T.C.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

SİYASET BİLİMİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER ANABİLİM DALI

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER (İNGİLİZCE) BİLİM DALI

A COMPARISON OF GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE LAST THREE US PRESIDENTS FROM NEOCLASSICAL REALIST PERSPECTIVE

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

FULYA BEYZA PARAMYOK

İstanbul, 2021

T.C.

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

SİYASET BİLİMİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER ANABİLİM DALI

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER (İNGİLİZCE) BİLİM DALI

A COMPARISON OF GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE LAST THREE US PRESIDENTS FROM NEOCLASSICAL REALIST PERSPECTIVE

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

FULYA BEYZA PARAMYOK

DANIŞMAN: AYŞE NUR ÇETİNOĞLU HARUNOĞLU

İstanbul, 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my first and the foremost appreciation to my former advisor Professor Hasan Kösebalaban who encouraged me choosing this topic and never stopped shedding light to the path even when the troubled times we have been through. Additionally, I would like to express my sincere thankfulness to Professor Muzaffer Şenel who is the real architect of this thesis and who always eases to write and search something in our field.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Professor Ayşe Nur Çetinoğlu Harunoğlu for her continuous support on my Master's study and research. I would like to appreciate for her patience and enthusiasm to accept me as her student, and I am grateful because Professor Harunoğlu shed the light to my research while broadening my horizon with her immense knowledge. I can never neglect her support for finishing my study on time, and her disciplinary attitude towards me helped me to encourage myself to conclude what I started. I can never imagine having a better advisor and a mentor for this dissertation.

I send my frank thankfulness to my friends -Sena Ersoy, İlayda Akarsu, Rabia Artan- and to my dearest colleague Victoria Erdoğu who never stop and giving up on supporting me even the times I lost belief in myself. I thank my friends because they led me rise up when I lost my hope and felt desperate. I thank them for their deepest and greatest support in this study. I am grateful that I have friends like them and I am sending my deepest gratefulness to them for believing me more than I do.

Last but not the least, my deepest thanks goes to my family: my parents and my sister, for believing me and for their every kind of contribution to my academic life. I would like to express my sincere thankfulness to them for encouraging me to start this long journey in academia's way.

ISTANBUL, 2021 FULYA BEYZA PARAMYOK

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE

Name and Surname	: Fulya Beyza Paramyok
Field	: Political Science and International Relations
Programme	: Political Science and International Relations
Supervisor	: As. Professor Ayşe Nur Çetinoğlu Harunoğlu
Degree Awarded and Date	: Master – June 2021
Keywords	: Grand Strategy, Domestic Dynamics

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE LAST THREE US PRESIDENTS FROM NEOCLASSICAL REALIST PERSPECTIVE

Since its foundation, the US has been one of the unique countries that directs international arena. Each political move in US has the power of influencing any sank into oblivion part of the world. Not only the US foreign policy has an impact on world affairs, but also its domestic environment is as strong as its foreign policy. In fact, the US Grand Strategy was born from this domestic environment and evolved throughout time by the historical forces. The grand strategy means cluster of the set of short term policies into whole long term strategy. In this regard, I argue that domestic dynamics, historical tendencies and presidents creates main short term goals and as time goes by they all form a complete long term US Grand Strategy. In other words, this study claims that the US Grand Strategy is the product of domestic features and historical tendencies in US. In addition, according to neoclassical realism these features and tendencies not only forms the US Grand Strategy, but also the American Grand Strategic behavior shapes the foreign affairs and it is the

essential determinative tool in US foreign policy. Besides, this study mainly discusses the role of the last three Presidents grands strategy visions on US Grand Strategy. Indeed, this study, merely covers 2001-2020 interim with three US Presidents reign. In this regard, the title of the study has been revised to reflect better the content as "A Comparison of the US Grand Strategy Visions of US Presidents from NeoClassical Realist Perspective: 2001-2020". However, due to bureaucratic reasons the title of our dissertation remained as ''A Comparison of Grand Strategies of The Last Three Us Presidents From Neoclassical Realist Perspective''. Our investigation concludes that each Presidents' own grand strategies have only a little impact on US Grand Strategy. Moreover, our dissertation illustrates the influence of domestic dynamics and historical tendencies on US Presidents' policy-making process. Results indicate that domestic features of US are the main obstacles in front of US Presidents and prevent the implementation of entire individual-grand strategies.

Keywords: *Domestic Affairs, Economic Priorities, Foreign Affairs, Grand Strategy, Historical Tendencies, Lobbies and Interest Groups, Public Opinion, Security Priorities, US, US Presidents.*

GENEL BİLGİLER

İsim ve Soyadı : Fulya Beyza Paramyok

Anabilim Dalı : Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler

Programı : Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler

Tez Danışmanı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ayşe Nur Çetinoğlu Harunoğlu

Tez Türü ve Tarihi : Yüksek Lisans – Haziran 2021

Anahtar Kelimeler : Grand Strateji, İç Dinamikler

ÖZ

NEO-KLASİK REALİST PERSPEKTİFTEN SON ÜÇ AMERİKAN BAŞKANININ BÜYÜK STRATEJİLERİNİN KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

ABD, kuruluşundan bu yana uluslararası arenaya yön veren önemli ülkelerden birisi olmuştur. ABD'deki her siyasi hareket, dünyanın unutulmaya yüz tutmuş herhangi bir bölgesini dahi etkileme gücüne sahiptir. ABD'nin yalnıza dış politikasının dünya meseleleri üzerinde etkisi yoktur, aynı zamanda iç dinamikleri ve kamuoyu da dış politikası kadar etkili olabilmektedir. Aslında, ABD Büyük Stratejisi bu iç dinamiklerden doğmuş ve zaman içinde tarihsel deneyimlerle gelişmiştir. Büyük strateji, kısa vadeli politikalar kümesinin tüm uzun vadeli stratejide kümelenmesi

anlamına gelmektedir. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışma, iç dinamiklerin, tarihsel eğilimlerin ve başkanların temel kısa vadeli hedefler oluşturduğunu ve zaman geçtikçe hepsinin tam bir uzun vadeli ABD Büyük Stratejisi oluşturduğunu savunmaktadır. Başka bir deyişle, bu çalışma ABD Büyük Stratejisinin ABD'deki iç dinamiklerin eğilimlerinin ve tarihsel eğilimlerin bir ürünü olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Ayrıca neoklasik gerçekçiliğe göre bu özellikler ve eğilimler sadece ABD Büyük Stratejisini oluşturmakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda Amerikan Büyük Stratejik davranışı da dış ilişkileri şekillendirir ve ABD dış politikasında temel belirleyici araçtır. Ayrıca, bu çalışma esas olarak son üç başkanın büyük strateji görüşlerinin ABD Büyük Stratejisi üzerindeki rolünü tartışmaktadır. Nitekim bu çalışma, yalnızca üç ABD Başkanının hüküm sürdüğü 2001-2020 dönemini kapsamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışmanın ana başlığı "ABD Başkanlarının ABD Büyük Strateji Vizyonlarının NeoKlasik Realist Perspektiften Bir Karşılaştırması: 2001-2020"dir. Ancak bürokratik nedenlerle tezimizin başlığı "Son Üç ABD Başkanının Büyük Stratejilerinin Neoklasik Realist Perspektiften Bir Karşılaştırması" olarak adlandırılmaktadır. Araştırmamız, her Amerikan Başkanı'nın kendi büyük stratejilerinin ABD Büyük Stratejisi üzerinde çok az etkisi olduğu sonucuna varmaktadır. Dahası, tezimiz yerel dinamiklerin ve tarihsel eğilimlerin ABD Başkanlarının politika oluşturma süreci üzerindeki etkisini göstermektedir. Sonuçlar, ABD'nin ulusal dinamiklerinin ABD Başkanlarının önündeki ana engel olduğunu ve bireysel büyük stratejilerin bütünsel bir şekilde uygulanmasını engellediğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Amerika, Amerikan Başkanları, Büyük Strateji, Dış Politika, Ekonomik Öncelikler, Güvenlik Öncelikleri, İç İlişkiler, Kamuoyu ve Başkanlık Seçimleri, Lobiler ve Çıkar Grupları, Tarihsel Eğilimler*

CONTENTS

Paper Page.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **ii**

ABSTRACT ..... **iii**

ÖZ ..... **v**

CONTENTS ..... **vii**

ABBREVIATIONS ..... **ix**

1. INTRODUCTION **1**

2. DEFINITION OF THE STUDY

2.1.Origins of The Study 6

2.2. Interests of The Research 8

2.3. Significance of The Research 9

2.4. Objectives of The Research 10

2.5. Hypothesis of The Study 10

2.6. Limitations and The Scope of The Study 11

2.7. Theoretical Background 11

2.8. Literature Review 19

3. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND: FOREIGN POLICY, NATIONAL INTEREST AND GRAND STRATEGY

3.1. Foreign Policy 30

3.2. National Interest 34

3.3. Grand Strategy 39

3.4. Foreign Policy-Making In US 42

3.4.1. Presidential power and foreign policy 46

3.4.2. Congress and foreign policy 51

4. IDEATIONAL BASES OF US FOREIGN POLICY

4.1. American Exceptionalism 59

4.2. American Expansionism 67

4.3. Two Mainstream Thoughts In American History 74

5. PRIORITIES, PUBLIC OPINION AND LOBBIES

5.1. Economic and Security Priorities 96

5.2. Lobbies and Interest Groups 102

5.2.1. Pro-Israeli Lobby 105

5.2.2. The Cuban lobby 108

5.2.3. Greek, Turkish, and Armenian lobbies 110

5.3. Elections and Public Opinion 112

6. GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE LAST THREE US PRESIDENTS

6.1. George W. Bush and His Grand Strategic Approach 127

6.2. Barack Obama and His Grand Strategic Approach 132

6.3. Donald Trump and His Grand Strategic Approach 139

6.4. A Comparison of The Last Three Presidents' Grand Strategies 142

7. CONCLUSION 147

BIBLIOGRAPHY 154

ABBREVIATIONS

AHEPA	:American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association
AHI	:American Hellenistic Institute
AIPAC	:American Israel Public Affairs Committee
CANF	:Cuban American National Foundation
CANI	:Commission on America's National Interest
D.C.	:District of Columbia
EOP	:Executive Office of the President
EU	:European Union
FDI	:Foreign Direct Investment
FDR	:Franklin Delano Roosevelt
FPA	:Foreign Policy Analysis
IMF	:International Monetary Foundation
INF	:Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty
IR	:International Relations
ISIS	:Islamic State of Iraq and Syria
JFK	:John Fitzgerald Kennedy
NATO	:North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NASA	:National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NGO	:Non-Governmental Organization
NSS	:National Security Strategy

NTBT	:Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
UAE	:United Arab Emirates
UK	:United Kingdom
UN	:United Nations
UNSC	:United Nations Security Council
USSR	:Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
PAC	:Political Action Committee
PM	:Prime Minister
PYD(DUP)	:Suriye Demokratik Birlik Partisi (Democratic Union Party)
SALT(I, II)	:Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
START(I, II, III)	:Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
TCA	:Turkish Coalition of American
WMD	:Weapons of Mass Destruction
WWI	:World War I
WWII	:World War II
YPG	:Halk Koruma Birlikleri veya Halk Savunma Birlikleri (People's Defense Units)

1. INTRODUCTION

American studies have always been popular among scholars that belong to interdisciplinary fields such as history, sociology, economics, political science and international relations. From the date of its foundation to the present day, America - first and the foremost- as a continent has witnessed many changes like invasions, developments, revolutions, and terror attacks. Besides, it is known that the most famous ancient civilizations –Aztec, Inca and Maya- dwelled on this continent and contributed the development and progress in the continent.

Apart from the American continent, since its founding date the USA has managed to proceed its unique nature, and thus most of the scholars in interdisciplinary fields interested in US from various notions and ways. For instance, whilst scholars of economics mainly investigate FED's monetary policies and their effects on international systems and markets; political science scholars focus on elections, presidential elections or choices of policy-makers and their effect on international system in the external sense. Visa versa, an interdisciplinary scholar may search the domestic effect of such choices and actions. Either way the US politics have always been attractive for scholars from every field.

Particularly for the political science and international relations field, after 9/11 terror attacks, the studies of interdisciplinary scholars concentrated more on US politics as the decisions of policy-makers started to effect the international system more than one could ever imagine and the upside down situation in American economics started simultaneous fluctuations all around the world.

Both the rising focus on American politics and my personal interest for US politics pushed me to create the dissertation model related with US politics. On the other hand, due to the critical status of 9/11 terror attacks in American politics the scope and timeline of this study starts with the inauguration of President George W. Bush and ends with 2020 Presidential Elections held in US. The aim of this assessment is

to make an illustration of domestic effect on US foreign politics, especially by looking for George W. Bush's, Barack Obama's and Donald Trump's grand strategy visions. Indeed, this study, merely covers 2001-2020 interim with three US Presidents reign. In this regard, the title of the study has been revised to reflect better the content as "A Comparison of the US Grand Strategy Visions of US Presidents from NeoClassical Realist Perspective: 2001-2020". However, due to bureaucratic reasons the title of our dissertation remained as ''A Comparison of Grand Strategies of The Last Three Us Presidents From Neoclassical Realist Perspective''. On the other hand, one must notice that the term grand strategy is inherently problematic. There are numerous definitions regarding grand strategy, and each definition defends different approaches. Therefore, this study will deliberately investigate the grand strategy as a term. For the purpose of this study, grand strategy corresponds to range of short term policy combination reflections to a single long term strategy, so-called grand strategy. This dissertation will only look for president's short term foreign, economic, security, and regional policies and their reflections on each president's grand strategy visions and their contribution to US Grand Strategy. In this regard, this thesis will try to answer the following core question: ''How the domestic factors in US affect president's grand strategy visions?'' While investigating this effect, the neoclassical realist perspective will support the dissertation model and to narrow the scope, only four basic features of domestic politics -historical background, and tendencies; presidential elections and public opinion; economic and securitization priorities; lobbies, and interest groups- will be taken into account. For the purpose of this study, the methodology and chapters will procced in a sequence. The chapters will discuss decisive topics that will lead us directly to the conclusion part. The methodology of this study as follows:

The second chapter will make an illustration of a better comprehension for readers and will mainly focus on problems that pushed me to write especially about this topic. The second chapter will demonstrate the interests, significance, objectives, hypothesis, limitations and scope of the study. Chapter two aims to draw a scheme of the study for the reader. Here I offer my hypothesis and the argument exclusively before making theoretical and empirical entrance so that the reader will be aware

what should and should not he/she might expect from the whole study. Moreover, the theoretical background will be touched upon in this chapter. As opposed to many scholars, I discuss the theoretical background –neoclassical realism- as a theory, and then associate with my dissertation model. The purpose of such elaboration is to ease comprehension of model and theory-model association. Eventually the last part of this chapter will focus on literature review and will demonstrate what has been left out in previous studies. The last part will also show what has been done regarding grand strategy-domestic effect line by reviewing previous studies.

Chapter three aims to offer the explanation of critical terms of this study such as foreign policy, national interests and grand strategy. In this regard, foreign policy and grand strategy are not the core elements of this dissertation, however, while discussing the main topic I will refer those terms frequently. So, it is important to grasp what we mean by referring foreign policy and grand strategy. The purpose of this chapter is to show how I approach to the particular terms and what I mean by emphasizing the particular word. Knowing the scope of the term will help our understanding and comfort the reader. On the other hand, all those claim regarding those two phenomena stance for national interest as a term. Nonetheless, as a result of many observations there is a correlation between historical background/tendencies and national interests. Therefore, the definition of national interest part also connected with the 4th chapter.

The fourth chapter will discuss how historical background of US and American tendencies affect US foreign policy choices. In this part, I will allude American Exceptionalism, American Expansionism and two mainstream thoughts that affect the entire American history and political choices. The aim of this chapter is to make a correlation between today's political behavior and US' historical past. In 'American Exceptionalism' part, I will discuss how the notion of American Exceptionalism influence public opinion in US and how the public as a domestic feature effect US presidents and foreign policy choices. On the other hand, in the following part I will investigate how being 'exceptional' that Americans have in mind impact on US' territorial expansionism. In the last part, I will exhibit how the

correlation between mainstream and fundamental thoughts and the way president's embrace those thoughts influence US foreign policy behavior.

In chapter five, I will continue to interrogate the last three domestic features that have an impact on US foreign policy. I will begin with economic/security priorities of US. In this part, I will briefly explain the fundamental economic and security priorities that American politics embraced, and then I will illustrate their influence by using the timeline –including time restrictions in this dissertation- of this study. Afterwards, I will focus on presidential elections and public opinion in US. As a first step, I will briefly explain the history of presidential elections and will give a short instruction for presidential elections. Then, I will illustrate the president's behavior during their electoral campaign and how it correlates with both internal and external system and how their campaign strategies influence the electorate's behavior. Besides, this part will demonstrate how a candidate benefits from domestic and foreign incidents in order to take the American public's attention and their votes. In the last part of chapter five, I will briefly narrate what lobby and interest group means, and then list the strongest groups in American domestic politics. Lastly, demonstrate the lobby and interest group effect on American foreign policy choices.

Chapter six will concentrate on the last three US president's grand strategies. This chapter will follow a historical sequence, and thus it will start with President George Bush, then President Obama and his grand strategic tendencies as a separate part will follow. Finally I will conclude with President Donald Trump and his grand strategy approach. In this chapter I will make a general correlation between domestic features' preventions that I have been alluded in the previous chapters and their impact on each president's grand strategies. On the other hand, the last part of chapter six will offer a comparison between the last three presidents' grand strategies. The last part of this chapter will exhibit the resemblances and differences between grand strategies.

Finally, in the conclusion I will discuss my findings and arguments and will make a general assessment of the study.

2. DEFINITION OF THE STUDY

2.1. Origins of The Study

In this study, there are several questions needed to be answered. However, this dissertation embedded on one fundamental question: ‘’How the domestic factors in US affect president’s grand strategy visions?’’. The rest of the questions that will find answers throughout the research were surrounded around the main research question as sub-questions. Since this study will look for several agent the sub-questions will help us to answer our main question. Each of these sub-questions will try to find an answer to each part and chapter of this study. Those sub-questions as follows:

This thesis will mainly discuss the influence of US domestic politics on US foreign policy. Especially, the research will tackle the shifts in the grand strategies of the last three US presidents and domestic influences with the systemic pressures on the context changing. Therefore, the fundamental question of the thesis is ‘’What are the differences in foreign policy implementations of the last three US Presidents in the sense of grand strategies?’’. As I ask this question, it means that I have already accepted the possibility of policy shifting from one president to another. However, the former question does not display my concern about the impact of domestic politics and systemic pressures. Thus, I have to ask another question which includes the effect of domestic politics and any kind of systemic pressures. The real problem will have investigated in this thesis appears with the latter question: ‘’If such systemic pressures and US domestic politics influence the foreign policy and grand strategies, then, how much impact do they have on the US foreign policy?’’ By using the phrase ‘’if’’, I try to demonstrate that I have already accepted one of the stereotypes of the political science field. Indeed, this cliché accepts the fact that domestic politics does influence foreign policy. However, the real problem here to be investigated is that ‘’Even though these features have impacts on the US foreign policy, will the national interests which have archaic roots and not open to major

changes, let a huge change in foreign policy?'' This question appears as the main problem and the essence of our argument for this thesis. As it is stated before, this research will focus on changes between the American President's Grand Strategies in the aspect of major and little shifting due to domestic prevention and systemic incentives.

Since I narrowed down the aspects of domestic politics I will only look for the impact of historical tendencies, presidential elections, economic and security priorities, and lobbies on US foreign policy and grand strategies. Hence, the initial problem to be investigated for this writing is how much these aspects of domestic politics affect the US foreign policy, in particular the grand strategies of presidents. After I find out the answer I will try to look for another problem of the thesis: ''How much do these narrowed elements of domestic politics and the nature of domestic politics affect the grand strategies of the last three US Presidents?'' Indeed, this question creates another problem to be investigated: Three different Presidents and different systemic pressures in a long interim.

In sum, I will interrogate the effect of the domestic politics on foreign policy/grand strategies and how the systemic pressures and nature of domestic politics affect the foreign policy implementations of the last three US Presidents in their grand strategies. On the other hand, the domestic effect on US foreign policy should be understood by every Political Science scholar due to the vitality of understanding the world's interdependent nature. Besides, as a realist author, I tend to explain some political problems with the systemic algorithms. In sum, these pure beliefs pushed me to search this field and I have found this topic worth to be investigated.

Finally the fundamental questions that surround this inquiry as follows:

– What are the differences in foreign policy applications of the last three US Presidents in the sense of Grand Strategies?
– Why these differences emerge?

– Does domestic politics of the US lead the construction of the US foreign policy?

– How much effect does domestic politics have in shaping the grand strategies and foreign policy applications?

– Do presidential elections and campaigns play a role in determining the US foreign policy?

– How does the historical background of a country play role in determining foreign policy approaches?

– When and how these policies differ?

– What are the main factors of these policy shifts?

2.2. Interests of The Research

The main motivation of this research emerges from the writer's special interest in both the domestic and foreign policy of the US. In this sense, I started with a stereotype standpoint –foreign policy is the product of domestic politics and systemic changes- and implemented the phrase to my field of interest. Hence, this research will subject the effect of US domestic politics and systemic changes on its foreign policy behavior through grand strategies.

By the same token, to focus on specific issues I will narrow the scope of the domestic politics' features. Therefore, this research will only concern with four elements of domestic politics, historical background, and tendencies; presidential elections and public opinion; economic and securitization priorities; lobbies, and interest groups. Furthermore, this research interests in the influence of these four elements on the last three US Presidents' Grand Strategies. Accordingly, this thesis merely includes President George W. Bush, Barack Hussein Obama, and Donald Trump's era to the account. In the economic and security priorities part, I will also allude the regional priorities of US. The first and the foremost important region is indeed, Eurasia for US. As Brzezinski argues in his epic book *''The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geopolitical Imperatives''* American global primacy is mostly and

frequently depends on the stability in the region and US' control over Eurasia. This is because, world's six biggest economic and military powers are located in Eurasia. Hence, the US does not want an emergence of a rival or a competitor in the region, in particular, the US does not prefer any kind of rapprochement between Russia and China. Besides, according to Mackinder's Heartland Theory –Russian soil is the heartland, a state that controls the peripheral caliber of the heartland could balance the heart of the world, whereas a state that controls the heartland controls the whole world.[1] In this regard, China and Iran are the strong peripheral actors and should be taken into consideration against any kind of geopolitical and security threats. On the other hand, due to the close ties between Israel and US, the US tries to preserve Israeli rights in the Middle East and also tries to make a balance within the region. Furthermore, since Bush Jr. proclaimed Iran as one of the 'axis of evil' country after 9/11 terror attacks, the relationship that has already corrupted, have deteriorated and embargos of US became the main foreign policy approach towards Iran. In this regard, the aim of this study is to show how domestic dynamics shape American foreign policy approach and prioritize some specific regions.

On the other hand, the other motivation that pushed me to deepen the investigation regarding the US comes from the need to demonstrate and find proof about whether a president can change the whole grand strategy of the state and act by own his own or the US has such a unique domestic mechanism that could conduct itself without the influence of an individual and national interests would not allow a major change in foreign reactions.

2.3. Significance of The Research

Initially, the importance of the research comes from the enthusiasm to consolidate a common idea –which I alluded earlier- 'domestic politics and international system have an ocular impact on foreign policy'. In other words, this study will aim to prove

[1] For more information please check: Zbigniew Brzezinski, **The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And Its Geostrategic Imperatives**, 1st Edition, Basic Books, 2016.

this common idea and the significance of the research embedded in that goal. On the other hand, this study is vital because of the sub-topic that covers. For instance, on the one hand, this research will demonstrate how domestic politics, especially historical background, and tendencies as one of the elements of domestic politics and the national interests influence policy-making in the US and how much effect do they have on grand strategies. Accordingly, since this study will touch upon the effect of these grand strategies on the international state system it is worth investigating.

Apart from all, most of the scholars either focus on the inter-state relations of the US or American public opinion as one of the aspects of domestic politics. Therefore, I believe that this is one of the rare researches which combines and displays the effect of domestic politics in one piece.

2.4. Objectives of The Research

The objective of this research is to demonstrate how the selected four elements of domestic politics influence US foreign policy, particularly grand strategies. Besides, the other aim is to display whether there are huge differences between the grand strategies due to the change in the external environment or the national interests, historical background, and tendencies as the basic phenomena of domestic politics prevent these fundamental changes in state reactions.

2.5. Hypothesis of The Study

As most of the scholars in this field, I claim that ‘’foreign policy is the product of domestic politics’’. Accordingly, in this study, I argue that the four elements of domestic politics that I have chosen might change over time due to the political environment. By the same token, these elements can affect the president’s grand strategies.

In this regard, the hypothesis of this research implies that the political environment and systemic pressures impact domestic features of the US, and these features affect grand strategies in the foreign policy aspect. Nevertheless, in this study, I argue that the national interests, historical background, and tendencies that America has, could prevent fundamental and major changes in the grand strategies and foreign policies of the US.

2.6. Limitations and The Scope of The Study

Since this study argues that domestic politics has an influence on foreign politics, I will look for the features of domestic politics. However, the field of domestic politics is a wide range arena. Therefore, I will only look for the four elements which I find more important in comparison to other features of domestic politics as investigating US foreign policy. These features are: Historical Background/Tendencies, Elections, and Public Opinion, Lobbies and Interest Groups, Economic and Security Priorities.

On the other hand, this research will only cover the last three presidents of the US. Thus I will only look for 2001-2020 interim. Hence, the main focus will only be five grand strategies.

Apart from the research era, the only obstacle will be the off-shore operation files and top-secret files of the militaristic implementations as the US's foreign reaction for political turmoils. Especially, I believe that this difficulty will show up during the investigation of Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Syrian War.

2.7. Theoretical Background

One of the most important actions to take as starting research is to embed the related international relations theory to our hypothesis model. The chosen theory should be the best fit for both our hypothesis and research. This thesis puts the US as the

central focus of the research. In other words, the state is the unit of our analysis. At this point, the best theoretical explanation should put the state as its center in order to guide our research model. Therefore, I chose realism to investigate the US' reactions towards international issues and their political considerations. Yet, knowing realism as the best fit for our research model is not enough to explain our main goal which is the hypothesis of the research. By the same token, since realism has many sub-categories in itself, I should clarify which sub-realist theory I will benefit from. Still, I find it useful to dig realist theory as a concept before clarifying the sub-theory I will use.

Generally, almost every type of realist theory is based on the same notions: State, Power, Evil, Survival, and Self-Help and states act either according to maximize their power or maintain their existence. Besides, realism distinguishes politics as high and low. For realists, issues as security and survival are the matters of high politics, and issues as education and economy are the topics of low politics. Nevertheless, each type of realism deals with this diversion differently. Apart from this, there is no type of realism that accepts or considers any other actor in the international system except for states. For realism, there is no authority over states. In other words, international organizations as the UN, IMF, EU, NATO, etc. cannot control states unless states want to be controlled. Either way, realists claim that only the powerful states can direct the actions of these international organizations and use them for their own greater good. However, the usage of specific phenomena I mentioned at the beginning changes in each type of realism.

For instance, according to Classical Realists, power is the aim to reach a reputation in international and foreign politics.[2] Therefore, Classical Realism claims that states seek to maximize their power in order to prevent possible attacks or extend the boundaries of its existence. On the one hand, philosophers like Machiavelli and Thucydides are considered as one of the first realists in history. On the other hand, the root of classical realism is as archaic as these philosophers. Also, they were the

[2] Tayyar Arı, **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri,** MKM Yayınlar,. 2013, p. 144.

first ones who thought that power is the essential core of states. Apart from the notion of power, classical realism claims that human nature could evolve to evil or at least could be corrupted as time goes by. In the early phases, Thomas Hobbes comes up with this hypothesis as another Realist philosopher. Later, Hans J. Morgenthau accepted this standpoint in his book *''Politics Among Nations''*. According to Morgenthau, there are two mainstream views for the nature of humans and the notion of politics.[3] Although Morgenthau accepts the idea that human nature is inherently bad, in the six principles of realism he claims that the evil personality of statesman could affect the politics only at a minimum level which should not be exaggerated and considered seriously.[4]

In the late 1970s, neorealism emerged as the criticism of classical realism. After that, international relations had witnessed debates among liberals, classical realists, and the Neorealists. However, Waltz never denied the roots of realism, but, at the same time, he tried to focus on the systems and the structures as opposed to classical realists. The distinction of two main currents helps to determine the differences between the formers and the letters:

First of all, for classical realism, foreign policy is based on human nature and the capacity of the states, thus, Waltz criticized their reductionist behavior. As opposed to former realists, Waltz and the other Neorealists explained foreign policy by the nature of the international system. In other words, their level of analysis is based on structures and systems.

