

The foreign policy of U.S.A in the Middle East and Great Middle East policy

Rostam Aydiyor

E-mail: aydiyorRostam@ymail.com

Abstract: Strategy of a rule rarely appears in a decision making, but it is appeared in a series of the successive decisions that they have been chosen in attempt to reconcile the goals, values and benefits with conditions and features of the internal and external environment. Regarding to the geopolitics and unique sources of the Middle East and its importance from different views after the Second World War and in the dipolar international system era and even after Union of Soviet Republics decline, the Middle East has been one of the foreigner policy priorities of U.S.A, as any choice isn't replacing of the Middle East in U.S.A diplomacy (Ikenberry, G. John, ed. 2010) . The political behavior of heads of U.S.A expresses the reality that benefits of U.S.A in the Middle East is red line to that country and U.S.A is ready in order to protect it accept any risk.

[Rostam Aydiyor. **The foreign policy of U.S.A in the Middle East and Great Middle East policy.** *Life Sci J* 2012;9(4):4605-4611] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 693

Keywords: U.S.A, the foreigner policy, Middle East, Great Middle East

1. Introduction

The foreigner policy is formed within the national benefits, so we observe the continuity and stability in the foreigner policy of U.S.A since 1898 that has been living; also we observe that the national benefits of U.S.A are formed by interaction and confluence of four elements. So we must say that the national benefits of U.S.A are fixed. Therefore it makes no difference that which group or party be in White House, because these four elements are always vital. These elements are: the historical life and background, the geographic condition and situation, the liberal value culture and the international conditions.

Regarding to these elements, we must notice that not only they are permanent, but also the foreigner policy is searching. Because the conditions of world are always changing and definition of heads about the national culture and values are completely inference. It means that ideology of heads affects on the foreigner policy of U.S.A living. The presence of U.S.A in the Middle East has been after the Second World War. In that time the Middle East and Persian Gulf have been considered as the vital areas in strategies of U.S.A. The geopolitics and geo-economic position of the Middle East located that area in the vital benefits domain of U.S.A. So the heads of U.S.A have being followed the Middle East problems with the high sensitiveness. Policy of U.S.A in Middle East before the end of Cold War and Union of Soviet Republics decline has being followed these below three principals:

1- Maintaining the continuation of oil flowing towards west. 2- Preventing Communism influence and development. 3- Maintaining the security and constancy of Zionism regime.

When changes has happened in different. Times, strategies of U.S.A in the Middle East have being changed also. So we observe different doctrines from presidents of U.S.A in that area that is:

1.1. Truman doctrine and control of Soviet Union:

Control of Soviet Union and barrage against communism and preventing attack of Soviet Union to countries of the Middle East and Persian Gulf were three policies of U.S.A in Cold War era. That plan called Truman doctrine basically was established on magnification of Soviet Union danger and had several goals:

Justifying the increasing interferences of U.S.A near people wanting peace, calm, the economical condition improvement, decreasing tax and the social welfare, more development of influence in different areas of world formed by document against Soviet Union danger and introduction of U.S.A as head of the free world, democracy and human right in world. According to that doctrine U.S.A was obliged to supply the economical, political and more important of all military needs of an anti-communist state when and anywhere it has being threatened from several ways. Meanwhile maintaining the North belt of the Middle East (Iran, Turkey and so on) was forming one of the main bases of the Middle East policy of U.S.A. In this way two important actions were done: presenting 400 million\$ to Egypt, Turkey and Iran, then sending the military counselors to these countries and settling the military forces of U.S.A in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. In U.S.A view, in case of lack of help to Iran and Turkey as the direct neighbors of Soviet Union and its goal and the vital ring in anti-communist countries chain and the main oil sources

and access way to the Indian Ocean, we will observe the fall of these countries to communism skirt. The second base of that doctrine in the Middle East area was Palestine crisis. Basis of that policy was that Jewish state is established in Palestine. Truman noticed without any doubt and ambiguity: In my view the urgent statement that has promised to Jewish reestablishment in Palestine always has progressed with policies of Sharif Wilson specially the right of fate assigning principle (Jentleson, B. (2000) . So when the special UN commission of Palestine suggested the division under guardianship land into a Jewish and an Arab country and changing Jerusalem to an international area, president of U.S.A ordered Ministry of Foreign Affairs to support the division plan.

