for the state to be the economic strategy, and in political planning the political strategy of the state is manifested in the internal and external field at the level of international relations. We should also note that the formulation of U.S. strategic planning has been linked to the geopolitical position of the United States of America in the international arena, as well as to the increase and growth of multi-dimensional American power, its awareness of the role it must play in international politics, and clear intellectual perceptions about the national goals and national interests of the American people. In addition, there are many dialogues, debates, intellectual proposals, academic discussions and internal political debates, which have governed the framework and course of foreign political behavior of the

United States of America and the formulation of a strategy that has been in place for this country since the time of the founding fathers, until today. The American concept of strategic management within the framework of international policy has not come out of its traditional meaning, since its dive into international relations, it has relied in formulating its global strategy on all the solid elements and components that make up the national power of the state. Its strategic significance was that the strategy should embody the art of using the armed forces and all other capabilities of the state for the purpose of achieving policy objectives by using force or threatening to use it.

It should be noted that the U.S. strategic framework in the field of foreign policy is essentially driven by the principle of realism - utilitarian pragmatism, considering that since its entry as an active and influential force in international politics, the United States of America has pursued political realism and has been the prominent title for describing its foreign policy throughout the 20th century and to this day. So if we pass the guidelines of U.S. foreign policy that focus on the higher strategic interests and protect national security, which is a strategic constant for most foreign policies of the countries of the world, and move to go deeper into U.S. policy toward the world as well as the Middle East region, there are axes and issues that are strategic constants in terms of administrations. The United States, especially during the post-World War II period, regardless of the backgrounds of the president and the government that holds power in the White House, whether republican or democratic:

### **1.1: The problem of the study:**

The problem with our research lies in the fact that with the change of administration and presidents in the United States its association with its pluralistic democratic system, and with the allusion to pursuing policies that approach the principles and values that America has become internally, this country has been and continues to formulate and manage its external behavior based on a pragmatic-utilitarian realistic approach, and the other problem is that the movement and action of this country is not a matter of It is easy for international politics, as it represents the most powerful country in the world, its action and activity are painted on international politics and are often influential.

### **2.1: Study questions:**

In light of the problem, the study asks a range of questions:

1. What are the foundations and constants surrounding the U.S. strategy?
2. What strategic parameters have neither departments nor presidents been able to overcome?

### **3.1: Study hypothesis:**

Our research tries to verify the test of the following hypotheses:

1. There are a number of strategic parameters that make it imperative for White House residents to adapt and program their personal ideas and beliefs, which are consistent and not to depart from those strategic constants.

2. On global foreign issues, there are quite a few strategic pillars, which have not accepted reluctance and departure within the framework of this issue, related to this issue, the overall U.S. strategy has not seen radical changes for the Obama and Trump administrations although there have been policies and positions that seemed to differ from each other, but it is only policy tactics and a policy approach specific to each president in the way of reaching goals Strategic.

#### **4.1: Study objectives:**

One of the most important objectives of this study is:

Focus on the most important and prominent foundations and constants that have shaped America's strategic doctrine since the post-World War III period to this day.

Trying to monitor the most important and prominent strategic objectives adopted by the Obama and Trump administrations, and the extent to which the United States has adapted to the strategic parameters that the United States has known throughout the second half of the 20th century to this day.

#### **5.1: Study methodology:**

In our research, we relied on the analytical approach, which helped us to monitor and analyze the most important stages during which the U.S. strategy evolved, and also helped us to analyze the most important strategic pillars and principles, especially in the post-War II period, and helped us the analytical approach in interpreting the most important strategic principles formulated during the Obama administration, as well as analyzing the strategic constants. During the Trump era, just as the comparative approach helped us track the arguments that accompanied U.S. foreign behavior for both President Obama and Trump, he revealed to us that the two administrations were unable to depart from the traditional approach to adhering to the overall framework of America's strategy, while acknowledging that there were minor changes that emerged here and there through a range of positions and sometimes decisions, but all of this was not seen as a departure from the overall strategic framework .

#### **6.1: The theoretical entry point of the study:**

The new structural realistic input was also used, considering that the United States of America, through its capabilities and strength, committed itself to adhering to a set of foundations that embodied strategic constants that enabled it to position itself in international politics for as long as possible, and also helped us realistically analyze the most important strategic principles that moved and moved American external political behavior based on the logic of purely pragmatic realism, which became adjacent to the strategic approach. J World for America.

## **2. STRATEGIC CONSTANTS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY**

In shaping the foreign policy process in the international environment, U.S. foreign policy makers set several goals and interests that reflect the ambitions of the United States of America in the international environment.