The second differences emerge with the essential goals of states. According to classical realists and neo-classical realists, the main objective of states is to maximize their interests and powers. In contrast to this perspective, Neorealists claim that the main goal is to provide a secure environment for the state itself.[5] Still, Neorealists

[3] Hans J. Morgenthau, **Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace**, 7th Edition, McGrawHill, 2005, pp. 2-14.
[4] To see the Six Principles of Political Realism: Morgenthau, pp. 4-15.
[5] Tayyar Arı, **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri**, MKM Yayınları, 2013, pp. 160-167.

believe there is an international system that exists but it is anarchic. This view bears two phenomena: the self-help and the security dilemma. In the anarchic structure of the international system, all states have to provide their own security, which Neorealists called self-help. The main assertion is that all the other states will act like this, hence, their interests will guide them in the international system, and the security dilemma emerges from the impulse of this self-help which means states tend to develop militarily. In other words, the increasing power of the state causes others' decreasing.

For instance, in ''Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory'' article, Kenneth Waltz claims that the system consists of interacting units and power is the tool, not the object as classical realists accept.[6] Furthermore, states main objective is survival in the anarchic system, in order to survive, states have to develop their military units as self-help. Thus occurs, a main problem which neorealist deals with: security dilemma.

The ''Security Dilemma'' concept leads states to prepare themselves against other states' actions and aggression. According to this concept, as Waltz states, ''one's increase leads other's decrease''. This means if one state starts to develop weapons, bombs, military vehicles and recruit soldiers in order to expand its army, then, it endangers the other state's secure environment. Thus, the other state tries to enhance its army to defend itself. Thence, for the purpose of defending their borderlines, each state tries to provide a secure environment for itself. As Waltz argues, system consists of interacting units and power is the tool, not the object as classical realists accept.[7] Furthermore, states main objective is survival in the anarchic system, in order to survive, states have to develop their military units in the self-help world.

On the other hand, According to Gilpin, if no state believes it profitable to change system then the system will remain stable, a state will attempt to change international

[6]Kenneth N. Waltz, "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", **Journal of International Affairs**, 44(1), (Spring/Summer 1990), pp. 36-37.
[7]Kenneth N. Waltz, pp. 36-37.

politics only if there is an expected net gain exists, a state seek to change the system in order to expand its marginal costs further, if the costs and benefits equal and the expansion has reached the highest level then they try to maintain status quo.[8] In the light of these statements of Gilpin, one can argue that no state is willing to change the system or status quo until its secure environment threatened. If this secure environment is in danger, then, the state act according to recreate the secure environment for itself.

In addition, Neorealism also separates into two mainstream standpoints in itself: Offensive and Defensive Neorealism. Whereas, as an offensive neorealist, John J. Mearsheimer states that the offensive realism is against the defensive's ''sufficient military'' theory; defensive neorealists –Waltz and Gilpin- claim that states need a self-sufficient type of power to provide its security. However, as Mearsheimer argues, the idea of defensive realism is so naïve in a self-help world. According to Mearsheimer, great powers look for opportunities to gain power at each other's expanse. His theory focuses on great powers and to qualify as a great power, each state must have sufficient military to fight back against foreign threats.[9] Besides, Mearsheimer argues that there is no statutory state in the system, all the great powers are offensive and revisionists. Because of that, each states can never be certain about the others intentions and survival becomes significant for states at the lack of authortiy.[10] In other words, Mearsheimer thinks the best defense is the offense. Therefore, it leads us to one phenomenon: States have to enhance their military spending in order to protect themselves and create more secure environment against any kind of attack from other states.

Yet, each type of realism I analyzed above does not open the black boxes of states. In other words, neither Classical Realism nor Neorealism considers internal variables. Moreover, Nicholas Kitchen says that both types of realism failed to identify/foresee states' actions. Therefore, the initial movement of Neoclassical Realism starts with

[8]Robert Gilpin, **War and Change in World Politics**, Cambridge University Press, 1981, pp. 10-11.
[9] John J. Mearsheimer, **The Tragedy of Great Power Politics**, W.W. Norton & Company, 2001, p. 15.
[10]John J. Mearsheimer, pp. 15.

the explanation of this basic problem[11] and thus, this version of realism adds both internal and intervening variables to the Realist literature. By the same token, these theories merely focus on state actions without considering domestic features and relative material power capabilities of states. On the contrary, the formers' perception of power is based on a pure norm that shapes states' foreign policy. At this point, I should clarify that in this research, I will examine US actions by considering systemic incentives and internal (intervening) variables such as decision-makers' perceptions and the relation between state apparatus and society. Furthermore, the main focus of this research will be the grand strategies of the last three US Presidents; accordingly, Lobell and Taliaferro argue that Neoclassical Realism takes grand strategies into an account as the part of the internal (intervening) variable.[12] Therefore, under these circumstances, the best fit for my hypothesis and to this research would be Neoclassical Realism due to our overlapping standpoint.

On the other hand, this research will illustrate a combination of US reactions which emerges from both international and domestic incentives. In other words, if we consider the decision-makers, state elites, elections, the economic and political interest of a country as the second image and international environment as the third, then this research will be located between those two dimensions. Indeed, Neo-classic scholars claim that the theory deploys itself in between the third and the second images.[13]

To broaden our horizon and grasp the mentality of Neoclassical Realism a tangible casual diagram would be helpful. The casual diagram of Neoclassical Realism as follows:

---

[11] Nicholas Kitchen, **Neoclassical Realism In European Politics: Bringing Power Back In (Chapter 5: Ideas Of Power And The Power of Ideas),** Edited By: Asle Toje, Barbara Kunz, 1. Edition, Manchester University Press, (December 2012), p. 88.
[12] Steven E. Lobell and others, **Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy. Cambridge University Press**, 2009. p. 61.
[13] Steven E. Lobell and others, pp. 139-141.

Systemic Incentives (Pressures) ⟶ Internal Factors ⟶ Foreign Policy (State Reactions)

(Independent Variable) (Intervening Variable) (Dependent Variable)

Indeed, the essential norms of Neoclassical Realism will help readers to comprehend why the certain theory is the best fit for this research:

1. According to Gideon Rose, Neoclassical Realism considers relative material power as their focal independent variable. The existence of relative material power leads states to construct long term foreign policies in terms of their use of power capabilities. In other words, a state acts according to its material power capabilities. For instance, as the relative material power of a state increases, the state will seek to realize its national interests both abroad and within the country.[14]
2. Although Neoclassical Realism accepts material power capability as the outcome of the state's foreign policy, Neoclassical scholars also claim that the impact of material power on foreign policy -as a sole variable is not enough to explain a country's reaction in the international system. In short, the effect of relative material power capability on foreign policy is indirect or complex.[15]
3. In the sense of including internal variables as the outcome of systemic pressures, Neoclassical Realists claim that foreign policy choices are made by decision-makers, such as political leaders and state elites.
4. According to Neoclassical Realists, states are directed by the combination of relative material power capabilities and their national interests.[16]
5. Due to the international anarchy and ambiguities of the political environment, states seek to observe and stabilize their external environment. Thus, states tend to seek and maintain their security.[17]

[14] Gideon Rose, ''Review: Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy'', **World Politics,** Vol. 51, No. 1 (Oct., 1998), pp. 151-152.
[15] Gideon Rose, p. 146.
[16] Tayyar Arı, **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri**, MKM Yayınları, 2013, p. 174.
[17] Gideon Rose, p. 152.

6. Neoclassical Realism argues that independent variables such as systemic pressures and political environment actuate the intervening variables such as domestic elements of a state and those two actuate or shape the state's foreign actions. Therefore, Rose says that goals and priorities as two of these domestic components will direct the external behavior.[18]

7. As Lobell states in his book ''*Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy''* political leaders act according to both internal and external politics. In his words; ''…leaders sit at the intersection of domestic and international political systems, and can act internationally for domestic reasons or domestically for international ends.''[19]

Furthermore, as I stated before, this thesis will analyze four domestic features, grand strategies while focusing the state as the main actor of world politics. This research will focus on state reactions in terms of foreign policy. Besides, since this research will examine the last three US Presidents' Grand Strategies and different interims from the beginning of the 2000s to the end of 2020s; it is possible to coincide with different systemic pressures and diversified state reactions due to these different pressures. In short, this research will try to understand the impact of systemic pressures on external (domestic) variables (features) and their sequent effect on US foreign reactions while examining whether fundamental national interests prevent the major change in US' external rebounds or not. Thus, the hypothesis of ours and Neoclassical Realism overlap at this point. Neoclassical Realism includes all features clarified above.

However, Nicholas Kitchen argues that Neoclassical Realists focus on the second-image features too much, and thus it is not plausible to examine international incentives without digging the grand strategies and national interests of states.[20] Yet, in this research, I will try to demonstrate how unexpected circumstances in the international environment shaped the US's external reactions and domestic elites'

[18] Gideon Rose, pp. 151-152.
[19] Steven E. Lobell and others, p. 56.
[20] Nicholas Kitchen, p. 91.

priorities in order to disprove this idea. For instance, I argue that the 9/11 terrorist attacks both as external and systemic pressures had shaped George Bush's Grand Strategies and the perception of state elites toward Muslims and terrorists. In the end, the US's security priorities and defense practices have changed accordingly. In other words, the 9/11 incident –the systemic pressure by only itself- directed domestic standpoint and it led to the change in external reactions of the US. Therefore, domestic politics did not bear any international incentives, on the contrary, external pressures led to the emergence of internal rebounds.

2.8. Literature Review

US politics is a wide range area and occupies a notable place in the lexicon. There are plenty of published reports, books, and articles related to our concern exist in the literature. Indeed, its wideness makes it hard to examine all branches and topics of US politics at once, and thus some scholars merely focus on domestic politics or lobbies, whereas others' motivation is on the US foreign policy.

Our main concern and the scope of this research here is unique due to the rare combination of both foreign and domestic topics in one piece. Our research topic covers domestic features like interest groups and lobbies; elections whilst emphasizing grand strategies and their implications on US foreign policy. Even though there is no precise work that corresponds to our research, still, some scholars' works regarding our topic inspired this research and became the main guides of the thesis. By the same token, I determined three fundamental books as the cornerstone of our dissertation. The common point in these publishings is that the grand strategy and domestic constraints are related in the sense of making the US foreign policy.

The first and perhaps the most similar work to our research is Christopher Layne's book *''The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present''* which was published in 2006, three years before President Barack Obama's inauguration. Christopher Layne is one of the famous scholars who specialized in US

foreign policy issues and grand strategy. In the book, Layne starts to examine the history of US grand strategies from the 1940s that also coincide with the Second World War years. In fact, the US policy-makers' initial emphasis on the requirement of a grand strategy started in the early 1940s. In other words, Layne starts his dissertation with the emergence of an American Grand Strategy idea. Then, he divides the history of the American Grand Strategy into two phases. The first phase starts from the early stages of grand strategies' formation and ends in 1991. The second interim starts in 1991 and reaches to present day. By dividing the history of grand strategy in the US, he aims to illustrate the historical pattern between archaic and current grand strategies of the US and find an answer to a significant question: Is the current grand strategy contains similarities with the grand strategy that the US used in the first period? Apart from the book's timeline, his work is vital and similar to our dissertation due to his standpoint throughout the book and the methodology that he uses to comprehend the essence of the American type of grand strategy is intense. In his book, Layne aims to demonstrate which historical event affects shifts in the American Grand Strategy and to extend he illustrates the historical pattern during the formation of the American Grand Strategy. In this regard, Christopher Layne also argues that each president's grand strategy is similar to each other's. As I stated above, one of the other similarities is the standpoint that he follows throughout the book. Layne approaches the grand strategy topic from the neoclassical realist point of view. He argues that the domestic incentives and systemic pressures, together, determine the US Grand Strategy. Whereas the international system allows or at least could tolerate the US for its expansion is the systemic factor, the desire for economic and ideological expansion counts as the domestic factors. To illustrate the argument, it is possible to state that the desire for a permanent ceasefire after WWII corresponds to systemic issues, whereas the promotion of American values and preserving American national interests are the topics of domestic incentives. This is because American values and promotion of them are ideologically important for American national security, and thus they embed as the core motivation that forms the American Grand Strategy.[21] The perception that he embraced in his book – neoclassical realism, led the escalation of challenges with other scholars that once

[21] Christopher Layne, **The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present**, Cornell University Press, 2006, p. 28.

possessed other types of realism. Layne offers his extraregional hegemony theory against Mearshemier's –neorealist- offshore balancer theory. From his point of view, the extraregional hegemony theory is the best explanation for American Grand Strategic behavior since the early 1940s. As opposed to the offensive realist argument, the US has deliberately chosen to be the extraregional hegemon and construct its grand strategy in this regard since WWII and it was determined by domestic factors.[22] Layne's main argument is based on the idea that the American Grand Strategy has not witnessed any sharp or major changes throughout history; this also includes George W. Bush's Grand Strategy. The main claim of the author here is that the invasion of Iraq and overthrowing Saddam Hussein are the examples of the continuity of somewhat the same grand strategy since 1989.[23] Furthermore, he stresses the essential foundation of American Grand Strategy which covers the idea of American expansion. At this point, it is important to be aware that we can coincide with the American expansionist priorities and promotion of American values in other scholars' works, including scholars who do not study grand strategy topics primarily. Particularly, in *''The Grand Chessboard''* Zbigniew Brezinski claims that East Asia –especially China- and Europe –particularly Western Europe- are the priorities of the US merely by studying American geostrategic imperatives.[24] By the same token, Christopher Layne claims that US Grand Strategy follows extraregional hegemony and this understanding drives the American desire of establishing its own hegemony in three specific regions outside the borders of the US. These three regions are Europe, East Asia, and the Persian Gulf; and Layne adds, the US must maintain its role as the ''stabilizer'' over these regions in order to preserve its national, security, and economic interests. The author thinks that this is also not a new thing and there is a correlation between WWII strategies and current strategies. Throughout history, the essential concern of the US remained the same, preserving geopolitical and economic interests are the cornerstones of American Grand Strategy. As a matter of fact, Layne emphasizes the idea of the ''Open Door'' policy in this regard and argues that with the perception of extraregional hegemony, the US Grand Strategy is also based on the Open Door policy which indulges the idea of homeland security and aims to

[22] Christopher Layne, p. 28.
[23] Christopher Layne, p. 1.
[24] Please check: Zbigniew Brezinski, **The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives**, 1st Edition, Basic Books, 2016.

protect ‘’American Way of Life’’ in the aspect of domestic concerns. According to this idea, in order to be safe within the borders of the US, safety abroad must be maintained and preserved.[25] Indeed, the US can only reach its economic interests by securing the natural flow of liberalism in other countries’ domestic environment. In this regard Layne argues that America’s Open Door policy has deeper roots than we thought, in fact, it is based on the Wilsonian-liberal approach which he emphasizes as the founding stone of the US’ Grand Strategic legacy. According to this approach, each state’s domestic politics determine its external behavior and in order to secure the US and its national interests, other states’ political environment should be peaceful and reflects American values or at least eager to turn its non-democratic nature into a democratic one. In short, the American Grand Strategy aims to promote internal stability for other countries to preserve its national interests, particularly the economic interests.[26] In sum, in accordance with the thoughts of neoclassical realism, Layne claims that the American Grand Strategy embraced two phenomena after WWII, one is extraregional hegemony and the other one is the Open Door policy. Moreover, according to the author, there is no sharp change in the history of American Grand Strategies, on the contrary, he demonstrates examples from the Bush administration and emphasizes that neither the National Security Strategy (2002) that his administration released nor the Quadrennial Defense Review (2001) contains different strategies of the Bush administration than his predecessors.[27] In conclusion, the main argument of Christopher Layne is that the main goal in US Grand Strategy remained constant and it aims to preserve the US’s extraregional hegemony to spread the ‘’American way of life’’ to the entire world.

Another source of inspiration of our dissertation is Thomas J. Christensen’s book *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958*. Since Christensen mainly focuses on American Grand Strategy and interactions between China, it would be useful to grasp his point of view and refer to his works for the sake of our research. Although it is a relatively old book, Christensen’s demonstration of former Sino-American relations in the aspect of

[25] Christopher Layne, pp. 3, 27-28, 30-32.
[26] Christopher Layne, pp. 34-35.
[27] Christopher Layne, p. 25.

domestic constraints with the implications of foreign policy illuminates our dissertation's path. He illustrates a linkage between domestic politics, grand strategy, and provoked ideological conflict within the society. Such an illustration sheds the light on another fragile relationship between domestic and foreign policies. Hence, his main argument is based on a linkage between domestic constraints and grand strategy that particularly emphasizes the domestic-originated political hurdles which leaders suffering from especially when they try to mobilize the public behind their grand strategies and their implementations. According to Christensen, the change in the international system enforces the states and political leaders to adjust their national security policies, however, such regulations may be difficult to apply due to public opinion. From this point on, the author emphasizes the necessity of following more hostile or ideological foreign policy implementations to ensure public support for realizing the fundamental strategy. Therefore, leaders might sometimes adopt the right strategies toward the shifts in the international area by confronting such obstacles that compel executives in the domestic political environment. It is important to grasp this book prudently due to Christensen's perfect demonstration of the link between shifts in leaders' way of constructing grand strategies, international system, escalating the short-term clashes in order to gain public support and domestic hurdles during the mobilization process. Understanding such linkage between the events and particularly the correlation between domestic and international incentives is crucial because of revealing the precise rationale behind leaders' decisions during the creation and finishing conflicts; electoral campaigns and foreign policy-making process.[28] Christensen's work is similar to our research because he shapes his main argument around neo-realism and neoclassical realism and he offers a brand-new design, called ''domestic mobilization model'' as an intervening variable. Besides, his perception of a grand strategy is composed as an overall strategy that gathers all domestic and international policies in one which also bounds a correlation with our perception of the grand strategy in this research.[29] Nonetheless, he argues that profited by the domestic mobilization model may endanger political leaders' grand strategic plans, and thus the leaders should avoid mobilizing the public if they want

[28] Thomas J. Christensen, **Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict**, **1947-1958**, Princeton University Press, 1996, pp. 4, 7.
[29] Thomas J. Christensen, pp. 7, 13.

to reach their foreign policy goals. From a different point of view, in this research, one can argue that there is a high possibility that domestic incentives and pressures prevent major changes in grand strategies and this is a natural process. So, the leaders cannot apply their policies precisely even if they want to. The author of the book also argues that leaders might sometimes follow so-called policies in order to guarantee public support for realizing their actual strategies that target to consolidate national security interests, therefore, leaders try to mobilize the society around the grand strategy.[30] In short, his neoclassical approach to the topic and efforts to illustrate the correlation between domestic politics and grand strategies are useful for our understanding.

One of the other significant emphasis in this study is related to the common phrase, ‘’American foreign policy of a domestic politics’’ that exposes the relationship between internal and external policies. In this regard, the last primary source of inspiration to our research is *‘’Sailing the Water’s Edge: The Domestic Politics of American Foreign Policy’’* written by Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley. Helen Milner is one of the notable scholars who examine the link between foreign and domestic politics and emphasize the importance of foreign policy evolution into foreign aid strategy approach due to domestic pressures and Dustin Tingley is the co-author of this book which awarded as the best publishing in the field of US national policy in 2015. The main focus of this book is how foreign policy made in the US and the role of domestic politics during the foreign policy-making process. In the book, the authors also examine how, why, and when the American political leader chooses a particular range of foreign strategies to deal with an ongoing international issue. Milner and Tingley focus on domestic politics and the role of president. In particular, the authors’ perception on grand strategy is similar to ours –Authors state that grand strategy is an overall policy that is based on the president’s ability to use domestic and foreign policy instruments. Therefore, they neglect the idea of high and low policy by focusing on the notion of policy as general and examine the role-changes of presidents and change in the aspect of international structure and threat. The overall investigation is important because the range of policies those American

[30] Thomas J. Christensen. p. 3.

presidents set directly affects the US interactions with other states[31] and organizations and it reveals the correlation between domestic and foreign politics at the same time. The entire study is based on the synthesis of two phenomena, the claim of ‘’two presidencies’’ and open economic politics (Open Door Policy) as we coincide within Christopher Layne’s research. Whereas the idea of two presidencies focuses on the dispute between Congress and President due to the ambiguities about foreign policy-making in the American Constitution; the open economic politics related American national interests, particularly argues that in order to realize American economic interests the US should act as the ‘’regional stabilizer’’.[32] Indeed, this is what the entire American Grand Strategy is based on. In contrast to Layne’s perception, he embraced throughout research –that the American Grand Strategy is based on ‘’extraregional hegemony- Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley’s understanding is different. They emphasize that the American way of grand strategy follows a liberal-international standpoint and it contains two mainstream features in itself, (economic) openness and non-isolationism.[33] By the same token, their understanding of the American Grand Strategy is way different from our understanding in this dissertation too. Still, they argue that even though President Bush’s ‘War on Terror (2001)’ policy is a turning point in US foreign policy, there is only a little change in US’ external position[34] and this is what we try to emphasize the infeasibility of major changes in American Grand Strategy due to impedance in the country. The general findings of the book demonstrate that domestic politics matters in the foreign policy-making process, especially the ideology and interest groups play an important role during the phase.[35] At this point, our study also considers the effect of domestic features and the role of interest groups and lobbies. In addition, the authors think that the American domestic politics tend to militarize American Grand Strategy instead of applying soft power strategies, such as financial aids or signing a treaty, and thus these variables influence the presidents’ grand strategy choices. On the other hand, Milner and Tingley imply that changes in the international system and the rising possibility of threat have an impact on US

[31] Helen V. Milner, Dustin Tingley, **Sailing the Water's Edge: The Domestic Politics of American Foreign Policy,** Princeton University Press, 2015, pp. 1-2, 30-31.
[32] Helen V. Milner, Dustin Tingley, p. 6.
[33] Helen V. Milner, Dustin Tingley, p. 21.
[34] Helen V. Milner, Dustin Tingley, p. 31.
[35] Helen V. Milner, Dustin Tingley, p. 262.

foreign policy and influence presidential power, in particular, due to the solid bound between presidents and grand strategy they also affect grand strategies. As a conclusion, the authors claim that the US Grand Strategy is likely to remain liberal-international. As opposed to other scholars in this field and our research in this matter, Milner and Tingley state that the current type of grand strategy will no longer bear challenges for US foreign policy path, on the contrary, the current embraced-strategy would help the US to deal with its the main competitors, like China, without declaring a war. In sum, domestic constraints and domestic biases for militarization may also strengthen US foreign policy and enrich the national security in the long term.[36] Although the authors of the book follow a more liberal path in their research, it is possible to say that some statements regarding the impact of domestic politics over US foreign policy are still useful for our study and are on the same path with our point of view.

On the other hand, John Ikenberry comes up with a truly different approach for the term grand strategy, in his book Liberal Leviathan. According to Ikenberry, the US embraced milieu-oriented grand strategy which aims to continuous reconstruction of international environment. Yet, Ikenberry criticizes this type embracement. From his point of view, rather than having milieu-oriented grand strategy, the US should follw the line of positional grans strategy which a great power seeks to limit the power and threats of a specific challenger state or group of states.[37] Besides, he emphasizes that the US could have been the Leviathan of the world with an accurate grand strategy approach. In the end of his book, Ikenberry gives advice regarding how the new American grand strategic approach should be like. According to Ikenberry, the American grand strategy should be informed by answers to this question: what sort of international order would we like to see in place in 2020 or 2030 when America is less powerful.[38]

[36] Helen V. Milner, Dustin Tingley, pp.31, 274-275, 281, 284.
[37] John Ikenberry, **Liberal Leviathan The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order,** Princeton University Press, 2011, p. 164.
[38] John Ikenberry, p. 348.

Apart from the leading guides of this research, there are other studies that encourage our dissertation, especially the articles that emphasize the non-existing grand strategy of President Donald Trump and George W. Bush are included to this group. As we alluded above, Christopher Layne also claims that President Bush's Grand Strategy has no different basis in comparison to his predecessors. Besides, some scholars argue that George Bush had followed his father and did what he could not have accomplished due to his defeat in the elections of 1992. As a matter of fact, most scholars who claim that George W. Bush's Grand Strategy is the continuation of his father's, illustrate the Second Gulf War (2003) as an example in this regard.

For instance, according to Daniel Drezner, President Obama came to the office with three convictions. First, he mentioned the reconstruction of domestic politics as the fundamental tool of foreign policy. Second, he claimed that the US overextended to the wrong places in the Middle East. The last one, the Bush administration's wrong policy decisions brought the US to the lowest status in the world.[39] Drezner claims that rather than having a single grand strategy approach President Obama had two approaches. The first one was multilateral retrenchment which corresponded to regaining the reputation of the US in the Middle East and burden-sharing with allies. The other one was counterpunching[40] which corresponded to ''winning the hearts and minds''. The second feature that the Obama administration embraced was to re-construct the trust for the US in the Middle East which collapsed during Bush Jr.'s presidency.

On the other hand, many scholars like Hal Brands, Peter Dombrowski, and Simon Reich make discussions on the existence of Donald Trump's Grand Strategy. Whereas some of them argue that he tries to demonetize the grand strategy phenomenon, others argue that President Trump's Grand Strategy is a demonstration of going back to American realism standards as we partially witnessed in George Bush's Grand Strategy.

---

[39] Daniel W. Drezner, ''Does Obama Have a Grand Strategy? Why We Need Doctrines in Uncertain Times'', **Foreign Affairs**, Vol. 90, No. 4, (July/August 2011), p. 64.
[40] Daniel W. Drezner, p. 58.

Most of the scholars in Turkey either studied the role of media in US foreign policy decisions as one of the sources of domestic politics like in Mohanad Khalid Alsoufi's thesis *'The role of media in implementing American foreign policy case study: American war on Iraq in 2003'* or merely studied US energy policies as Eşref Cihad Koca did in his master thesis 'US energy policy after 2001: A comparative analysis of the Bush, Obama and Trump administrations'. Most of the political science scholars studied comparative foreign policy analysis with several different topics by excluding Donald Trump's presidency from the framework. Furthermore, some scholars that studied these kinds of comparisons neglected the features of domestic politics. The list of their work as follows:

– *'The role of arms trade in American Foreign Policy: A comparative analysis of Middle East policies in Bush and Obama periods'* Nihan Özcan-Master Thesis[41]

– *'Differing conceptualizations - overlapping policies: A comparison of Bush and Obama doctrines'* Merve Dilek Dağdelen-Master Thesis[42]

– *'The USA's Russian policy during George W. Bush's and Barack Obama's terms'* Farida Abuzarova-Master Thesis[43]

– *'Foreign policy comparison of Obama and Bush'* Sema Coşkun-Master Thesis[44]

– *'The comperative analysis of the period president George W. Bush and Barack Obama in the context of Iranian policy'* Meysune Yaşar-Master Thesis[45]

– *'The Impact of Domestic Factors in US Foreign Policy Towards Turkey during the AKP Era'* Batuhan Şar-Master Thesis[46]

Besides, even the 9/11 terror attacks is a cornerstone in US foreign policy most of the camp shaped their dissertations and comparisons around 9/11 and omitted other significant occasions as Syrian Civil War, Libya Intervention and other issues that affected Barack Obama's presidency. In addition, as a final step of my researches I

[41] Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, SBE, 2019.
[42] Marmara University, SBE, 2019.
[43] Istanbul University, SBE, 2018.
[44] Bahçeşehir University, SBE, 2016.
[45] İstanbul Medeniyet University, SBE, 2015.
[46] Marmara University, SBE, 2020.

only found Dr. Çağatay Özdemir's *'Repercussions of Obama's Grand Strategy in the Middle East'* Ph.D. thesis regarding grand strategy which only subjects President Obama's grand strategy and he focused on grand strategy effect on US foreign policy.

According to this research, it is possible to claim that our scholarship does not focus on four elements of domestic politics as this dissertation offers or it is rare to coincide such comparison that issues last three US Presidents.

3. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND: FOREIGN POLICY, NATIONAL INTEREST AND GRAND STRATEGY

The school of Political Science and International Relations contains various concepts and terms within its area of research. Most of the time, various books, articles, or even theories shape around these concepts, or some scholars forms the redefinition of some concepts according to their standpoints. In both conditions, the IR terminology is a tool that broadening our understanding of our field of research. Likewise, in this research, I will profit from a couple of concepts from the terminology of International Relations in order to help the reader to illustrate a framework for the research. Knowing these terms and concepts will help the reader to comprehend what I will aim to argue in the thesis. Moreover, due to the significance and unique uses of some terms, both our research and readers will not be fulfilled or even satisfied without knowing the definition of these terms.

Nonetheless, some concepts might vary according to a particular standpoint or a theory. For instance, some concepts -like democracy, international system, economy, foreign policy have different definitions according to different theories or schools. Therefore, as I offer a couple of concepts that might help to grasp the exact subject, I will try to demonstrate the concepts per the purpose of the research. Indeed, the definition of these concepts will be shaped within the realist framework, particularly the neoclassical realist theory's framework.

3.1. Foreign Policy

Definition of Foreign Policy

The definition of foreign policy has been stated differently by a lot of sources and encyclopedias. For instance, a famous encyclopedia *Britannica* proclaims that

foreign policy is a combination of a state's general activities and relationships with other states in the pursuit of its national interests.[47]

On the other hand, Political Science scholars made diverse descriptions of foreign policy. Whereas George Modelski defines foreign policy as ''the system of activities lead by a certain society which can change the behavior of state towards other states and can also regulate the internal reactions of the state.''[48], scholars like Padelford and Lincoln define foreign policy as ''the overall dealing of a state with its external environment''.[49] As it is implied in different definitions, the International Relations scholars separate in their comprehensions of foreign policy. While some scholars claim that foreign policy is merely the product of certain state elites decisions –a component of internal affairs-, some of them say that states' actions depend on their external environment or the international system.