2.1. Eisenhower doctrine:

In this strategy in addition to communism, nationalism and Pan-Arabism were two serious threats for benefits of U.S.A in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. So the Middle East policy of U.S.A in that era differed with Truman era. Hate of the majority part of Arab world from the colonial behavior that had increased the influence bed of Soviet Union, nationalism of Jamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt and strengthening Pan-Arabism against Israel had created some serious crisis in the Middle East area that had compromised benefits of U.S.A. So setting the serious program for the Middle East was important for diplomacy of U.S.A.

Americans were attributed all of area changes to communism progress in own declaratory policy. Therefore according to Eisenhower doctrine interference in the critical countries and supporting the united states was base of the Middle East policy of U.S.A. Fall of Mossaddegh state in Iran in 1952, weakening Nasser state in Egypt, Supporting Hashemite family state in Jordan and presenting 10/000/000\$ gratuitous to that country and sending the sixth navy of U.S.A to east of Mediterranean to suppress the insurgents, interference in Syria affairs, the political interference in Iraq affairs, landing U.S.A soldiers in Lebanon were among Proceedings that were done according to Eisenhower doctrine. Beside above proceedings, the Middle East policy of Eisenhower about the Northern belt that was a strategic area besides Soviet Union chose prevention policy. In this regard, background of Baghdad treaty change to CENTO treaty was provided with Iran, Turkey and Pakistan membership.

3.1. Kennedy doctrine:

After Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy entered white house. He presented "unity to progress" doctrine about the third world that had roots in his

belief and his foreign policy team in necessity to destroy poverty, illiteracy and destruction in the third world countries in order to prevent their fall into communism.

Content of that plan had several goals such as: increasing the industrial productions, creating the social justice, fixing prices, increasing the agricultural productions, building the cheap houses, combat with illiteracy and doing land reforms, but it had more motto aspect being actually inefficient (Fitzsimons, Louise. 1972).

4.1. Johnson doctrine:

Supporting of Johnson from Israel role in the Middle East was accompanied with the internal problems to him specially failure to achieve the liberals support from his policy for Southeast Asia. Advisors of president were hopeful that government be able to attract the support of the main part of Israel fans in the liberal anti-war society of Vietnam with the strategic role of Israel and South Vietnam and emphasis on necessity of the defensive position of powerful U.S.A and the pragmatic intervention policies in outside as a way to protect benefits of Israel in the Middle East.

5.1. The two column strategy of Nixon (U.S.A the security governing of Persian Gulf):

After exit of U.K from the Middle East area, U.S.A accepted to make itself obliged to prevent the influence spread of Soviet Union and supplying the security of the Middle East and filling vacuum due to exit of U.K. In these years U.S.A was fighting with Vietnam and wasn't ready to replace U.K IN THE Middle East, as was replaced it in Egypt and Turkey in Truman era. So U.S.A was sought to suffice to the limited presence of own navy i.e. one destroyer and one battleship in Bahrain monitoring area. Because on the one hand, there was this danger that the more presence creates a motive to enter navy of Soviet Union and on the other hand, there was this tendency that this country avoids the military cost considerations. So this view was strengthened that the coastal states of Persian Gulf and the Middle East area must fill any power vacuum protecting the security and stability of area. So according to this (indirect presence strategy and divestiture of security responsible of area to the local powers) were chosen. This general trend in foreign policy of U.S.A caused Nixon doctrine plan or Nixon- Kissinger doctrine or Guam. Richard Nixon underpinned regarding to the Middle East own strategy called "two columns" also Nixon faith and "Guam island faith "in his trip to Philippines in 22 July 1969 and in his stay time in Guam Island. In this policy, U.S.A was obliged to use the local powers as possible for own goals in the