The goal of the general foreign policy and the President is to maintain national security, but what is really different in the application is the means of achieving those goals, varying and varying from state to state as dictated by their circumstances and possibilities in an area towards which the desired goal is directed. (Sawsan, 2003).

## 1.2 Global Leadership and Leadership Strategy

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the atmosphere became appropriate for the United States to declare itself a "super power empire" that imposed its hegemony and leadership on the international scene. The United States may seek to protect and strengthen its power, and try in all its power to maintain its international standing and dominance by putting an end to the emergence of other international rival powers internationally in accordance with the recommendation of the Pentagon's 1999 Defense Planning Directives, which stressed that the U.S. strategy should focus on preventing the emergence of any U.S. competitor globally because it is a threat to its security. National. (Issa, article).

In the same vein came the report of the secretary of defense in charge of political business former MP Paul Wolfowitz in 1992. The world by building enough military power to bend the arm of any nation or group of nations, challenging the superiority of the United States. (Paul, 2007, p. 42-43).

Bruno colons explains that the goal of U.S. foreign policy is to assert its global leadership, saying that "the supreme strategic objectives of U.S. foreign policy have remained consistent for more than 50 years" to eliminate opponents — powerful or disabled, whether friends or enemies — in order for the United States to maintain its superior and only position, for as long as possible, whether its competitors or opponents are Westerners or others, and whether or not. They were former members of NATO or close allies of Washington within NATO. (Moses, 2004, p. 9).

## 2.2 Upholding the Principle of Hegemony in U.S. Strategic Thinking

The goal of global hegemony has its historical roots, in U.S. foreign policy, where calls for America to play a global role in the Roosevelt-Wilson administration's began, and later continued until it reached the summit of the administration of President George W. Bush Sr., and he wrote in his memoirs, "We simply have to lead others and ensure the prediction of the future, and ensure stability in international relations, because we "The only country with the necessary resources and reputation, and if the United States of America does not lead others, there will be no leadership in this world." Anatoly, 2003, p. 23).

"The political objective of U.S. foreign policy is to prevent the development of any power that can dominate the world or be hostile to the United States," Bergenske said in his 1998 book *The Only Super Power*. (Fredon, 2008, p.156).

The United States of America has established a new world order based on a number of foundations consistent with the American will to dominate the world, such as the growth of U.S. military power and the proliferation of U.S. military bases in various regional circles, taking advantage of the weakness of the United Nations body, marketing American values and

controlling the global media, monopolizing the role of "world policeman" in the doctrine of international humanitarian intervention, NATO's dominance over the Mediterranean Sea, U.S. control of global energy sources, supervision Direct to THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION OMC/WTO, and control of the global monetary system.... And other manifestations of American hegemony over the world. Jamal, 2014, p. 12), reinforcing this global control, the American sense of exceptionalism, and the refusal to allow international players to share Washington's "values of global leadership. (Ren, 2002, p.107).

Despite the burdens this role imposes on Washington, as a result of the focus of all international adversaries on it, the increased likelihood of the positions of the Hostile American nation, and the growing threats aimed at draining American imperial power. (Ben Sheikh, 2016, p.288).

Although the events of September 11, 2001 hit the image of a "happy, reassuring America," U.S. politicians' insistence on maintaining global leadership has made them devote their reliance on the pragmatic, pragmatic utilitarian doctrine to protect U.S. interests around the world. (Ziauddin, 2005, p. 12).

In his important book Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power, Zbigniew Berginsky pointed to Washington's concerns about the potential for overlaying the rise of Japan, India, China, South Korea and the ASEAN Community, and the opportunities for the emergence of potential international powers, which may play geostrategic roles, or try to reflect their regional power globally in an effort to disperse U.S. global power. "America remains the center of global attention, whether you like it or not," Brzezinski insists on the strength of the American model, saying, "America remains the center of global attention, whether you like it or not," it is still the subject of fascination and envy, because it is the best model of tradition globally, and Brzezinski advises the U.S. leadership to redirect and formulate foreign policy in a way that restores the world's admiration for the superiority and relevance of the American political system. (Bin Sheikh, 2016, p. 292).

"American control of the world is a fundamental guarantor of global stability, and an indispensable element of global security for the following reasons: Zingy, 2004, p.13," says Berginsky in his book Choice, World Domination or World Leadership.

1. Because there is no parallel to U.S. military power globally, thanks to the leadership and dynamism of U.S. military technology.
2. Because of the continued and effective activity of the U.S. Economy, the main guarantor of the health and mobility of the global economy, and ensuring that it is not the victim of the recession and the global financial crises.
3. Because of the attractiveness of American human culture and values and the popularity of modern values of American media and cinema, the world's leading

But Brzezinski warns of the "siege mentality" that necessarily comes because the attention of others -- especially from "failed states" -- is focused on the American nation, and because of the creation of an American nation obsessed with its own security, the American nation finds

its exile isolated in a hostile world, which may make serious mistakes, even though it can pursue a wise, responsible and effective policy. (Zpingyu, 2012, p.97).