Regardless, I argue that to make a more solid definition for our understanding we should dig the term down and separate the words ''foreign'' and ''policy''. The separation and description of these words would grant productivity to our definitions. Besides, we could easily distinguish the word ''domestic'' from ''foreign'' by doing so.

The term ''foreign'' usually means a state's external territorial borders in International Relations. In other words, by implying ''foreign'' we refer to a somewhat policy that is applied outside of a state's soil. For instance, whereas declaring war and sign treaties with other states are the subjects of foreign issues; improving the national education system, collecting taxes, elections are the subjects

[47] Britannica, ''Foreign Policy'', *britannica.com:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/foreign-policy, [Access Date: 15.07.2020].
[48] Bojang As, ''The Study of Foreign Policy in International Relations'', **Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs,** 6:4. 2018, p. 1.
[49] Bojang AS, p. 2.

of domestic issues. From this point on, the word ‘’domestic’’ corresponds to a range of policies that are solely made for a state’s internal bureaucracy.[50]

Apart from the distinction between foreign and domestic, one must also clarify the meaning of the term "policy" both for the sake of the research and reader. Yet, as opposed to other terms I enlightened above, the notion of policy is broader and includes the totality of some sort of subjects, issues, and activities as well. Besides, it is not limited to a combination of military and security or economic policies; on the contrary, it also includes issues as human rights, international environmental policy and others.[51]

Since it is stated as separate facts before, it would be useful to reunite them and examine the term ‘’foreign policy’’. As it was mentioned above, the definition of foreign policy might vary according to different standpoints or theories embedded in our scholarship. Therefore, it is impossible to reduce foreign actions only to the state level. In other words, NGOs, terrorists, state leaders, and international organizations might be the subject of foreign policy.[52] However, as it was stated before our theoretical model is neoclassical realism and thus, for the purpose of this research, the main focus should remain as the state with internal variables of domestic politics and external incentives of the international system.

Yet, analyzing foreign policy is not limited to physical standards like the internal and external borders of a state. Indeed, the place of the occurrence is still a measurement unit; however, we can also define policies according to intentions. For instance, a state can release a new economic plan in its own borders, but the new plan might also intend to alter the international economic system or trade system among states. In this case, the new plan would seem like the product of a state’s domestic politics, yet

[50] Ryan K. Beasley and others, **Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective Domestic and International Influences on State Behavior**, Second Edition, CQ Press, 2013, p. 2.
[51] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 4.
[52] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 3.

it intends to change the state's external environment. Therefore, it is an issue of foreign politics.[53]

Foreign Policy-Makers

Policies are considered as the product of government activities.[54] Thus, governments are the focal actors of foreign policy which act as a state apparatus to release and implement both domestic and foreign policies.

Nevertheless, in recent years through the effect of globalization all around the world, the actors of foreign policy have altered. Currently, leaders –as individuals, multinational corporations, international organizations, NGOs can direct foreign policies according to their interests, particularly through their economic goals.[55]

Still, for the purpose of this thesis the focal unit will be the US government and a couple of domestic actors such as lobbies and interest groups. Indeed, Realist theory also neglects all other actors in the international system, but states.

The determinants of foreign policy

Foreign policy analysis mostly refers to a bridge that concerns the impact of both internal and external politics on the state's reactions and interactions with another state.[56] Besides, FPA also examines the execution of foreign policy and the executive mechanisms or actors in the sense of state reactions towards other states in the system.[57]

---

[53] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 3.
[54] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 4.
[55] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 4.
[56] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 2.
[57] Philip B.K. Potter, ''Methods of Foreign Policy Analysis'', **Oxford Research Encyclopedia, International Studies**, March, 2010, p. 1.

In the same vein, for the purpose of this thesis, it is proper to argue that both internal and external factors directly and independently affect the state's foreign policies.[58] Furthermore, from a realist standpoint, states with strong relative material power are biased to mobilize their military forces when they feel threatened. Indeed, the threat I mention here is an external incentive/pressure that awakens the state's external reactions and alters foreign policy accordingly.[59]

Apart from this, the first and the foremost thing I have to offer here comes from the need for distinguishing external and internal determinants of foreign policy. As we say external determinants, it commonly corresponds to International System or Power Structure, International Law, Alliances, Military Strategy/Arms Race… On the other hand, domestic determinants of foreign policy mostly refer to Political System, Political Parties and Interest Groups, Economic Development and Natural Resources, Military Capabilities, Press and Public Opinion, Culture and History, Personality and Character of the Leader…[60] However, as it was stated in the previous chapter, the scope of this research will only include lobbies, interest groups, military capabilities within the notion of security priorities, public opinion and elections, the political system in the sense of US Presidents' Grand Strategies, history within the framework of foreign reactions as the sources of domestic determinants.

On the other hand, as an external determinant of foreign policy, I will only take the international system or power structure and military strategy into account due to the neoclassical standpoint we possessed in the thesis.

3.2. National Interest

As other terms that exist in our terminology, the *national interest* is also an archaic and a broad term at the same time. The national interest has deep roots and long

[58] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 333.
[59] Ryan K. Beasley and others, p. 315.
[60] For more information please see: Bojang As, ''The Study of Foreign Policy in International Relations'', **Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs**, 6:4, 2018, pp. 1-9.

history that evolved throughout time. At the end of my quest for the first usage of the term, I was not able to find neither a valid answer nor an appropriate implementation. This problem emerges from two different issues: Primarily, the term national interest used to have different meanings for each theory of international relations. Secondly, national interest differs from one state to another. Therefore, there is no single definition or implementation of national interest in history.

According to the famous encyclopedia –Britannica, the term was even used by Cardinal Richelieu during the 30-Years War. Yet, Britannica refers to this one of the initial usages of national interest as the practice of raison d'état. In other words, the term national interest also corresponds to the term raison d'état. However, it is logical to say that this practice of Richelieu led to the emergence of the Peace of Westphalia (1648)[61] and thus, it is also possible to argue that the national interest operates properly even though there is a disagreement for the definition.

Likewise, scholars of political science also bring different explanations to the national interest. According to Joseph S. Nye, it is used to describe the foreign policy. Yet there is an ongoing debate about whether national interest determines the foreign policy or not. In addition to that, he separates the notion of national interest according to regime types and he claims that in democratic regimes, the series of common tendencies and priorities on the subject of relationship with the external environment define the national interest.[62] Besides, Peter Trubowitz claims that the national interest has a social base in his book *Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy*. He claims that ''the national interest is a product of politics''; by stating this, he implies that the national interest arises from society. The society has the societal desires and interests that they inherit and thus,

[61] Britannica, ''The development of the foreign ministry and embassies'', *britannica.com.* https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy/The-spread-of-the-Italian-diplomatic-system#ref233744, [Access Date: 22.07.2020].
[62] Joseph S. Nye, "Redefining the National Interest", **Foreign Affairs,** 78, no. 4, (1999), pp. 22-24.

those state elites hold the power to collaborate with the government to be the part of the bureaucracy.[63]

Regardless, as it was stated above, the notion of national interest varies according to one IR theory to another. Since I adopted the realist perspective in my research model, the realist point of view for national interest is our only concern here. Indeed, the standpoint for the national interest changes among realist scholars too. Whereas the initial realist definition comes from a realist originated school that has been called 'objectivists' by Rosenau, classical realists like Morgenthau brings another definition to our scholarship. According to objectivists, objective reality clarifies the first and the foremost desires and interests of a nation-state. This objective reality corresponds to national interests in terms of usage and it leads both improvement and implementation of foreign policy within the realm of reality.[64] On the other hand, as a classical realist, Morgenthau clarifies the national interest phenomenon in his book *Politics Among Nations*. According to his point of view, each state must follow or conduct several political actions in order to govern its external environment to preserve its imperial status, an international reputation, and status quo. At this point, national interests are the guiding stars of nation-states in any kind of struggle with other nations. Moreover, Morgenthau adds that it is not a political duty but also moral. In addition, he claims that the essence of national interest is not stagnant; on the contrary, it changes constantly, particularly due to external and systemic incentives.[65] Generally, for traditional realists, the national interest is the essential guide that is responsible for conducting foreign policy actions in the state.[66] Yet, the traditional explanation of national interest is debatable for other schools of realism.

---

[63] Peter Trubowitz, **Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy**, The University of Chicago Press, 1998, p. 4.
[64] Scott Burchill, **The National Interest in International Relations Theory**, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p. 33.
[65] J. Peter Pham, ''What Is in the National Interest? Hans Morgenthau's Realist Vision and American Foreign Policy'', **American Foreign Policy Interests,** (30), 2008, p. 258.
[66] Scott Burchill, p. 43.

Apart from traditional realists, Kenneth Waltz argues that the national interest is not a duty or a necessity after all. As opposed to Morgenthau, he claims that the national interest works automatically and drives political leaders' choices.[67]

Nevertheless, neoclassical realists like Taliaferro, Ripsman, and Lobell argue that national interests may coincide with obstacles during its implementation. From their point of view, it is a tool for exclusive state officials and those state officials want to increase the effectiveness of national interests on foreign policy exercise. However, the internal characteristic of a state or nation might prevent the statesman to realize national interests.[68] So, in this case, neoclassical realism's standpoint for national interest overlaps with Trubowitz's definition of national interest, yet, the nature of neoclassical realism also focuses on domestic variables and its effect on national interest.

Although I will construct the third chapter around the historical tendencies of the US, I will also give a brief instruction about the linkage between national interests and the US. First of all, the Commission on America's National Interest (1996) declared that ''national interests are the fundamental building blocks in any discussion of foreign policy…'' and then the declaration adds that the definition of national interest addresses very ample community which includes Congress, state officials, and US citizens.[69] On the other hand, the CANI Declaration of 2000 claims that ''The only sound foundation for a sustainable American foreign policy is a clear sense of America's national interests. Only a foreign policy grounded in America's national interests can identify priorities for American engagement in the world.''[70] By the same token, Samuel Huntington emphasizes the impact of American national

[67] Scott Burchill, p. 43.
[68] Steven E. Lobell and others, pp. 140-142.
[69] Joseph S. Nye, p. 23.
[70] Graham T. Allison and Robert Blackwill, ''America's National Interests A Report from The Commission on America's National Interests''**, The Commission on America's National Interests**, 2000, p. 2.

identity on national interests. He claims that without the collective mind of national identity the US cannot determine its national interests.[71]

On the other hand, Peter Trubowitz argues that the US does not have certain national interests. His research demonstrates that the foreign policy of the American nation has witnessed a somewhat shifting throughout time.[72] However, as Brands argues in his article *''The Idea of the National Interest''*, the search for national interest in the US remained constant.[73]

Even though Nye claims that the American public does not interest their external environment as the way we thought, the essence of the American public's national interest consists of specific values and the promotion of these values for other nations.[74] For instance, both the American public and government officials believe that American democracy is supreme and thus, they want to increase democratic values among other nations. Therefore, recent foreign policies of the US have shaped around the promotion of democracy.

Additionally, according to Trubowitz, on a domestic base, the conflict within the US occurs due to two institutional structures. The first one is federalism and the second structure is the two-party system. Due to federalism, each state's responses to international challenges differ. Furthermore, without examining the sub-structures of the US' socio-economic system, the institutional role and ideas that shape political actions cannot be understood. In other words, the socio-economic system in the US shapes national interests.[75] The further explanations regarding national interest and American identical standpoint towards national interest will be touched upon in chapter 3 and 4.

---

[71] Joseph S. Nye, p. 22.
[72] Peter Trubowitz, pp. 1-2.
[73] H. W. Brands, "The Idea of the National Interest", **Diplomatic History**, 23, no. 2, (1999), p. 239.
[74] Joseph S. Nye, ''The American National Interest and Global Public Goods'', **International Affairs**, 78, no. 2, pp. 233-234 and, Joseph S. Nye, "Redefining the National Interest", **Foreign Affairs**, 78, no. 4, (1999), pp. 23-24.
[75] Peter Trubowitz, p. 4.

3.3. Grand Strategy

The roots of grand strategy are older than its very own name that we use today. Throughout history, most nations used various grand strategies under different phrases. Although the phrase is evolving, the purpose of grand strategies remained constant. Generally, the grand strategy means a state's future plans that contain every aspect of strategy that overlaps with the national interest of a country. Whereas each strategy offers short-term goals and actions through national interest, the grand strategy works as a long-term guiding map which regulates the state's actions by harnessing all available national/international tools and strategies.[76] By the same token, the essential purpose of the grand strategy is to set goals for precise upcoming plans and illustrate what the state's internal and external actions ought to be in accordance with its national interest. Besides, the grand strategy grants rationality, legitimacy, and morality to the state actions that could ease to conduct more precise foreign policy which throws the common moral values away for the country's national interests.[77] Even though the general definition of the grand strategy could seem straightforward initially, it should be noted that most of the scholars emphasize the complexity of separating such terms like strategy and foreign policy from the grand strategy, let alone the term grand strategy is also debatable and thus, there is no common agreement regarding the existence of grand strategy among scholars. Regardless, in order to grasp the difference among these terms, I will allude to this issue in the upcoming paragraphs.

The phrase of grand strategy is a brand new phenomenon in the lexicon. However, we can find the footprints of it in works and mentalities of Sun Tzu's The Art of War; Niccolo Machiavelli's The Prince, and in Thucydides's The History of the Peloponnesian War. To recapitulate, these philosophers never granted their strategies as the Grand Strategy. In other words, they implemented somewhat strategies without knowing that they were actually applying a grand strategy. Furthermore, we

[76] Britannica, ''Grand strategy'', *britannica.com:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/grand-strategy, [Access Date: 05.08.2020].
[77] Sarwar J. Minar, ''Why States Need Grand Strategy'', *Ourtime*, June, 2018, p. 1.

can also find another footmark of the grand strategy in the early stages of the 19th century. Yet, this time, some state elites and scholars started to understand the existence of grand strategy and what it is meant. We can observe this kind of initial awareness in Otto Von Bismarck's Realpolitik right before the eruption of WWI.[78] The former examples here I gave demonstrate the military-oriented grand strategies that only construct a one-dimensional grand strategy. In the upcoming examples, I will illustrate the evolution of grand strategies and how changing goals led to the evolution of the grand strategy from one dimensional to multiple. We can witness the change in the aim of grand strategy during WWII. At the beginning of WWII, the American and British state elites gathered together and argued about a couple of strategies that seemed separated from each other initially. Their priority was to consolidate peace after the catastrophe of the world war. Nevertheless, their only target was not the promotion of a permanent ceasefire but also, they intended to win the war as an initial step and then, increase the economic development all around the world both for American and British profits. Indeed, firstly those state elites tried to handle each strategy in itself. Then, they saw the need for a bigger –grand- strategy that covers every each strategy and offers a long-term path.[79] Therefore, the grand strategy as we know today emerged from this idea. It is possible to argue state that the militaristic aim of grand strategy converted to the promotion of a ceasefire and then, increase in the economy. However, some state elites realized that the grand strategy could contain each strategy in itself at the same time, and thus when we mean grand strategy it coincides with something bigger as the big picture or combination of all strategies.

In the scholarship of Political Science, some scholars deal with grand strategy by separating it into two phenomena as domestic grand strategy and foreign grand strategy. Nonetheless, I offered the term grand strategy above as the combination of all strategies; therefore, it is not plausible to cut grand strategy into pieces.[80] Besides,

---

[78] Timothy Andrews Sayle, ''Defining and Teaching Grand Strategy'', **Part of the FPRI-Temple University Consortium on Grand Strategy**, Vol. 4, January 2011, p. 1. and William C. Martel, **Grand Strategy in Theory and Practice**, Cambridge University Press, 2015, p. 24.
[79] William C. Martel, pp. 24-25.
[80] Alasdair Roberts, ''Grand Strategy Isn't Grand Enough'', *foreignpolicy.com*: https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/20/grand-strategy-isnt-grand-enough/, [Access Date: 07.08.2020].

both domestic and foreign strategy concerns might be composed of short-term plans and each strategy requires dealing with a narrower field rather than seeing the big picture. In sum, the grand strategy is a general term we use for mentioning the greater framework of a country's long-term future plans by depending on a particular path to serve for national interests. Still, it is possible to say that there's always been a linkage between foreign, domestic policy, and the grand strategy. On the one hand, foreign policy could be the reflection of the grand strategy in the international area. On the other hand, most of the time foreign policy works as the product of domestic politics[81] that driven by the country's national interests. In short, rather than conducting the whole grand strategy states can sometimes use single policies and strategies as the apparatus of the grand strategy. Moreover, the implementation of the grand strategy also depends on activating the domestic features and elements that embed in the nation-state which works as a catalyzer to consolidate the extraction of national resources and power in order to conduct foreign policy to realize the state's long-term profits.[82]

In this paragraph, I will quote from different strategists and political scientists in order to illustrate a further explanation of the grand strategy. It should be noted that our understanding of grand strategy is a compound which we grasp as a whole unit for the purpose of this thesis. For instance, Peter Trubowitz claims that grand strategy is "a means by which national leaders strive to maintain or strengthen their hold on executive power," and he adds that the implementation of foreign policy is not its only usage.[83] Another definition in accordance with the purpose of research comes from Stephen Krasner. Krasner argues that the grand strategy is a "conceptual framing that describes how the world is, envisions how it ought to be, and specifies a set of policies that can achieve that ordering."[84] In addition, realist scholar Hans Morgenthau was one of the first ones who brought a wide-range definition to grand strategy by stating it is ''the art of bringing the different elements of national power

[81] Sarwar J. Minar, p. 1.
[82] William C. Martel, p. 47.
[83] Alasdair Roberts, ''Grand Strategy Isn't Grand Enough'', *foreignpolicy.com*: https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/20/grand-strategy-isnt-grand-enough/, [Access Date: 07.08.2020].
[84] William C. Martel, p. 31.

to bear with maximum effect upon those points in the international situation which concern the national interest most directly.''[85]

After WWII, the establishment of the grand strategy became more important for the US state elites for pursuing US national interests in a long and stable term. Yet, the American version of the grand strategy also leads debates among US statesman and scholars who studies this issue. Each president in the US offers new grand strategies during their own presidency. From this point on, some scholars claim that grand strategy is in an ongoing change in the US from one president to another but, some scholars disagree with this idea. On the contrary, they argue that due to the stability in the US national interests the grand strategy hasn't witnessed any major changes, still, slight changes are inevitable. I will dig the American Grand Strategy down in chapter 5.

3.4. Foreign Policy-Making In US

The policy-making process has its own ambiguities and uniqueness that require too many actors. It is also too fragile due to the complex impact of these agents over one to another. This research will investigate some components of ''foreign'' policy-making act in some parts and chapters throughout the thesis. In general, the policy-making process divides internally and externally. Yet, some scholars argue that domestic politics bears a country's foreign policy and thus, they do not see any further need to distinguish each policy-making process. Nonetheless, in the example of the US, it is hard to define each process. This is because the US has been composed of 50 different states that are relatively independent in their domestic politics. Therefore, even though we can consider that the president and congress may deal with general domestic issues, each state's domestic concerns might vary with their separated executive, legislative, and judicial organs from the federal government. In other words, it is important to emphasize the word ''foreign'' as referring to the policy-making process in the US. It is significant to remember that

[85] William C. Martel, p. 32.

our methodology in this thesis includes the foreign policy analysis in a comparative modal. Hence, when I refer to the policy-making process, I neglect every systemic input of each 50 states and focus on the federal government and the intervening domestic variables that could influence the foreign policy-making action.

The Constitution of the United States (1787) distributes the power among presidents, Congress, and the Supreme Court. In other words, the US Constitution divides executive, legislative, and judicial power, rather than charging the president according to the union of powers principle. Besides, the 'check and balance' mechanism in the US was empowered by the constitution; whereas the president has the power of veto for legislative decisions, the Congress can override the president's veto power. On the other hand, the Supreme Court could declare a policy of a president or a legislative decision of a congress unconstitutional.[86]

The Constitution of the United States separates foreign-policy powers too. According to constitution the Congress holds the power to deploy military units and can declare war, while the president acts as the commander-in-chief.[87] Since this study aims to examine the grand strategies of the last three US presidents and offers their implementation in China and Iran as case studies, it is crucial to understand the president's overall duties during the foreign policy-making process. At first, the power of an American president may seem boundless, furthermore a president might seem like the one and only deciding-mechanism in foreign policy. Hence, the constitution of the US balances the power of the president with the American Congress which works as a domestic executive and a legislative branch that limits presidential power. To elaborate, it is possible to argue that the American Constitution prevents the tyranny of one-man or restricts the establishment of an

[86] Foreign Policy Association, ''How U.S. Foreign Policy Is Made'' *fpa.org:* https://fpa.org/features/index.cfm?act=feature&announcement_id=45&show_sidebar=0, [Access Date: 12.08.2020].
[87] John Dumbrell and David M. Barrett, **The Making of US Foreign Policy,** 2nd Edition, Manchester University Press, 1997, p. 55.

oligarchy within the borderlines of the US.[88] Therefore, this part will also touch upon the congressional power in the bureaucracy of foreign policy-making.

Notably, it must be noted that sometimes the executive branch would be superior to Congress; however, in some cases, it might be the opposite. It is possible to divide such policies into three as; crisis, strategic and structural. Whereas strategic policies are related to national interests, tactics, and goals of foreign policy and security issues, the crisis policies are regarding external threats to the US. The structural policies deal with the productivity of national resources and how efficient are they used, in this type of policies the American Congress is superior. As opposed to structural policies, both the presidential and executive power are at their maximum in crisis policies. In comparison to crisis policies, the presidential power's effect decreases over the strategic issues.[89]

In terms of foreign policy-making, the executive board and Congress have their own frictions between each other. This friction occurs due to the unclarified articles that arrange and grants overall duties to each branch. The American Constitution does not clarify which apparatus of the state is responsible for the foreign policy-making process. In spite of clarifying that, the constitution divides the power of making policy among these two organs, the Congress and the executive branch. Therefore, their interests and duties in the aspect of foreign policy-making are overlapping. Despite their overlapping duties, it is still possible to make division among their capabilities of foreign policy-making. For instance, presidents are allowed to make foreign policy decisions through:

- Policy implementation,
- Negotiation,
- International response,

[88] Foreign Policy Association, ''How U.S. Foreign Policy Is Made'', *fpa.org:* https://fpa.org/features/index.cfm?act=feature&announcement_id=45&show_sidebar=0, [Access Date: 12.08.2020].
[89] James M. Lindsay and Randall B. Ripley, "How Congress Influences Foreign and Defense Policy", **Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences**, 47, no. 6, (1994), pp. 10-12.

- Independent action,
- Statement of policy,
- Proposal for legislation.

On the other hand, the Congress might make such policy via:

- Congressional Oversight,
- Pressure,
- Directives,
- Advice,
- Resolution and policy statements,
- Restriction.[90]

Most scholars who study Congress assertiveness on US foreign policy claim that the president is the leading actor in the foreign policy-making process, yet according to some scholars Congress influences foreign policy but, it does not pioneer major changes. On the other hand, scholars like Hinckley argue that both organs have little impact due to their competition over their overlapping duties in the foreign policy-making process.[91]

Moreover, such actors as interest groups and lobbies, media, and public opinion have an impact on the presidential power of foreign policy-making. However, I will emphasize the influence of these futures on chapter 4. Still, one must know that since all these actors are overlapping during the foreign policy-making action, it would be useful to separate all these features and grasp each of them solely as an initial step. Then, in order to illustrate the interactions of all agents I will reunite them at the end. Therefore, our primary step starts with examining presidential power and then the American congress.

---

[90] For more information please see: Richard F. Grimmett, ''Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress'', **Congressional Report Service Report for Congress,** 1999.

[91] James M. Scott and Ralph G. Carter, ''Acting on the Hill: Congressional Assertiveness in U.S. Foreign Policy'', **Congress & the Presidency**, 29:2, 2002, p. 153.

3.4.1. Presidential power and foreign policy

After the American War of Independence (1776), there was a huge endeavor to prepare a constitution for a newly independent America. Eventually, such efforts ended up with the construction of a successful American Constitution in 1787. According to this new constitution, there are two different and interrelated mechanisms that conduct the US foreign policy: The American President and the Congress (Senate and House of Representative). Therefore, the first presidential elections were held in 1788 due to the need for a head of state, and the journey of the American presidential system had begun.

The constitution of the US regulates the presidential power and grants such authorization that helps the president to lead the American nation. According to the American constitution, the president is the head of the state and the head of the executive branch at the same time. Also, a president shall become the commander-in-chief during wartime. The president shall appoint the ambassadors, judges of the Supreme Court, ministers for his executive cabinet;[92] and shall create another organization where there is no unit in the US that corresponds to such issue and due to the need of personnel for new units the American president shall appoint agents for these special units.[93] The American president has the authority to sign treaties, form policies, implement and interpret law[94] and sign the legislation into law or veto bill that formed by the Congress, unless the two-third votes of both houses in the Congress reserved the right of veto for bills. The president has the authority to sign treaties providing that the two-thirds approval votes of the Senate.[95] Indeed, the first

[92] Law.Cornell.,''Article II'', *law.cornell.edu*: https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/articleii, [Access Date: 19.08.2020].
[93] Morton H. Halperin and others, **Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy**, Second Edition, The Brookings Institution, 2006, p. 305.
[94] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, p. 10.
[95] Whitehouse, ''The Executive Branch'', *whitehouse.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/the-executive-branch/, [Access Date: 19.08.2020].

and the essential duty of an American President is to preserve American national interests.[96]

It must be noted that executive power has witnessed couple of changes throughout time. These evolutions occurred due to the requirement that emerged because of the ongoing transformation, age-to-age, all around the world. For instance, today an American president is allowed to run the oval office only for two terms due to the restrictions that the American constitution brought in 1951 with the twenty-second amendment. Such limitation passed from Congress after 32nd President Franklin Delano Roosevelt won the presidential elections for the fourth time. He was the first and the last American president who served for four terms.[97] However, this was not the only change that occurred in history, Franklin D. Roosevelt also created the Executive Office of the President (EOP) in 1939. The EOP is responsible for several duties like preserving American national interests in treaties or proclaiming the president's message to the public.[98] After the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the vice president Harry Truman became his successor and he brought a very modern understanding of the American presidential system. After WWII, the presidential power over the foreign policy became more predominant and it even became more prominent with the Korean War. Harry Truman and the secretary of state Dean Acheson's actions during wartime have changed the archaic executive power implementations in foreign policy. Harry Truman deployed the American troops in South Korea to defend the American interests and promote democratic values without the authorization of Congress. With this decision, President Truman demonstrated the ability of the total presidential control on US armed forces during wartime and disabled the war powers of Congress. Likewise, the presidential power over the foreign policy had been tested during the Dwight Eisenhower's, John F. Kennedy's, Lyndon Johnson's, and Richard Nixon's presidencies, particularly with

[96] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, p. 10.
[97] Whitehouse, ''Assuming the Presidency at the depth of the Great Depression as our 32nd President (1933-1945), Franklin D. Roosevelt helped the American people regain faith in themselves'', *whitehouse.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/presidents/franklin-d-roosevelt/, [Access Date: 01.11.2020].
[98] Whitehouse. ''The Executive Branch''. *whitehouse.gov* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/the-executive-branch/ [Access Date: 19.08.2020].

the war of Vietnam and occasions in Haiti and the Gulf War.[99] One of the most prominent examples for the extension of presidential power was the pass of Tonkin Gulf Resolution in 1964 which gave wide range of authority to President Johnson to take any measures that he believed were necessary. The bill also approved any kind of use of force in Southeast Asia, particularly in Vietnam and became the justification during the Vietnam War.[100] In fact, it coincided with the assassination of J.F. Kennedy and it was the years of turmoil, and thus Americans were still in shock. It is possible to argue that in order to extend his presidential power in foreign politics, President Johnson also used the patriotism card to persuade Congress and gain public opinion. As a matter of fact, right after the pass of Tonkin Gulf Resolution, most of the Congress members believed that they were tricked by President Johnson and his close friend Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara who lied to Congress to ensure the pass of the resolution. Besides, another close friend of President Johnson, Senator William Fullbright persuaded the entire Congress whilst only two Senators from Alaska and Oregon were against the bass of a bill.[101] Today, most of the scholars also argue that President Johnson tricked and lied to Congress only for acquiring wide range of authorization. Indeed, the Congress abolished the Tonkin Gulf Resolution due to its wide range rights that gives to American Presidents and in 1973, during Nixon's presidency, the Congress proclaimed War Powers Resolution in place of Tonkin Gulf Resolution.[102] As in terms of declaring war, American presidents might act unilaterally during the different processes such as the purchase of Louisiana, the annexation of Texas, freeing the slaves, the captivity of the Japanese, cancellation of the US treaty responsibilities to Taiwan.[103] In such cases, no house of the American Congress has overridden the presidential decisions. Although these presidents had neglected the war powers act, as opposed to these cases the Congress had vetoed Woodrow Wilson's decision of joining the League of Nations at the end of WWI. The 28th president of the United States of

[99] John Dumbrell and David M. Barrett, pp. 58-65.
[100] History.com, ''Gulf of Tonkin Resolution'', *history.com:* https://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/gulf-of-tonkin-resolution-1, [Access Date: 21.11.2020].
[101] Karen Elise Schwindt, ''The Obligation for Patriotism: Why Congress Passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution'', Research Paper, 2009, pp. 16-17, 23-24.
[102] Scott Bomboy, ''The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the limits of presidential power'', *constitutioncenter.org:* https://constitutioncenter.org/blog/the-gulf-of-tonkin-and-the-limits-of-presidential-power, [Access Date: 21.11.2020].
[103] Terry M. Moe and William G. Howell, ''Unilateral Action and Presidential Power: A Theory'', **Presidential Studies Quarterly,** 29, no. 4, (December), pp. 851-852.