critical focuses of world preventing the direct military presence (McCormick, James M. et al. (2012). According to two columns Nixon strategy, the regional powers must fill the security vacuum of area to prevent the influence of Soviet Union and the revolutionary and nationalist movements and also the regional disparities. Choosing this strategy in the Middle East with the increasing role of Iran as the military column and Arabia as the financial column was continuing. They believe that U.S.A is able to control and maintain the security and stability of area from long-distance by strengthening and training of these two countries. Strengthening the military power of Iran and Arabia was base of Nixon doctrine. So that Iran is able to act as a regional power and more clear as "gendarme or the regional police". On the other hand, Nixon preferred diplomacy to other ways to rescue Israel and ending crisis of Arabs and Israel damaged due to Arabs and U.S.A relations.

6.1. Carter doctrine and forming rapid reaction:

Victory of Islamic revolution of Iran and new approach of revolution leaders in foreign policy according to no east no west motto, issuance of revolution plan and today Iran and tomorrow Palestine motto and finally happening some Islamic rising in area created the serious threats behind U.S.A benefits back in the Middle East area. In addition to Soviet Union attacked Afghanistan contemporary. It challenged benefits of U.S.A within the boundary of the Middle East area called "crisis crescent" by Berzhinsky. U.S.A that was depended on own economical benefits in this area was concerned about being in danger own situation in this vital section of world (Meiertöns, Heiko (2010).

The response of U.S.A heads to confront these challenges was avoiding from strategy "leaving the responsibility" and renewed tendency to "accepting the responsibility strategy". Carter state considered reviewing two- columns security order in the Middle East with counseling of Berzhinsky the national security counselor and Harold Brown head of Pentagon counselors designing strategy "without the regional column" and representing power against threats for U.S.A benefits directly. According to this strategy U.S.A undertook maintaining security and stability responsibility in the Middle East area directly. Carter president of U.S.A considered security of the Middle East related with the national security to defend from West benefits and U.S.A in the Middle East relying on "control of Soviet Union".

7.1. Ronald Reygan doctrine and choosing balance policy of the regional powers in The Middle East:

Ronald Reygan entered the international political field with renewed motto of excellence of

U.S.A against Soviet Union and strengthening and influence of that country to the third world in 1981. In this era process of the Middle East changes and Persian Gulf was worrying from U.S.A view. Reygan claimed that Carter rule years have been retreat era and weakness. So using force to remove the existing challenges was necessary. Carter considered choosing barrage policy against the revolutionary regimes and preventing policy to control presence of anti-west Regimes and using force to shoot down such regimes. The war with little intensity was the main tool of Reygan doctrine. Reygan state declared Islamic revolution of Iran a serious threat for own benefits in the Middle East area fortifying created security orders in Carter era to confront with it. He emphasized that he will not allow Saudi Arabia be other Iran and exit from West camp like that country falling in someone hands wanting to cut the vital oil flowing to West. In this regard, he created more spread proceeding of the military presence of U.S.A in area and for the probable military interference of Santcom central command forces in north of Arab sea helping to form "cooperation council of Persian Gulf" with Saudi Arabia pivotally and partnership of five countries i.e. Qatar, Kuwait, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates and Oman. Tool of Reygan state for the Middle East and Persian Gulf security was the behavioral pattern "power balance" between Iran and Iraq and using one of them against the other called "befriending and threat". Iraq war against Iran was exactly conformed to foreign policy goals of Reygan Formed within this strategy. The most of politicians of U.S.A was estimating that change "regional power balance" standard considering Iran focus of hard anti-American and Israel tendencies and same with Soviet Union dangers for U.S.A benefits in Cold War. They were suggesting locating Iran in focus of "prevention" attempts of U.S.A emphatically (Wittkopf, Eugene R. et al. (2007).

