

ҒЫЛЫМИ МАҚАЛАЛАР
SCIENCE ARTICLES
НАУЧНЫЕ СТАТЬИ

IRSTI 03.09.55

<https://doi.org/10.26577/JH.2021.v103.i4.02>

A.Z. Abbasova-Guliyeva 

Baku State University, Azerbaijan, Baku
e-mail: aytanabbasova-quliyeva@bsu.edu.az

**A HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE U.S. MIDDLE EAST POLICY:
THE PERIOD OF OBAMA ADMINISTRATION**

This research work examines the historical aspects of the Middle East policy of the United States, conducted by Obama administration. The aim of this investigation is to clarify “soft (smart) power” policy of B. Obama government and to illustrate the impacts and regional events, occurred at the result of this policy.

There were made some summarizes on such points as public diplomacy of the United States, facts about the Arab Spring and the consequences of this political event to the attitude of the USA to Middle Eastern countries (Iran, Turkey, Israel and so on).

This research was made on the ground of various sources (periodicals, books, articles and internet sources) that clarified major aspects of the investigated topic, as well as there was obtained general hypothesis and consequences of the investigation. Consequently, Obama administration did not realize the theory of soft power in the Middle East region entirely. The attitude to Iran, which based on this theory concluded with disagreement between U.S. and her stable military, economic and political allies in the Middle East region. The challenge for democratization in the Persian Gulf and Middle East regions on the ground of “Arab Spring” did not establish stability and pro-Western authority in these regions; otherwise, this political confrontation caused to the acceleration of anarchy and growth of the number of states that became to be governed by Islamic rules and which criticized pro-American countries. The relations of the United States with her regional partners and key actors of the Middle East – Turkey and Israel aggravated at the result of “soft power” of Obama administration. Historical outlook shows that, the policy of Obama administration deeply altered the regional circumstances and leadership position of the United States in the Middle East, as well as strained political confrontation in this region.

Key words: the Middle East, USA, Obama administration, “soft power”, Arab Spring.

А.З. Аббасова-Кулиева

Баку мемлекеттік университеті, Әзірбайжан, Баку қ.
e-mail: aytanabbasova-quliyeva@bsu.edu.az

**АҚШ-тың Таяу Шығыс саясатына тарихи шолу:
Обама әкімшілігі кезеңі**

Бұл зерттеу жұмысында Обама әкімшілігі жүргізетін АҚШ -тың Таяу Шығыс саясатының тарихи аспектілері қарастырылады. Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты – Обама әкімшілігінің «жұмсақ (ақылды) билік» саясатын нақтылау және осы саясаттың нәтижесінде болған салдарлар мен аймақтық оқиғаларды суреттеу.

АҚШ қоғамдық дипломатиясы, араб көктемі туралы фактілер және осы саяси оқиғаның АҚШ -тың Таяу Шығыс елдерімен (Иран, Түркия, Израиль және т.б.) қарым-қатынасына әсері сияқты мәселелер бойынша нәтижелер шығарылды.

Бұл зерттеу жұмысы зерттелетін тақырыптың негізгі аспектілерін нақтылаған, сонымен қатар зерттеудің жалпы гипотезалары мен салдарын алған әр түрлі дереккөздер (мерзімді басылымдар, кітаптар, мақалалар мен интернет көздері) негізінде жүргізілді. Нәтижесінде Обама әкімшілігі

Таяу Шығыста жұмсақ күш теориясын толық енгізбеді. Осы теорияға негізделген Иранға деген көзқарас АҚШ пен оның Таяу Шығыс аймағындағы тұрақты әскери, экономикалық және саяси одақтастары арасындағы келіспеушілік болды. «Араб көктемі» негізінде Парсы шығанағы мен Таяу Шығыс аймақтарындағы демократияландыру мәселесі бұл аймақтарда тұрақтылық пен батысшыл билікті орнатуға әкелмеді; әйтпесе бұл саяси қақтығыс анархияның ұлғаюына және ислам ережелері бойынша басқарыла бастаған мемлекеттердің санының көбеюіне әкеліп, американдық елдерді сынға алатын еді. АҚШ -тың аймақтық серіктестерімен және Таяу Шығыстағы негізгі ойыншылармен, Түркия мен Израильмен қарым-қатынасы Обама әкімшілігінің жұмсақ күшімен ұшығып кетті. Тарихи көзқарастар Обама әкімшілігінің саясаты аймақтық жағдайды және АҚШ -тың Таяу Шығыстағы жетекші орнын түбегейлі өзгерткенін, сондай-ақ аймақтағы саяси қарсыластықты ұшықтырғанын көрсетеді.

Түйін сөздер: Таяу Шығыс, АҚШ, Обама әкімшілігі, «жұмсақ күш», араб көктемі.

А.З. Аббасова-Кулиева

Бакинский Государственный Университет, Азербайджан, г. Баку
e-mail: aytanabbasova-quliyeva@bsu.edu.az

Исторический обзор Ближневосточной политики США: период администрации Обамы

В данной исследовательской работе исследуются исторические аспекты ближневосточной политики США, проводимой администрацией Обамы. Цель этого исследования – прояснить политику «мягкой (умной) силы» правительства Б. Обамы и проиллюстрировать последствия и региональные события, произошедшие в результате этой политики.

Были подведены итоги по таким вопросам, как публичная дипломатия США, факты об арабской весне и последствиях этого политического события на отношения США к странам Ближнего Востока (Иран, Турция, Израиль и т.д.).

Это исследование было проведено на основе различных источников (периодические издания, книги, статьи и Интернет-источники), которые прояснили основные аспекты исследуемой темы, а также были получены общие гипотезы и последствия исследования. В результате, администрация Обамы не полностью реализовала теорию мягкой силы в ближневосточном регионе. Отношение к Ирану, основанное на этой теории, заключалось в разногласиях между США и ее стабильными военными, экономическими и политическими союзниками в регионе Ближнего Востока. Вызов демократизации в регионах Персидского залива и Ближнего Востока на почве «арабской весны» не привел к установлению стабильности и прозападного авторитета в этих регионах; в противном случае это политическое противостояние привело к усилению анархии и росту числа государств, которые стали управляться по исламским правилам и критиковали проамериканские страны. Отношения США с ее региональными партнерами и ключевыми игроками на Ближнем Востоке – Турцией и Израилем обострились в результате «мягкой силы» администрации Обамы. Исторические взгляды показывают, что политика администрации Обамы глубоко изменила региональные обстоятельства и лидирующую позицию Соединенных Штатов на Ближнем Востоке, а также обострила политическую конфронтацию в этом регионе.

Ключевые слова: Ближний Восток, США, администрация Обамы, «мягкая сила», арабская весна.