America was reluctant to engage in war (WWI); on the contrary, he wanted to maintain the neutrality of the US as former presidents did.[104] However, in 1917, a German submarine attacked on trade ship which belonged to the US. After that, President Wilson had to declare war against Germany.[105] At the end of the war, he offered the establishment of the League of Nations for the aim of a collective and more stabilized world. However, the Senate did not vote in favor of joining the League of Nations and the US government did not involve such an organization that gathered Europeans. Yet, this was not the only example of Senate-impede. After the Turkish War of Independence, the US and Turkish delegation signed a Treaty of Amity and Commerce at Lausanne Conference, 1923 apart from the original treaty of Lausanne that was signed between newly-established Turkish Government and European Powers. Nevertheless, as for the membership incident of League of Nations, the US Senate did not ratify the good fellowship treaty. The escalation of tension in US and emergence of opponent and proponent groups within Senate stalled the ratification or rejection of treaty, thence, the US Senate waited for 4 years, until 1927 to reject the Turkish-US peace treaty. The main reason behind this rejection had deeper roots which leans to the Ottoman Empire stages. For Americans the Ottoman Empire was an orient state and its Muslim identity worsens the partnership due to the 'Islam is the enemy of Christianity.' perception among public. In particular, Ahmed Rüstem Bey's interview, who was ambassador to US, escalated tension between those two nations due to his rough criticizes. In the light of these occasions, American public saw newly-established Turkish Republic as the continuity of the Ottoman Empire. Besides, the Senate looked for obtaining more extend rights and privileges from the treaty. Therefore, the Senate did not ratify the signed treaty and another presidential decision had overridden within the same term.[106] In sum, the domestic features in the US, particularly the Congress in this case, may impede the foreign policy decisions and external interactions of the

[104] Brooke L. Blower, "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941", **Diplomatic History,** 38, no. 2, (April 2014), p. 365.

[105] For more information please check: Margaret MacMillan, "World War I: The War That Changed Everything", **Wall Street Journal,** June 20, 2014.

[106] For more information please see: John M. Vander Lippe, ''The "Other" Treaty Of Lausanne: The American Public and Official Debate On Turkish-American Relations'', **The Turkish Yearbook**, Vol. XXIII, 1993, pp. 31-63.

executive apparatus with the so-called domestic concerns and its disapproving attitude.

The president of the US and his executive cabinet are the faces of the country that conducts foreign policy decisions and take part during their implementation. Furthermore, the executive branch in the US is expected to be the respondent towards the international issues that might occur in any part of the world[107] and thus, it is possible to argue that the executive branch also works as an oversight in examining international influences and interferes when it becomes a threat to the US. As it was emphasized above, the foreign policy decisions are not only made by the President but also, the Secretary of State, White House, and the State Department take part in the US policy-making system.[108] Hence, the president and his consulting crew are the significant actors, because those actors are also setting parameters to the decision-making process.[109] Since the Congress observes domestic impact of public opinion and interest groups, the president and his executive cabinet are acting more predominantly in foreign policy.[110]

Indeed, the Constitution of the US gives the authority and almost all sources of the country to the president and makes him the chief actor in foreign policy. According to the American constitution, the president shall define his own foreign policy pathway and his external goals in the light of his belief in preserving the American interests and create his own policy-making/decision-making system. Therefore, the presidential system in the US might seem hierarchical due to the power of the president.[111] Yet, as I emphasized in the previous paragraph with President Wilson-illustration, the president's influence on foreign policy depends on his interactions with lobbies, interest groups, and especially with Congress. In short, if a president wants to implement his foreign policy choice, then he should act according to domestic considerations and collaborate with domestic actors as lobbies or interest

[107] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, p. 10.
[108] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, p. 10.
[109] Asaf Siniver, **Nixon, Kissinger, and U.S. Foreign Policy Making: The Machinery of Crisis**, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 22.
[110] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, pp. 10-11.
[111] Asaf Siniver, p. 22.

groups to get what he wants. In addition, the economic situation within the country and ideological, historical priorities and values of the US might lead the president's foreign policy choices.[112] The president's interaction with the public is also as important as the interactions with Congress. Most of the time presidents seek to gain public support for his popularity and thus, the public opinion might lead his political actions. In particular, during the presidential elections, a president's popularity among the society is linear with his actions that are done for the greater good of the American nation. For instance, while President George W. Bush was running for the second term at the oval office, the American public gave full support to his 'war on terror' policy, moreover, his opponent supported the war on terror for the support of the voters too.[113] Nevertheless, since George Bush was the president at that time he also took some of his actions towards the enemies of the US for the support of voters. Hence, he elected for another term of the American presidency.

In the following chapters, our investigation regarding the impact of the domestic phenomena that it was stated above will be discussed furtherly.

3.4.2. Congress and foreign policy

Another significant organ in the foreign policy-making process is the American Congress that is run from Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. As it is stated above, the American Constitution separates power among three state apparatus and Congress is located as the legislative branch in the equation with its power of influencing the foreign policy-making process along with the executive branch, particularly with the president. In accordance with this info, the role of Congress in foreign policy starts with the act of legislation. Congress, in particular the Senate, approves or disapproves of international treaties and/or nominations that the president signed earlier or Congress can pass a law bill regarding the international issues. Hence,

[112] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, pp. 12-17.
[113] Morton H. Halperin and others, pp. 67-68.

Congress impacts the US interplay with the rest of the world, including the NGOs and International Organizations[114] through its power to legislate.

The American Congress has first emerged as an idea that desires to check and balance executive powers. The state elites like George Washington and Alexander Hamilton sought to establish a strong and powerful government and thus, they established the American Constitution through this aspiration. Whereas the Article II regulates powers and duties of the executive branch, the Article I grants powers to the American Congress, such as declaring war, enacting a law, approving or disapproving international treaties that are signed by the president. As a part of the Anglo-American concept, Congress is composed of 2 different chambers that constantly check and divide crucial duties in between of each other. According to this, whilst the Parliament of the UK divides as House of Commons and Lords, the separation in the American Congress was established as the House of Representatives and the Senate. Each organ has a different amount of members and elects contrarily. The House of Representatives contains 435 members and their election is based on the population rates of 50 states in the US. The members of this house are elected for two years. In addition, there are 6 non-voting members in the House of Representatives, including D.C., Puerto Rico, and four other territories of the US. As opposed to the crowded representative population at the Capitol Hill, the Senate has lesser members based on the election of 2 senators from each state. In sum, the Senate has 100 members who are coming from 50 different states of the US. The other difference between these houses is the duration of the deputy's election. Each member of the Senate is elected for 6 years, besides, one-third of the Senate re-elect for every two years. Additionally, both houses' approval is required to pass a bill. On the other hand, Congress has the right of overriding presidential veto providing that the two-third vote of each chamber against the presidential veto.[115]

[114] Toni Johnson, ''Congress and U.S. Foreign Policy'', *cfr.org:* https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/congress-and-us-foreign-policy, [Access Date: 28.08.2020].
[115] Whitehouse, ''The Legislative Branch'', *whitehouse.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/the-legislative-branch/, [Access Date: 21.08.2020].

The Article I also arranges foreign efficiency of the Congress, including raise and support armies; maintain and adjust foreign trade with other countries; regulation of US military forces. Furthermore, Congress gathers for annual budget hearings in order to prevent waste of money in bureaucracy, military, and diplomatic interactions. This responsibility demonstrates that the American Congress also works as the oversight in general bureaucratic processes. Besides, Congress might open investigation or report requirements from relevant authorities if the national security or foreign policy interactions are at stake. Congress may also form new executive agencies or remove them entirely.[116]

As the four mentioned presidents above increased their effectiveness in foreign policy, their efforts to become predominant led to the emergence of reforms within Congress too. Starting with the Second World War, the Congressional reforms have witnessed its heydays during the post-Vietnam War phase. According to some scholars, these reforms did not empower the entire Congress, rather it decreased the whole power of Congress and grant special powers and effectiveness to individuals in Congress. This kind of power allows the individual to create public opinion within the Congress regarding foreign policy issues.[117] Nevertheless, some scholars, like James M. Scott and Ralph G. Carter, partially disagree with this point of view and argue that while the foreign policy activities of the Congress declined, the Congress' assertiveness increased after the Vietnam War.[118] They even take their argument further and argue that the American Congress acts differently in different phases but these different roles are shaped around its assertive nature.

Their research model indicates that the Congress' roles in foreign policy-making might change according to time and circumstances starting from WWII and reach to 1997. Congress embraced four different roles throughout this interim and these are Strategic, Competitive, Disengaged, and Supportive types of a Congress. Whereas the Disengaged Congress can work with the president in a harmony and choose to be

---

[116] Jonathan Masters, ''U.S. Foreign Policy Powers: Congress and the President'', *cfr.org:* https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/us-foreign-policy-powers-congress-and-president, [Access Date: 21.08.2020].
[117] James M. Scott and Ralph G. Carter, p. 153.
[118] James M. Scott and Ralph G. Carter, p. 151.

more active in domestic politics, the Cooperating Congress collaborates with the executive branch for realizing American foreign policy goals. The other types of Congress usually challenge with the president but, whilst the Competitive Congress is active and assertive at the same time, the Strategic role of the Congress requires to be less active as being more assertive in order to impede actions of the executive branch.[119] Indeed, the constantly transforming Congress has its own methods to be the predominant power in foreign policy-making or at least to make pressure over the executive branch regarding the foreign policy issues. In this regard, James M. Lindsay and Randall B. Ripley offer four diverse procedures of influencing foreign policy in their study ''How Congress Influences Foreign and Defense Policy''. These techniques of the American Congress are divided as direct and indirect. The three of them are indirect means of influencing foreign policy and only one of them contains a direct effect of such impact.[120] The methods are as follows:

- *Substantive Legislation,*
- *Anticipated Reactions,*
- *Procedural Legislation,*
- *Framing Opinion.*[121]

Substantive Legislation is the only way to affect foreign policy directly. In this method, the Congress shall influence the foreign and defense policy by enacting a law, passing a bill, or disapprove an executive act by claiming it as unconstitutional.[122]

The first and foremost indirect way of influence is Anticipated Reactions which emerges from the verb anticipate and requires prediction of other branches' actions. In this model, both the executive and legislative branches act as chess players and adjust their actions according to the opponent's moves. The other indirect method is

[119] James M. Scott and Ralph G. Carter, p. 164.
[120] James M. Lindsay and Randall B. Ripley, p. 7.
[121] James M. Lindsay and Randall B. Ripley, p. 7.
[122] James M. Lindsay and Randall B. Ripley, p. 14.

Procedural Legislation. The Procedural Legislation intents to change the decision-making process due to the belief of 'change in procedure changes the policy'. The target here is the participant's ideas and behaviors that joins to the policy-making process. Besides, since it contributes to constructing a winning coalition and electorally beneficial, the Congress members are attracted by the Procedural Legislation method. The Procedural Legislation method divides into five procedures in itself too. According to this, the Congress might ask for a required report, form new bureaucratic institutions within the executive branch, use its legislative veto, escalate such conditions that ambush the executive branch in a troubled time, especially in military basing issues, and empower new groups for influencing the decision-making process. The last method that is been using to direct foreign policy by Congress is the way of Framing an Opinion. The members of Congress aim to change the overall climate that is fenced around a policy. The American Congress believes that the most solid way to change policies that are controversial to its interests is also possible by changing public opinion and creating a favorable coalition among state elites. In this regard, the Congress depends on numerous ways including, reports, radio appearances, orations, and committee hearings to direct public opinion.[123]

It is emphasized earlier that the friction between Congress and the executive branch is a notable issue that occurs due to the ambiguities in the American Constitution related to the foreign policy-making process. Furthermore, as I elaborated in previous paragraphs, due to some sort of tensions the Congress has been trying to become more assertive over foreign policy issues particularly after WWII. These endeavors comprise ending US participation in the Vietnam War, voting down the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, creating a Russian-American exchange program, and codifying the economic embargo on Cuba. Furthermore, the 42nd president of US, Bill Clinton faced one of the most challenging experiences with Congress, especially after 1994 mid-term elections. As many scholars argue, the turbulent years for Clinton started after Democrat Party's defeat on all levels of government in 1994. Democrats lost eight seats of Senate, however the very devastating part was not the

[123] James M. Lindsay and Randall B. Ripley, pp. 18, 22-24, 27-28.

loss of seats but losing the majority of Senate by losing those seats. Besides, Republicans derived 54 House of Representative seats in the same election.[124] After Republican's taking the control, the contentious term has started for Democrat President Bill Clinton. As the first signal of an obstacle, Clinton confronted the Republican Congress' unwillingness during the 1995's budget proposals. These disputes between Democrats and Republicans within the Congress led the governmental shutdown due to funding conflicts –education, healthcare, environmental budget- in 1996.[125] Yet, this was only the beginning and the situation got worse. It is a well-known fact that the argumentative relationship between Republican Senator Jesse Helms and President Clinton was one of the most compelling factors in the post-1994 era for Bill Clinton. Indeed, Senator Helms even threatened Bill Clinton before his visit to North Carolina military base. Yet, Senator Helms had to apologize and proclaim that his unfortunate statements and threats were mistake.[126] Still those were not the worst part of Clinton's turmoil years. The actual hit was the expose of his secret affair with a White House intern and trials on sexual abuse; thus the impeachment hearings for Clinton came after. Nonetheless, President Clinton was a real survivor, he acquitted from the hearings in 1999, but he had to sacrifice what he believed in the sense of multilateral international affairs and trust in international organizations. As many of the Congress members argue, mostly Republicans, when President Clinton ordered the US-led airstrike to Iraq in 1998, this was only to distract attention from his impeachment trials. Even though President Clinton's alibi was valid –Iraq's refusal to cooperate with UN for weapons inspection,[127] his conflicting foreign policy approach to airstrikes and timing of the decision was suspicious. However, after his survival from the hearings in 1999, he continued to intervene in problematic regions through deploying American soldiers or American-led operations under the umbrella of NATO, in particular his decision

[124] Charles F. Bingman and Bernard T. Pitsvada, ''Perceptions of Federal Management In The Clinton Era'', **Public Administration**, Vol. 76, Winter 1998, p. 763.
[125] Charles F. Bingman and Bernard T. Pitsvada, pp. 772-775.
[126] Melissa Healy, ''Helms Stirs Furor With Warning to President : Politics: Senator says Clinton 'better watch out' if he visits N. Carolina bases. He later admits to 'mistake.''', *latimes:* https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1994-11-23-mn-691-story.html, [Access Date: 22.11.2020].
[127] History.com, ''President Clinton orders air attack on Iraq'', *history.com:* https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/clinton-orders-air-attack-on-iraq, [Access Date: 22.11.2020].

to bomb Kosovo with NATO reinforces.[128] In this regard, one might think that due to the change in the nature of international environment President Clinton might also changed his foreign policy attitude towards these kind of issues. To extend the samples, it would be also plausible to examine the Congress pressures on the administration for the reconstruction both in Afghanistan and Iraq[129] that are also cover the main topic of this research, the President Bush era. On the other hand, during the presidency of Barack Obama, Congress refused to give authority to the president for joining to NATO-led operations in Libya, 2011.[130] This decision of the Congress and Hilary Clinton's declaration regarding the inexpediency of approval escalated the dispute between these two actors in the US. Likewise, in the same term of his presidency, Congress banned the closure of Guantanamo Bay Prison as opposed to Obama promised before he got elected.[131]

In conclusion, due to the notion of separation of powers and strong check and balance mechanism in the US with the ambiguities in making foreign policy procedures, it is hard to maintain a consistent approach or method during the decision making phase. By the same token, the friction between the executive and legislative branches to take control of the foreign policy-making process weakens both organs and thus, both have little influence on US foreign policy.

[128] For more information please check: John F. Harris, **The Survivor: Bill Clinton in the White House**, Random House Trade, 2005, Ch. 36.
[129] Ralph G. Carter and James M. Scott, **Choosing to Lead: Understanding Congressional Foreign Policy Entrepreneurs**, Duke University Press, 2009, pp. 5-6.
[130] BBC, ''House of Representatives votes against US Libya role'', *bbc.com:* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-13908202, [Access Date: 21.08.2020].
[131] Katie Reilly, ''5 Reasons President Obama Hasn't Been Able to Close Guantanamo Bay'', *time.com:* https://time.com/4179278/state-of-the-union-guantanamo-bay-president-obama/, [Access Date: 21.08.2020].

4. IDEATIONAL BASES OF US FOREIGN POLICY

There has always been a resemblance between a country and a trivet. In the example of trivet, there are three legs that are inseparable due to the delicate balance. A country is just like a trivet that contains a lot of inseparable features and most them are inherited within the statecraft culture which formed throughout time. It is not the soil that makes country the people's home; on the contrary, it is impossible to imagine a country without society, unique values, historical legacy, and shared feature goals. In the construction of grand strategy, too many variables play different roles and each of them influence a state's long term plans. Therefore, in this study, I argue that the society and American historical legacy play a part during the development of an American Grand Strategy. Hence, in order to understand the notion of grand strategy, it is necessary to grasp American Exceptionalism and some historical cornerstones in the American history.

As it was indicated before, the grand strategy is not a new phenomenon, but so does not the US as a country. American values, ideology and supremacy in the minds of Americans embed in the dusty shelfs of history. In the historical layer, the US has witnessed a lot of expansionist incidents and policy shift phases starting with its War of Independence and struggles during its establishment. In this research, our perception starts from this argument to explain American ideology, in particular the American public ideology and way of life. In other words, it is possible to say that the American way of life and its entire ideology are the outcomes of the US' historical evolutions. Therefore, this chapter will be based on American expansion in the sense of Manifest Destiny and two mainstream thoughts (isolationism and internationalism) that changes according to international environment and presidents' grand strategies throughout time with American exceptionalism and the American public ideology as the outcomes of expansionist movements, isolationist and internationalist policies.

Before explaining the overall territorial expansionist idea and two mainstream thoughts that has been leading US since the very beginning of its establishment, it would be useful to touch upon the foundation of US. To understand the American expansion and its ideology we should touch upon to the American *'War of Independence'* at first. Before the war of independence, the US was a colonial state of Great Britain. After the *'Seven Years War'*, the collapse of the grand France Empire in the American continent had started. As one of the consequences of the war, France had to turn over its territories to Great Britain.[132] After this great victory, the first 13 colony-state had established under the leadership of the UK. As an initial regulation, England appointed new governors to each state and started to execute these 13 colonies by the help of its newly appointed politicians. At the same time, the UK was gaining new territories and moving forward to the West side of North America. However, this new colony system was a failure for the UK due to its wrong management and high taxes. As a result of its oppressed executive style,[133] these 13 colonies upraised against them and started the War of Independence in 1775. In other words, it was an uprising which led by British governors in 13 colonies. In sum, it was such a rebellion that occurred against UK reign. At the end of the war in 1783, these 13 colonies had proclaimed their independence and became a new country,[134] called the United States of America, and thus the US that we know started its independent historical journey as a federal country. In the following sub-chapter I will examine the American Exceptionalism and US' territorial expansion and how the American priorities affected these expansionist movements.

4.1. American Exceptionalism

American Exceptionalism is a broad term that infiltrated into every part of life in US. Whereas it has religious, public, educational, identical sides; it also has political and economic sides. In the political science literature anyone who studies US knows that

[132] ''Amerikan Tarihinin Ana Hatlari'', *USEM:* http://www.usemb-ankara.org.tr/ABDAnaHatlar/Tarih.htm#b3, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[133] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, **This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity,** UNC Press Books, 2010, pp. 55-56, 91-97, 107.
[134] To see the map of American Expansion please check: https://worldview.stratfor.com/article/united-states-territorial-expansion-0.

there is an unseen and solid tie between foreign politics and American Exceptionalism. In other words, those two phenomena shape each other. In particular, this tie empower itself when the exceptionalism effects the American national identity. For instance, Hilde Eliassen Restad argues that US political choice regarding being isolationist or internationalist depends on the type of exceptionalism. If the exceptionalism type is missionary then the US political applications will be shaped around internationalism, or visa versa, if US policy makers embrace isolationist political attitude towards the rest of the world, then it is exemplary exceptionalism.[135] Since, the notion of American Exceptionalism is a broad term to comprehend; it would be useful to look up the core explanation of the term.

American Exceptionalism

According to Deborah L. Madsen, American Exceptionalism as a term has deep roots and as old as the American history. In fact, she argues that it penetrated into every parts of American history.[136] Most of the scholars who studies American Exceptionalism states that the *Democracy in America*'s author Alexis de Tocqueville was the first historian who defined US as 'exceptional', but they rarely touch upon the beginning of exceptionalist movement. American Exceptionalist movement starts even before the foundation of US, it begins with the Massachusetts Bay Colonists (Puritans). Madsen argues that since they were the explorers of a new continent and started the flame of some sort of developments, these colonists were enthusiastic to create New World and they saw themselves as they had some kind of divine and special destiny to do that. In their opinion, this new world was given by the God for saving the fallen and corrupted humanity.[137]

Many scholars who study on American Exceptionalism have different approaches and their explanations regarding the term vary. In other words, whereas some

[135] Hilde Eliassen Restad, ''Old Paradigms in History Die Hard in Political Science: US Foreign Policy and American Exceptionalism'', **American Political Thought,** Vol. 1, No. 1, (Spring 2012), pp. 56-57.
[136] Deborah L. Madsen, **American Exceptionalism**, Illustrated edition, University Press of Mississippi, (July 1, 1998). p. 1.
[137] Deborah L. Madsen, 1-2.

scholars like Stephen M. Walt accept the superiority of American exceptionalism, other international relations authors, as Seymour Martin Lipset the author of a critical book on American Exceptionalism, American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword,[138] criticizes the term due to its overrated nature. Generally the term American Exceptionalism is mostly known as a set of values, ideology, and prioritized identity that makes US and Americans 'exceptional'. On the other hand, some scholars argue that these exceptional values are celestial and they were given by the God to US for spreading these values to the humanity. For instance, as Henry Kissinger search for a better comprehension regarding the US position in the world, he refers to President Woodrow Wilson's and Thomas Jefferson's words on messianic notion of America in order to consolidate the argument regarding American Exceptionalism.[139] In other words, Wilson was among real belivers who defend the phenomena that America is a chosen country and a nation by God. In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson gave a speech at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He stated that:

''It was as if in the Providence of God a continent has been kept unused and waiting for a peaceful people who loved liberty and the rights of men more than they loved anything else, to come and set up an unselfish commonwealth.''[140]

On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson emphasized the US' divine mission with these words:

''…that circumstances denied to others, but indulged to us, have imposed on us the duty of providing what is the degree of freedom and self-government in which a society may nevture to leave its individual members.''[141]

In other words, most of the Americans believe that they and their country have a mission to teach and help the proliferation of American democratic values all around

[138] Seymour Martin Lipset, **American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword**, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1997.
[139] Henry Kissinger, **Diplomacy**, Reprint, Simon & Schuster, 1995, p. 33, 45-46.
[140] Woodrow Wilson, **Commencement Address at the U.S. Military Academy,** West Point, June 13, 1916, in ibid.,vol. 37, pp. 212ff.
[141] Henry Kissinger, p. 33.

the world. Nonetheless, some scholars disagree with this idea and claim that the American Exceptionalism does not separate American nation from others. In short, they neither define US nor the Americans as the 'chosen one'. In their perception, exceptionalism is more like a belief that makes American democratic system, constitution, law and their way of life superior, and thus, US embrace a role as the savior and bearer of liberty and freedom to the world.[142]

On the other hand, Dennis Hoover, in his book *Religion and American Exceptionalism*, argues that there are three types of usage regarding American Exceptionalism. The first type of usage referred to as an empirical hypothesis. In other words, it is the academic usage of the term that could be tested through research, particularly comparative research can be more effective in this regard. Another usage of the term moves America's position to a higher level and enhances its role around the world. In this type of usage America and its public is superior and their role is divine. The US is the leader of the world and should lead all nations to save them, especially from being a fallen and corrupted nation that contradicts with God's order. Undoubtedly American Exceptionalism has a religious side and thus, the last usage that Hoover emphasizes in his book is the most famous claim that American society embraced as their ''civil religion''. According to this last type of usage the US is a country gathered as a sole nation under God, guided by God and its borders are given by the God.[143]

Apart from the very famous and common explanations of American Exceptionalism Stephen M. Walt sees the term as a myth. Indeed, he separates this so-called myth into five:[144]

---

[142] ''What, exactly, is 'American exceptionalism'?'', *theweek.com:* https://theweek.com/articles/654508/what-exactly-american-exceptionalism, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

[143] For more information: Dennis R. Hoover, **Religion and American Exceptionalism,** 1st edition, Routledge, (July 19, 2013).

[144] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Myth of American Exceptionalism'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

Myth 1: *''There Is Something Exceptional About American Exceptionalism.''*

According to Walt, most of the American leaders imply that ''America is unique''. In fact, American Presidents believe that the US should take more responsibility and carry more burdens due to its exceptional nature, divine rights, superior values and identity.[145] In the light of this explanation, it is possible to understand why American Presidents use some specific rhetoric during their electoral campaign or wartime. For instance, after 9/11 terror attacks, George Bush claimed that terrorists attacked on American values and those terrorists should be exterminated in order to preserve American values and democracy. From this point on one might say that most of the American Presidents are guided by the norms of American Exceptionalism. However, American Exceptionalism could also be the alibi of a president's interventionist foreign policy towards international issues. Either way, historical and religious tendencies influence US foreign behavior.

Myth 2: ''*The United States Behaves Better Than Other Nations Do.''*

Walt argues that American nation like to think they behave different than the rest of the world and they are better than other nations that dwell on the earth. Furthermore, Walt emphasizes on how much American people like to think themselves as keen to respect human rights and the rule of law.[146] This type of policy can be observed during Woodrow Wilson's and Bill Clinton's presidency. It is known that Wilson embraced multilateralist attitude towards international issues and was the founding father of League of Nations. He believed that the American Nation could paw the way of democratic values and guide the other nations. Most of the scholars believe that Bill Clinton was a president like Wilson. However, his multilateralist behavior was not as innocent as Wilson's. Clinton believed the strength of international institutions and worked with them during his presidency, but sometimes Clinton's

[145] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Myth of American Exceptionalism'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].
[146] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Myth of American Exceptionalism'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

team used those institutions to intervene in other regions and promote American values. For instance, after the escalation in Bosnia and Kosovo, Bill Clinton sent American troops to the region under the umbrella of NATO. At the beginning, it was a humanitarian intervention led by NATO and indeed, NATO soldiers stopped Serbian army, ended the slaughter in Kosovo. However, it was also a good opportunity to promote American values in the region.

Myth 3: *''America's Success Is Due to Its Special Genius.''*

With the quote Walt implies that American Nation's and political success come from the virtue of its founding fathers.[147] At this point, I meet on the same layer with Walt and argue that if the US can preserve its cosmic structure at present, if its values are universal and it could win the hearts and minds in the sense of ''American Culture'' it owes this success to the patience and farsightedness of its founding fathers. Besides, the founding fathers of US embraced isolationist policies during the establishment of the country. Therefore, while they were writing the American Constitution and establishing individual liberty rights, the US did not interested in international issues, thus the solid notion of American Constitution and values comes from this foreign policy attitude of US during its establishment.

Myth 4: *''The United States Is Responsible for Most of the Good in the World.''*

The fourth myth claims that most of the contribution regarding peace, financial aids, humane aid comes from US. Moreover, Walt argues that Bill Clinton's internationalist foreign policy perception reflects this myth. According to Walt, Bill

[147] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Myth of American Exceptionalism'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

Clinton's belief about creating stable political environment is US' endeavor to make world better.[148]

Myth 5: *''God Is on Our Side.''*

This type of myth is what we called ''America's civil religion'' above. For most of the Americans, the US is divine and they have a duty to make world better and this sacred duty and its borders given by the god.

However, Walt criticizes American Exceptionalism and he concludes that even though the US has superior values, advanced in economy and human rights; it does not mean that each policy it applies towards other states in the international sense is correct and plausible.[149]

Throughout history, the American Exceptionalism phenomenon witnessed changes in its rhetorical and empirical usage. Whereas, in the early stages, the term coined with democratic values and foundation of a new world; it created sensations with the beginning of WWI. During two world wars and one Cold War period, most of the presidents and congressman used the term as an obstacle in front of multilateral foreign policy attitudes. In other words, some politicians and academics thought that if America proceeds its exceptional nature only in itself; then, it would only become an isolated power. However, this isolationist behavior cannot protect American values and interests during wartimes. Therefore, most of the politicians argued that America should give up on the exceptionalism within its borders and must spread its exceptional notions.[150] For instance, President Bill Clinton embraced multilateral foreign policy approach during his presidency; he believed in the strength of multinational international organizations. Nevertheless, the domestic dynamics in US

---

[148] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Myth of American Exceptionalism'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

[149] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Myth of American Exceptionalism'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

[150] Uri Friedman, 'American Exceptionalism': A Short History, *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2012/06/18/american-exceptionalism-a-short-history/, [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

pushed him to apply imperious policies during his second term at the oval office. After Congressional elections Republicans gained the majority against Democrat Clinton's administration, and Republican majority in Congress pressured Bill Clinton regarding domestic and foreign policy-making processes. Therefore, Bill Clinton could not resist against pressures and had bomb Iraq in 1998. This decision of Clinton administration turned American policy implementations from multilateral to isolationist, and thus the domestic dynamics had defeated both presidential power and policy-makers once again.