8.1. Soviet Union decline and end of Cold War:

One of the potential threat for U.S.A in order to achieve own goals in the Middle East was the presence of Soviet Union that was considering that country as the most essential threat of own national security during years after the second world war. When red troops of Soviet Union entered Afghanistan, this object was exacerbated by West district with U.S.A leadership. But Soviet Union decline and creating independent countries of the Middle Asia and Caucasus removed that potential risk for U.S.A and its West supporters taking U.S.A seeking excuses levers from it. But it created a new strategic environment in North of the Middle East that caused the regional life renewal. Besides above changes a set of the International changes affected on

strategic environment of the Middle East that the most important changes and objects are: changing U.S.A to only world superpower, being considered new world order discussion by Georg Bush and U.S.A attempt to perform that, being important Europe, Japan and China in world.

Economical field and recently Europe in the Middle East and Persian Gulf and changing the importance and priorities in the strategic problems. So U.S.A after Soviet Union decline and ending Cold War considered the Middle East area as the first own rival wanting field and proving own power and hegemony doing the spread programming to domain and constant presence in that area.

9.1. The great policy of U.S.A after Cold War:

1.9.1. Isolationists:

Isolationists have the limited definition about the national benefits of U.S.A considering limited it to the physical security, freedom and properties of U.S.A people. They want to dissolve the security responsibilities of U.S.A, decreasing the defensive costs and returning to protect the western hemisphere.

They believe that any power isn't to threaten the national benefits of U.S.A and Soviet Union decline has caused to create power balance in Eurasia. If any Soviet Union and China country develop own military power, the rich and powerful governments in two sides of Eurasia such as Japan and Europe Union control them, so the presence of U.S.A in the Middle East isn't necessary.

2.9.1. Power balance:

The second view is balancing role in Eurasia for U.S.A. Supporters of that view called "**power balance**" consider the existing international system as a multi polar system and believe that U.S.A must search a situation that it be able to utilize multi polar system. In that view U.S.A hasn't the sufficient power and will to maintain the internal and international peace in world level. It isn't able to act as unquestionable leader in one- polar world. They believe that peace between the great powers is one of the vital benefits of U.S.A.

Their reason is that as the first and Second World War concerned U.S.A, any war in Eurasia between Soviet Union, European states, China and Japan cause involving U.S.A. So U.S.A must try to maintain peace between the great powers. Supporters of power balance Consider Europe, East of Asia and the Middle East area as the vital benefits of U.S.A. But they believe that the allies of U.S.A must perform more attempts to defend from themselves.

3.9.1. Creating world order:

Supporters of that strategy called "Globalists" have a vast approach about the national benefits of U.S.A. They believe that U.S.A has many benefits in world peace considering peace comprehensive and indivisible. That strategy doesn't consider the great powers as the main problem because of having democracy or being in democracy way.

In view of globalists the main threats for U.S.A aren't states, but the collective world problems such as developing the collective elimination weapons, risk of developing the civil wars, threatening the economical depression for the economical security, the environmental problems that above cases are existing in the Middle East area are the serious threat for U.S.A. So using a world policy to control states of area is necessary.

4.9.1. One- polar system:

Supporters of that strategy believe that only supremacy of U.S.A on world support peace. In their view, maintaining U.S.A as the great power, preventing presence of the new hegemonic political-military power in Eurasia and maintaining situation of U.S.A in the third world specially in the Middle East are from the vital benefits of U.S.A. In view of supporters of that strategy U.S.A is only superpower of world having ideological and strategic domain performing the hegemonic influence and power. They believe that if U.S.A exits from the Middle East, the regional powers such as Japan and Germany may fill vacuum from U.S.A exit. So the goal of that strategy is maintaining excellence of U.S.A on any world challenger.