Introduction

The Middle East has always been among the zones of interest for the United States. Due to accomplish supremacy over this region, U.S. administrations have implemented different theories and plans in various phases. For instance, Truman doctrine, Eisenhower doctrine, Carter doctrine, Camp-David Accords, Gulf War, “Dual Containment” policy, Oslo Accords, “Unilateralism”, “preventive war” and so on....

Harsh adjustment in the Middle East policy of the U.S. occurred after the 9/11 events. Namely, after this occasion the U.S. administration altered

her policy on public diplomacy towards Arabic countries: she closed Arabic editorial of “American Voice”, instead of this office there was formed “Radio Sawa” and “Middle Eastern Radio Network”, as well as “Radio Farda” (“Radio Sabah”) in Persian in 2003 (Tarbayev, 2009: p. 73). The purpose of all these measures was to change anti-American thought of the Middle Eastern youth and to increase U.S. authority in the region through public events.

Simultaneously, after 9/11 events George W. Bush administration declared war against terrorism, accused Iraq government about the aid to terroristic organizations, and began war against Iraq, which resulted with the removal of S. Hussein regime. Such

theories and strategies of Bush administration, as “Unilateralism”, “preventive war”, and “Axis of Evil” were implemented against Iraq and for the supremacy of the U.S. in the region. Nevertheless, the policy of Bush administration towards the Middle East altered the circumstances in a bad point; U.S. supremacy aim was not realized, vice versa her regional position deteriorated. Therefore, Iraq confronted with the separation of powers (Shiite, Sunnite and Kurds); Iran and Shiite factor strengthened in the region, Kurdish separatism began to escalate not only in Iraq, but also in Iran, Turkey and Syria.

At the end of his presidency, George W. Bush sought to normalize relations with the countries of the Middle East region and did his best not be kept in mind as the initiator of ethno confessional confrontation within the region by the vehicle of new peace negotiations on Arab-Israeli conflict. Of course, the sample for this was the Annapolis Conference that did not give any decisive results. Nevertheless, President Bush put very difficult duties in front of his successor – democrat Barack Hussein Obama in the framework of Middle Eastern policy of the U.S.

The most essential issues, which were succeeded from George W. Bush to Barack H. Obama related with the Middle East policy of the United States. The negotiations for the solution of Israel-Palestine conflict, the nuclear proliferation problem, related with Iran, the provision of a durable relationship of the United States with Pakistan – her permanent ally in Afghanistan war, the capture of Osama bin Laden, the elimination of terroristic organizations, and the withdrawal of American troops from Iraq area.

Everybody was interested in one question: Which method would be chosen by the new administration, forced or moderate means? Would this government be able to demonstrate and strengthen the regional supremacy of U.S. in the region?

Materials and methods

This article was examined on the ground of various sources (books, articles and internet sources) that clarified major aspects of the investigated topic. Among the numerous studies, devoted to this topic we may highlight two types of works. The works, which can be referred to primary sources, such as National Security Strategy (2010) and Inaugural Address of the President (2009), Reports of the UN and U.S. Congress (for instance, Blackwill (2016), Zanotti (2011), Changing Course (2008), The ISIS and al-Nusrah front (2014)) make condition to examine the events much deeper and to analyze cir-

cumstances more objectively. The second type of studies are the monographs and articles of various researchers. The works of Sharipov (2014), Oran (2013), Sonmezoghlu (2012), Eligur (2014), Eiran (2011), Ozarowski (2016), Chakmak (2012) and others can be appreciated as valuable works for studying the topic. There are illustrated and investigated some historical aspects of foreign policy of Obama administration in these works.

Due to study the essence of the problems, a comparative and critical analysis of events and facts was carried out, generalizations were made, scientific objectivity, an integrated approach to the study of information and the principle of historicity were observed.

Results and Discussion

“Soft power” theory: New deal in the foreign policy of U.S. towards the Middle East

It should be pointed out that, the current circumstances in the US public order after the Iraq war had made Obama prioritize dialogue method towards his foreign policy, especially in the Middle East.

Even in January, 2009 in his Inaugural Address Obama expressed one idea “...And so, to all other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born: know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more.... To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history, but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist....” (Obama’s Inaugural Address, 2009)

This expression became the indicator of the substitution of former theories, such as “Axis of evil”, “preventive war”, “rogue states”, and “unilateralism” with much more liberal and soft policy of new administration as well. In fact, Obama also advocated for realism, but this reality did not coincide with George W. Bush’s realism. Thus, the new American president called Karl Paul Reinhold Niebuhr as one his favorite philosophers and he in fact acted in this foreign policy with the philosopher’s realistic thoughts:

“...Realization of U.S. foreign policy on the ground of diplomacy, without any demonstration of power, implementation of coalition game and compromise method, as well as realization of U.S. foreign policy by defending national interests of the state...” (Timofeyev, 2010: p.262)

Taking into account these ideas, Obama administration founded new priority in the context of the world policy, rotated conducting directions of policymaking by the maintenance of global leadership of the United States, as well as by preventing the decline of her international positions. This new tactic was illustrated as “soft power” in foreign literature. The examined policy, which brought its corn from “smart power” theory of Joseph S. Nye, aimed to cooperate with international organizations and to make the U.S. world leadership for other states much more useful and attractive (Pechatnov, Manikin, 2012: p. 635).

Obama administration published the next “National Security Strategy” document in 2010, which illustrated major priorities of America for the subsequent four years, foreign affairs conceptions, clarified further destinations of the United States in the Middle East and other essential regions of the world, as well as determined main national interests of the country as below-mentioned:

- “Collaboration with partners on the ground of weapons of mass destruction;
- Al Qaeda’s abolition and the Taliban’s weakening;
- Providing military and political assistance to Afghanistan and Pakistan;
- Iraqi sovereignty, withdrawal of troops, and the transfer of power to the Iraqi government as a whole;
- Peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the Middle East in the context of Israeli security and the establishment of a legitimate Palestinian state” (National Security Strategy, 2010)

So, president Obama began to realize “Obama doctrine” that observed to utilize active diplomatic methods in the solution of several issues in U.S. Middle East policy, based on the shape of equal and large-scaled dialogue both with partners and foes of America in this region. Simultaneously, the U.S. president implemented his ideas on Muslim countries in the framework of the report, called “Changing Course: A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World” by former Secretaries of State Madeleine Albright, Richard Armitage and other 34 members. There was mentioned the pillars of building strong and mutually beneficial relations with Muslim counterparts in the report:

1. Elevate diplomacy as the primary tool for resolving key conflicts involving Muslim countries, engaging both allies and adversaries in dialogue;

A) Engage with Iran to explore potential for agreements that could increase regional security, while seeking Iran’s full compliance with its nuclear

nonproliferation commitments;

B) Work intensively for immediate de-escalation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and viable path to a two-state solution, while ensuring the security of Israelis and Palestinians;

C) Promote broad-based political reconciliation in Iraq, and clarify the long-term U.S. role;

D) Renew international commitment and cooperation to halt extremists’ resurgence in Afghanistan and Pakistan;