Nonetheless, the biggest change in political rhetoric regarding American Exceptionalism happened after 9/11 terror attacks. For instance, Andrew Rojecki states that after 9/11 Americans started to follow up international updates, domestic politics and became more eager to support military spending.[151] Furthermore, most of the Americans believed that terrorist were targeting American leadership and their unique and exceptional values. In this regard, President Bush benefited from this sensitivity among American public and justify each of his foreign policy action, including the invasion of Iraq, under American Exceptionalism. In the beginning, this kind of justification was working well. However, after expensive military spending started to be the burden for Americans and some militaristic actions turned against American democratic values, American's economic priorities and democratic values became more important than President Bush's foreign policy goals. Simultaneously the support for President Bush's foreign actions decreased. After the intense usage of term by Bush, President Barack Obama whom may be the first president who emphasis on American Exceptionalism in his electoral campaign but also be the first president who least believes in American Exceptionalism in a way Americans understands. It would be wrong to criticize Obama as non-believer, however, the way he comprehends the American Exceptionalism was way different and led the emergence of criticisms and disputes among political elites. Besides, after Bush's spoiling the term, Obama had to step back due to electoral worries. It would not be effective to judge rhetorical change after Bush, eventually American

[151] Andrew Rojecki, ''Rhetorical Alchemy: American Exceptionalism and the War on Terror'', **Political Communication,** 2008, p. 70.

Exceptionalism embeds in American society, but no one can deny that it is an old term as history and should keep up the international changes and take the form of the new glass.

4.2. American Expansionism

One of the most significant components of American Exceptionalism is the American expansionist history and the ideology behind the expansionist movements. As it stated before, neither the foundation nor the ideology behind the construction of an American identity processes are ordinary –even though every nations' ideology, identity and fundamental values are unique for themselves. Likewise, most of the Americans, including state elites, believe that American expansionism is an extraordinary example among these movements. Indeed, there is no American in the world call herself as interventionist; on the contrary, Americans believe that they expanded without starting a war. Conversely, they believe that the state elites foresaw specific opportunities throughout expansionist stage and took the advantage. However, history demonstrates the opposite in some occasions.

On the other hand, there is a common belief that claims the American borders are destined by the God long before its foundation. This divine destiny and the expansionist mission of US also stated in John L. O'Sullivan's Manifest Destiny. According to Manifest Destiny, today's borderline of US is exclusive and given by the God. In addition, the US is surrounded by two big oceans from its east and the west costs and those oceans are the natural protectors of American borders. The North and Southern sides –Mexico and Canada- are not potential threats for US soils and citizens. Therefore, American expansion according to Manifest Destiny has reached its destined borderlines and there is no need for US to expand further. In this part, I will examine the American expansion phases and illustrate the expansionist behavior of state elites through Manifest Destiny.

At the beginning of the 1800s, Thomas Jefferson became the Secretary of State. He is one of the most important presidents in US history. One of the reasons of labelling Jefferson as an important president embeds in his achievement of doubling the US territory with the purchase of Louisiana. On the other hand, he is the writer of the American Independence Declaration. Thus, today Americans have known him as one of the founding fathers of the US. According to Albert H. Bowman, both his and Hamilton's foreign policy understanding was based on the neutrality of the US[152] back in those days. Yet, he was also a clever politician and took the advantage of the situation of Europe at that time.[153] After the Seven Years War, France had to give up on Louisiana and left this territory to Spain, nevertheless, in the first quarter of 1800s France took this territory back from Spain under the leadership of Napoleon. However, Napoleon needed a very large amount of money in order to finance his troops to engage in a war in Europe.[154] This is because after Napoleon's taking Louisiana back, the tension had escalated in Europe; particularly the France-Britain friction had started. By the time, the American government was concerned about the control of the Mississippi River and the city of New Orleans because of the fact that the US's entire trade was provided from New Orleans Harbor at that time. Furthermore, Jefferson concerned about the possibility of establishing a new French colony –called Louisiana- near the American border.[155] It was a big tactical and strategical gap for the US in those days and being a neighbor with a colonial European power might jeopardize the newly-established US existence. Therefore, when Napoleon wanted to sell Louisiana in order to finance his troops, Jefferson used this opportunity. Even though the American government only wanted the Mississippi River and the city of New Orleans, Napoleon offered to sell the entire Louisiana territory. Consequently, the US government bought Louisiana from France in exchange for 15 million dollars. In fact, this purchase did not only doubled the US territory, but also the US acquired fertile soils. After the purchase of Louisiana, the

---

[152] Albert H. Bowman, ''Jefferson, Hamilton and American Foreign Policy'', **Political Science Quarterly**, Vol. 71, No. 1, (Mar., 1956), pp. 20-21, 26, 28.

[153] Shane Mountjoy, **Manifest Destiny: Westward Expansion**, Infobase Publishing, 2009, p. 23.

[154] To see the casual scheme: ''ABD Bölgesel Genişleme - 1803 Louisiana Satın Alınması'', *Storyboardthat:* https://www.storyboardthat.com/tr/storyboards/tr-examples/abd-bolgesel-genisleme---1803-louisiana-satin-alinmasi, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

[155] ''Amerikan Tarihinin Ana Hatlari'', *USEM:* http://www.usemb-ankara.org.tr/ABDAnaHatlar/Tarih.htm#b3, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

US has become the biggest agricultural exporter because the soil of Louisiana is very rich and valuable in order to cultivate grain and cotton. Besides, before the purchase the US territory was flat, but after gaining Louisiana, the US became the possessor of the Rocky Mountains.[156] In this regard, I believe that the personality and personal values of Jefferson had played a significant role in purchasing Louisiana. This is because Jefferson cared about the agricultural improvement,[157] thus purchasing this territory was not only about security concerns, but also it was about economic development. In sum, Thomas Jefferson purchased Louisiana and improved the US economy and at the same time he preserved the policy of neutrality. Jefferson achieved great success just by taking advantage of Europe's situation.[158] In other words, he showed how great and a clever US politician he was.

The war of 1812 was another turning point in the American expansionist history. Although the American-British war occurred due to the economic concerns of the US, some of the American state elites saw this war as an opportunity to gain new territories. Yet, the war erupted because the US government wanted to trade independently.[159] As a conclusion of the war, ''what is now North Dakota became part of the Missouri Territory when the 49th parallel was agreed to as the boundary between the U.S. and Great Britain.'' However, it took very long to regulate and separate Dakotas, the US government gained this territory in 1812 but separated them during the 1861-1868 interim.[160]

During the expansion years, the US government had two predominant and potential threats. One of them was the UK in the North and the other one was Spain who settled in Florida, the southern border of the US.[161] However, the US government solved its Northern border problem during James Madison's and Monroe's

---

[156] Shane Mountjoy, p. 25.
[157] ''Amerikan Tarihinin Ana Hatlari'', *USEM:* http://www.usemb-ankara.org.tr/ABDAnaHatlar/Tarih.htm#b3 [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[158] Albert H. Bowma,. p. 25.
[159] Shane Mountjoy, p. 27.
[160] ''North Dakota History'', https://www.familysearch.org/wiki/en/North_Dakota_History, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[161] Shane Mountjoy, p. 28.

presidencies. During that time, the US government should have solved this problem immediately because Florida had become heaven both for refugees and American Indians who escaped from the American land.[162] Therefore, the US government started to support Spanish colonies for emancipation.[163] The Spanish government was aware of its weakness against the US, especially in the North American continent.[164] Thus, Spain agreed to sign the Adams-Onis treaty which ratifies the purchase of Florida in exchange for 5 million dollars as the compensation for the colonial rebellions against Spain which supported by the American government.[165] As a result of the treaty, the US also began to export fur coat from Florida.

In 1846, the US government solved the problem with Canada and included Oregon to its territories. Nevertheless, the process of including Oregon to the US was more challenging than the former expansionist movements. This is because four different nations, including the US, claimed their rights on the territory of Oregon. Spain claimed that they explored this territory earlier before the UK and Russia had. UK claimed that a British explorer claimed the land for Queen Elizabeth, nonetheless the UK has not done anything in this territory for at least two decades, and Russia claimed that a Danish, named Bering, explored this territory for the czar, and today his name was given to Bering Strait. On the other hand, the US did not claim that either they explored this territory or lived on it. Instead of using these claims as formers did, the US government claimed that the purchase of Louisiana did not demarcate the US border precisely or clearly. In addition, the UK and Spain could not manage to be the dominant powers over Oregon territory; therefore it was easy to claim its rights for the US.[166] However, the issue of Oregon had yet to answer, the UK postponed the issue, but James Polk –former president of the US during that time- had to conclude this problem without engaging in a war with the UK because of the escalation of the tension between the US government and Mexico due to the

[162] Shane Mountjoy, p. 28.
[163] ''Acquisition of Florida: Treaty of Adams-Onis (1819) and Transcontinental Treaty (1821)'', *HistoryStateGov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/florida, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[164] Shane Mountjoy, p. 30.
[165] ''Acquisition of Florida: Treaty of Adams-Onis (1819) and Transcontinental Treaty (1821)'', *HistoryStateGov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/florida, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[166] Shane Mountjoy, pp. 47-52.

annexation of Texas.[167] Thanks to Oregon Trail, thousands of North Americans moved to Oregon, and the UK could not manage to control American population on this territory. Thus, America expanded to the North.[168] By the time, expansionists saw this leak as an opportunity to take Oregon, also James Polk who dedicated himself to realize manifest destiny saw this opportunity and proposed a settlement on the 49-degree line to Great Britain.[169] Again, thanks to the upcoming war with Mexico the Senate ratified this treaty and 49th parallel became the new boundary between Canada and America.[170] Additionally, the US took Oregon without fighting with the naval power of the UK.

The Manifest Destiny had witnessed one of the most challenging expansionist movements with the annexation of Texas. Before the annexation, Texas was an independent state, however, it became the 28th state of the US in 1845. Indeed, the annexation of Texas brought border issues with Mexico which later led the emergence of the Mexican-American War. Whereas the US claimed that Rio Grande was the boundary, Mexico objected the US's claim and declared that Nueces River was the boundary.[171] On May 13, 1846, the US Senate declared the war against Mexico. The US troops captured New Mexico and California, and it was one of the turning points of the Mexican-American war. Eventually, the war ended in 1847 with the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. According to this treaty, Mexico gave California, New Mexico, and Utah territories in exchange for 15 million dollars. In addition, Mexico agreed to recognize Texas as a part of the US territory.[172] According to Manifest Destiny, reaching to the coast of the Pacific Ocean is the destiny for Americans, thus, most of the Americans moved to New Mexico and California even before the war. Besides, California has known for gold mining, and Americans moved there in order to benefit from it. As a result of the war, California became a part of the US and it increased the gold mining activities within the country.

---

[167] ''The Oregon Territory, 1846'', *HistoryStateGov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/oregon-territory, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[168] Shane Mountjoy, p. 55.
[169] ''The Oregon Territory, 1846'', *HistoryStateGov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/oregon-territory, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[170] Shane Mountjoy, p. 59.
[171] Shane Mountjoy. pp. 60, 74, 76.
[172] Shane Mountjoy, pp. 92, 100-102.

Nevertheless, the disagreement between Mexican and the US governments did not end up until Gadsden Purchase. In fact, after the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the US government insisted to extend its border to Rio Grande and Southern of the Gila River. Therefore, James Gadsden negotiated with Santa Anna in order to purchase the territory. In the end, in 1853 the US agreed to pay 10 million dollars for this territory. It was the last territory which the US government acquired in the mainland.[173]

After these expansionist movements, the US government purchased Alaska from Russians. In 1867, William Seward purchased Alaska and it became the biggest state of the US. Initially, most of the politicians thought that Seward made a useless move by purchasing such a worthless territory as Alaska.[174] However, one might state that Seward foresaw the future even at that time. I believe that this was a tactical move in order to secure the US border after solving problems of Canadian and Mexican border.

During the Spanish-American War, the US government has also been conducting good relationships both with the Philippines and Hawaii. Nevertheless, Hawaii was seeking for annexation, but president Grover Cleveland was against the annexation of Hawaii. Yet, during William McKinley's presidency, Hawaii became a part of the US in 1898.[175] Actually, according to Alfred Mahan's *''The Influence of Sea Power…''* theory, it was a great gain for the US. This is because such annexation –an island which settled on a tactical position nearly middle of the Pacific Ocean, could secure west sea-side of US and increase its naval power. Indeed, the US established the Pearl Harbor base in Hawaii after the annexation.

All these expansionist movements that we alluded above were the examples of integrative expansionism because the US government included these territories either

[173] Shane Mountjoy, pp. 108-109.
[174] ''Amerikan Tarihinin Ana Hatlari'', *USEM:* http://www.usemb-ankara.org.tr/ABDAnaHatlar/Tarih.htm#b3, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].
[175] ''Annexation of Hawaii, 1898'', *Stategov:* https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/gp/17661.htm, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

by acquiring the consent of locals who live in these territories or purchasing them by or by not as an ending result of wars. This is because the war of independence was against colonial states of Europe, and the US had never identified itself as the colonial power, on the contrary, it identified itself as the oppositional power which stands against Europe's colonial states. However, the Spanish-American war and its consequences demonstrate the opposite. Even though the yellow journalism movements in the US led the escalation of the tension, and some politicians and groups were against the war, fake and exaggerated news under the yellow journalism movement gained the public support for the declaration of war.[176] Although the author of the *''Incurring a Debt of Gratitude: 1898 and the Moral Sources of United States Hegemony in Cuba''* Louis A. Pérez, Jr. claims that the US did not intervene in those countries and it just wanted to liberalize them because it is the US's moral duty, at the end of the war, the US government intervened into Cuba and the Philippines.[177] In other words, the US found this right of interventionist actions -in order to spread democracy and liberalize former colonies of Spain- in the roots of Manifest Destiny. Yet, this intervention was way more different than integrative expansionism and former expansion model of the US at the same time; it was more like a version of imperial expansionism. Therefore, one can claim that the US government lost its difference between European colonial states and itself.

The American expansionism is based on John L. O'Sullivan's Manifest Destiny. It is a common view among the American society that the US is the one nation under God, and it has a divine aim to fighting for humanity, spreading democracy and etc.[178] On the other hand, America's expansion to the West had to happen due to the moral and divine target of the US.[179] In addition, during the expansionist period, many of the US presidents had devoted themselves to the Manifest Destiny, thus,

---

[176] ''PBS Crucible of Empire'', *Youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UmKSPyTptis, [Access Date: 16.03.2019] and David Ralph Spencer and Judith Spencer, **The Yellow Journalism: The Press and America's Emergence as a World Power**, Northwestern University Press, 2007, Ch.6.

[177] Louis A. Pérez, Jr., ''Incurring a Debt of Gratitude: 1898 and the Moral Sources of United States Hegemony in Cuba'', **The American Historical Review**, Vol. 104, No. 2, (Apr., 1999).

[178] John L. O'Sullivan, "The Great Nation of Futurity", **The United States Democratic Review**, 6, no. 23, (1839).

[179] Adam Gomez, ''Deus Vult: John L. O'Sullivan, Manifest Destiny, and American Democratic Messianism'', **American Political Thought**, Vol. 1, No. 2, (September 2012), pp. 243-244.

they benefited from every expansionist opportunity in order to expand the US territory to the West. Moreover, American society also believed that they had to move to the West, therefore, they have always tried to move to the West during the American Expansionist period.

Another striking part of the Manifest Destiny is related to securing the borders. The US saw Canada and Mexico as potential threats, thence; it expanded itself in order to secure its borders. The question here: Why did they stop going further? Actually, there is a simple answer to this question: Manifest Destiny. America has expanded according to Manifest Destiny. In other words, they reached the borders that they had to reach. Furthermore, they spread democracy –they will continue to do that- and they brought peace –they will also continue to do that- by expanding their territories. In conclusion, they saw their expansionism as a destiny which is written by God and God gave this territory to them. Therefore, because of this view, the US becomes some kind of a ‘’Messianic State’’.

4.3. Two Mainstream Thougths In American History

Americans have always seen themselves as the superior in comparison to other nations in the world. Their ideological beliefs shaped around the idea that they have special values and way of life with their special democracy within the homeland. Nonetheless, constructing these special values was not an easy process. The American state elites saw that problem and decided to turn their own shell right after the country’s establishment. Although the American way of isolationism is different than the type of isolationism we know, some scholars argue that the American success lies behind the isolationist attitude of presidents in the establishment process.

Yet, incident in the international area will never remain the same, the bilateral relationships among states are known as the ongoing processes. Thus, in some phases we witness that American Presidents broke the isolationist tradition in US foreign

policy behavior and become more predominant in the international arena in the sense of being internationalist.

In this part, I will examine these two mainstream traditions in the US foreign policy and try to demonstrate in which occasions the US left its isolationist attitude. Furthermore, this part will focus on the US' former essential needs and compulsory circumstances in the world history to turn into an internationalist from an isolationist.

If we look into American Foreign policy deeply, we will probably coincide with two fundamental foreign policy approaches of the US government that they have implemented throughout American history. One of them is isolationism and the other one is internationalism. In other words, sometimes the US government wrapped into an isolationist identity and sometimes it was the opposite. Furthermore, in some periods the US government had contradicted itself. Still, the US government has benefitted from both foreign policy approaches. In this part, I will illustrate the exact explanations of both approaches and how the US government implemented them. Then, I will separate the US foreign policy into three mainstream interims in order to demonstrate foreign policy transformation in the historical context. In addition, this part will show how the US government benefitted from these different foreign policy approaches.

The term of isolationism corresponds to avoiding all political and economic engagements with other countries.[180] However, according to Blower, the notion of isolationism in the US is way more different then this explanation. The US isolationism is not avoiding any of these political and economic engagements with the rest of the world; on the contrary, the US isolationism only tries to avoid the US to involve in European issues and wars which especially occurs in the European continent. Besides, the American isolationism is based on forming alliances and

[180] ''Isolationism'', *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/isolationism-foreign-policy, [Access Date: 17.03.2019].

balancing only with the warring powers[181] of Europe. In other words, according to American isolationist foreign policy, there is no need to interact with other states in the world. Nevertheless, even the notable universities of the US had misinterpreted this foreign policy approach and they thought the ''US is retiring within their own shell''.[182] In conclusion, the US isolationist point of view is different than the exact meaning of the term. For the US government, the isolationism means staying away from Europe's problems.

The notion of internationalism in the US foreign policy corresponds to an antithesis version of isolationism. It includes all forms of external interaction with the world. Furthermore, by meaning internationalism we could also understand nonpolitical activities such as scientific researches, social and cultural activities and etc.[183] At this point, actually isolationist movements increased because of the eruption of Wilsonian style internationalism. For them, the internationalist idealism started with Wilson's Versailles Treaty failure and had to end. Therefore, during the interwar period, most of the American scholars called American foreign policy as isolationist. This is because the Americans needed a ''draw oneself'' action due to Europe's ambiguities during that time. In other words, Americans should have retired from their dangerous role in Europe to get no or at least less harm.[184]

Before I start to discuss the events and interims, I want to separate the US foreign policy into three phases in order to draw a proper scheme. Due to the scope of this, I will briefly mention the first and the second phases. The third and the last period starts with the beginning of the Cold War and reaches to present day.

First Phase

---

[181] Brooke L. Blower, "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941", **Diplomatic History**, 38, no. 2, (April 2014), p. 351.
[182] William Appleman Williams, ''The Legend of Isolationism in the 1920's'', **Science & Society**, Vol. 18, No. 1, (Winter, 1954), p. 2.
[183] Warren F. Kuehl and Gary B. Ostrower, ''Internationalism'', *AmericanForeignRelations:* https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Internationalism.html, [Access Date: 17.03.2019].
[184] Brooke L. Blower, p. 345.

Throughout the establishment process of America, most of the American presidents and politicians embraced isolationist policies. This phase starts with President George Washington –also known as the father of America- and ends with WWI. Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, Theodore Roosevelt are the popular president of this term.

For instance, the Monroe Doctrine is the fundamental work of the American isolationism. In his *''Seventh Annual Message to Congress'',* he basically emphasis on the American independence, and adds that they can communicate or engage in a war only when their rights are invaded. Additionally, he claims that they should never be taken any part during the war which occurs among European powers.[185] The Monroe Doctrine has three key features. The first and the third one related to the independence of the US and anti-colonial policies towards European countries. The second one is related to American isolationism which restricts the American government's involvement to the old continent issues.[186] Nevertheless, the isolationism we understand is different from the American isolationism. In this regard, Monroe Doctrine slightly emphasizes the US sovereignty on the whole American continent and through this framework the main goal of US is to prevent European intervention to its continent. Moreover, the isolationist approach in Monroe Doctrine allows foreign trade with eastern countries. For instance, in the 19th century, the US had a highly-advanced shipping and trade traffic in Mediterranean Sea. Yet, the Monroe Doctrine is one of the significant cornerstones of US isolationism. Although the US government interacted with other states in this interim, they remained neutral against Europe's problems and tried to defend their anti-colonial policies by keeping their independence and political rights. In addition, many presidents inspired by the Monroe Doctrine and implemented his approach to their policies after President Monroe.

[185] James Monroe, **''Seventh Annual Message''**, December 2, 1823.
[186] Shane Mountjoy, pp. 38-39.

On the other hand, Theodore Roosevelt was known for his ''Big Stick Diplomacy'' which he used for many foreign crisis such as Canal, US influence in Cuba.[187] By the same token, after the Venezuelan Crisis in 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt added his *''Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine (1905)''.* The Roosevelt Corollary claims that ''not only were the nations of the Western Hemisphere not open to colonization by European powers but that the United States had the responsibility to preserve order and protect life and property in those countries''. In other words, President Roosevelt justified the American Intervention in Western Hemisphere with his addition to the Monroe Doctrine.[188]

Second Phase

The second phase starts with WWI and ends with the beginning of Cold War. In this interim, the US has witnessed two world wars and several foreign policy approaches towards Western hemisphere. For instance, during the interwar period, most of the American scholars claimed that the US government re-embraced its isolationist policy. Nonetheless, the isolationist policy disrupted with an incident during the WWII, particularly with Pearl Harbor. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson are one of the famous presidents of this term.

For instance, the 28th president of the United States of America was Woodrow Wilson whom also known as the great idealist and the first liberal internationalist president of the US. In fact, before the US involvement to the First World War, President Wilson was reluctant to engage in a war; on the contrary, he wanted to maintain the neutrality of US as former presidents did.[189] However, in 1917, a German submarine attacked on trade ship which belonged to the US. After that,

[187] ''Sep 2, 1901 CE: Big Stick Diplomacy'', *NationalGeographic:* https://www.nationalgeographic.org/thisday/sep2/big-stick-diplomacy/, [Access Date: 21.03.2019].
[188] ''Theodore Roosevelt's Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine (1905)'', *Ourdocuments:* https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=56, [Access Date: 17.03.2019].
[189] Brooke L. Blower, p. 365.

President Wilson had to declare war against Germany.[190] Thence, a hundred-year US isolationist foreign policy had disrupted with Wilson's decision. At the end of the war, Woodrow Wilson declared his 14 idealist points for the sake of the world. In addition, one of his points refers to the establishment of the League of Nations. From this point on, it is possible to say that with the idea of this establishment President Wilson declared his new diplomacy of liberal internationalism.[191] The plan of being a part of an interstate association is the opposite policy of American isolationism. In other words, Wilson broke the rules and tore the American foreign policy approach apart. Yet, the Senate did not vote in favor of joining the League of Nations and the US government did not involve such an organization that gathered almost all European powers in one pot. Indeed, this was still the triumph of isolationism in the US.[192] Perhaps, the only intention of Wilson was to realize the Manifest Destiny. Maybe he declared his 14 points in order to fulfill the American mission and tried to play the role of Messianic State by spreading democracy and giving independence through using the right of self-determination. According to Tony Smith, Wilsonianism corresponds to human rights and fostering democracy for other states.[193] Perhaps, the aim of realizing the Manifest Destiny was the fundamental agent for President Woodrow Wilson. Nonetheless, both his ideas and policies were against the American isolationist foreign policy. Furthermore, he dragged the US into an internationalist foreign policy approach.

Additionally, right after the end of the Second World War, the US joined to the United Nations which is an inter-state organization, and at the same time is an organization that European states also joined. In this case, the US contradicted its isolationist policies by joining an inter-state organization. Besides, the UN also deals with European and world issues. However, the US isolationist policies do not allow the US to involve to world issues, particularly to European issues.

---

[190] Margaret MacMillan, "World War I: The War That Changed Everything", **Wall Street Journal,** June 20, 2014.

[191] Erez Manela, **The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism**, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 37.

[192] ''Isolationism-The triumph of isolationism'', *AmericanForeignRelations:* https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Isolationism-The-triumph-of-isolationism.html, [Access Date: 17.03.2019].

[193] Tony Smith, ''Wilsonianism'', pp. 619-620.

Third Phase

The third phase starts with the beginning of the Cold War and reaches the present day. We could say that the US established NATO and become a member of it. From this point on, it is possible to claim that both the establishment of NATO, UN and being a member to these international organizations, is against the American isolationism. This is because it leads to engaging in an upcoming war which could occur in the European continent.

After the defeat of Hitler and his German Empire, French, British, American and Soviet Leaders gathered in Potsdam Conference. As one of the decisions of conference, the Allies divided Hitler's Germany among themselves. Right after this decision, the Allies started to occupy Berlin and the rest of the Germany at the same time. Whilst, Soviet Union deployed its army both in South of Berlin and Germany, French, British and American armies settled in the Western side of the zone with the aim of mild transition after WWII.

The relationship between allies had never been well enough to maintain such good relations that would help to sustain collaboration against Germany or else any other common enemy, instead, the friction between Western Camp and Soviet Union started in Potsdam Conference. Indeed, the friction between East and the West deteriorated after Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain speech in Missouri, 1946.[194] Churchill's Iron Curtain speech hypothetically demarked border between Soviets and Western allies –which also turned into a real borders shortly after his speech.

Indeed, the escalation of tension between Soviet Union and US emerged from the arms race and it had a past. It is known that US used atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan during the WWII after the incident of Pearl Harbor, and in the end of WWII, Soviets tried to develop their very own arms in case of using towards US

[194] ''Cold War Timeline'', *spartacus-education:* https://spartacus-educational.com/ColdWarChron.htm, [Access Date: 14.12.2020].

while establishing its union gathered around socialist ideology against liberalism. Therefore, a non-engaging type of war –Cold War- had been officially started.

In this part, I will not elloborate other presidents' presidency terms such as Harry Truman, JFK, Nixon or Ronald Reagan. Yet, in order to comprehend the foreign policy approaches of presidents during the third phase, this part starts with George H. W. Bush's presidency term even though this study does not cover his incumbency.

George H. W. Bush

George H. W. Bush was the 41st president of the US during the 1989-1993 interim. When President Bush got elected the world was evolving into a new phase, thus it was actually hard times for all states and indeed for a newly elected president. This is because when Bush got elected the world had witnessed rapid global changes. First and the foremost change in world politics are the collapse of the Soviet Union and the reunification of Germany by the end of the Cold War. Moreover, the apartheid in South Africa ended, pro-democracy demonstrations in China's Tiananmen Square emerged and etc.[195] In short, the US foreign policy had to update itself according to those radical changes in the world. By the same token, after a year that passed in the oval office, President Bush gave one of the most famous speeches of him which regarding ''New World Order''. The timing of ''New World Order'' speech was quite meaningful for the whole world. This is because President Bush's speech coincides with Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in the year of 1990 and Gulf Crisis. Many scholars claim that rather than emphasizing the newly-establishing world and new types of cooperation among states, Bush's main target was to intimidate revisionist dictatorships like Saddam Hussein. According to this new world order approach, great powers should cooperate in this era. The term was used by both President Bush and Gorbachev in order to define this post-Cold War era. As a matter of fact, this term is not a brand-new thing for world politics. Similar actions happened after the

[195] ''Bush's Foreign Policy'', *history.state.gov:* https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/bush, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

end of the two world wars. For instance, at the end of the First World War, the US president Wilson offered an establishment of the League of Nations and he defined the new era as internationalist. Furthermore, this phrase had also used for the post-Second World War era, especially during the establishment of the United Nations and Bretton Woods system.[196] According to his new world order speech and the futures that this phrase's comprised, it is possible to say that George H. W. Bush embraced multilateral approach because of the fact that he believed that the new era will only be established through the efforts of great powers and institutions. Indeed, one of the signs of his multilateral approach was the sign of START I treaty in 1991 and START II treaty in 1993 which ratify arms reduction[197] and seemed as the continuation of Cold War's SALT I-II treaties.