10.1. Importance of the Middle East after ending Cold War:

Regarding to decreasing systematic threats against U.S.A goals and benefits after Cold War, Americans considered own regional strategy according to the internal and regional priorities of the Middle East and did interactions with the spread level inevitably to supply own goals and benefits. So in view of the political officials and elites of U.S.A, the Middle East and Persian Gulf is one of war and struggle areas after Cold War. It is against goals and benefits of U.S.A that wants to create stability of area and destroying any reaction and confronting with the security patterns of that country (Blechman, B. M. (1990). U.S.A creates stability and using the former rules of the regional behavior to fix own regional benefits in the Middle East. Fulfilling this affair isn't possible without using the military tools regarding to the existing challenges and the centrifugal elements

in the Middle East area. However the behavioral indexes of the regional actors are effective in the regional and strategic focus of American forces in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. The main reason of that focus is within needs and tendencies of the ultra-regional actors and also the economical and strategic goals of those units. The comprehensive need of the industrial countries especially U.S.A to oil has caused increasing importance of oil as the major inherent

index of the Middle East. The Middle East area generally and Persian Gulf specially are very important in the geographical classification of new world structure as the main source to supply fuel of U.S.A in long- term and also an efficient lever to confront with the economical competitors of that country that all of them are related to oil(Herring, George C.(2008).

Table 1: Comparison foreign policy of U.S.A before and after Cold War in the Middle East

	Foreign policy of U.S.A before Cold War	Foreign policy of U.S.A after Cold War
Comparison foreign policy of U.S.A before and after Cold War in the Middle East	<p>The first and main principles of U.S.A policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Maintaining continuation of oil flowing towards West. 2- Preventing communism development and influence. 3- Maintaining security and stability of Zionism regime. <p>The second principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Interference in the critical countries and supporting the united states base of the Middle East policy of U.S.A. 2- Choosing barrage policy against revolutionary regimes and preventing policy to control the appearance of anti- west regimes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Balancing role in Eurasia considered as "power balance". 2- Choosing a world policy to control states of area. 3- Preventing appearance of a new hegemonic political- military power in Eurasia and maintaining U.S.A situation in the third world and the Middle East. 4- Maintaining excellence of U.S.A on any world challenger.

11.1. The new world order (George Bush doctrine):

George Bush believes that: As he said in his lecture, one of the goals of new order is creating new era: a new era without killing risk, the legal following with more power and security, attempt to peace, era to be successful world nations, east and west, north and south and living in harmony. George Bush emphasizing on that case said: **1-** It means that different countries attract together in new world order by having a common goal to achieve human world wishes that are: peace, security, freedom and rule of law. However these goals aren't the main goals of U.S.A, but when U.S.A is interested in these goals that they are suitable for its national benefits. Otherwise, none of these objectives has meaning for U.S.A. So we can observe other goals in author's writings that show that object. **2-** Maintaining existence and strengthening Israel as a fear factor and a tool for the political and military maneuvers among Arab countries, a factor that isn't able to take considerable part of income of the rich countries of west against weapons that more developed of them first gave to Israel, account U.S.A and West limiting possibility of development and investment in the comprehensive progress field of area. **3-** Own life survival and continuance as a free and independent country with maintaining the fundamental values and

security of organizations and people of U.S.A to reach that goal. Harvard University says: New world order, the collective security, the reciprocal dependence of countries, stopping the regional aggressive actions is in order to prevent fall of U.S.A. In this field, U.S.A will try to prevent any attempt to threat n the security of country confronting with threats such as terrorism that notice security, nations and benefits of U.S.A, improving approach stability, preventing to transfer technology and the sensitive military sources, specially nuclear, chemical and biologic weapons to enemy countries besides attempt to maintain the nuclear monopolistic power. **4-** Reach to the rich, safe, searching, developing and competitive economic. **5-** Establishing the healthy relations based on the excellent political position with allies and friend countries. **6-** Creating the safe and constant world that there are the political and economical freedoms, principles and human rights standards and democracy in it being regarded. It seems that all of the mentioned objects are result of good suspect to U.S.A policies and according to politician's sayings of U.S.A. Otherwise, actually U.S.A has only one goal i.e. maintaining hegemony and domain on world according to the short- term benefits of that country and world order is really an excuse to maintain that domain.