E) Provide top-level U.S. leadership to resolve regional conflicts and to improve coordination with international partners;

2. Support efforts to improve governance and promote civic participation in Muslim countries, and advocate for principles rather than parties in their international political contests;

3. Help catalyze job-creating growth in Muslim countries to benefit both the U.S. and Muslim countries’ economies;

4. Improve mutual respect and understanding between Americans and Muslims around the world; (Changing Course, 2008: p.36-37)

It is also should be noticed that, before Obama’s coming to White House, more exactly in the years of 2007-2008 there had been succeeded some achievements in Iraqi problem; Baghdad had been divided on the ground of confessional principles. In the context of the “Consensus on the status of international forces”, obtained in 2008 by George W. Bush all military forces had to be withdrawn from the cities of Iraq until June 30, 2009, and whole from the country till the year of 2011. The implementation of this consensus had been included in Obama’s list of tasks, indeed the U.S. forces had been deported from Iraq at the designated time, and the new U.S. administration had already focused on normalizing relations with hostile countries such as Iran. When taking into consideration the Obama administration’s policy regarding Iran, it should be mentioned that, relations with this country had been the major exam of Obama and played a key role in the implementation of the US policy on the Middle East. So, even during the presidency of George W. Bush Iran has always played a central role in the settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli peace process, U.S. relations with Iraq, Saudi Arabia and other Arab states, as well as the protection of the security and territorial integrity of the State of Israel. The conservative cabinet of Mahmoud Ahmedinejad, who came to power in 2005 in this country turned out to be the new reason for the further deterioration of U.S.-IRI relations at the beginning of the 21st century. Ahmedinejad rose to Iran’s leadership in the Middle East

region after the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime. He played an essential role in the shape of "Shiite Crescent", ignored international demands on nuclear nonproliferation, condemned expansionist policy of the U.S. and NATO towards the states of Middle East and Persian Gulf, and sent explicit warnings to Israeli state. All these issues disturbed American administration and after the beginning of the presidency of Obama there began new deal on U.S.-IRI relations – the phase of dialogue. The idea about extending a hand if any country is willing to unclench her fist had also been addressed to Iran government. Simultaneously, U.S. president's advisor on foreign deals Richard N. Haass emphasized in his report that, negotiation process with IRI had to be divided into several parts for its importance. There should be given much more attendance to the restoration of diplomatic relations with this state, issue on nuclear security in the Persian Gulf and Iraq, as well as to the discussion of some other regional problems (Haass, Talbot, 2008: p-7-8). Despite of all attempts, made by Obama administration the U.S. couldn't give appropriate respond from Ahmedinejad cabinet, on the contrary during the conference on the "Treaty of Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" (NPT), held in UN headquarters in New-York, in 2010, it became obvious that, mutual relations between these two countries were hard / intense yet. This conference reminded duel between Ahmedinejad and Hillary Clinton (Secretary of State of U.S.); the IRI president substantiated his decision about not signing NPT with the appliance of nuclear weapons against Japan during the WW2 and against Iraq in the Gulf War by the U.S. administration. At the same time, Ahmedinejad insisted to create non-nuclear zone within the Middle East region including the state of Israel regarding to NPT of 1995 (Sharipov, 2014: p.154). These allegations prompted the U.S. administration to re-direct the IRI and to continue the policy of imposing sanctions against the Ahmedinejad government.

U.S. Public Diplomacy and Education Policy for the Middle East

Another main highlight of US policy in the Middle East under Obama's presidency is the fact that the United States had sought to influence the Arab world with public diplomacy and education policy during this period.

In general, following the 9/11 events the U.S. administration realized that it was wrong to pursue only military policy as during the Cold War, such policy reinforced anti-American tendencies within

the world, and by this reason presidents of new age had gradually intensified their attitudes towards education policy and public diplomacy. The implementation of education policy within the world, especially in the Middle East region deepened namely in 2003-2007, after the Gulf War of 2003. Major directions of this policy were:

- Changing the political situation in the region through the emergence of parties, the training of alternative politicians, the emancipation of women (reducing public dependence) and the formation of democratic ideas among young people;
- Changing the economic situation as well as legislation at the expense of "educated" businessmen and lawyers;
- Changing the education system through access to education for women, as well as changing curricula and distributing American books to regional universities; (Svetkova, 2009: p.282-283)

According to this policy, there have been provided English courses for journalists in the Middle East countries and short-term courses for lawyers due to learn US law and congressional rules. There were founded American schools in Qatar and Kuwait. There were organized summer schools in America to teach young people democratic values and special schools for girls in such countries as Morocco, Egypt and Afghanistan. There were created new TV channels to promote U.S. history and culture, there were conducted new courses on the principles of civil society and democracy, as well as there were established partnerships with a number of Middle Eastern Universities and U.S. Universities.

It should be also stressed that, U.S. Congress created "Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy" in 2004, which destinations were:

- Formation of cultural diplomacy as the major tool of U.S. foreign policy;
- Promoting cultural cooperation by displaying the most important examples of American art abroad;
- Realization of U.S. national interests to move forward in the world; (Filimanov, 2010: p.69)

Public diplomacy of the U.S. much more expanded by "The Middle East Partnership Initiative" and "IT strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2011-2013" programs during Obama's presidency. The first document examined to select bright political people from the Middle East countries and send them to the United States for a period of 6 to 24 months, then to grant such people with 50-150 thousand U.S. dollar (Bulgaru, 2017: p.159-160). The second document provided the exchange of information with countries in the region through social networks such as

Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn, as well as enhancing their role based on data from the State Department (Antyuhova, 2016: p.17).

In addition, during the Obama administration, the U.S. had implemented a broad strategy called "Public Diplomacy 2.0" regarding the Middle East, explaining the implications of American foreign policy to the Arab world, preventing U.S. disinformation and al-Qaeda ideology in the Arab information space. There had been increased great support for network dissidents in the media of the Middle East, as well as the implementation of information impacts on liberalization of authoritarian regimes.

Under the aforementioned diplomacy there was organized "Alliance of Youth Movement", which observed to make partnership with Facebook, Google, YouTube, MTV, Howcast and that was supported by U.S. State Department in 2008, as well as there was held "1st International Conference of Network Dissidents" by the participation of Syria, Venezuela, Cuba, Iran, Russia, and China in Texas in 2010. (Antyuhova, 2016: p.17)

So, all explored issues on U.S. public diplomacy and education policy allows considering that, American administration had great role in the functioning of political processes, which was called "Arab Spring" in the Middle East and Persian Gulf region.

"Arab Spring" and its consequences for Arabic states

The Arab Spring, which was the rational consequence of public and educational policy of the U.S administration, is one of the main highlights of Obama presidency. In foreign literature "Arab Spring" was estimated as the "Revolution, based on communication" and "Internet Revolution"; simultaneously, according to a 2011 poll by Time magazine, Egyptian blogger Vail Ghonimi was declared "the most influential person of the year" and Tunisian blogger Lina Ben Menny's name was on the list for the 2011 Nobel Prize (Aliisgandarli, 2014: p.164). These facts might also be samples for U.S. interference to "Arab Spring".