A couple of incidents happened during his presidency. The first one of them is Panama. President Bush sent the American troops to Panama in order to secure the canal and the Americans who were living there. Besides, he wanted to overthrow the corrupt regime of General Manuel Noriega. At the end of the intervention, Noriega came to the US and charged for the drug traffic.[198] This case also demonstrates that President Bush was interventionist because of the fact that his administration interfered to a state's regime and political life.

On the other hand, one of the most important incidents happened when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. As a matter of fact, according to Douglas Little, neither President Bush nor Secretary of State James Baker gave much attention to the Middle East in their first year at the office.[199] However, when Iraq invaded Kuwait the US immediately responded. At this point, the First Gulf War is important to understand President Bush's multilateral approach. This is because Douglas Little claims that the Bush administration wanted to work with the United Nations and seek

---

[196] ''Bush 'Out Of These Troubled Tımes . . . A New World Order'', *washingtonpost.com:* https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1990/09/12/bush-out-of-these-troubled-times-a-new-world-order/b93b5cf1-e389-4e6a-84b0-85f71bf4c946/, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''Bush's Brave New World Order'', *airforcemag.com:* https://www.airforcemag.com/article/0807keeperfile/, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].
[197] Tayyar Arı, pp. 568-569.
[198] ''George H. W. Bush'', *whitehose.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/presidents/george-h-w-bush/, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].
[199] Douglas Little, **American Orientalism,** The University of North Carolina Press, 2002, p. 253.

Security Council authorization for economic sanctions and military intervention. ‘’President Bush agreed that “we’ve got to get the international community behind us’’ and noted that he had already contacted Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak, Jordan’s King Hussein, and Saudi Arabia’s King Fahd, all of whom “still tell me they can find an Arab solution.’’[200] In addition, according to Douglas Little, with the victory of the First Gulf War, President Bush also kicked the syndrome of Vietnam.

In addition, in the last weeks at the office, he sent the American troops to Somalia in order to stop the civil war. However, since he lost the presidential election to Democrat Bill Clinton in 1992, thus he handed over his ongoing Somalia legacy to his successor. Yet, Somalia case also showed that Bush was an interventionist.

Bill Clinton

Bill Clinton won the presidential election against Bush (senior) in 1992 and came to charge in 1993. In fact, he was the president of the US during 1993-2001 interim. In other words, he got elected for the presidency two times.

As it was discussed above he started to his mission with the legacy of Somalia. He also believed that protecting Somalia is one of the American responsibilities. However, according to Stephen Schlesinger, he failed to conduct Somalia and the US had 18 casualties in the civil war.[201] Yet, seeing the civil war of Somalia as the responsibility of the US sounds very interventionist and idealist for a president.

Of course, many incidents also happened during his presidency. One of them is Haiti. In 1994, President Clinton replaced a military junta in Haiti with the democratically elected president.[202] Indeed, it was such an interventionist move that interferes to

[200] Douglas Little, pp. 255-256.
[201] Stephen Schlesinger, ‘’The End of Idealism: Foreign Policy in the Clinton Years’’, **World Policy Journal,** Vol. 15, No. 4, (Winter, 1998/1999), p. 36.
[202] ‘’Bush, Iraq, and the World’’, *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/Bush-Iraq-and-the-World-916775, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

another state's political life. Therefore, it is possible to claim that this decision of President Clinton was so interventionist like Bush.

On the other hand, in 1999 the US-led troops intervened to Kosovo in order to prevent ethnic cleansing led by Serbians. At this point, Clinton's speech to NATO forces illustrated that it was for humanitarian ends[203] the definition of interventionism includes humanitarian intervention. Thus this was also an interventionist move. However, this did not only demonstrate that President Clinton merely stood as interventionist but also he showed his multilateralist standpoint as his predecessor Bush Senior.[204] This is because before the intervention Clinton cooperated with other states in UN, and NATO got an authorization to intervene in Kosovo. Thus, in the end, the US-led NATO troops intervened. The cooperation and getting authorization from an international organization shows that rather than neglecting the international community, President Clinton cooperated with it. Therefore, he was a multilateralist like Bush. Furthermore, since he sent troops to almost everywhere this makes him more aggressive multilateralist than his predecessor. However, in 1998, after UN's retreatment from Iraq, the UK and US claim that Saddam's government refused to cooperate for diminishing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Since Saddam Hussein refused to work with international organizations on this matter, along with UK troops, the Clinton Administration sent the American troops to Bagdad in 1998. The operation name was Desert Fox and in this scope American troops bombed Iraq. Operation Desert Fox separates international relations scholars. This is because one groups argues that President Clinton was not willing to bomb Iraq, yet due to ongoing trials in Congress, he ordered airstrike to distract attention and avoid being found guilty.[205] On the other hand, the other group of scholars only mentions Operation Desert Fox as the exceptional multilateral behavior of President Clinton.

---

[203] J. Dumbrell, ''Was There a Clinton Doctrine? President Clinton's Foreign Policy Reconsidered'', **Diplomacy & Statecraft,** (2002), p. 51.

[204] J. Dumbrell, p. 53.

[205] Andrew Glass, ''Clinton orders airstrike on Iraq: Dec. 16, 1998'', *politico.com:* https://www.politico.com/story/2016/12/clinton-orders-airstrike-on-iraq-dec-16-1998-232571, [Access Date:17.04.2021].

Additionally, during his presidency, he improved NATO in order to fight against international drug traffic and he tripped to Europe, Asia, and Africa in order to improve foreign relationships of the US. This also shows that he was a real multilateralist. He used multilateralism through NATO. Besides, his aim of improving trade with China demonstrates that he was also liberalist.

Even though most of the democrat presidents are idealists, it is hard to define Bill Clinton as a total idealist. Still, I do not claim that his multilateral approach was not an idealist. Nevertheless, in many cases he tried to justify the American interests with plausible reasons,[206] this is why he also embraced a realistic approach. Yet, we cannot claim that he is neither a total realist nor a total idealist.

George W. Bush

After the two terms presidency of Bill Clinton, Republican's party candidate George W. Bush got elected as the 43rd president of America. Unlike his father, Bush Jr. stayed at the oval office in the years between 2001 and 2009. In this regard, one can ague that due to incidents that happened during his first term, especially 9/11 terror attacks and his retaliation policy against the events led the US citizens to re-elect him for the office.

As it is indicated above, the most important incident happened during his first term presidency was the 9/11 terror attacks. With the 9/11 incidents so many things have changed, including the US foreign policy. Therefore, President George W. Bush is known for his famous precautions in the aftermath of 9/11 terror attacks. For instance, after 9/11 he proclaimed Iran, Iraq and North Korea as the ''axis of evil''

[206] ''The 'Realists,' the 'Idealists' and Clinton'', *baltimoresun:* https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-xpm-1994-05-02-1994122033-story.html, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

countries.[207] On the other hand, he proclaimed his doctrine which is one of the most famous doctrines in US history due to its new policy approaches.

In fact, according to Robert Jervis, the Bush doctrine which was released with his first NSS, is idiosyncratic due to Bush's extraordinarily ambitious goals. In addition, he separates his doctrine into four mainstream elements. These are: Spreading (Promoting) Democracy, Preventive War, Remaining Unilateral, Maintaining the American hegemony.[208]

In the aftermath of 9/11 terror attacks, President George W. Bush immediately declared war against Afghanistan. Indeed, the most striking point was the implementation of the article 5 for the first time in NATO's history, for the war in Afghanistan. The article five indicates that when a NATO-member country is under attack and decided to respond to a certain attack other NATO members will help under the collective security action. Besides, the non-NATO members such as China, Russia, UAE and etc. supported the Afghanistan operation.[209] At this point, in all security arrangements, the principles of multilateralism are embodied in collective security actions.[210] In other words, during the operation to Afghanistan, President Bush embraced the multilateral approach like his father.

Nevertheless, one cannot argue that same things happened during Iraq's intervention. After Afghanistan, the US claimed that Saddam Hussein has nuclear power in Iraq. Nonetheless, the US could not find the support from most of its allies as it found for Afghanistan. Thus, the US started the operation only with the coalition of the UK. Besides, before the intervention the Bush administration stated that even though the international organizations, such as UN and UNSC, would not approve this military

---

[207] To see the speech please check: ''The Axis of Evil Speech by George W. Bush'', *wheelersburg.net:* https://www.wheelersburg.net/Downloads/Bush%20Axis%20of%20Evil.pdf, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''Text of President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address'', *washingtonpost.com:* https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.html, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[208] Robert Jervis, ''Understanding the Bush Doctrine: Preventive Wars and Regime Change'', **Political Science Quarterly,** Volume 131, Number 2, 2016, pp. 286, 289, 294, 297, 308.

[209] Ahmet Hamdi Topal, **Uluslararası Terörizm ve Terörist Eylemlere Karşı Kuvvet Kullanımı**, Ankara: Beta Yayınları, 2004, pp. 234-238.

[210] ''Multilateralism'', *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/multilateralism, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

activity, then the US will not listen them. Therefore, it is possible to argue that the Bush administration embraced unilateral approach in their foreign policy. In the end of the war, Iraq Survey Group released that there is no nuclear power in Iraq, however, the Bush administration overthrown Saddam Hussein and interfered to Iraq's domestic politics. Thus, it is possible to emphasize that President George W. Bush and his administration was acted according to interventionist school of thought.

During his era, President Bush was surrounded by Jewish-New Yorker intellectuals also known as neoconservatives. As he was controlling the oval office, the debate between neo-cons and realist became more apparent. For instance, whereas realists saw the Iraq war as unecessary, neoconservatives supported the war. Indeed, Stephen Walt strongly criticized their balance-of-power theory and stated that even his balance-of-threat theory's main goal is to form alliances against common threat. Yet, in Iraq invasion, there was no alliance, on the contrary, there were a huge international opposition against US' decision.[211] As a matter of fact, during the Iraq intervention in 2003, most of the realist international relations scholars were against neo-conservative beliefs and their balance-of-power politics. Indeed, 33 Realist scholar in international relations field, including scholars like Barry Posen, Robert Jervis, John J. Mearsheimer, Stephen Walt…, demonstrated their opposition by publishing an open letter named ''War With Iraq Is Not In America's National Interest'', on New York Times, in 2002.[212] Furthermore, one of the famous articles of Stephen Walt and John J. Mearsheimer ''An Unnecessary War'' published by Foreign Policy magazine. In this article, Walt and Mearsheimer maintained their opposition for Iraq War and superficially explained costs and cons of the war.[213] According to this information, unlike his father, in most of the cases, along with neo-conservative majority in domestic politics, President Bush's idealist perspective dominated the US foreign policy. One can argue that even though there were two disputing parties in US domestic politics during the Iraq War, the neo conservative

[211] Brian C. Schmidt & Michael C. Williams, 206.
[212] To reach the entire open letter please check: ''Ad Against Iraq War by 33 IR Scholars, Appearing on Op-ed Page of New York Times, September 26, 2002'', *sadat.umd.edu:* https://sadat.umd.edu/sites/sadat.umd.edu/files/iraq_war_ad_2002_2.pdf, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].
[213] To see the entire article please check: John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, ''An Unnecesary War'', **Foreign Policy**, 2003, pp. 50-59.

majority has the influence and power on institutions that could affect public opinion. On the other hand, academic opposition in US only managed to influence elitist groups in domestic politics. Therefore, before the Iraq War, President Bush gained public support with the help of neo-conservative group in American Congress. Thanks to neo-conservative rising in US domestic politics, in the light of idealism, he protected his interventionist policy approach.

In the second term of President Bush, the relatively sharp change in his foreign policy approach became more observable. For instance, George W. Bush released another National Security Strategy in 2006. As opposed to his first term's National Security Strategy, President Bush prioritize global peace and commerce in this time, also he claimed that he cares about international cooperation. Therefore, his second term strategies demonstrate a transition from unilateralism to multilateralism.[214]

Barack Obama

After George W. Bush left the oval offica, Barack Obama came to office as the 44th president of the US who elected for two terms of American presidency. In other words, he got elected for another term like Bush Jr. and Clinton. Indeed, so many incidents also happened during his presidency.

According to Daniel Drezner, during his presidency, President Obama had two approaches as a grand strategic approach. The first one was multilateral retrenchment which corresponded to regaining the reputation of the US in the Middle East and burden-sharing with allies. The other one was counterpunching[215] which corresponded to ''winning the hearts and minds''. The other notion that the Obama administration proceed was regarding the re-construct the trust for the US in the Middle East which collapsed after 9/11 terror attacks due to President George W.

[214] Gökhan Öçalan, ''Soğuk Savaş Sonrası ABD Ulusal Güvenlik Stratejileri'', *Akademik Perspektif:* http://akademikperspektif.com/2014/02/20/soguk-savas-sonrasi-abd-ulusal-guvenlik-stratejileri/, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].
[215] Daniel W. Drezner, p. 58.

Bush's extremely harsh political rhetoric towards Arab and Muslim world. Indeed, President Obama demonstrated his multilateral approach with the sign of New-Start (also known as START III), in 2010.

One year later, after he got elected, the US troops retreated from Iraq and President Obama realized his electoral campaign promise.[216] Nevertheless, when they withdrew the American troops from the field, there is nothing much left, as an option to maintain the US counterterrorism policies, but unmanned drone strikes and supporting local groups in the region according to the US national interests. At this point, even though Krieg claims that President Obama was not an interventionist[217], he was not a total isolationist. This is because he maintained the policy of interference for other states through other tools. Thus, I will define his foreign policy as semi-isolationist or semi-interventionist. He neither backed down from intervening Middle East nor retreat American soldiers from the region.

President Obama's doctrine mostly used surrogate warfare policy due to five reasons: deniability, legitimacy, urgency, costs, and capability. The Obama administration emphasized burden-sharing policy within the international organizations, such as UN and NATO, and thus it could be considered as a multilateral retrenchment. After the eruption of Arab Spring in Middle East, President Obama decided to cooperate with Middle Eastern states and local gorups in local crises. For instance, the US fought against ISIS with the cooperation of local powers and the US-led strikes operated in 2014 and 2015.[218] Therefore, especially with the international cooperation attitude against ISIS, the Obama administration embraced the multilateral approach in their foreign policy as opposed to President Bush Jr.

On the other hand, President Obama offered a new foreign policy approach during his presidency, named "reset" with Russia. Moreover, the U.S. tried to cooperate

---

[216] Muhammed Bilal Kenasari, ''Obama'nın Irak karnesi'', *AA:* http://aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/obamanin-irak-karnesi/692072, [Access Date: 129.04.2019].
[217] Andreas Krieg, ''Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East'', **International Affairs,** 92: 1, (2016), p. 103.
[218] Andreas Krieg, pp. 103-104, 106-107.

with Chinese government and started China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, after named "g-2". War. The administration embraced the G-20 to supplant the g-8 as the premier international economic forum.[219] Building an economic relationship and cooperation with other states is also the sign of multilateral foreign policy approach. Also, it was the sign of his liberalist personality.

Althoguh President Barack Obama tried to erase the old reputation of the US from Muslim minds, in 2011, the Libyan intervention disrupted the aim of Barack Obama. After long meetings regarding the intervention in Libyan soil, the US got authorized from the UNSC and US-led coalition intervened to country under the umbrella of NATO and its collective security. At the beginning of intervention, President Obama demonstrated a really good example of his multilateral foreign policy approach; however, the US-led forces went further and changed the regime in Libya. Therefore, it is possible to claim that the Obama administration was semi-isolationist due to its un-authorized actions during the intervention.

Even when he was a senator, Obama embraced a realist foreign policy approach. In fact, Obama summarized his view in Pennsylvania in 2007: “The truth is that my foreign policy is actually a return to the traditional bipartisan realistic policy of George Bush’s father, of John F. Kennedy, of, in some ways, Ronald Reagan.” Moreover, the author claims that during his presidency Obama continued to embrace a realistic policy approach.[220]

Donald Trump

After his predecessor Barack Obama left the office, Donald Trump became the 45th president of US. One can argue that Donald Trump’s electoral campaign success comes from his opposition to the Iraq War like his predecessor Barack Obama.

[219] Daniel W. Drezner, pp. 64-65.
[220] Fawaz Gerges, **Obama and the Middle East**, Palgrave, 2013, pp. 92, 95.

However, unlike multilateral President Obama, even when he was a candidate, there were so many signals that indicated Trump's unilateralist personality. In this regard, when he came to office, President Donald Trump declared that Iran's nuclear power is a threat to the US. Then, he withdrew from the Nuclear Treaty with Iran. Moreover, he also withdrew from Paris agreement on climate change and Trans-Pacific partnership[221] due to his prior topics released in his NSS, in 2017.

President Donald Trump clearly mentioned his standpoint regarding interventions. Trump emphasized that ''When we intervene in, clearly we have an only temporary impact over balance-of-power.'' Besides, he sees the necessity for interventions only when the US national interests are threatened.[222] At this point, this worldview makes him non-interventionist and also makes him realist, because of the fact that he prioritizes the American interests at the same time. As a matter of fact, according to Stephen Walt, Trump is realist, because realism serves well to his international goals.[223] On the other hand, there is another reason that makes him non-interventionist. Even before the elections Donald Trump gave the signals that he embraced the Jacksonian populism for his political identity, and mixed it with his contemporary populism style, Make America Great Again! As Reuben Steff and Alan Tidwell argues his campaign motto depends on two old historical notions in US, the Tea Party and Jacksonian threads. Besides, they emphasize that Trump's populism awakens something lost within the American soil, a Jacksonian version of America. The Jacksonian exceptionalism defends economic well-being of American citizens with the awareness of American government's protectionist duty towards them. The Jacksonian school stress on American dignity on public mind and cares for equality among Americans.[224] In other words, Trump's priority is America and its citizens as the Jacksonian school offers. Nevertheless, this does not mean Trump led America to live in its own shell, on the contrary, the thought of Jacksonian school is

[221] John R. Haines, ''Divining a "Trump Doctrine", **Foreign Policy Research Institute**, 2017, pp. 1, 4. and Randy Schweller, ''Three Cheers for Trump's Foreign Policy What the Establishment Misses'', **Foreign Affairs,** Volume 97 Number 5, September / October 2018, p. 137.
[222] John R. Haines, pp. 5, 6.
[223] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Tragedy of Trump's Foreign Policy'', **Foreign Policy,** 2019, p. 2.
[224] Reuben Steff & Alan Tidwell, ''Understanding and Evaluating Trump's Foreign Policy: A Three Frame Analysis'', **Australian Journal of International Affairs**, 2020, pp. 397-398.

eager to give aggressive militaristic responses unless American interests, economic priorities or American borderlines are in danger. The Jacksonian populism addresses international obligation of other states in international trade and if any of them stop contributing or disrupting international trade, then the American government should retaliate through proper ways.[225]

In his presidency, the US left its fundamental approach toward the world, and the US Congress had separated into two mainstream phenomena. The first one is Asia-Pacific focus and the other one is North-Atlantic focus. Apparently, President Trump was the greatest supporter of Asia-Pacific group due to his several policy implementations and his hostile policy towards China. President Trump maintained Obama's burden-sharing foreign policy approach with a more demanding way for offensive military expenditures from allies, however, he slightly changed it and he slacked off the ties with NATO allies.[226] Indeed, the pro-Asia-Pacific approaches of him are not the only motivators behind this decision, additionally, President Donald Trump's unilateralist personality is also effective in this shift in American foreign policy approach.

In conclusion, the US foreign policy has three mainstream phases throughout its history. In the first phase, the US was a newly discovered continent by Europeans that had been trying to find its own identity, especially after the ''Boston Tea Party''[227]. In this phase, the US embraced isolationist -later it called the Monroe Doctrine- approach in order to find and establish a proper state system, and did not involve the European issues.[228] In the second phase which coincides with the First World War period, the US left the isolationist policies and involved international

[225] Corina Lacatus, ''Long Read: Trump's Electoral Rhetoric Has Become Self-Interested, Nativist Policy'', *USAPP:* https://bit.ly/33n5X2z ,[Access Date: 18.04.2021].
[226] Stephen M. Walt, p. 3.
[227] The Boston Tea Party was a political protest that occurred on December 16, 1773, at Griffin's Wharf in Boston, Massachusetts. During the 13 colonies struggle for freedom, American colonists, frustrated and angry at Britain for imposing "taxation without representation," dumped 342 chests of British tea into the harbor. To understand the notion totally: ''Boston Tea Party'', *History*: https://www.history.com/topics/american-revolution/boston-tea-party, [Access Date: 09.01.2019].
[228] Buket Bektaş, ''11 Eylül 2001 Terörist Saldırısı Neticesinde ABD'nin Güvenlik Algılamalarındaki Değişiklik'', Master Thesis, Ankara, 2007, pp. 10-14.

issues. Furthermore, during Woodrow Wilson's presidency, the US became the protector of international law.[229] However, at the end of the war, the US turned back to the isolationist policies until the next world war. The third and the last phase starts with the Second World War and reaches to the present day. In this period, the US is neither embraces isolationist approach nor proceeds regional policies because of the fact that the US government sees itself as the police of the entire world.[230] In the light of these statements, it can be said that the US role on international politics has witnessed evolvements. Due to the globalization efforts all around the world, each problem started to connect with another. For instance, today a war in Africa might disrupt the gem industry in American, accordingly its economy. This is because the US is one of the main exporters of gems in the world. Nevertheless, a war in Africa might lead more security breaches and gem smugglings, and thus gem exporter countries' economies might damage. In this sample, it is possible to state that Africa is not the prior region for US to implement unilateral or multilateral policies. However, it might indirectly effect American gem industry. Therefore, from this new American point of view, focusing on every part of the world became more important for American interests, rather than focusing prior areas on the world.

The inference from the US's phases is that the success of the state comes from the isolationism because the US rise up during the isolationist periods and if it were not embraced the isolationism at the beginning of its establishment, the US might not be as strong as it is today. However, during each phase there were some contradictory events had happened against the US foreign policy approaches. Besides, each president tried to govern the country with his own beliefs, values, and standpoints. Therefore, the US had witnessed different foreign policy approaches throughout its history. However, sometimes domestic dynamics acts or reacts differently to the international issues and most of the time presidents and their administrative team have to change their beliefs and foreign policy goals according to these dynamics' expectancy. For instance, during the Cold War, even though some presidents –as

[229] Henry Kissinger, **Amerika'nın Dış Politikaya İhtiyacı Var mı?,** Hazırlayan: Mehmet Özaydın, Metu Press, Ankara 2002, pp. 219-222.
[230] Gültekin Sümer, ''Amerikan Dış Politikasının Kökenleri ve Amerikan Dış Politik Kültürü'', **Uluslararası İlişkiler,** Cilt 5, Sayı 19, (Güz 2008), p. 128.

Gerald Ford- were the fighters against Communism, they wanted to focus on enhancing American economy and focus on domestic issues. Yet, the escalation in the international area and American public's reaction to USSR led them change the direction of their focus from internal to external domain.

Apart from domestic dynamics, it is important to comprehend that US isolationism and internationalism are also unique and different from the classical explanation of these terms in the international relations school or cannot be divided sharply as the way we grasp. As we qualify ''US is isolationist'', it does not mean Americans are living in their own shell, on the contrary, it only means that the US policy-makers does not interest any kind of issues on the world, but their own. By the same token, the internationalist America could act both multilaterally and unilaterally. This is because, in the American perception ''being an internationalist'' means dealing with world's problems as a caretaker. For instance, the times US becomes internationalist, the state could intervene in Iraq without acquiring international approval or US could lead an operation within NATO to bomb Kosovo or Libya through its multilateral approach. It should be noted that the US embraces those approaches according to its national interests not by the meaning of these words.

5. DOMESTIC DYNAMICS IN US: PRIORITIES, PUBLIC OPINION AND LOBBIES

The essential purpose of this study is to demonstrate the existence of domestic features' impact on American foreign policy and presidents' grand strategies, in particular the stereotype domestic tendency influences on these matters. In the previous chapter, this study discussed the historical tendencies and ideological background and their influence over foreign policy. Moreover, the third chapter made an illustration for how ideological and historical background of a country affects the public throughout history; creates stereotype sociological patterns among public and how those essential dynamics pushed presidents to take particular measurements and embrace essential policies according to these tendencies. This chapter will discuss the other three domestic phenomena that have been selected for this dissertation.

The chapter four will elaborate economic/security priorities, lobbies and interest groups, and elections/public opinion within US in order. Firstly, I will try to find an answer to 'What are the economic and security priorities of US?' question in general. In this part I will try to demonstrate economic and security priorities in the historical context. Then, I will look these reflections over foreign policy and president's grand strategies. The following part will be based on the lobby influence on US foreign policy. In order to illustrate a better image, I will explain what we mean by lobby and interest group according to purpose of this study. Then, I will list the most influential groups in American Congress. After that this part will exhibit the lobby and interest group impact on both American foreign policy and president's grand strategies. In the last part of this chapter I will show the effect of public opinion in US foreign policy and impact over American presidents, especially during elections. Firstly, I will identify the presidential system in US, then, elaborate the meaning of public opinion according to purpose of this dissertation. Lastly, I will look to the rhetoric of the last three presidents during their electoral campaign and try to make a correlation between public opinion effect and rhetorical change. In other words, I will try to

argue that what presidents say or use in order to get support and what he could and could not apply after he got elected. The main goal here is to demonstrate the contrast between theory and practice due to domestic prevention within the country. In short, this chapter aims to make an illustration regarding contradictions between theoretical approach of a president and historical/ideological/traditional-based domestic preventions. From this point on, such examples will be mostly given from the last three presidents.

5.1. Economic and Security Priorities

As we alluded in the previous chapters each country has its own national interest, and so does US too. American national interests have shaped around the country's historical experience. In other words, American national interests could also evaluate within the historical framework. By the same token, many American presidents had shaped their foreign policy approaches according to American national interest even though their initial grand strategic foreign policy approaches were different. For instance, as I emphasized in the previous chapter a couple of American Presidents came to Oval Office by embracing American isolationism, however, with the influence of Monroe Doctrine which emphasizes the American superiority in the Western Hemisphere and the whole American continent due to security and economic concerns, many of them had to disrupt their isolationist approach and intervene in external problems with those concerns. Moreover, although Bill Clinton started his journey in White House as a multilateralist president and during his presidency humanitarian intervention gained acceleration through international organizations such as NATO and UN's help. Yet, both because of domestic pressures and external problems President Clinton's US had to bomb Iraq in 1998. In this regard, it is possible to define that the American national interests are superior to its presidents' grand strategies. At this point, it would be useful to illustrate American economic and security priorities to draw a scheme on our minds.

The US' first and the foremost economic goal is the prosperity within the entire country. The economic growth is the starting point of military expansion[231] and promotion of democracy. By the same token, the US believes that once they increase the economic wealth throughout country, the military spending will increase accordingly. Hence, the economic growth is the cornerstone of entire American Grand Strategy without discriminating presidents own grand strategies. Therefore, as it was stated in the first chapter, ''the US can only reach its economic interests by securing the natural flow of liberalism in other countries' domestic environment''.[232] In other words, to ensure US' economic interests, promotion of democracy should be implemented simultaneously. On the other hand, in the sense of ensuring economic prosperity in US, the security of the pipelines are also important to maintain energy trade between US and other countries. Therefore, US must ensure political and domestic stability especially in the Middle East and Caucasians. In this regard, it should be noted that although there is no country which could compete with American economic growth in the world, including Asian economies, due to oil reserves that Middle East acquires the American economy has to deal with Middle East countries both economically and in the sense of ensuring the security of pipelines.

Even though the economic and security interests of US are inseparable pieces of a puzzle, I would like to define US security interests and regional priorities in the sense of security priorities. According to Gholz and his colleagues, American security priorities are based on physical security like homeland and borderline security. As one of the fundamental features of American Expansionism emphasizes the US has reached its natural and divine borders. Both Canada and Mexico are the friendly and weak neighbors for the US. Besides, the East and the West side of US are surrounded by the two biggest oceans of the world.[233]

---

[231] Eugene Gholz, Daryl G. Press, and Harvey M. Sapolsky, ''Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation'', **International Security**, Vol. 21, No. 4, (Spring, 1997), p. 9.
[232] Christopher Layne, pp. 34-35.
[233] Eugene Gholz, Daryl G. Press, and Harvey M. Sapolsky, p. 8.

According to some scholars in the international relations, since the American way of life and moral values are important for Americans, the foreign threat that jeopardizes American values becomes the secondary security concern for US. Therefore, scholars claim that the US has always been looking for an offshore enemy. For instance, in the early years of American establishment, the chief enemy was the European powers such as UK and France. Then, when German expansion in the European continent started to threaten US borderlines and its European allies, Germany became the main rival during the two world wars. In the end of the WWII, the communist USSR became the main opponent due to its threatening ideology towards American liberal values. By the beginning of Cold War, the US understanding of threat has changed. The American way of life, promotion of democracy and liberal values became more important. However, the peak in this understanding occurred in the end of the Cold War, particularly after 9/11 attacks. After 9/11 terror attacks, the US security priorities started to follow a different path: The US foreign interventions embedded on the strategy that finds the original source of threat and then, according to this strategy the US military intervenes before the source of threat attacks to American borderlines or jeopardizes American values.