Brzezinski also presents in his book "The Great Chessboard: American Domination and Its Geostrategic Implications," a theory of the concept of "optimal imperial power", indicating his intention to "normalize the phenomenon of American domination of the world", which is attractive thanks to its modernist culture, its democratic idealism "as a measure of tradition", as well as the important geopolitical prize that has been received. The American nation has on the American continent, not to mention its ability to employ its internal popular democracy in a way that does not disrupt its ambition for international sovereignty (Zpingyu, 1999, p.63)

### **3.2 Protecting U.S. National Security**

The post-Cold War national security strategy focused on everything that would preserve the United States' position as the world's only superpower, and seeks to protect it through numerous measures. International assistance and the prevention of the spread of weapons of mass destruction. (North, 2017, p. 143).

The protection of the security of the American nation, the people, the land and the lifestyle, is at the forefront of the administration's constitutional duties, according to a Report on the U.S. National Security Strategy issued by the White House in February 1996. (Malik, 1997, p.94).

Although the protection of national values is a goal of national security policy, those values must be translated into something less abstract and linked to certain positions so that they can be considered as the basis for a particular policy. (Ala., 2009, p. 126-127).

Interests can be described as the circumstances that the nation is trying to achieve or maintain in both the international and domestic environments. Interests therefore provide a link between values and policies. An example shows the relationship between values and interests through U.S. policy toward the Arabian Gulf region during its three crises. There is no doubt that the free flow of oil from the Arabian Gulf region is a vital interest of the United States. That interest is to maintain the fundamental value of prosperity. Without oil, the United States would be exposed to economic weakness, and if the U.S. economy weakened, the prosperity of American citizens would decline, so it seems clear how interests can stem from national values: (Ala., 2009, p.127).

U.S. literature points to three important points to consider when examining national interests:

1. National interests are not important in themselves, but they are important only if they contribute to national values. Policymakers and analysts should be careful not to avoid focusing on interests as ultimate goals in themselves rather than as intermediate targets, so as not to formulate policies that do not contribute to national values and may be counterproductive.
2. Interests such as values can wrestle with each other and must be reconciled by setting priorities and making acceptable compromises.

3. Politics is often justified as protecting vital interests, which are associated with the most important values. Although some define vital interests as those that can be used as military force to protect them, this definition can take the opposite direction, namely that it is more appropriate to view the use of military force as justified only when it is done in order to protect vital interests. (Daniel-Jeffrey, 1985, p.7)

Because national interests are defined as the product of interaction between values and both the international and domestic environments, the next step in analyzing national security policy is to examine local and international environmental elements that unite with national interests to form national policy.

Although these domestic and international environmental factors do not determine how a country chooses its policy or the factors that motivate it to pursue a particular policy by reducing the advantages of certain policy options in exchange for defending other options, the link between domestic and international environments is now stronger than in the past, because domestic policy is now subject to more international influence. For example, the decision to raise interest rates in the United States affects the economic well-being of western European countries by transferring capital investment from their markets. A decision to cut US defense spending to control the budget also affects European security and European confidence in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

One of the most striking examples is that in recent decades the international environment has had a greater impact on vital domestic interests than in the past, with the decision of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) to ban oil exports to pro-Israeli countries and the negative impact on Western economies. The obvious result of this link between the domestic and international environments has been increased concern about events occurring thousands of miles from the United States. (Alaa, 2009, p.127).

## **5.2 International Environment**

A number of important impacts on national security policy can be identified through the study of the international environment. Some researchers divide these effects into two main types (1985, p. 8-11 (Thomas- Type 1: specific to a particular country, i.e., affecting relations between the United States and other countries unilaterally. The second type is systemic, affecting the entire community of nations.

Relations between states are influenced by both geography and ideology. States tend to pay more attention to neighboring countries or close to vital resources or lines of communication. Easy to observe, the mistrust resulting from the inability to determine the true and precise level of those capabilities can negatively affect national security policy, as it can lead to the assumption of the worst alternative because of the potential costs resulting from a line of calculations. The threat causes political conclusions. This perception is determined by the value of information gathered by national intelligence services about other countries, and is therefore an important element in policy-making, and the degree of accuracy by which the threat can be determined by the proximity of concepts, as well as the best possible reactions.