12.1. The great Middle East:

The plan of great Middle East first was proposed by Colin Powell in 12 September 2002. He stated establishment of Enterprise organization contemporary and got bound that U.S.A helps some countries such as Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Algeria and Yemen developing the bilateral commercial relations with countries such as Egypt and Bahrain and support the regional programs to do the political, social Reforms and reforming the educational system and struggles of area citizens to get the political freedoms and establishing democracy. Subsequently, assistant of U.S.A president in January 2003 Dick Cheney in a summit of world economy organization (WEO) in Davos Switzerland proposed "forward strategy for freedom" that made U.S.A obliged to support people acting for reforms in the great Middle East being devoted. He emphasized that Bush state is persistent to promote democracy in the Middle East and beyond it. In the other side, Nicholas Burns representative of U.S.A in NATO invited Europe in own lecture in October 2003 in Prague to focus own attempts on creating peace and security in great Middle East. Bush declared own plan for great Middle East in November 2003. Subsequently U.S.A distributed draft of great Middle East between group 8 countries to investigate in the future meeting in June 2004 before informing Arab countries from its content. Plan of great Middle East in one side faced the strong opposition of Arab countries and in other side faced suspicion and doubt of Union Europe countries. Arab countries considered that plan as interference in own internal affairs with fear from its results for own states. European countries supporting that plan considered it unrealistic and ambitious. Yemen government held a regional meeting about democracy, human rights and role of the international courts in January 2004. Statement of that conference called "Senna" restated supporting all of representatives of democracy principles wanted to end Arab countries occupation suggesting formation of "forum of Arab democratic dialogue" to promote gadgets between states and civil society groups of Arab countries. In the same time, Bush suggested in a lecture to established a free commerce area between U.S.A and the Middle East during 10 years. Subsequent to Senna conference content of great Middle East plan chinked to Arab newspaper Zaban el Hayat distributed by that newspaper in February 2004. Reforms in Arab world conference held in Skandariyyeh Egypt in March 2004. The non-governmental organizations participating in that conference wanted all of Arab countries in a statement to perform own reforms programs. But fail of Arab Union heads summit in Tunisia in beginning March 2004 hit hardly Bush state goal to perform

great Middle East plan in meeting in June group 8. Egypt and Saudi Arabia proposed another plan to replace the great Middle East plan that wasn't successful. In May 2004 Arab League formed an extraordinary meeting in Tunes in order to approve a political reforms program taking the initiative and preventing to appear the Middle East reforms plan as program of group 8. But that summit was a cheap statement that only did a surface generalization about democracy and human rights not presenting a clear program to promote the economical and political reforms of area. Following hard opposition of Arab countries and lack of welcome of European countries, great Middle East plan was adjusted and Approved with new name "spread Middle East plan" in summit group 8 in See Island in June 2004. That plan consists of two sections: The first part is dedicated to necessity discussion of democracy establishment in the Middle East have the milder tone than the first draft (GMENAI) as it approaches to a general discussion about benefits of democracy, freedom, rule of law and human rights. The second section like the first draft is a relative comprehensive program to do the economical reforms in great Middle East area. In "spread Middle East plan justifying tone of the first part, the second part that was devoted to the economical reforms program seems more outstanding. In addition to, despite the first draft that Palestine and Israel object was ignored in it, text of "spread Middle East plan indicates to necessity of continuing attempts t resolve Palestine and Israel problem. Also subsequence to summit in June, group 8 distributing an independence statement emphasized on necessity of establishing peace between Israel and Palestine and key importance of road map(Haeri, Safa (2004-03-03) . Despite the done Adjustments, that plan is famous in the first name i.e. great Middle East plan. Countries of area are hardly opposite with that plan and European countries are cautious about it. Among area countries participated only Afghanistan, Iraq, Qatar, Bahrain, Jordan, Tunes and Yemen in the formal banquet summit of group 8. Saudi Arabia and Egypt are hardly opposite with the mentioned plan. Hosni Mubarak has remarked that the external attempts to impose the reforms are Illusion resulting chaos. Saudi Arabia avoided even to participate in Tunes summit to provide Arab countries response to great Middle East plan(Achcar, Gilbert (2004). In other side, American critics of spread Middle East plan believe that this plan relies on mainly on the economical affairs not paying attention to the political reforms and strengthening non-governmental organizations and society civil institutes. The first summit of spread Middle East plan held in Rabat Morocco in December 2004 called (Forum for the future). In addition to countries of