In this regard, Samuel Huntington might be the only one who could foresee the upcoming aspects of new wars in the post-Cold War era. His main argument is people's cultural and religious identities will be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world. The future wars would be fought not between countries, but between cultures.[234] According to Huntington, the definition of civilization is the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity which distinguishes humans from other species. Furthermore, this civilization might involve a large number of people.[235]

After the 9/11 terror attacks, so many things have changed, including the US foreign policy. Thus, George W. Bush is commonly known for his precautions in the

[234] Samuel P. Huntington, ''The Clash of Civilizations?'', **Foreign Affairs**, Vol. 72, No. 3, (Summer, 1993), p. 22.
[235] Samuel P. Huntington, pp. 23-24.

aftermath of 9/11. For instance, after 9/11 he declared Iran, Iraq and North Korea as the ''axis of evil''.[236] He and his administration changed the nature of war. His fight was against radical Islam or in other words, the good (the US) versus evil in this fight. He declared the ''alliance of the willing'' policy which requires the US' allies to fight against evil. In short, Bush said ''You will either be with us or without us.'' Thus, President Bush separated the world to the ''us'' and ''them''. In addition, it became more apparent during the Iraq war. After Afghanistan, under the umbrella of President Bush's preventive war and pre-emptive strike doctrine[237] the US claimed that Saddam Hussein has nuclear power in Iraq and President Bush turned this fight into a clash against evil.

Another example of this clash of civilizations thesis is the fight against ISIS. ISIS is one of today's Jihadist multinational terrorist organizations which is known for its opposition to Western values and wants to establish a new sovereign state. During his presidency, the Obama administration cooperated with Middle East states in local crises and supported them with the US airstrikes. In particular, the US fought against ISIS with the cooperation of local powers and the US-led strikes operated in 2014 and 2015.[238] In addition, both before and after the presidential elections President Trump also claimed that ISIS should be demolished.

On the other hand, President Trump's Asia-Pacific policy approach led him to take some precautions against China because of the fact that President Trump sees China as the real enemy of the US.[239] Thus, he does not want to see a strong China close to

---

[236] To see the speech please check: ''The Axis of Evil Speech by George W. Bush'', *wheelersburg.net:* https://www.wheelersburg.net/Downloads/Bush%20Axis%20of%20Evil.pdf, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''Text of President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address'', *washingtonpost.com:* https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.htm, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[237] ''The National Security Strategy of the United States of America'', *state.gov:* https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[238] Andreas Krieg, 'Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East'', **International Affairs,** 92: 1, (2016), pp. 103-104, 106-107.

[239] Tucker Higgins, ''In a bad sign for trade talks, Trump deploys a new label for China's Xi – 'enemy''', *cnbc.com:* https://www.cnbc.com/2019/08/23/bad-sign-for-trade-talks-trump-calls-china-president-xi-enemy.html, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and Tom Phillips, ''China urges Trump: be our friend, not our enemy'', *theguardian.com:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jan/20/china-urges-trump-be-our-friend-not-our-enemy, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and Peter Hartcher, ''Why Trump has become China's enemy ... with benefits'', *smh.com.au:* https://www.smh.com.au/national/why-trump-has-become-china-s-enemy-with-benefits-20201102-p56aod.html, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

his Asian allies and the US borders. Moreover, he knows that China threatens the US economy; therefore, he took some economic precautions against China due to his economic nationalist personality.[240] I believe that this is also a version of economic clash of civilizations. As a matter of fact, President Donald Trump was one of the first presidents who proclaimed the rivalry between China and US openly. Indeed, his administration moved the attention of US from North-Atlantic to Asia-Pacific line. At the first glance, it is possible to argue that American security priorities have always been acted on the North-Atlantic line within the historical framework, and thus the new regional priority of the Trump administration has separated American policy-makers into two dimensions: North-Atlantic and Asia-Pacific. Hence, in the last two years of his presidency, President Trump understood that the US cannot neglect North-Atlantic direction along with Middle East problems. By the same token, he tried to focus on issues in Middle East more than Chinese economic growth. For example, with the pressures of Israeli lobby in US, the Trump administration withdrew from the nuclear deal with Iran in 2018.[241]

On the other hand, as Zbigniew Brzezinski argues in his famous book *''The Grand Chessboard''* America focuses on several regions in the sense of ensuring economic safety and physical security. The primary region according to Brzezinski is Eurasia which covers, Europe, Middle East and Caucasians due to its proximity to Russia. Besides, China should be the second focal point for American foreign policy due to its economic rising and Chinese band-wagoning policy both with Russia and Iran.[242] In this regard, it would be plausible to give President Obama's foreign policy sample to draw a better scheme. As it is known, Barack Obama's campaign rhetoric was softer in comparison to Bush's cruel political language. As he came to Oval Office, his administration's initial foreign policy action was the decision of American

---

[240] Randy Schweller, ''Three Cheers for Trump's Foreign Policy What the Establishment Misses'', **Foreign Affairs,** Volume 97, Number 5, September / October 2018, pp. 134-135.

[241] Jackie Headapohl, ''Reactions to President Trump's Decision to Withdraw From the Iran Nuclear Deal'', *thejewishnews.com:* https://thejewishnews.com/2018/05/17/reactions-to-president-trumps-decision-to-withdraw-from-the-iran-nuclear-deal/, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and Anthony Zurcher, ''Three reasons behind Trump ditching Iran deal'', *bbc.com:* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-43902372, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[242] Please check: Zbigniew Brzezinski, **The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And Its Geostrategic Imperatives**, Basic Books, 1998.

troops' withdrawal from Iraq.[243] President Obama's grand strategy was based on burden-sharing policy which means the US will no longer put extra budget for European allies' security.[244] In other words, the US will no longer finance the big share of military spending in international organizations, such as in NATO. Furthermore, the main goal of Barack Obama's grand strategy was to deploy less American soldiers in the offshore countries. However, his presidency interim coincide with the eruption of Arab Spring and Syrian War. Additionally, the annexation of Crimea, Russian resurgence over the Caucasians pushed the Obama administration to pay more attention to those regions again.[245] Hence, in his second presidency interim, President Obama intervene in Middle East, particularly took more responsibility in the Syrian War and arranged high-ranked officers visit to Caucasians due to security and economic concerns. Besides, one should state that President Obama knew the significance of Middle East for the US. Even though his rhetoric was softer and based on smart power, the Obama administration has never stop controlling the threats in this region. Indeed, targeted killing drone strikes to Middle East peaked during his presidency. Barack Obama implemented the targeted killing policy more than any of his colleagues have done.[246] This is because since he decided to retreat American soldiers from Middle East, Obama had to ensure the American security by using other materials. Therefore, one can ever mention that even though his grand strategy was different, the American national interests led him to maintain the existing American foreign policy approach towards Middle East.

---

[243] Lawrence J. Korb, ''The Promised Withdrawal from Iraq'', *americanprogress.org:* https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2009/02/27/5520/the-promised-withdrawal-from-iraq/, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and Thom Shanker, '' Campaign Promises on Ending the War in Iraq Now Muted by Reality'', *nytimes.com:* https://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/04/us/politics/04military.html, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[244] Andreas Krieg, ''Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East'', **International Affairs**, 92: 1, (2016), p. 103.

[245] To reach more information please see: Mahir Khalifa-Zadeh,''The South Caucasus: Obama's Failed Russia "Reset" and The Putin Doctrine in Practice'', **Middle East Review of International Affairs**, Vol. 18, No. 3, (2014), pp. 32-45.

[246] ''Why Obama's 'targeted killing' is worse than Bush's torture'', *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/jan/20/why-obama-targeted-killing-is-like-bush-torture, [Access Date: 27.04.2019].

5.2. Lobbies and Interest Groups

Lobbies and interest groups are as old as states. The lobbying actions have been maintaining their existence since the foundation of states. This is because states are the caretakers of people and each person is unique to himself. Therefore, different thoughts, needs and criticisms might emerge throughout time. Since, humans are eager to talk and communicate, different thoughts might easily gather together and share common beliefs against any kind of phenomenon. For instance, before the rising influence of lobbying actions and interest groups, the Pro-Israeli Lobby had a little impact on US foreign policy. In 1948, the Harry Truman's government became the first country that recognizes Israel as a state. Indeed, the Jewish minority in US played a major role in this foreign policy decision.

The increasing impact of both lobbies and interest groups over American foreign policy can be seen particularly after 1970s. In the beginning of 70s, American society has pulled their unconditional support from American Presidents because of the US failure in Vietnam War. Due to Vietnam Crisis during those years, the public increased its interests towards foreign issues and foreign policy-making and accordingly, amount of these kinds of groups mounted up rapidly.

The lobbying activities are not exclusive to US. There are numerous ethnic lobbies that predominantly influence the state's foreign policy all around the world. For each country, the superior ethnic lobby differs. For instance, in Canada French Lobby is superior to Pro-Israeli lobby, vice versa, in US the Pro-Israeli lobby is superior to French Lobby. Nevertheless, the most intense lobbying activities can be seen in US domestic politics. In his foreign attachments, Tony Smith explains this situation with two statements: The first and the foremost reason of these intense impacts of lobbying activities in US stems from the structure of American political system. Smith argues that the pluralist nature of American domestic politics[247], the structure

[247] James M. McCormick, **Ethnic Interest Groups in American Foreign Policy**, Political Science Publications, Iowa State University, 2012, p. 71.

of the American Congress, and fund-based electoral system bear the competitive environment among lobbies, and thus each lobby tries to control both the domestic atmosphere within States and foreign politics of US according to their interests. On the other hand, as Tony Smith argues, the characteristics of ethnic lobbies and their capabilities make them more influential exclusively in US.[248] The lobbies resort couple of methods while dictating their interests. Generally, there are two mainstream types of lobbying actions. The first one is direct lobbying which requires straightforward communication between the representative of a lobby and decision-maker. The other type is indirect lobbying activity that requires some sort of PR management which supplied by professional lobbying companies in order to create reputation, decent image and direct public opinion according to lobby's interests and goals. For instance, one of the most effective ways is face to face meetings with Congressman. Most of the time, rather than connecting with all the members of American Congress, lobbies pick strategic Congress or Committee members that acquires the critical votes. By using this way, lobbies identify themselves directly to the critical member and impose their interests. Although reaching to particular member of Congress is an effective way of imposing the needs, some lobbies prefer Committee Hearings to deliver their messages. Besides, Grassroots Movement –as correspondence and PR Management- and cooperation among lobbies could be the other options for lobbies. However, providing financial support is the best way to influence the American domestic politics due to fund-based electoral system in US. Lobbies provide financial support either by supporting electoral campaigns or using PAC (political action committee). During Presidential Elections lobbies pick a candidate that is closer to their goals and interests and financially support the candidate during his campaign; rather than supporting the entire political party that the candidate belongs to, lobbies directly make their investments on the individuals. On the other hand, lobbies or interest groups can sometimes create PACs in order to support their candidate or Congress member. Especially after 1970s' Vietnam Crisis unconditional support for the American Presidents has decreased and American society raised their interests towards international issues, and thus such lobbying actions increased as the conclusion of this process.

[248] James M. McCormick, p. 71.

To illustrate better understanding it would be better to explain what we understand from interest groups and lobbies. Therefore, before referring examples of pressure group affects over American Politics, this paragraph will explain both of these terms that were alluded above as an initial step. In *''Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements''* book, Jack L. Walker refers to David Truman's explanation regarding interest groups. According to Truman, interest group could gather around any kind of worldview in order to influence the political life for achieving their gathering-goal. As they gather for an ultimate purpose that aims to influence a state's actions according to their goal, they will automatically become a political genesis. Mostly the members and representatives of these kinds of groups are either messengers of large institutions, multinational corporations, companies or members of local governments.[249] Moreover, McCormick argues that the main purpose among interest groups is to enhance international trade issues, therefore along with corporates, labor unions and agricultural formations can be counted as interest groups. McCormick adds that nowadays interest groups extended their caliber and cover academic think tanks, religious communities, ideological organizations, and veteran organizations.[250] Mearsheimer and Walt define the concept of ''lobby'' as a formation that represents individuals or organizations that endeavor to direct US foreign politics. Indeed, their definition of lobbying actions neither covers a unified movement with core leadership nor individuals that might uncomfortable with certain political issues.[251]

The most effective types of lobbies are undoubtedly ethnic ones. In his book, James McCormick lists some powerful ethnic groups in US. The list is as follows:

[249] Jack L. Walker Jr, **Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements**, University of Michigan Press, 1991, pp. 4-6.
[250] James M. McCormick, p. 69.
[251] John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, **The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy,** Vol. 28, No. 6, London Review of Books, (March 23, 2006), p. 13.

5.2.1. Pro-Israeli lobby

The Pro-Israeli Lobby is the most influential in the US political system and best-known for the goal of shaping US foreign policies according to strategic pro-Israeli implementations. Pro-Israeli Lobby in US has two sub-organizations in its organization scheme. The first formation within the lobby organization is AIPAC that mainly concentrates on supporting or condemning resolution decisions in American Congress, particularly related Israel's and Jewish rights and interests.[252] For instance, mostly after 9/11, AIPAC played role on imposing sanctions on Iran in 2006. Furthermore, AIPAC played major role on US withdrew from Iran nuclear deal in 2018. Indeed, Israel's PM Netanyahu gave a speech at AIPAC meeting and stated that unless Iranian Government will not fix the deal, the US will immediately withdraw from the agreement. Besides, some American anti-war groups that against the withdrawal decision condemned Donald Trump-AIPAC cooperation in 2018.[253] In addition, American public opinion polls demonstrate that Americans prefer to stay in the deal.[254] As another country's PM it is unethical to intervene US's foreign policy actions; nevertheless, his speech could possibly influence the AIPAC members, thus as a strong community Pro-Israeli Lobby in US can shape the foreign policy towards Iran according to their needs.

Another example regarding Jewish-Persian dispute in the region occurred during Trump's withdrawal decision from Syria. Both Jewish minority in US soils and Israel disagreed on this decision. This is because the withdrawal decision was for the prevention of US military's over-extension and prevention of the disruption of the main focus on Chinese issue. However, Israel's strong attacks to Syrian army was

---

[252] To see the entire article please check: John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, ''Is It Love or The Lobby? Explaining America's Special Relationship with Israel'', **Security Studies**, 18:1., pp. 58-78.

[253] Patrick Wintour, ''Trump's decision on Iran is not as black and white as it seems'', *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/may/08/trump-iran-decision-sanctions-waiver-nuclear-deal-continue, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[254] Anthony Zurcher, ''Three reasons behind Trump ditching Iran deal'', *bbc.com:* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-43902372, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

depend on American existence and cooperation in the Middle East,[255] and thus both the biggest lobby in US and state of Israel wanted to pressure Donald Trump to maintain the American existence in the region. The real reason behind this pressure is neither AIPAC nor Israel want any terrorist actions and Iranian existence near its borderlines, in Syria. Recently AIPAC released an issue brief regarding this and it says ''Hezbollah is an Iranian-backed terrorist group based in Lebanon that is dedicated to Israel's destruction.''[256] On the other hand, during the withdrawal disputes another press briefing released by AIPAC that targets Iranian existence in Syria and Hezbollah's terrorist actions, "The administration should work with our regional allies and take steps to counter the mounting aggression of Iran and its terrorist proxy Hezbollah. Iran must not be allowed to have a permanent military presence in Syria, which is counter to US interests and threatens the peace and security of the region."[257] Furthermore, in 2018, American Jewish Committee tweeted that ''We urge President Trump to reconsider withdrawing all U.S. troops from Syria. They have performed heroic service, but their job isn't over. The only winners will be Russia and Iran — and a resurgent Islamic State. Why would we possibly cede ground to them? Stay the course!''.[258] Still, Trump applied his withdrawal decision regardless of all the warnings that came from Jewish community. Yet, one can argue that President Trump maintained US actions in Syria, according to US Grand Strategy interests and cooperated with local powers during the Syrian civil war. In sum, this decision does not indicate that US ends its existence in Middle East, on the contrary, due to its national interests and security concerns the US will continue to its interference through other warfare tools.

---

[255] Eric Cortellessa, ''Trump decision to pull troops from Syria puts pro-Israel groups in a bind'', *timesofisrael.com:* https://www.timesofisrael.com/trump-decision-to-pull-troops-from-syria-puts-pro-israel-groups-in-a-bind/, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

[256] AIPAC Issue Brief, ''Hezbollah'', *aipac.org:* https://aipacorg.app.box.com/s/bvsyb7lm12smg6saintu6mtr7o54zrna, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

[257] Eric Cortellessa, ''Trump decision to pull troops from Syria puts pro-Israel groups in a bind'', *timesofisrael.com:* https://www.timesofisrael.com/trump-decision-to-pull-troops-from-syria-puts-pro-israel-groups-in-a-bind/, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

[258] To reach to AJC tweet please check: *Twitter:* https://twitter.com/AJCGlobal/status/1075888607422930946?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1075888607422930946%7Ctwgr%5E%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.timesofisrael.com%2Ftrump-decision-to-pull-troops-from-syria-puts-pro-israel-groups-in-a-bind%2F, [Acces Date: 23.05.2021].

AIPAC and the Pro-Israeli lobby is so strong in US, in fact, sometimes, it can be stronger than the American citizens' pressure on US President. For instance, in 2000-2005 interim, during Second Intifada years, there was a raising anti-Israeli standpoint among Americans. In fact, in 2001, more than %60 of Americans were backing up President Bush to take American support from Israel. However, after Israeli PM Ariel Sharon's visits and Israel government's pressures on Bush's administration along with Pro-Israeli Lobby's efforts in Congress in order to prevent Bush-Arafat meeting were superior to American public support. On the other hand, the Bush administration was afraid of misunderstandings towards US among Arab world. This is because Israel had the power to change the flow in the Arabic region against US. In the end, the Bush administration could not manage to change foreign policy towards Israel, on the contrary, the US gave support to Israel's hard-line approach.[259]

On the other hand, one of the concerns of Jewish community regarding Iran can be seen in Iran-US rapprochement during the Obama presidency. As a matter of fact, Murtaza Hussain argues that Obama admitted –in his book- that AIPAC wanted to distort Iran nuclear deal and two country's rapprochement during his incumbency.[260] On the other hand, PM of Israel Netenyahu can be considered as a real defender of non-proliferation. In this regard, both Israel's and Jewish community's goal is to prevent the use of WMDs in Middle East, especially by the Iranian government. Therefore, as opposed to Obama's claim in his book and Hussain's argument, AIPAC resources demonstrate that AIPAC offered more strict sanctions on Iran when Iran and UNSC members, plus Germany, were signing the nuclear deal.[261] Besides, AIPAC further argued that for the sake of US-Israel relationship, The American Congress has to maintain its efforts in order to balance Iranian government.[262] Indeed, in 2015, this topic further discussed in one of the House of Representative hearings. According to this hearing, institutions in US not only

[259] John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, pp. 25-27.
[260] Murtaza Hussain, ''Aipac Distorts U.S. Policy On Israel, Obama Admits In Book'', *theintercept.com:* https://theintercept.com/2020/12/01/obama-book-israel-aipac-iran/, [Access Sate: 23.05.2021].
[261] ''AIPAC Statement on Proposed Iran Nuclear Agreement'', https://fedweb-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/fed-72/229/Additional%2520Statements%2520on%2520Iran.pdf [Access Date: 23.05.2021] and ''Six Years After the JCPOA, Much Has Changed'', *aipac.org:* https://www.aipac.org/resources/six-years-after-the-jcpoa-much-has-changed, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[262] ''Congressional Action on Iran Since the JCPOA'', *aipac.org:* https://www.aipac.org/resources/congressional-action-on-iran, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

supported the decision, but also discussed the future of President Obama's multilateral approach regarding international cooperation on non-proliferation.[263]

It can be seen that AIPAC tied itself into the decision-making process, but, the other organization of Pro-Israeli Lobby –Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations-[264] is not as effective as AIPAC in decision-making process.

On the other hand, one can argue that one of the fundamental goals of Israeli Lobby is to ensure the state of Israel's regional security. Yet, it should be noted that according to Osama Anter Hamdi, the interests are mutual in the sense of security strategies. In other words, US foreign policy approach is based on securing Israel and ensuring Israel's superiority in Middle East in order to control the region, and this win-win coalition would preserve both countries interests.[265] In short, US and Israel need each other to realize their national interests and ensure their own securities. Therefore, some of the US interventions in the Middle East occurred due to ensuring Israel's regional security. For instance, US foreign policy towards Iran is mostly shaped by Israel's preferences. This is because Iran, Egypt and Turkey can be counted as the regional hegemons in Middle East and The Israel government sees those countries as threat to its sovereignty. In addition, scholars argue that in President Obama's decision to Syrian intervention, the Israel lobby in US played role due to the security concerns of the state of Israel nearby its borders.

5.2.2. The Cuban lobby

The population of Hispanic Group in US is undeniably excessive. From Texas to Florida Hispanic Groups that mostly migrated from South America dwell in different States. Although the Cuban population holds a smaller rate in this Hispanic Group, they settled in the key electoral states like Florida and New Jersey. Therefore, they

[263] US Congress, House, ''The Future of U.S. International Nuclear Cooperation'', *foreignaffairs.house.gov:* https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/2010/5/future-us-international-nuclear-cooperation, [Access Date: 24.05.2021].
[264] James M. McCormick. pp. 71-72.
[265] Osama Anter Hamdi, "American Foreign Policy toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Strategic Transformations", **Insight Turkey**, 20, no. 2, (2018), p. 252.

hold an important vote potential, and it leads to enhance Cuban Lobby's effectiveness in US policy-making process. Many sources claim that the Cuban Lobby is the second influential lobby in US politics after Pro-Israeli Lobby. The Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) was found in 1981 in order to direct US foreign policy decisions in favor of Cuba.[266] Indeed, as time goes by, the original goal of the Cuban Lobby has converted to the promotion of democracy to Cuba and bringing peace for Cuban citizens who still suffers from the regime in their hometown. Besides, since the Cuban Lobby in US is against Castro and Communist Regime in Cuba, they support US' embargos towards their hometown.[267] As a matter of fact, in 2003, the Cuban Lobby pressured the US Congress and President Bush for the accusation of Castro and his government. In the end, The Cuban Lobby's efforts succeeded; neither George Bush and his government nor President Barack Obama changed the direction of their foreign policy towards Cuba during their presidencies.[268] Yet, according to White House archives and President Obama's speech in 2014, it can be seen that the Obama administration tried to normalize the relationship between Cuba and US. In other words, President Obama took a step to normalize these two country's bilateral relationship and commerce.[269] As a matter of fact, the relationship between US National Security and President Obama's policy shift on this bilateral relationship discussed in one of the House of Representative's Hearings due to the emergence of security concerns that caused by the rapprochement between socialist Cuban Government and liberal US Government.[270] Therefore, it is possible to argue that both American Institutions and Cuban Lobby in US were against Obama's changing policy towards the Cuban Government.

---

[266] ''Purpose'', *canf.org:* https://www.canf.org/about-us/purpose, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[267] Patrick J. Haney and Walt Vanderbush, ''The Role of Ethnic Interest Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the Cuban American National Foundation'', **International Studies Quarterly**, Vol. 43, No. 2, (Jun., 1999), pp. 341, 346-349.

[268] William M. Leogrande, ''Normalizing US–Cuba Relations: Escaping The Shackles of The Past'', **International Affairs**, 91: 3. 2015, pp. 473, 476, 479.

[269] ''Statement by the President on Cuba Policy Changes'', *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/17/statement-president-cuba-policy-changes, [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

[270] US Congress, House, ''The President's New Cuba Policy and U.S. National Security'', *foreignaffairs.house.gov:* https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/hearings?ID=60B70686-B0CD-4C8E-8B6E-1E7A14FBF70A, [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

5.2.3. Greek, Turkish, and Armenian lobbies

There are so many lobby structuring in US political domain. However, these three lobbies are exclusive due to their unique natures. These lobbies are the representatives of three clashing parties both in their own region and in US political system. Especially, the Turkish lobby confronts with both Greek and Armenian sides in its region due to historical disputes.

For instance, after Cyprus intervention in 1972, American Hellenistic Institute (AHI) was established with the endeavors of Greeks. Since then, their fundamental goals to affect US foreign policy and towards Turkey did not witnessed any major changes. Greek Lobby's ideal is to take back Cyprus with the help of US and ensure its regional supremacy in Mediterranean and Aegean Sea.[271] The other Greek organization that aims to influence US Congress is American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA). These two organizations not only tries to take Cyprus back by the help of US, but also they support and try to influence US sanctions on Turkey by sending open letters that aims to distort American-Turkish partnership. For instance, during George W. Bush's presidency, AHI sent a letter to American President regarding 1 March Resolution issue. As a matter of fact, Greek minority in US offered an open cooperation in Cyprus problem and tried to convince that Turkey is an unreliable counterpart.[272] On the other hand, AHI increased its activities against Turkey when the Eastern Mediterranean Gas disputes escalated between Turkey and Greece. As a matter of fact, when US-Turkey relationship deteriorated in 2019, during Donald Trump's presidency, both AHI and AHEPA sent

[271] Füsun Türkmen, ''Turkish–American Relations: A Challenging Transition'', **Turkish Studies**, 10:1, pp. 116-117.
[272] ''AHI Sends Letter to President George W. Bush Regarding The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Times and Turkey'', *heleniccomserve.com:* https://www.helleniccomserve.com/ahi_letter_to_bush.html, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

an open letter to President Trump. The letter aimed to influence to impose more rigid American sanctions to Turkey and maintained Greek claims on Cyprus.[273]

On the other hand, Turkish Lobby's essential interest in US foreign politics is to prevent Armenian genocide resolution in US Congress in order to stabilize international area in favor of Turkish rights and balance Greek Lobby's activities in US political system.[274] The Turkish Lobby proceeds its activities through newly-established Turkish Coalition of American (TCA) organization.[275]

Visa versa, Armenian Lobby tries to make Armenian Genocide legit with the American Congress Resolution.[276] In fact, the American Congress frequently gathers regarding Armenians legitimacy effort. Although the Congress does not proclaim certain verdict on this issue, decisions such as ''encouraging education and public understanding about the Armenian Genocide'' would pass in a resolution.[277] On the other hand, for instance, during Joe Biden's electoral campaign the Armenian lobby invested too much money hoping that he would admit the genocide. Besides, Vice President Kamala Harris met with Armenian communities before the elections and promised for the resolution of the issue.[278] Indeed, as Joe Biden became president, he admitted the Armenian Genocide. On this matter, some scholars argue that although his point of view is very close to pronounce the word ''genocide'', the investment and Armenian support played the major role on this decision. It would be plausible to think that Biden choose this political move due to his fear from any kind of support decline among Armenians.

---

[273] American Hellenic Institute, "Sanctions On Turkey Long Overdue" AHI's Letter To President Trump", 25 May 2019, https://www.ahiworld.org/press-releases-1/2019/5/25/sanctions-on-turkey-long-overdue-ahis-letter-to-presidenttrump?rq=TURKEY. [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

[274] Heather S. Gregg, '' Divided They Conquer: The Success of Armenian Ethnic Lobbies in the United States'', **Inter-University Committee on International Migration**, Rosemarie Rogers Working Paper Series: 13. 2002, p. 19.

[275] To see TCA organization and its actions please check: https://www.tc-america.org/

[276] John Newhouse, ''The Influence of Lobbies on U.S. Foreign Policy'', **Foreign Affairs**, Vol. 88, No. 3, (May/June 2009), pp. 87-88.

[277] ''H.Res.296 - Affirming the United States record on the Armenian Genocide'', *congress.gov:* https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/296?q=%7B%22searc, [Access Date:24.05.2021].

[278] Gökhan Gökçe, ''What's behind Joe Biden's "Armenian Genocide" Statement?'', politicstoday.org: https://politicstoday.org/what-behind-joe-biden-armenian-genocide-statement/, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Indeed, there are other small and effective minority groups exist in American political system. For example, African-American Lobby, Mexican-American Lobby, and The Indian Lobby play role in the decision-making process.

It should be noted that lobbying actions are generally based on PR management and most of the lobbying activities succeeded with indirect lobbying practices. For example, in 1970s, the Argentinian Lobby wanted to create good reputation, lead FDIs to their hometown, and a better image for Argentina among American public. Thus, their lobbying actions included direct letters, press tours regarding Argentina, get along with American press both financially and morally, visits to editorial board members of famous magazines and newspapers, and meetings with businessman.

As a matter of fact, not all the lobbying activities can manage to be successful. For instance, Taiwan Lobby is known as one of the most powerful lobbies among Asian Lobbies, yet, in 1978, all efforts of Taiwan Lobby to prevent Carter administration to recognize People's Republic of China failed.[279] Therefore, even if lobby actions as domestic intervening variable play major role in shaping presidents grand strategies and decisions; sometimes those domestic features are not the leading actors during policy-making process.

5.3. Elections and Public Opinion

Elections and electoral behavior of the voters have always been the focal point for statesmen and political parties. Either an incumbent party or a candidate creates campaign strategies according to voters' behavior or present public opinion. In other words, if there is an economic turndown in the country, the candidate's electoral campaign will be based on economic welfare during the election eve. Indeed, it is a stereotype and inefficient example for understanding the entire voting behavior. This

[279] Conor O'clery, ''Carter defends Taiwan move 20 years ago'', *irishtimes.com:* https://www.irishtimes.com/news/carter-defends-taiwan-move-20-years-ago-1.169073, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

is because each country has different domestic dynamics and each public has different standpoints and expectation towards candidates.