Many political positions stem from the lack of agreement on the determination of the intentions of the opponents. If the United States realizes that a country is aggressive in nature, it considers it a justification for dealing with any increase in that country's military capabilities or actions that increase its military might. (Alaa, 2009, p.128).

Although a show of will can be an effective element in deterring an opponent from carrying out aggression, it could be counterproductive if the other state acts swiftly and counter-measures out of insecurity. If the primary objective of national security policy is to counter military threats, not all threats take this form, security may be threatened by economic actions such as preventing approach to vital natural resources, and ideological challenges from potential aggressors can be perceived as threats to the continued influence of the United States around the world, and may cause policies to be formed to meet such challenges. Aggressor through the attack on his land, his inhabitants and his property. (Glenn, 1961, p.9).

The remaining elements of the international environment affecting national security policy can be considered systemic because they have a more general impact. In the absence of a global government, countries live in anarchy, and the degree of anarchy determined by economic, political, historical and cultural relations between countries. Other countries.

Efforts to impose order in the international environment through the establishment of international organizations such as the United Nations have not been successful. Other international relations, such as alliances, play a key role.

Alliances are important for understanding national security policy, through which countries can increase their strength and try to propose some order to the international environment. Alliances are formed in accordance with mutual interests, even if they are not always identical, by promising to pool resources in the face of a common threat, coalition partners hope to gain influence or achieve interests that they cannot achieve unilaterally.

## **6.2 Local Environment**

There are local factors that affect national security policy options. In order to understand why a policy is adopted, it is important to understand how a country sees the world, the economic conditions that impose restrictions on defence expenditures, and the political constraints that shape interests and affect politics. (Glenn, 1961, p.9). The local environment interacts with the values of society and forms national interests. The local environment can be seen through three broad dimensions: social, economic and political. Within these dimensions, there are local variables that affect the formation of national security policy. These variables mainly affect the distribution of resources (human resources, funds, raw materials, and the degree of public support for security policies).

The social dimensions of the local environment have its origins in the historical experience of the state, the degree of national unity, geography, and population. The trend of public opinion on national security issues and the desire to use military force are an expression of these social factors, and public opinion is influenced by cultural factors, mass media and important actors in the local environment. Economic factors in the local environment are important elements in

decisions to distribute the resources necessary to implement national security policy. The degree of industrialization and the strength of the economy determine the number of resources that can be used in programmers. Defense spending can have an impact on the U.S. economy, through its impact on inflation, employment and spending patterns.

### 3. THE MAIN PILLARS OF U.S. STRATEGY IN THE MIDDLE EAST:

There is no doubt that the United States is formulating its strategy in different regions of the world, including the Middle East, on the basis of the basic pillars through which it tries to pass its foreign policy in order to achieve the ultimate goals of its national interests, and because the Middle East is among those areas detailed in achieving those goals, the American discourse has singled it out as a kind of exceptional, especially after the transformation of the international system since the end of the Cold War, a transformation that goes hand in hand with the popularity of the capitalist system. The collapse of traditional balances to calculate American hegemony, and the emergence of new rules and policies not between nations and political entities but between societies within the states themselves, as talk of state sovereignty is no longer acceptable in light of the realities of interference in internal affairs and the return of direct military occupation (Afghanistan and Iraq), just as states can no longer remain cohesive in the face of the consequences of globalization.( Samirand NakloN, 2004, p. 7).

Therefore, it was prevalent at some point to witness a transformation or adaptation to the data of the current phase, consistent with what is happening in the international environment, especially since the Middle East region has witnessed variables that have led to a serious shift at the functional and structural levels (Khalil, 2009, p. 1.2), the most important of which are: -

**First:** - Some countries enter into unequal wars with the United States.

**Secondly,** the East is not a middle ground that has witnessed and witnessed an international cold war in what has come to be known as the conflict of the axes "the good and the good", and the regional conflict between many of its components in what is known as the struggle of moderation and extremism.

**Third:** The Eustis not in the middle of a decline in some parts of the role of the state in favor of armed organizations and forces, which allowed the emergence of models of failed states.