"Arab Spring" aimed to substitute autocratic regimes of Middle Eastern countries with much more liberal, democratic, and pro-Western ones. This occasion caused to the removal of former cabinets in Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, and Yemen, reformation of cabinets in Saudi Arabia, Oman, Morocco, Bahrain and other states, beginning of the civil war in the area of Syria, strengthening of terror danger in the area of the Middle East (in the context of ISIL), as well as increasing Kurdish separatism.

Therefore, self-immolation of Mohamed Bouazizi pushed to Jasmine revolution in Tun-

sia (in Tahrir square) in January 2011. Protests of public order in the framework of anti-Zine El-Abidine Ben Ali demonstration complained against authoritarian regimes, social status, poverty and unemployment throughout the Arab world. Soon these political processes expanded to Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Saudi Arabia, as well as influenced to bilateral relations of these countries themselves.

Egypt was one of the main countries affected by the Arab Spring. The leader of this country since 1981 Hosni Mubarak was removed by the organization of "Muslim brotherhood" and their leader Mohammed Morsi became the new president of Egypt. However, this new regime was not as pro-western as European countries and U.S. had expected. Therefore, Morsi government, which divided the world into two parts – "dar-ul-Islam" (Muslim world) and "dar-ul-kufr" (world of infidels) expressed its ideas about Israeli state in such words: "...We will never recognize the "green line" between Israel and Palestine. All these lands belong to the Palestinians, not the Zionists" (Krilov: p.48). This expression had clarified the ideology of new Egyptian cabinet in certain way.

Moreover, what about Iraq... The Iraqi government, which had already lost all its influence because of political upheaval and ethno confessional confrontation after the removal of Saddam Hussein, as well as a consequence of the military policy of the US administration had become a nest of terror on the ground of the Arab Spring. The name of this terroristic danger was Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). The background of ISIL refers to 2006. So, namely in this year there was established Islamic State of Iraq (ISI) in the area of Iraq and after making connections with Jabhat al-Nusra- branch of Al Qaeda, this organization added to its name "Levant"; consequently it included Syria, Lebanon, Israel and Jordan (Klepikov, 2016: p.46). ISI, which mainly composed of Sunnites organized terroristic acts in Mosul, Kirkuk and Baghdad in 2011-2012, did its best to push ethno confessional confrontation in the framework of the civil war in Syria.

The existed circumstances in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, bilateral relations of this state with the Obama administration, and her attitude to neighbor countries on the ground of "Arab Spring" and in the context of the change of regimes in the region were reminded with significant events as well. Saudi Arabia had always scared of increasing the hegemony of Iran in the Middle East region, expanding the idea of "revolutionary Shiite Islam" by this state, and gave priority namely to these factors in the

military-political relations with the Obama administration. Simultaneously, U.S. administration did her best to prevent the danger of Iran by the vehicle of military-economic aid to Saudi Arabia, as well as to preserve U.S. hegemony in the Middle East region. For this purpose there was signed military agreement between United States and Saudi Arabia Kingdom about the sale of military equipments on 60 billion \$ on December 29, 2011. According to this agreement, U.S. would sell 84 F15SA and 24 AH64 D – Apache aircrafts to Saudi Arabia, modernize 70 airplanes, and implement training of more than 5 thousand Saudi Arabian military officers in the United States. The first sale of F15SA would be realized in 2015, and modernization in 2014 (Suvo-rova, 2012: p.5-6).

The major goal of Saudi Arabia in the framework of the “Arab Spring” was enlarging her influence zone in the Middle East and restricting Iran from the region; therefore, she did her best to infiltrate the events of Libya, Yemen, Bahrain and Syria, sometimes directly or indirectly. One of the countries that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) directly intervened during these political processes was Yemen, and the reason for its attention was to protect the southwestern regions of the kingdom against the threat of the “Arab Spring”. Namely by the initiative of KSA the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (CCASG) adopted “Gulf initiative” on April, 2011, which examined to protect the union, defense of the stability and safety of Yemen and to change of regime of the country by “national consensus” (Kosach, 2015: p.56). Despite of the fact that, President Ali Abdullah Saleh hand over his post to the vice president, Mansour Hadi Houthi movement that relied on Iran support intensified; this event pushed KSA to respond Yemen events by military interference as well. Before the military intervention Saudi Arabian ambassador in the U.S., Adel bin Ahmed Al-Jubeir made negotiations with President Obama and namely after this negotiation there began the operation of “Decisive Storm” against Yemen by the support of the U.S., Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait and United Arab Emirates (UAE) on March 25, 2015 (Vinogradov, Shumilov, 2017: p.24). The international community did not welcome the Saudi Arabian intervention to Yemen; the United Nations (UN) intended to include this state to its blacklist, but as after the king of KSA stated that, his country would not participate in counterterrorism and humanitarian assistance programs the organization moved away from its idea. Simultaneously, the Iranian administration called this war as the scenario of U.S., KSA and Israel.

There emerges one question?...Why did the U.S. administration support KSA in this intervention (as Obama preferred soft power in foreign affairs)?....This incentive might be related with the shape of anti-American tendencies inside of Saudi Arabia after the softening in USA-IRI relations, as well as Obama’s desire to prevent this inclination. So, in April-June, 2015 the United States signed two agreements with IRI, such as “Nuclear Deal Framework” and “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” (Ponamm, 2016: p.1); these agreements eliminated the long-standing tension between two states, stopped economic sanctions against Tehran, and caused to the aggravation of U.S.-Saudi Arabian relations.

The interests of KSA and IRI had not only confronted in Yemen, but also in Bahrain and Syria, the major column of Iranian religious extremism in the region. In February 2011 there began protests and demonstrations for the independence to Shiites and change of regime by the maintenance of IRI in the area of Bahrain, at the result of military aid of KSA and UAE (KSA sent 1200, UAE sent 800 military officers to this country (Cheikh Ibrahim, 2018: p.4)) to Bahrain the authority of King Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa was preserved. Obama administration also supported the intervention of Saudi Arabia to Bahrain (there is placed the 5th navy of the U.S. as well), as there might be strengthened the role of anti-American and pro-Iranian Shiite population here.

Another country that had been included to the list of interests of the U.S.-Saudi Arabia alliance in the context of “Arab Spring” was the Arab Republic of Syria. Syria had also been under the supremacy of autocracy (Hafez al-Assad and Bashar al-Assad) for a long time, the public order of the country encountered with various social problems, such as poverty, unemployment, inequality because of this regime.