group 8, Representatives of some countries of area such as Pakistan, Morocco, and Turkey Participated in also. Indeed, (Forum for the future) is a frame for the regular Summits of the beneficiary countries ministers to codify and investigating progress of area reforms program. In that frame, some summits between the economical and social leaders specially the civil institutes of society of area countries are performing parallel to the regular summits of the political leaders of the related countries.

2. Discussions

New world order and these sentences shoe that U.S.A try to create a stable world within new world order using own hegemony that its clear example was in the second war of Persian Gulf that resulted in evicting Iraq from Kuwait. Indeed, new world order of those scanning is movements and changes formed after Soviet Union and east district decline. How creating and change in that affair is Considered with Berlin wall close and subsequently ending Cold War. New world order was created with mottos of Americans considering mottos such as "human emancipation" and "democracy" as international orientation thought and standard of U.S.A contract were as land of liberty. In that policy west values and liberal are proposed as the universal values. However that policy was proposed as "development oriented changing to intervention oriented later. Indeed, these concepts were proposing idealism. As end of any war is with Idealism, end of idealism Cold War was with "new order" and "development" and intervention later and that idealism addressed U.S.A to advertising and promoting democracy and new order. U.S.A must create a kind of balance between own opposite benefits in explanation of its policies in the Middle East. Certainly the Middle East is full of series of possible crisis, so it must choose exactly policies that are able to achieve the best results. The main object is that must U.S.A encourage the political stability in area or wanting to do democratic reforms? In addition to democratization process in the Middle

East is able to open on the nationalist and fundamentalist opposite groups with U.S.A benefits. In the past, U.S.A was supporting the governing regimes, when it was getting over two ways of maintaining stability of none- democrat alley and promoting the democrat changes.

Acknowledgements:

Author is grateful to the persons for support to carry out this work.

Corresponding Author:

Rostam Aydipor

E-mail: aydiporRostam@ymail.com

References

1. Achcar, Gilbert (2004). Greater Middle East: The US plan, *Le Monde*.
2. Blechman, B. M. (1990). The Politics of National Security: Congress and US Defense Policy, New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Fitzsimons, Louise. 1972. The Kennedy Doctrine (New York: Random House, 1972), 10.
4. Haeri, Safa (2004-03-03). "Concocting a 'Greater Middle East' brew". *Asia Times*. Retrieved 2008-08-21.
5. Herring, George C.(2008).From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776.
6. Ikenberry, G. John, ed. 2010.*American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* (6th ed. Wadsworth,), 640pp.
7. Jentleson, B. (2000) American Foreign Policy: The Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century, New York: Norton.
8. McCormick, James M. et al. (2012). *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*.
9. Meiertöns, Heiko (2010): *The Doctrines of US Security Policy - An Evaluation under International Law*, Cambridge University Press.
10. Wittkopf, Eugene R. et al. (2007). *American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process*.

12/2/2012