In the face of all this, the main pillars of the U.S. strategy must take a role in the direction of the new administration through the following pillars: -

#### 1.3 Ideologically based J

The unique position of the United States after the end of the Cold War has become a world-wide world renown.( Zpingyu, 2004, p. 12)according to this privileged status, has become the one who decides on many international and regional issues and in order to be decided by the factors of the upcoming international environment, because the East, with its extensions towards the Caucasus and Central Asia, occupies a very important position in the geopolitical of the United States and its project of domination of the world. He stuck to his affairs, which he owes to three factors, geographically in the heart of the ancient world and his oil wealth and

the fact that he has become the soft belly of the world order. (Samir, 2004, p. 24), as well as the transformation of some of its countries as a source of terrorism at least from the American point of view, and accordingly there must be subjective and objective justifications for passing the policies required and necessary to meet American interests in that region, the most important of which are:

**First: Religious justifications:**

Within these intellectual thesis, it becomes natural that religious discourse in its philosophical and functional dimension goes hand in hand with the general strategic orientations of the state, even for those countries that advocated the separation of religion from the state, but later employed religious discourse in directions associated with state affairs, especially if this association serves the higher interests and does not intersect with them, hence reflects the belief of the Protestant Tuaregs, the first immigrants who settled The United States and then the Evangelical churches are associated with official political discourse and up to this moment in American political history as they focus their ideas on three basic principles ending with exclusive American duties (Hussein International Studies, p. 53), of these principles:

1. America has existed in the mind of God for specific purposes since the beginning of creation, and there is a comprehensive plan for the universe, which is the management of the divine will, this plan in which the Taheri's play an important role by migrating to the new world because they are god's chosen people, chosen by the divine care of salvation and escape from the corruption of the world and its sins to create the Kingdom of God on earth, this treaty partnership With the Creator includes a dangerous and urgent task which is to enlighten the rest of the world and its guidance and save it from ignorance and darkness, and from this idea of renewal derived most of Fukuyama's thesis as an intellectual reference to American political discourse, and because of this partnership the Puritans American people became a religious society, and therefore the members of this people are the citizens of the future Kingdom of God.) Abdelkader, 2009, p. 34-38).
2. Religion is the only guarantor of national virtues that allow worldly success, and that other life is an extension of the present and what man earns in it is the product of his worldly work in the sense that faith is the one that always saves man and leads him to salvation from every sin and those who are afflicted by salvation are not all people. Good and bad man like him as well among nations. (Abdul Qadri R, 2009, p. 34-35).

**Second: Philosophical justifications:**

These questions are answered by former U.S. national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski by saying that the external projection of American democracy is consistent with semi-imperialist responsibility and the dominant force can defend and even strengthen democracy, but democracy can also be threatened, in the first axis if applied abroad in a way that takes into account the aspirations and rights of others, but in the second axis if the hypocritical slogans are adopted in democracy. (Hussein, International Studies, p.57).

We believe that dropping democratic models in the Middle East in a hypocritical way represents a threat to all democratic models that do not conform to the American vision and perhaps like not dealing positively with Hamas's victory in the 2006 elections. Which will contribute to hiding the face of traditional geopolitical law and the introduction of a law that divides nations into two parts, the first is the civilized countries that deserved to win the perfection of history and reach its end, and the second nations that are unable to reach the perfection of history, and the peoples of the Middle East fall within the helpless nations, hence the message of the white colonial man again in taking the hands of the different in order to bring them to what Fukuyama calls the promised paradise, but this time not on the basis of liberation but on the basis of subjugation by force, and the truth that It is indisputable that more than two decades have passed since the United States became the world's first dominant power, and politics and great strategists have long sought, within a real American century, embracing the whole world, believing that such a dignified American hegemony of the world will bring peace and abundance, but peace has remained as far away as the promised paradise. (Andrew, 2004, p. 41-46).

### **2.3 Geostrategic Foundations**

If geo-strategic means researching the strategic center of the state or political unity, whether in war or peace, it deals with analysis based on its elements or factors, i.e., it is interested in studying the strategic location of the state or regional region, and the extent to which this site and that region affect peaceful and military relations. Saud, 2010, the early U.S. indication of the vitality of the geostrategic position of the Middle East appeared in a statement made by Alfred Mohan, a commander in the U.S. Navy, to which the first descriptions of the Middle East are attributed, that the Middle East, whether as a strategic concept or as a site on the southern border of the Mediterranean and Asia, is the scene of a strategic confrontation between the conflicting forces. Marwan, 1991, p. 49, and if so, what is the Middle East in the American geopolitical term? It is the entire region extending to a geographical area estimated at 17.778 million km<sup>2</sup> distributed in the following form (Mohammed 2009, p. 345): - The Arab world 13,923 million km<sup>2</sup>, i.e., the total area of the Arab League countries and the number of 22 countries, the following Asian countries: Pakistan 796,100km<sup>2</sup>, Afghanistan 652,090km<sup>2</sup>, Iran 1633190km<sup>2</sup>, Turkey 775,000km<sup>2</sup> plus Cyprus 9251km<sup>2</sup>.