Bashar al-Assad’s cabinet signed an agreement on an amount of 10 billion \$ about the construction of gas pipeline with Iran and Iraq in 2011 (Markitos, 2013: p.85; Aliisgandarli, 2013: p.267). This fact pushed Obama administration to turn over this country, as well as to internal events, happening here (so, one of the major directions of the U.S. Middle Eastern policy consisted of the safety of energy resources and their transition).

Syrian conflict that grew in three – local, regional and global levels on the ground of “Arab Spring” had been defended by several powerful states of the world. Especially the military branch of Syrian opposition – Free Syrian Army (FSA) had been supported by the United States. This fact was proved by the creation of secret committee in order to prepare

the aid forms to Syrian opposition under the leadership of Steve Simon, the member of U.S. National Security Council in 2012, as well as financial aid of the United States to this opposition even in 2005 according to WikiLeaks (Sharipov 2014: p.214; Martinenko, 2016: p.3).

In general, taking into account the Middle Eastern policy of U.S. Obama administration did his best to protect energy resources and transit routes from the influence of Russia and Iran, simultaneously Iran and Russia tried to preserve Syria as outpost in the region and therefore did their best to aid Bashar Assad regime. So, the member of IRI Parliament Aladdin Barujerdi made a speech during the civil war in Syria and emphasized that, "...Iran either should let the Wolf (U.S. here) capture Syria and be the initiator of NATO intervention to the region, or had to aid the Muslim people of Syria, which could be considered the heart of Palestinian defense..." (Kochergina, 2016: p.189)

Although the United States did her best to preserve her strength and positions in the Middle East region, Obama was much more careful by preferring coalitional activity (it was the major distinction between George W. Bush and Obama administrations). So, in August 2014 was organized international coalition by U.S. initiative that aimed to abolish danger of the IS and Jabhat al-Nusra in Syria and in 2015 was conducted military trainings for Syrian opposition by Pentagon (Bezrukov, 2016: p.34). Simultaneously, Russia aimed to prevent U.S. influence to Syrian events and began to military-air hostilities against the IS in the same year. Despite of the joint statement of these two states about the cease of fire in the area of Syria on February 22, 2016, Syrian issue continued being major object of struggle in the Middle East region.

In general, "Arab Spring" caused to several definite modifications in the Middle East region:

- Ethno confessional confrontation had strained;
- The interference of foreign countries to internal problems of the regional countries had increased;
- The argues for regional hegemony of Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey had deepened;
- Several states of the region, such as Libya, Syria, Iraq, and Yemen had broken inside;
- Radical Islam and refugee issue had turned into more disputable issue of international world.

U.S.–Turkey and U.S.–Israel political relations under the Obama administration:

Negative impact of the Arab Spring

The U.S.-Turkey relations during the Obama's presidency have moved from a "model partnership" to mistrust and contradictions. Seventy-seven days

after taking office, Obama paid his first official visit to Turkey in April 2009, giving a good impression of the normalization of relations in Turkish political circles. During the visit, the U.S. President addressed the Parliament, saying, "...I was asked, if I had sent a message during my visit to Istanbul and Ankara. My answer was, "Evet"...." After his visit, Obama mentioned that, "...Bush insulted Turkey and brought it to the brink of extinction. I gained Turkey again, increased the level of cooperation and friendship with this state...." This speech indicated Obama's appreciation to the relations with Turkey (Degishen dunyada Turk Dış Politikası, 2011: p.102-103).

At the same time, when analyzing the relations between the two countries, Obama used the term of "model partnership" and expressed his opinion as follows: "...This is a union based on ideals and values, not religions and beliefs. Relations between two countries will not be limited to security, but will be based on greater cooperation. Freedom of religion, the rule of law and democracy are our common values. Our cooperation will ensure unity between the Muslim world and the Western world, and bring security and peace to the world...." (Chakmak, 2012: p.1090) Obama's idea can be evaluated as a "union of cultures" or "intercultural dialogue" as well.

During his first presidency, Obama pursued a policy of close cooperation with the Turkish leadership in the context of both NATO, the UN as well as fight against terrorism. The issue of Iran occupied an essential place in U.S. relations with the Republic of Turkey within the framework of NATO and the United Nations. A Uranium Enrichment Exchange Agreement and the Ballistic Missile Defense (Shield) Project were the samples to their partnership. Hence, the Turkey government has been involved in dialogues on Iran along with Brazil since 2008. The United States did not object to Turkey's actions in this direction, as it was proper to the line of the Vienna Group (Germany, Russia, France and the MAGATE) and the P5 + 1 formula. However, the signing of the Tehran agreement by Turkey, Brazil and Iran on May 17, 2010 was not positively greeted by the United States, which justified her protest as follows:

- Iran wants to gain time for uranium enrichment.
- The agreement does not say anything about stopping uranium enrichment.
- The 1,200 kg of uranium, which Iran would sent to Turkey, is very small, and Iran can produce a nuclear weapon with the remaining uranium.

- The agreement does not say anything about imposing an embargo on Iran, whether it does not comply with the agreement (Oran, 2013: p.295).

Despite its relations with Iran, Turkey had to join the Ballistic Missile Shield Program in 2011 due to its international interests, which was signed in November 2009 at the NATO summit in Lisbon. The project predicts the gradual establishment of a missile defense system against Iran's alleged ballistic missile program, the deployment of defense missiles and radars in certain countries to protect Europe from this threat, and the use of Malatya's Kurecik province for this purpose (Chakmak, 2012: p.1091; Sonmezoglu, 2012: p.339). The Congress report, called "Turkey-US Defense Cooperation: Prospects and Challenges" stated that, "...Turkey has never been so important during the Cold War. Its location in a hot region like the Middle East has made this country vital to the United States..." (Zanotti, 2011)

The Arab Spring, which has escalated since 2011, the ISIS threat, and the turbulence in Syria, have caused tensions between the United States and Turkey, which has negatively affected political relations between two countries. The Obama administration was initially inactive in the events in Syria and did not want to throw the United States into another panic that would lead to a fiasco. He simply supported the idea of changing the Assad regime and did not directly participate in military operations to overthrow his regime. For this reason, the Turkish government asked NATO for support to prevent the threat from Syria and to deploy Patriot missiles on its territory in 2012. Turkey allowed the Syrian National Council to establish a headquarters in Istanbul as an "emigration government" and even waged a "hybrid war"¹ against the Assad regime with the participation of jihadists. Erdogan's government wanted Syria to be defended by the United States and coalition forces, to create a "safe haven" there², but the United States was content to fight only against ISIS. In a special report prepared by the UN Security Council, allegations that Islamic State and Jabhat al-Nusra had smuggled ammunition through Turkey and that Turkish businesspersons smuggled oil from Syria

¹ Hybrid War – The offensive state repulses its rivals through covert operations, sabotage, cyber warfare, or by assisting opposition forces in the area without resorting to classical warfare.