#### **1. Geopolitical justification:**

For the official political discourse of the United States, the Middle East is a clear geopolitical unit, although it includes more than two distinct areas, Israel's neighborhood and the Oil Gulf, each of which differs in terms of its geopolitical and geo-military function. (Samir, 2004, p. 15-16), the region is opposed by several factors, the most prominent of which are geographical and the other with political and security economic structure, and any of these elements is of particular importance to the United States (Mohammed, 2009, P.S. 15), these factors do not cancel one another, but can be reinforced by it, it was not oil alone that shaped the fate of the Middle East, because the Middle East in the deep history of civilizations and long before the discovery of oil was a strategic confluence of roads between Africa and Eurasia as it is. Today, however, after the functional change of the region and with or without oil, strategic importance,

especially geo-military, will remain. (Hussein, Dr.T. International, p. 60), the United States is active in its quest to tighten control of the Middle East in close cooperation with regional pillars represented by Iran, the Shah and Saudi Arabia in the so-called "pillars", as well as its allies Turkey and Israel, and was trying to annex Iraq to those pillars through the Baghdad Pact, which was established in 1955 and toppled. In 1958, it is increasing those pillars to include more Middle Eastern countries, Egypt, Jordan, Afghanistan and Iraq, for example, as well as the Gulf of Six countries, and in this activity, which has been expressing itself in various airports confirming that this East is the lung from which it supplies the necessary energy to face the trouble of international competition, Europe has remained on the sidelines of the region satisfied that the United States alone defends its vital interests as many greedy countries have remained by refraining from competing with her. (Samir, 2004, p. 15).

Since the occupation of Iraq in 2003, a new phase has emerged, the main features of which have been the disappearance of the sovereign manifestations of some Middle Eastern countries, even those cooperating with the United States, and the emergence of a new regional order based on an unconventional geopolitical vision characterized by a direct U.S. military presence not in Iraq but in various Arab countries, and the disappearance of the traditional regional balance that exists, and the absence of the simplest rules of legal conduct governing states, the new regional order aims to restore the new regional order. "The formation of the international security system in the interests of the United States and also tries to neutralize the competing forces of the United States in areas of international conflict, so what I want from it is nothing but to reflect the success of the American strategic directions, which date back to before the end of the Cold War, when the United States laid red lines on some areas of international competition between it and the Soviet Union, which means or reflects a global geopolitical planning that did not take into account the rights of the major fundamental states of the international system," he said. (Hussein, International Studies, p. 60).

## **2. Geochemical justification:**

American Center capitalism has realized that the best way to overcome its internal crisis lies in absorbing oil surpluses and employing them to secure cumulative capital mobility, as the law of capitalism adopts accumulated as a necessary condition for the continuation of the capitalist system and its resilience in the face of crises that can ravage it both at home and abroad. (Muhammad, 2009, p.305). The reason for the U.S. interest in oil in the region is due to the growing U.S. need for energy consumption, especially since an upward deficit has been rising the oil balance since the 1970s, and there are three headlines that make the Middle East a very dangerous geo-economic anchor for the U.S. economy:

**First**, protect the US economy from any shock it may experience as a result of the interruption of the flow of oil or even its high prices significantly due to the growing demand for it by China, Europe and Japan.

**Second**: To talk about the prices and distribution of oil, and then control the nerve of the economies of the industrialized countries competing for the United States such as China, Japan and Europe or in other words: solve the American impasse represented by the decline of the

position of the American economy globally through the use of instruments of cosmic hegemony in which the superior military means have. (Muhammad, 2009, p.288).

### **3.3 The Importance of Middle East Oil in U.S. Strategy**

Oil is one of the most valuable natural resources in the world, and is considered the lifeblood of the world economy, continuous population growth, high standard of living in developed industrialized countries, and the development of developing countries, all of which require more energy that enters all areas of life, and it is not strange that oil is a constant controlling the strategies of the importing countries, as it is one of the most important factors that played a dangerous role in the manufacture of strategies during the 20th century so far, we find the United States of America planning a future Its relations are based on the continued provision of long-term access to oil and its derivatives at the lowest prices. (Barzani, 2009, p. 56). The United States views the Arab Gulf states, led by Saudi Arabia, as having excess oil production capacity and alone is able to mitigate price increases through their production capacity, to reduce the risk to the Western economy. (Al-Azami, 1992, p.100).