² The situation in Syria obliged the population to flee to Turkey. This was reminiscent of the Kurdish migration that followed the 1991 Gulf War. For that reason, Turkey government wanted the international coalition to seize the situation.

resonated with the international community (Report of UN SC, 2014).

In general, the events in Syria have damaged U.S.-Turkish relations after 2011. The attitude of two countries' leaders differed from each other on such issues as further destiny of Assad regime, the Syrian opposition and military units. Thus, in the first years of the Syrian crisis, the United States, which unequivocally demanded the removal of the Assad regime, later changed its mind and in 2013 signed an agreement on the withdrawal of chemical weapons from Syria. In 2014, the Obama administration cut military aid to the Syrian opposition. Nevertheless, Turkey government did not only reduce her support in this direction, but also used Syrian rebellions in the "Operation Euphrates Shield", which lasted from August 26, 2016 to March 29, 2017 (Shlikov, 2019: p.210).

One of the main contradiction between the United States and Turkey concerned to the issue of ISIS, Jabhat al-Nusra and the Syrian Kurds. In the summer of 2014, when cities such as Raqqa, Mosul, and Kobani came under Islamic State control, the United States initiated the creation of an "international coalition" against the threat, and TC only joined the coalition in July 2015 and allowed the use of the Incirlik base (Sly, DeYoung, 2015). U.S. cooperation with Kurds in the defense of Kobani territory, U.S. air and Kurdish ground attacks against ISIS, PKK flag and pictures of Ocalan in mass media after the liberation of Raqqa, the sharing of pictures of Kurdish militants has shown that the two countries' leaders have different views on the Kurdish issue and that the Obama administration has found a new ally in the Middle East in the form of the Syrian Kurds.

By the end of his presidency, Obama's views on Turkey had changed, and bilateral relations had reached the level of mutual distrust. Jeffrey Goldberg, an analyst of US foreign policy during the Obama administration, described his relationship with Erdogan as follows: "...Obama used to see Erdogan as a moderate leader, who could repair the bridges between the East and the West. Now, Obama calls him a failed and authoritarian politician who has failed to bring stability to Syria..." (Markus, 2016) Erdogan evaluated Obama as a politician, who had turned the region into a bloodbath by helping the Kurdish military and not seeing their faces.

In 2016, shortly before the coup attempt, Obama spoke to Erdogan by telephone and tried to persuade the Turkish president to agree to the Syrian Kurds crossing the Euphrates and capturing Islamic State strongholds in Manbij. Erdogan was concerned that

the Syrian Kurds would control the entire Syrian-Turkish border by capturing Manbij, and thus the Kurds in Turkey would rise up against the government. Nevertheless, he agreed to the operation, but demanded that after the liberation of Manbij, Kurdish forces should withdraw to the east of the Euphrates (Shlikov, 2019: p.215). However, the Kurds did not return.

Another event that contributed to the escalation of tensions in US-Turkish relations was the July 15, 2016 coup attempt against Erdogan and the JDP cabinet. Fethullah Gulen, who damaged relations with the JDP government in 2013 and accused Erdogan of oppression, was accused of masterminding the uprising in Ankara and Istanbul. This coup attempt, which killed 246 people and injured nearly 2,000, was allegedly backed by the United States. Afterwards coup attempt was thwarted, Erdogan said that foreign countries were behind it, and this reaction was justified by many factors. On the night of the uprising, when Erdogan tried to fly from Marmara to Istanbul, the U.S. NBC television channel reported that, the Turkey president had sought asylum in Germany, but the latter refused, and the news was broadcast by thousands of media outlets around the world. In addition, Obama took the stage only four hours after the coup attempt and expressed support for Turkey's democratically elected government (Sulima, Shepelov, 2017: p.223; Avatkov, 2017: p.185). Some researchers have described the U.S. support for Gulen as a reaction to the normalization of Turkey's relations with Russia and Israel. Nevertheless, the main reason was the Erdogan government's failure to pursue a policy in line with U.S. regional interests, disagreements and distinctive attitude to many issues. The U.S. administration's refusal to extradite Gulen, despite Turkey's demands, has raised tensions between the two countries and further eroded confidence in Turkey's political and public circles. In order to prevent escalation of tensions, U.S. Vice President George J. Biden visited Ankara in August 2016 and emphasized that, "...The United States has no interest in defending anyone who harms her ally. However, we must do everything within the framework of our laws...." (Bobkin, 2018: p.40)

The Arab Spring negatively influenced to U.S.-Israeli relations as well. But, it is important to mention that, this occasion was not the sole issue that strained bilateral relations between two countries. The attitude of Obama administration to Palestinian problem and its "soft power" strategy towards IRI also played an essential role in this context. Nevertheless, namely Arab Spring prompted Arab countries such as Egypt,

Tunisia, Libya, and Syria, including a pro-Israel state such as Egypt, to rebel against Israel, and Islamist terrorist groups, including Al-Qaeda, became more active in the region. In other words, because of the Arab Spring, Israel faced the threat of Egypt after Hamas and Hezbollah.

The capture of The Arab Republic of Egypt (ARE) by the Muslim Brotherhood-led by Mohamed Morsi in 2012 and the recent increase in anti-American and anti-Israeli tensions in the country showed that the Obama administration did not have the right strategy. It was during M.Morsi's presidency that Egypt contacted Hamas, during Ahmadinejad, mutual visits were made between Egypt and The Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI), and the new Egyptian president emphasized that the 1979 agreement signed between Israel and The Arab Republic of Egypt would be revised. However, M.Morsi failed to strengthen his power in the country, and 2013 protests against him spread throughout Egypt. During the protests, the US administration was also accused of "supporting terrorism Obama and Peterson³," "Awake America!" "Obama is returning the fascist regime to Egypt." (Eligur, 2014: p.289). The weakening of US positions in Egypt negatively affected Israeli security, but the rise to power of Abdel Fattah al-Sisi in The Arab Republic of Egypt in 2014 relatively stabilized relations between the two countries.

In the context of the Arab Spring, the Syrian civil war and Israeli policy in the current situation were also unique. In the early years of the civil war against the Assad regime, Israel took a neutral position, but the opportunity to change the regime in Syria took advantage of this. Amos Gilboa, a retired general and expert on Syria, said: "The anti-Israel axis will fall not because of Israel's withdrawal from the Golan Heights, but because of the fall of the Assad regime" (Eiran, 2011: p.2)

During the activities of the international coalition against IS, created in 2014, Israel helped the United States only on the sidelines, since the government believes that its accession to the coalition could lead to the withdrawal of Arab states. In general, Israel's policy towards Syria during the Arab Spring can be explained by three main components:

1. The Israeli government took a neutral position and did not support any political party in Syria.
2. The Israeli government responded to missile strikes from Syria when there was any action or threat against Israel's security.