The period of time oil and gas are established deep in the earth is not known specifically, but geological studies say the rocks from which oil is extracted were formed two million years ago. This means that current oil and gas inventories will be consumed by other aquifers of gas and oil through geological processes. That's why oil as well as gas are non-renewable sources of energy. Today, the remaining reserves are estimated at 1 trillion barrels and there may be another trillion worldwide that have not been disclosed to date, but exploration requires new technologies, time, money and solid infrastructure (e.g., in Africa, which is suffering from underdevelopment and lack of technology) and half of the oil reserves have been consumed in just a quarter of a century. Current oil reserves are two-thirds of which are in five Middle Eastern countries. The United States has only 4 percent of the world's oil reserves, but consumes more than 25 percent of the world's oil produced daily, "Alaska has 10 billion barrels, a reserve that lasts only a few weeks." That's why it will run out of reserves in a few decades when Gulf oil runs out. Wars will be waged in Africa for oil and diamonds and for the Tantalite and Colombians, whom Africans call "Kaltan" Colton, two minerals used in electronic industries. Since the Arab regimes do not have the strength to fight conflicts, they will remain the same and America will force them to provide their oil free of charge. (Izzedine 2008, p. 9-10). In 1998, Zbigniew Berginsky published a book entitled "The Global Chessboard: The Superiority of the United States and Its Geopolitical Followers." China and Here are the countries that are able to counter the political and economic point of view of the United States in Asia.

3. The United States of America should therefore seek to dominate and control Eurasia.

U.S. strategic geopolitical plans aim to achieve military, political, and economic goals that ultimately enable America to take control of the world. This mission requires an army capable of fighting anywhere in the world and able to move quickly anywhere in the world. (Izzedine, 2008, p.11).

## CONCLUSION

Among the findings of our study, we can draw conclusions as follows:

1. The first strategic constant that contained the U.S. strategy was the issue of hegemony and global leadership, which seemed to be an intellectual and strategic proposition for most of the American administrations that succeeded in holding on to the authority of the White House, and even was an intellectual proposition for most of the American ideologues and thinkers, adhering to their ideological and pragmatic protectionism, and in order to preserve America's higher strategic interests.
2. The second strategic constant was to protect the higher American interests in the world by invoking the material, military and technological capabilities that this country has created to occupy the position and place of the summit in the international system, especially for the post-Cold War period. The emergence of international forces that can extend their emerging influence specifically in the Middle East.
3. In the United States of America ratio, the great overall strategy, especially for the post-World War II period and even nowadays, is to be primarily in international politics, and this was one of the most prominent and important pillars of international politics, in the sense that positioning in a position and a place that enables it to dominate world affairs. It is based on its military strength and superiority, as well as other economic and technological capabilities.
4. The link between the formulation of the U.S. strategy and the geopolitical position of the United States of America in the international arena, as well as the increase and growth of the American multi-dimensional force, its awareness of the role it should play in international politics, and the clear intellectual perceptions about the national goals and national interests of the American people. The American, which originally did not depart from the American external political behavior from its global framework and which seeks hegemony and global leadership, and therefore these proposals that governed the drawing of the framework and course of foreign political behavior of the United States of America and the formulation of the strategy that is supreme and comprehensive for this country from the time of the founding fathers, to this time.

## SOURCES

1. Sawsan Ismail Al-Assaf (2003): Constant and changing U.S. foreign policy, international papers, Center for International Studies, Issue 120, March, Egypt.
2. Michael Band William (2016): Lessons in the upcoming nuclear war, translated by Khader Mohammed al-Douri, Political Affairs Magazine, House of Cultural Affairs, Issue 166, Baghdad.
3. Marwan Bahiri (1991): U.S. and Middle East policy from Truman to Kissinger in U.S. and Arab politics, MarkG. Studies of Arab Unity, i2, Beirut.
4. Charles Kingley, Eugene Whitkov (2004): U.S. Foreign Policy and Its Internal Sources, Translation: Abdul Wahab Globe, First Edition, Supreme Council of Culture, Cairo.
5. North Hussein (2017): U.S. Post-September 11, 2001, First Edition, King Press, Sulaimaniyah.

6. Musa al-Zoubi (2004): *Where is the world heading today?* First edition, Arab Writers Union Publications, Damascus.
7. Anatoly Utkin (2003): *U.S. Strategy for the 21st Century*, translated by Anwar Mohammed Ibrahim, Mohammed Nasreddine Jebali, First Edition, Supreme Council of Culture, Cairo.
8. Faridoun Hama Saleh (2008): *U.S. Foreign Policy Analysis from the School of Realism*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of The Two Rivers, Faculty of Political Science, Baghdad.
9. Art Toffler (1992): *The transformation of power, between violence, wealth and knowledge*, translated by Fathi Ben Shewan, First Edition, Jamahiriya Publishing and Distribution House, Tripoli.
10. Richard Nixon (1998): *Victory without War*, translation: Mohammed Abdel-KreyM Abu Ghazala, First Edition, Al-Ahram Center for Translation and Publishing, Cairo.
11. Henry Kissinger (2002): *Does America need a foreign policy? Towards 21st Century Diplomacy*, Translation: Omar Al-Ayoub, First Edition, Arab Book House, Beirut.
12. Jamal Sanad al-Suwaidi (2014): *The Prospects of the American Era: Sovereignty and Influence in the New World Order*, Emirates Center for Strategic Studies, Abu Dhabi.
13. Paul Salem (2016): *Trump's Victory: His Readers in the U.S. and International Scenes: Interview with Paul Salem*, Interview: Fares Abi Saab, Arab Future Magazine, Issue 454, December, Hamra, Kuwait.
14. Dana Ali Saleh al-Barzani (2009): *U.S. Foreign Policy toward Saudi Arabia*, I1, Kurdistan Center for Strategic Studies, Baghdad.
15. Walid Hamdi al-Azami (1992): *Saudi-American relations, Gulf Security*, I1, Dar al-Hikma, Baghdad.
16. Hussein Hafez Wahab (2013): *The new U.S. administration's Strategy for the Middle East*, International Policy Magazine, Al-Ahram Center, Issue 46, and Cairo, Egypt.
17. Khaled Awad Qala Al-Daham (2018): *U.S. Strategy for the Middle East under Obama (2009-2017)*, Master's Thesis, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Middle East University, Jordan.
18. Ben Sheikh Essam (2016): *Hegemony as a goal in U.S. foreign policy, policy and law books*, issue 15, Kasdi Marbah University and Ouaqla, Joan, Algeria.
19. Zbigniew Brzezinski (2004): *Choice: Controlling the World or Leading the World*, Translated by Omar Al-Ayoubi, Arab Book House, Beirut.
20. Zbigniew Brzezinski (2012): *Seeing America's Strategy and the Crisis of Global Power*, translated by Fadel Jetker, Arab Book House, Beirut, Lebanon.
21. Zbigniew Brzezinski (1999): *Grand Chess: U.S. Control and Its Implications geostrategically*, Center for Military Studies, Damascus
22. Zalmay Khalil (1997): *The great strategy of the United States of America, its implications for it and the world*: Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, I1, Abu Dhabi.
23. Qayati Ashour (2017): *Arab Nationalist Mother, Challenges and Ways of Confrontation*, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts, Beni Suf University, Algeria.
24. Bernard S. Quinn (1986): *U.S. Foreign Policy*, translated by Hassan Saab, Arab Book House.
25. Amin Houidi (1986): *Kissinger and the Department of International Conflict*, Second Edition, Arab Position House, Cairo.
26. Samir Amin and others (2004): *Globalization and the new international order*, Center for Arab Unity Studies, I1, Beirut, Lebanon.

27. Khalil Anani (2009): OpamA and the Middle East (Good Intentions - Lack of Vision), Arab Affairs Magazine, Arab League Publications, CountD137, Cairo, Egypt.
28. Nassif Nassar (1994): Ideology is at stake (new chapters in Idol analysisandjia and criticism, Dar al-Tala'a, Beirut.
29. Abdul Qadr. Mohamed Fahmy (2009): Political and Strategic Thought of the United States of America (Study of Ideas, Beliefs and Imperial Construction), Al Shorouk Publishing and Distribution House, Amman.
30. Manar Al-Shubarji (2005): The Changer in U.S. Foreign Policy, International Policy, Volume 40, CountD161, Cairo.
31. Omar Koch (2004): Self-centered metaphysics, Syrian Literature Magazine, March 3, 4, Damascus.
32. Gerard Lawal (2009): American Philosophy, translation: Elham Al-Sha'rani, Arab Translation Organization, i1, Beirut.
33. Francis Fukuyama (1993): The Endof History and The Last Man, translated by Fouad Shaheen, Center for National Development, Beirut.
34. Andrew Basevich (2004): The American Empire Facts and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy, Arab House of Sciences, I1, Lebanon.
35. Arshad Hazam Mujbal (2012): The Development of Iraqi-American Relations, Academic Book House, Amman.
36. September Samia - Fatima Speech (2015): U.S. Foreign Policy toward the Middle East after the Cold War: Iran as a Model, A Message, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Mouloud Muammari University- Tizi Ouzou, Algeria.
37. Alaa Abdul Hafiz Mohammed Abdul Jawad (2009): The relationship between national security and democracy "a study of the impact of the September 11, 2001 crisis on democracy in the United States of America, Doctoral Thesis, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Cairo University.
38. Naseema Tawil (2010): U.S. Security Strategy in Northeast Asia: A Post-Cold War Study, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Lawand Political Science, Hajj Lakhdar Batna University, Algeria.
39. Malik Aouni (1997): U.S. Strategy and Its Position in U.S. Foreign Policy, International Policy Magazine, Al-Ahram Center, Issue (127), Cairo.