³ Ann Peterson was the ambassador of U.S. in Egypt at the examined period

3. Israel's actions in Syria have reduced Hezbollah's activity and its support for Syria (Ozarowski, 2016: p.149-150).

The Government of Israel is also concerned about the intensification of Al-Qaeda in Libya, Yemen, and Gaza as a result of the Arab Spring. Because of the Arab Spring, Al-Qaeda intensified its activities in Syria and Iraq through the Jabhat al-Nusra wing, and the new leader of the organization, Ayman Al-Zawahiri, even met with representatives of the Qatari branch of the Taliban in June 2013. During the meeting, Zawahiri emphasized the importance of removing Assad from power and launching a jihad against Israel (Eligur, 2014: p.292). The rise of Al-Qaeda in the Middle East and the growing activity of this organization on the border with Israel (Syria, Gaza, the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt) increased the threat to the Jewish state.

Disagreements between the United States and Israel on these issues and the loss of the original nature of bilateral political relations were reluctantly received in the United States, and various political institutions prepared a package of proposals to restore relations between these two countries. A striking example of this is the report prepared by the US Council on Foreign Relations in November 2016. The following is noted here:

- At the Camp David summit in 2017, we should consider US-Israeli relations, as well as discuss the Palestinian issue, the role of the United States in the region, the change of the Middle East, and ensuring strategic dialogue.

- Israel's confidence in the United States must be restored through cooperation in the missile defense system project and the provision of long-term defense assistance.

- It is necessary to develop a common vision and cooperation with Israel regarding Iran's renunciation of its nuclear program and the nuclear deal.

- Simultaneously, Iran's regional hegemony must be prevented.

- The United States should refrain from international condemnation of the Palestinian problem and the construction of Jewish settlements.

- Economic cooperation with Israel needs to be steadily increased to integrate into the region. (Blackwill, Gordon, 2016: p.6)

Conclusion

After examining the above mentioned historical aspects, related with the Middle East policy of Obama administration we can give some summaries over the topic:

- Obama administration drew new political line through the Middle East policy of the U.S., which was coincided with the "soft power" theory. This strategy definitely concerned to Iran issue, but had eventually been unsuccessful. The main reason of failure related with conservative policy of M. Ahmadinejad.

- Along with "soft power" strategy, Obama administration implemented deep public diplomacy and educational policy, which aimed to shape enlightened pro American and anti-autocratic young generation (as well as female emancipation). This policy served to strengthen American supremacy over the Middle East region.

- The "Arab Spring", which was the rational consequence of "soft power" strategy and public diplomacy of Obama administration, did not result with expected desires of the U.S. The new created regimes of Arabic countries were pro-Islamic governments, and they began to criticize the U.S., their supremacy ambitions in the region.

- Relations of the U.S with her historical allies in the Middle East – Turkey and Israel spoiled at the result of the strategy and policy of Obama administration. Therefore, a new alliance of the U.S with Syrian Kurds and scandal on the coup attempt against Erdogan and the JDP cabinet strained the attitude of Turkish government to Obama administration. Simultaneously, a differed concern to Israeli-Palestinian conflict, condemns on the construction of new Jews settlements, dialogues with Iran government and new anti- American and anti- Israel regimes of Arabic countries (at the result of Arab Spring) destabilized U.S-Israeli relations.

Consequently, the policy of Obama administration have destabilized the existing circumstances in the Middle East, spoiled historical alliances of the United States with several regional states, rather than correcting the mistakes of its predecessor and shaping the situation in the region in favor of the United States.

References

- Aliisgandarli J. (2013). Arab bahari: Geosiyasi ve geoqitisadi maraqlarin qarshiliqli tesiri [The Arab Spring: The Conflict of Geopolitical and Geoeconomic Interests]. Baku: History and its actual problems, Volume 4, p.263-272.
- Aliisgandarli J. (2014). "Arab bahari" (Analitik bakhish). Arab bahari kontekstinde Turkiye ve Iran ["Arab Spring (analytical review). Turkey and Iran in the context of the Arab Spring], Baku: History and its actual problems, Volume 1, p.161-169.

Antyuhova E.A. (2016). Strategiya NATO i vneshnepolitieskiye podxodi SSHA kak lidera Severoatlanticheskogo Alyansa pri administrasii B.Obami [NATO Strategy and US Foreign Policy Approaches as Leader of the North Atlantic Alliance under the Obama Administration]. Orlov: Learning notes of the Orlov State University, Volume 1 (70), p.13-21.

Avatkov A.V. (2017). Turtsiya: povorot na Vostok [Turkey: turn to the East]. Moscow: The contours of global transformations: political science, economics, law. Vol. 10, Issue 2, p.181-196.

Bezrukov A.E. (2016). Strategiya SSHA v Sirii: process prinyatii resheniy [US Strategy in Syria: The Process of Adoption]. Moscow: Problem analysis and state – management design, Volume 3(9), p.18-37.

Blackwill, R.D., Gordon, P.H. (November, 2016). Repairing the US-Israel Relationship. Council on Foreign Relations, No.76. https://cdn.cfr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2016/11/CSR76_BlackwillGordon_Israel.pdf (Accessed: 20.08.2020).

Bobkin N.N. (2018). Krizis strategicheskogo partnyorstva SSHA i Turtsii: ot nedoveriya k protivostayaniyu [The Crisis of the Strategic Partnership between the USA and Turkey: From Mistrust to Confrontation]. Moscow: USA and Canada: Economy, Politics, Culture, Issue 7, p.33-50.

Bulgaru D.I. (2017). Kommunikatsionniy menedjment kak instrument vneshney politiki SSHA v kontekste popitkam smeni siriyskogo politicheskogo rejima [Communication management as a tool of US foreign policy in the context of attempts to change the Syrian political regime], Moscow: Electronic Bulletin, Volume 61, p. 153-172.

Chakmak H. (2012). Turk dish politikasi (1919-2012) [Turkish foreign policy (1919-2012)]. Ankara: Barış Platin, 1244 p.

Changing Course: A New Direction for US Relations with the Muslim World. Report of the Leadership Group on US-Muslim Engagement (2008). Washington D.C., Cambridge MA, 153 p.

Cheikh Ibrahim A.J. (2018). The United States and the “Arab Spring”, Tripoli: International Journal of Scientific and University Research Publication, Political Science, Volume 9 (145), p.1-8.

Deghishen dunyada turk dish politikasi. (2011). [Turkish foreign policy in transforming world]. Ed: M.Ercan. Nobel Yayimlari, 437 p.

Eiran E. (2011). Watching from the Sidelines: Israel and Syrian Uprising. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 4 p.

Eligur B. (2014). The Arab Spring: implications for US – Israeli relations. London: Israel Affairs, 20 (3), p.281-301.

Filimanov Q. (2010). “Myaqkaya sila” kulturnoy diplomatii SSHA [“Soft Power” of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy] Moscow: RUDN, 212 p.

Haass R.N., Talbot S. (2008). Executive Summaries from the “Restoring the Balance: A Middle East Strategy for the Next President. Brookings and the Council of Foreign Relations: Saban Center, 21 p.

Klepikov S.S. (2016). Qrajdanskaya voyna v Sirii (2011-2015 qq.) I pozitsiya Rossii I Irana [The civil war in Syria (2011-2015) and the position of Russia and Iran]. Krasnodar: Historical and socio-educational thought, Volume 3(1), p.45-48.

Kochergina M.E. (2016). Noviye formi I metodi protivostayaniya Rossii I SSHA: Osvesheniye v SMI “Arabskoy vesni” v Sirii [New forms and methods of confrontation between Russia and the United States: Enlightenment of media in Syria about the Arab Spring] Moscow: Geopolitical aspect. Bulletin of MQUP named after Ivan Federov, Volume 2, p.189-195.

Kosach Q.Q. (2015). Evolyutsiya vneshney politiki Saudovskoy Aravii posle “arabskoy vesni” [The evolution of Saudi Arabia’s foreign policy after the “Arab Spring”]. Nijniy Novqorod: Bulletin of Nijeqorod University named after Labochevskiy, Volume 3, p.50-62.

Krillov A.V. (2013). Rol religioznoqo faktora v “Arabskoy vesne” [The role of the religious factor in the Arab Spring] Moscow: *Bulletin of MQIMO. International Relations*, 4 (31), p.43-51.

Markitos T.N. (2013). Qlobalniye I regionalniye aktori v “geopoliticheskoy talkuchke” vokruq energeresursov Vostochnoqo Sredizemnomorye: SSHA, Rossiya, Israil, Turtsiya, Iran [Global and regional actors in the “geopolitical market” around the energy resources of the Eastern Mediterranean: USA, Russia, Israel, Turkey, Iran]. Moscow: *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, Volume 16(1), p.80-88.

Markus J. (29 March, 2016). SSHA I Turtsiya: rassorivshesya soyuzniki [USA and Turkey: Allies at War] BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/russian/international/2016/03/160329_us_turkey_sour_rel_tions (Accessed 03.08.2020).

Martinenko E.V. (2016). Vzaimodeystviye I konflikt vneshnix aktorov v voyni v Sirii [Interaction and conflict of foreign actors in the war in Syria]. Krasnodar: Society: politics, economics, law, Volume 10, p.1-7.

National Security Strategy (May, 2010). The White House. <http://nssarchive.us/NSSR/2010.pdf> (Accessed: 20.07.2019).

Obama’s Inaugural Address (January 20, 2009). <http://www.obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2009/01/21/president-barack-obamas-inaugural-adress> (Accessed: 18.07.2019).

Oran B. (2013). Turk dish politikasi. Kurtulush savashindan bu gune olgular, belgeler, yorumlar. [Turkish foreign policy. Vol. 3 (2001-2012)], İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık, 885 p.

Ozarowski, R., Grabowski W. (2016). Arab and Muslim World in International Relations. Warsaw: Rambler Press, 195 p.

Pechatnov V.O., Manikin A.S. (2012). Istoriya vneshney politiki SSHA [The history of the foreign policy of the USA] Moscow: International Relations, 672 p.

Ponamm M. (April 30, 2016). Saudi Arabia-Shift in Strategic Focus. Center for Air Power Studies (CAPS). https://www.academia.edu/38305170/Saudi_Arabia_Shift_in_Strategic_Focus_pdf (Accessed: 15.08.2019).

Sharipov U.Z. (2014). Amerikanskaya konsepsiya “Bolshoqo Blijneqo Vostoka” i nasionalniye strategii na Blijnem I Srednom Vostoke [American conception of “Broader Middle East” and national strategies in Near and Middle East] Moscow: Center of Strategic Conjunction, 280 p.

Shlikov P. (2019). Turetsko-Amerikanskiye otnosheniya v zerkale bližnevostočnogo i yevropeyskoqo ismereniy [Turkish-American relations in the mirror of the Middle East and European dimensions]. Moscow: Actual problems of Europe, Issue 1, p.184-229.

Sly L., DeYoung K. (July 23, 2015) Turkey agrees to allow U.S. military to use its base to attack Islamic State. Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/turkey-agreesto-allow-us-military-to-use-its-base-to-attack-islamic-state/2015/07/23/317f23aa-3164-11e5-a879-213078d03dd3_story.html, (Accessed 08.08.2020).

Sonmezoglu F., Baklacioglu O., Ozlem N.T. (2012). XXI. Yüzyılda Turk Dish Politikasinin analizi [The analyses of Turkish foreign policy in the 21st century]. İstanbul: DER Yayınları, 904 p.

Sulima Y., Shepelov M. (2017). Veyenniy myatej b Turtsii: vnutrenniye i vneshniye faktori a takje posledstviye [Military coup in Turkey: internal and external factors as well as consequences]. Zeszyty Naukowe Panstwowej Wyzszej Szkoły Zawodowej im. Witelona w Legnicy, Vol. 22, Issue 1, p.223-233.

Suvorova V.V. (2012). Voenno-tekhnicheskoye sotrudnichestvo SSHA i Saudovskoy Aravii (90ye qq. XX –nachalo XXI vv.) [Military-technical partnership USA and Saudi Arabia (90s of 20th – beginning of 21st centuries)]. Adigey: Bulletin of Adigey State University, 1(3), p.1-10.

Svetkova N.A. (2009). Obrazovatel'naya politika SSHA v stranax Blijneqo Vostoka, 2001-2007 qq. [US Educational Policy in the Middle East in 2001-2007] Sankt Petersburg: Bulletin of Sankt Petersburg University, Volume 6 (1), p. 272-289.

Tarbayev S.A. (2009). Politika SSHA na Blijnem Vostoke pri Djordje Bushe [U.S. Politics in the Middle East under George W. Bush] Moscow: Bulletin of RUDN. International Relations, Volume 2, p.71-78

The Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant and the Al-Nusrah Front for the People of the Levant: Report and recommendations submitted pursuant to resolution 2170 (November 14, 2014). UN. Security Council. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2014/815 (Accessed 15.07.2020).

Timofeyev I.N. (2010). Razqadat "Eniqmu": Barak Obama skvoz prizmi eticheskoye realizma Reynxolda Nabura [Unravel Enigma: Barack Obama through the Prism of Reinhold Niebuhr Ethical Realism] Moscow: Bulletin of MQIMO: Political Sciences, p.261-270.

Vinogradov R.F., Shumilov M.M. (2017). Vliyaniye voyni v Yemene v amerikano-saudovskiye otnosheniya v 2014-2017 qq. [The impact of the war in Yemen in US-Saudi relations in 2014-2017]. Sankt Petersburg: Management Consulting: Politics and the rule of law, Volume 6, p.22-30.

Zanotti J. (April 8, 2011). Turkey-U.S. Defense Cooperation: Prospects and Challenges", Congressional Research Service. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/R41761.pdf> (Accessed 09.08.2020).