For instance, the US has a unique type of presidential election. The presidential election in US is based on fundraises and in order to run the campaign candidates must obtain various supports from lobbies, multinational corporates and local business owners. Therefore, elections in the country are mostly based on strategic moves toward both domestic and international area, and targets specific foundations and institutions that give huge back up to the candidate. Every four years American citizens vote for the election of the next US President and Vice President. The elections held on the first Tuesday of November. Nonetheless, the process began 1 year earlier before the election date. The first and the foremost essential thing is to determination of the actual candidates from two main parties, Democrat and Republican Party. Indeed, before the determination, there are more than one nominee who want to be the next American President. Therefore, in the primaries and caucuses party members discuss and then vote for the best candidate that will represent the party for a greater good.[280] Then, the victorious candidate begins their rally tour for their campaign, fundraisers and support. Most of the presidential candidates are eager to please lobbies to get more funds. Hence, whether they believe or not, they work on some sort of particular strategies that will help them obtain more support for their campaign.

In the second step of electoral campaign, candidates confronts with each other on a TV platform called the 'debates'.[281] The debates give the opportunity to consolidate candidates' campaign and each candidate has the chance to explain himself better in front of the public, or at least a candidate has the chance to demonstrate his upcoming political reforms and grand strategic behavior. Some particular and

[280] ''Presidential Election Process'', *usa.gov:* https://www.usa.gov/election#:~:text=In%20other%20U.S.%20elections%2C%20candidates,electors%20comes%20from%20the%20Constitution, [Access Date: 24.04.2021] and ''Primaries and Caucuses'', *th.usembassy.gov:* https://th.usembassy.gov/summary-of-the-u-s-presidential-election-process/primaries-and-caucuses/, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

[281] ''Summary of the U.S. Presidential Election Process'', *th.usembassy.gov:* https://th.usembassy.gov/summary-of-the-u-s-presidential-election-process/, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

popular topic of both domestic and international area will be given to candidates before the debate date and candidates make their own strategies against those specific issues, then discuss those topics on the date of debate. The debates are very significant for American public and they are the samples of one of the most clearly observable media impact on elections. American citizens can easily comprehend a candidate's strategy and attitude via TV debates. Thus, Americans' vote is slightly depends on candidates attitude during the debate and his developed strategies. For instance, the last debates between Joe Biden and Donald Trump on 2020 elections made a sound. Most of the reporters and columnists like Domenico Montanaro evaluated Trump's attitudes toward Biden as disrespectful, unpresidential and unethical.[282] On the other hand, Biden's debate strategy was embedded in Barack Obama's debate behavior. His focal targets were economic turndown, increasing of diversification among public and rising rates of poverty during Trump's presidency.[283] Due to Trump's informal behavior against Joe Biden and Biden's debate strategy's correctness some polls had turned upside down in favor of candidate Biden after the debate.

The last step of the presidential election is indeed the day of voting that occurs on the famous first Tuesday of November. Americans go to ballots to vote for President and his Vice President. While they are voting for the administration they want, American citizens actually vote for a group of people named 'electors'. Those voters form a bigger unit system called Electoral College. In the Electoral College system each state's number of electors is based on the population rate of state.[284] Therefore, states like Texas, Florida, California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania are more important due to delegate numbers they contribute during the elections. However, whereas some states are historically tend to vote for a certain party. In other words, for instance, the State

[282] Domenico Montanaro, ''Trump Derails 1st Presidential Debate With Biden, And 5 Other Takeaways'', *npr.org:* https://www.npr.org/2020/09/30/918500976/trump-derails-first-presidential-debate-with-biden-and-5-other-takeaways, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[283] To reach debates please check: ''First 2020 Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden'', *youtube*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wW1lY5jFNcQ, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''Second 2020 Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden'', *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bPiofmZGb8o, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''Trump v Biden: The Final Debate'', *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yGPfKkjDIts, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[284] ''Summary of the U.S. Presidential Election Process'', *th.usembassy.gov:* https://th.usembassy.gov/summary-of-the-u-s-presidential-election-process/, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

of California is tend to vote for Democrats, while middle American states as Nebraska, Kansas, Kentucky and Utah are eager to vote for Republican Party. In addition, some states as Florida, Wisconsin, and Texas are called six swinging states and most of the politicians see them as the determinants of American Presidential Elections. Each state has its own electoral cast and they vote for the next president of US ın the Election Day. The president got elected after getting more than half of (270) the votes of electoral casts and becomes the next-president-elect.[285]

The other important factor that determines the fate of presidential elections and President's grand strategies is indeed the public opinion. Before analyzing the connection between elections and public opinion it would be proper to comprehend the term public opinion and variations of public opinion in US.

The term ''public opinion'' has become the concern of both philosophers and scholars in the early stages of history. From Plato to Hobbes, Locke to French writers, particularly scholars like Rousseau, they all tried to explain the meaning of public opinion for politics. In fact, according to Erikson and Tedin, Rousseau was one of the first scholars who used public opinion as a political term. Their research concludes that Rousseau's public opinion corresponds to behavior and manners of all members of society towards particular issue. Yet, in the early stages of political history no statesmen concerned about public opinion, on the contrary, they did not believe such impact of public on politics. Later on, most of the French writers defined public opinion as public spirit, common will, and public conscience. In this regard, it must be noted that, apart from the French writers, scholars were mentioned above did not refer public opinion while examining the influence of mass opinion on politics. In other words, their understanding of public opinion covers the entire society's standpoint.[286] However, today's public opinion is different than they comprehended. Indeed, the debate about the meaning of the term and its impact on democracy has changed throughout time. Whereas some scholars like Bourdieu

[285] ''US Election 2020'', *bbc.com:* https://www.bbc.com/news/election/us2020/results, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].
[286] Robert S Erikson and Kent L. Tedin, **American Public Opinion: Its Origins, Content and Impac,**. Routledge, 2015, p. 1.

denied its existence,[287] others began trials for explanation of public opinion influence on foreign policy and democracies through scientific polling in 1935. In particular, George Gallup was the first entrepreneur who offered this scientific initiation. According to Gallup and his colleagues, one can identify the will of people correctly by using polls. Nonetheless, sociologist Herbert Blumer and political scientist Lindsay Rogers claim that ''one vote equals to one person'' thought does not corresponds to entire public opinion, rather Gallup's scientific theory was reductionist. Hence, it is not possible to understand interactions among small groups and the formation of common sense in society by merely using polls.[288] Indeed, since the society layer is fluctual, it is impossible to define public opinion with a one stereotype definition.

On this matter, there are various definitions regarding public opinion. This paragraph aims to offer more than one definition of a term, and then, embrace only one of them for the purpose of this study. According to Britannica, public opinion covers individual attitudes, opinions on particular issue, aggregation of the individuals' point of view and their entire expression through notable community. On the other hand, an American sociologist, Charles Horton Cooley defines public opinion as the interactions between individuals.[289] Furthermore, V. O. Key Jr. defines public opinion as "opinions held by private persons which governments find it prudent to heed."[290] Yet, the most satisfying researches regarding public opinion directed by Walter Lippmann. In Lippmann's publication ''Public Opinion'', he approaches to the term from an elitist point of view. Lippmann argues that there are qualified, educated, and elected organizers of opinion and they gather mass communities around them on the Election Day. Still, he foresaw the impact of media on public opinion by the time his book was published, 1922.[291] Besides, some scholars emphasize that Lippmann has changed his own argument throughout time. In this regard, for the purpose of this study, it would be logical to accept public opinion as

[287] George F. Bishop, **The Illusion of Public Opinion: Fact and Artifact in American Public Opinion Polls,** Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004, p. 1.
[288] Robert S Erikson and Kent L. Tedin, pp. 3-4.
[289] ''Public opinion'', *britannica.com:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/public-opinion, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].
[290] Robert S Erikson and Kent L. Tedin, p. 7.
[291] To reach more information please check: Walter Lippmann, **Public Opinion**, Martino Fine Books, 2012.

the entire behavior and standpoint of society as it was in the early stages of its definition in order to embed American public opinion in historical context and tendencies.

The public opinion polling history and its implementation is a very new thing. As Adam J. Berinsky states public opinion polling began in the 1930s.[292] Each country's public opinion shapes in a historical context through particular goals. Indeed, some scholars argue that public opinion has the role on shaping political outcomes and policy actions. In democracies like US, the impact of public opinion on foreign policy is observable. Therefore, even though the leaders and their administration claim the opposite, most of them evaluate those public opinion polls before taking any serious action.[293] For instance, Richard Nixon emphasized that his foreign policy strategy is based on 'realpolitik' norms, nonetheless, he ran a public opinion operation from White House at the same time. Likewise, President Ronald Reagan followed the same path with Nixon. At first, the Reagan administration did not admit the public effect on their decision-making process. Yet, his tactical team institutionalized the public opinion polls in White House.[294]

On the other hand, whereas some scholars argue that national conditions are the essential variables of public opinion polls and presidential elections[295], some scholars claim that most of the Americans usually do not pay attention to external issues and US foreign affairs. In addition, there is only a little correlation found between electoral campaigns and election outcomes. By the same token Thomas M. Holbrook separates the national conditions into two main domains. The first one is the consumer sentiment and the second one is the presidential popularity. According to consumer sentiment idea, the prosperity in economic circumstances and economic

[292] Adam J. Berinsky, **In Time of War Understanding American Public Opinion from World War II to Iraq**, The University of Chicago Press, 2009, p. 13.
[293] Bojang As, p. 7.
[294] Philip J. Powlick and Andrew Z. Katz, ''Defining the American Public Opinion/Foreign Policy Nexus'', **Mershon International Studies Review**, Vol. 42, No. 1, (May, 1998), p. 46.
[295] Thomas M Holbrook, "Campaigns, National Conditions, and U.S. Presidential Elections", **American Journal of Political Science,** 38, no. 4, (1994), p. 973.

strategy of the incumbent party gain more support at the public opinion polls.[296] As a matter of fact, in *''The American Campaign: U.S. Presidential Campaigns and the National Vote''*, James E. Campbell claims that election-year economy, economic developments during the electoral campaign, and the economic performance during four-year presidency are the decisive notion of political outcomes and the creation of public opinion.[297] Regardless, the other criteria that influence voters and public is the president's popularity and charismatic stance against foreign issues.[298]

Apart from this, scholars of international relations are in dispute regarding the stability of American public opinion towards foreign issues. A notable portion of scholars and elites know that Americans stance toward US foreign applications has been fundamentally doubtful, and thus according to this small and respectful portion of elites, it is not stable. By the same token, Gabriel Almond claims that an external crisis which threatens US borderline and Americans might temporarily change the public opinion. In other words, their reactions are volatile or might witness rapid changes throughout history.[299] The rapid increase in the rates of anger and statecraft among Americans might become more observable, but when the side effects of the foreign policy crisis the public reaction vanishes. Likewise, Page and Shapiro agrees on Almond's idea and they further add that the shift between two different points is plausible considering the notable influence of mass media and changing environment over Americans.[300] Nevertheless, Caspary has reached different results. According to his research model, American people have stable standpoint towards the US role in the external domain and its interventionist foreign policy approach.[301] On this matter, one must argue that Caspary was right. The Americans have particular goals both in domestic and foreign area. Although the circumstance and issues are changing, their goals and the window they look from remains constant. Still, it is possible to add that

---

[296] Thomas M Holbrook, pp. 973, 982.
[297] James E. Campbell, **The American Campaign: U.S. Presidential Campaigns and the National Vote**, Texas A&M University Press, 2000, p. 127.
[298] Thomas M Holbrook, p. 983.
[299] Gabriel A. Almond, **The American People and Foreign Policy**, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950, p. 72.
[300] Benjamin Page and Robert Shapiro, "Foreign Policy and the Rational Public", **Journal of Conflict Resolution**, 32, no. 2, (1988), pp. 211–247 and Benjamin Page and Robert Shapiro, **The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences**, University of Chicago Press, 1992.
[301] Pierangelo Isernia, Zoltán Juhász, and Hans Rattinger. "Foreign Policy and the Rational Public in Comparative Perspective", **The Journal of Conflict Resolution**, 46, no. 2, (2002), pp. 203-204.

the rate of anger might change due to changing environment and circumstance, but this does not lead any major opinion or standpoint changes among Americans.

In order to understand American public opinion and election strategies, it would be useful to list American public's nerves and concerns regarding political issues and daily routine goals. As Drezner argues, although Americans may seem like the only thing matters is the promotion of liberal values, those are the secondary topics and concerns for Americans. On the contrary, according to Drezner, American public opinion has a realist tradition. This is because more than %70 of Americans concern about their jobs, continuation of energy supplies and safety of the pipelines, and protection of their Homeland against various attacks from American enemies and terrorist. Besides, Public Agenda's 2005-2006 interim surveys prove the argument of Daniel Drezner. According to these series of inquires, Americans are inherently self-interested people. Therefore, topics as the promotion of democracy, encouraging the awareness for human rights violation and enhance UN's statue are the secondary topics for American citizens. Yet, one must argue that they could still be on the agenda of Americans due to their belief in morality influence on US foreign policy choices among American public.[302] In addition, most of the Americans secondarily care about US hegemony and charisma against bully states and countries which endangers American borderlines, and thus Americans rather see US superiority against other nations. Moreover, apart from US' national interests, Americans created a common national interest tendency that directly shapes public opinion. According to a famous article ''Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation'', American shared goals and US national interests covers each other. In this regard, cherish the American prosperity and protecting American borderlines are highly important for Americans along with the promotion of democracy and spreading liberal American values.[303] As a matter of fact, it is possible to argue that due to US' federal system each state within American soil might have different public opinions. For instance, both the mass media and political elites separate states into two colors that originally indicates two mainstream parties,

[302] Daniel W. Drezner, ''The Realist Tradition in American Public Opinion'', **Perspectives on Politics,** Vol. 6, No. 1, (Mar., 2008), pp. 56-57.
[303] Eugene Gholz, Daryl G. Press, and Harvey M. Sapolsky, p. 7.

blue and red. Red states are known for their Republican leans and blue are known as the supporters of Democrat Party. Besides, states could also be distinguished according to their prosperity level.[304] For instance, poor states' public opinions might transform around the opposition of international trade due to the belief that international trade jeopardizes American jobs, on the contrary, rich states might support free market system along with international trade applications. In this regard, a Republican candidate might concentrate on his tours to red states, whereas a Democrat prefers to visit blue states. By the same token, a candidate could possibly want to demonstrate his endeavor for national economy in poor states, whereas the incumbent emphasize the significance of international trade in rich states.

Whilst most scholars, like Philip J. Powlick and Andrew Z. Katz, argue that American public opinion has changed in the last twenty-year interim[305], some scholars say that the 9/11 terror attacks are not a cornerstone in the restoration of American public opinion and surveys claim that public opinion remained constant as it was back in 1990s.[306] On this matter, one could argue that electoral campaigns and campaign strategies have no effect on public opinion. However, the flow might go reverse. In other words, public opinion could shape a president's Grand Strategy and rhetoric during the election-year, and thus this claim proves that the candidate's campaign cannot make any major change in American public opinion. Only the candidate who wants to defeat his opponent might shape his Grand Strategy and rhetoric around public choices and needs. Indeed, it would be useful to dig this argument down through election-year samples and scholars' claims.

The beginning of millennium can be seen as the cornerstone of change in electoral campaigns. As Costas Panagopoulos argues the sociopolitical environment within the country influences a candidate's campaign strategy.[307] Especially, it is possible to

---

[304] For more information please see: Peter K. Enns and Julianna Koch, ''Public Opinion in the U.S. States: 1956 to 2010'', **State Politics & Policy Quarterly**, 13(3), 2013, pp. 349–372.
[305] Philip J. Powlick and Andrew Z. Katz, ''Defining the American Public Opinion/Foreign Policy Nexus'', **Mershon International Studies Review**, Vol. 42, No. 1, (May, 1998), p. 29.
[306] Daniel W. Drezner, p. 56.
[307] Costas Panagopoulos, ''All about that base: Changing campaign strategies in U.S. Presidential elections'', **Party Politics,** Vol. 22(2), 2016, pp. 179, 188.

confirm that American public have increased its involvement in foreign affairs and 9/11 became the eruption point for statecraft in US soils. In other words, something have been sleeping within American souls for a long time awakened, being American became popular along with the notion of American exceptionalism. Therefore, candidates realized that even though their grand strategies or worldviews are different, they should act or change their rhetoric according to public needs, sensitivity, and ongoing domestic dynamics. Or else Democrats or Republicans select their presidential candidate according to those features. As a matter of fact, public opinion is fluid and so does the developments, particularly developments in the measurement of public opinion and tactics in mobilizing American public. For instance, in the beginning of 2000s persuading the individual or swing votes became more important rather than leaning on base mobilization.[308] Moreover, whereas both national and local media are the key factors that affect American public in 2004 elections, the internet became more important in 2008 presidential elections.[309] In addition, researches demonstrate that American beliefs played role in 2012 elections, particularly candidates' rhetoric regarding American beliefs which they used during their electoral campaign had a great influence on public's moral conviction and president-elected preferences.[310] In this regard, President Donald Trump was one of the candidates who benefited from American beliefs. This is because his campaign slogan ''Make America Great Again!'' reminds the old and privileged America to American citizens.[311] Donald Trump awakened old Jacksonian School among American public by taking advantage of Americans' historical tendencies.[312] Yet, one must argue that Donald Trump did not change his political rhetoric according to public needs. Still, from one aspect his party could have seen the public needs and the direction of public mobilization, and thus Republicans elect Trump as their

---

[308] Costas Panagopoulos, 179-180.

[309] Dan Drew and David Weaver, ''Voter Learning Did the Media Matter? In The 2004 Presidential Election'', **J&M Quarterly**, Vol. 83, No. 1, 2006, pp. 25-42 and Sunil Wattal and others, ''Web 2.0 and Politics: The 2008 U.S. Presidential Election and an E-Politics Research Agenda'', **MIS Quarterly,** Vol. 34, No. 4, December 2010, pp. 669-688.

[310] Mark J. Brandt, Daniel C. Wisneskib, and Linda J. Skitka, ''Moralization and the 2012 U.S. Presidential Election Campaign'', **Journal of Social and Political Psychology**. Vol. 3(2), 2015, pp. 211–237.

[311] Paul Blumenthal, ''Trump's 'Make America Great Again' Myth Reaches Its Catastrophic Conclusion'', *huffpost.com:*https://www.huffpost.com/entry/trump-make-america-great-again-riot_n_5ff8dc13c5b691806c490ecd, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[312] **Jacksonion School:** is a widespread thought among American middle class that corresponds to less-knowledged community and defends American security could only been ensured by enhancing military. In the state of peace they defend American isolationism.

president candidate. However, these are not the only factors of Trump's election. According to Lawrence D. Bobo, Donald Trump's electoral victory depends on 3 fundamental sources. 1) Other presidential candidate Hilary Clinton's failure on her electoral campaign, 2) Donald Trump's political rhetoric, as I elaborated above, 3) Economic turndown in the country.[313] Indeed, economic wealth is an important factor for each nation in this world. As James Campbell argues election-year economy and prosper environment might be the decisive factor on shaped-public opinion towards the incumbent president or candidate.[314]

On the other hand, although there is no clear evidence or correlation between starting up war during the election time and its influence on American public opinion, some scholars believe that American presidents' strategy regarding warfare back fires most of the time. For instance, after 9/11 terror attacks, there were a huge public support for Bush and his Afghanistan intervention. Nevertheless, the American public pulled back his support in 2003, when the Iraq war started. It would be inaccurate to claim that there were no support for Bush during the whole 2003, yet, the huge support decreased either way. Therefore, even though Senator John Kerry voted for the intervention in Iraq, he never mentioned the Iraq intervention during his electoral campaign for 2004 elections.[315] However, whilst most of the political elites were waiting for President Bush's defeat in 2004, as it happened for President Johnson and Truman when they started an offshore war, George Bush did not share the same fate with his predecessors.[316]

Apart from the relationship between war and elections, both presidents and candidates are highly interested in public opinion polls. A 2002 public opinion survey revealed that Americans prefer burden-sharing policy approach[317], rather than carrying European countries military spending budgets. Therefore, there was no

---

[313] Lawrence D. Bobo, ''Racism in Trump's America: reflections on culture, sociology, and the 2016 US presidential election'', **The British Journal of Sociology**, Volume 68, Issue S1, 2017, p. 85.
[314] James E. Campbell, p. 127.
[315] Adam J. Berinsky, p. 30.
[316] Christopher Gelpi, Peter D. Feaver, and Jason Reifler, **Paying the Human Costs of War**, Chapter 1. Princeton University Press, 2009, p. 6.
[317] Daniel Drezner, p. 57.

coincidence that after President Obama elected in 2008, he placed his grand strategy approach on burden-sharing policy, especially towards NATO-member European countries. Besides, Obama's campaign strategy was based on retreatment from Iraq and less deployment of American soldiers in offshore countries. This is because even during the 2004 presidential elections, the support for Iraq war decreased. Furthermore, Barack Obama knew that no American wants to spend holidays and Christmas far from homeland, especially in warfare. This might count as one of the reflections of American Exceptionalism in the historical context, and thus Obama used this sensitivity during his electoral campaign, promised to pull back American soldiers from Iraq. Yet, as it was emphasized above in the first part, this was not the initial grand strategy of Barack Obama, on the contrary, one might argue that this was only related with President Obama's soft rhetoric after his predecessor's cruel political discourse. However, Obama knew that he had to maintain US security priorities, and thus while he was pulling back American soldiers from the war zone, he increased targeted killing drone strikes towards Middle East. In fact, the targeted killing drone strikes peaked during his presidency. Still, it is possible to argue that if the Obama administration would not have done this implementation, the American public would have pulled back their support due to increase in security breach against their borderlines or the American way of life.

6. GRAND STRATEGIES OF THE LAST THREE US PRESIDENTS

As it was stated in the second chapter grand strategy means ‘’a set of short term policies produces as a long term plans’’. In this regard, any kind of short term plans including the tools of low policies as realist school of thought classifies could be the part of grand strategy. In other words, from security to economic policies, education strategies to environment politics, those kinds of short term policies forms a state’s grand strategy. On this matter it is possible to argue that each state has its own grand strategy. Within their historical context a state’s grand strategy can be shaped around different kind of prior topics. For instance, for Asian states enhancing economic development could be the fundamental goal of the grand strategy, whereas European states or countries of Middle East prioritize safety in their long term policies.

Scholars who focus on the evolvement of American Grand Strategic plans throughout time come up with numerous arguments. As I investigated in the first chapter scholars believe that the US Grand Strategy has transformed from time to time and there are three possible definitions stands for US Grand Strategy since the early 1940s. Yet, it should be noted that this does not mean the US Grand Strategy has not been changing since then, on the contrary, as the world changes and globalizes the US Grand Strategic plans slightly transforms itself. Without any major differences the three different theories regarding US Grand Strategy meets on the same platform, and almost argues the same idea, the US Grand Strategy inherently concerns about borderline security and preserving American way of life. In this regard, Mearsheimer claims that US Grand Strategy is based on offshore balancing which advocates the security in the offshore countries ensures American values and Homeland’s security. As opposed to Mearsheimer’s offshore balancer theory, Christopher Layne argues that American Grand Strategy has embedded on extraregional hegemony since the early 1940s.[318] In addition, Layne says that US’ ‘’Open Door Policy’’ indulges the idea of homeland security and aims to protect

[318] Christopher Layne, p. 28.

‘’American Way of Life’’ in the aspect of domestic concerns. According to this idea, in order to be safe within the borders of the US, safety abroad must be maintained and preserved.[319] On the other hand, as a different point of view from this dissertation, Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley argues that the American way of grand strategy follows a liberal-international standpoint and it contains two mainstream features in itself, (economic) openness and non-isolationism.[320] In conclusion, it can be observed that many scholars worked in this field have developed various arguments for US Grand Strategic behavior. Still, this study is somewhere between Layne’s and Mearsheimer’s standpoint. Besides, it can be argued that the US has its own grand strategy and it does not merely depend on a single individual, so-called president.

Although it was emphasized that the US maintains the same grand strategy since the beginning of WWII, according to some authors the 9/11 terror attacks was the turning point for US Grand Strategy. Indeed, according to Audrey Kurth Cronin, the US demonstrated five basic grand strategic reactions in the post 9/11 era.[321]

1. In the post 9/11 era, the main goal of US Grand Strategy shaped around protecting American soils against Radical Islamist groups which directly attacks to American physical borders and against American values. Ensuring Homeland security became the essential goal both for US Grand Strategy and US Presidents due to the significance of providing domestic resilience.[322]

2. As it was emphasized frequently in this thesis, one of the fundamental goals of US Grand Strategy is to provide economic prosperity in order to increase military spending. Therefore, the US Grand Strategic aim leaned on regaining the reputation of American economic opportunism. Besides, since Americans concern about the

[319] Christopher Layne, pp. 3, 27-28, 30-32.
[320] Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, p. 21.
[321] Audrey Kurth Cronin, ‘’U.S. Grand Strategy and Counterterrorism’’, **Orbis**, (2012), pp. 22-23.
[322] Audrey Kurth Cronin, pp. 22-23.

protection of American jobs, ensuring the stable economic environment is much more important for controlling domestic atmosphere within the country.[323]

3. Since the rule-based international system was created by the intense efforts of US, the American statesmen must consolidate the existence of this system.[324]

4. In order to deal with regional issues the US Grand Strategy offers the cooperation of US with other regional powers in the problematic continents of the world. Later, this theory became the part of both Obama's and Trump's Grand Strategic plans, as burden-sharing policy. Besides, both presidents cooperated with the local powers during the Arab Spring clashes, particularly with the aim of demolishing ISIS their administrations worked with what Turkey called enemy, PYD-YPG.[325]

5. In the post 9/11 era, the transformed US Grand Strategy re-offers the implementation of the self-determination idea as the initial argument of US since WWI. [326]

Apart from US Grand Strategy, each president might have his own grand strategy approach. However, most of the time it overlaps with US Grand Strategy and American domestic features. Indeed, most of the time US domestic features and grand strategy prevail president's own grans strategic plans. As the ultimate goal of this dissertation, this chapter will illustrate the overlapping and prevailing points of each three presidents' grand strategies, excluding Joe Biden.

In the following parts, each Presidents' grand strategic behavior will be investigated around multilateral, unilateral and interventionist approaches. By the same token, this chapter will look into overlapping and prevailing parts of each three Presidents' grand strategies. In addition, each part aims to understand why those presidents could

[323] Audrey Kurth Cronin, pp. 22-23.
[324] Audrey Kurth Cronin, pp. 22-23.
[325] Audrey Kurth Cronin, pp. 22-23.
[326] Audrey Kurth Cronin, pp. 22-23.

not manage to make major changes in their policies even though their initial grand strategies and point of views were different.

6.1. George W. Bush and His Grand Strategic Approach

After the two terms presidency of Bill Clinton, the son of the 41st president of the US got elected from Republican's party as the 43rd president of America. As opposed to his father, Bush Jr. stayed at the oval office for two terms, in the years between 2001 and 2009. In fact, due to incidents that happened during his first term and his policy implementations against the events led the US citizens to re-elect him for the office.

Without no doubt, the most important incident that happened during his presidency was the 9/11 terror attacks. According to Huntington's ''The Clash of Civilization'' thesis, after the 9/11 terror attacks, so many things have changed, including the US foreign policy. Thus, George W. Bush is commonly known for his precautions in the aftermath of 9/11. For instance, after 9/11 he declared Iran, Iraq and North Korea as the ''axis of evil''.[327] He and his administration changed the nature of war. His fight was against radical Islam or in other words, the good (the US) versus evil in this fight. He declared the ''alliance of the willing'' policy which requires the US' allies to fight against evil. In short, Bush said ''You will either be with us or without us.'' Thus, President Bush separated the world to the ''us'' and ''them''. As an initial reaction, George W. Bush's administration found the source of problem and intervened in Afghanistan to demolish al-Qaede. In addition, the phrase of President George W. Bush, became more apparent during the Iraq war. On the other hand, he proclaimed his doctrine which is one of the most famous doctrines in US history due to its new policy approaches. In 2002, the Bush Administration proclaimed its National Security Strategy. The 2002 NSS was aimed to fight with diseases, spreading and enhancing free trade, struggling with terrorist groups, re-arrangement

[327] To see the speech please check: ''The Axis of Evil Speech by George W. Bush'', *wheelersburg.net:* https://www.wheelersburg.net/Downloads/Bush%20Axis%20of%20Evil.pdf, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''Text of President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address'', *washingtonpost.com:* https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.htm, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

of the American Army and promotion of democracy. Both NSS and President George W. Bush's doctrine demonstrated that the US will no longer lives in the détente process of Cold War, on the contrary, the US will embrace more offensive strategies after 9/11 terror attacks.[328] Indeed, in his book Liberal Leviathan, John Ikenberry states that all those policies that George W. Bush embraced throughout his presidency consists the six elements of his grand strategy vision.[329] However, Ikenberry emphasizes that there are several failures that his grand strategy vision has. For instance, President Bush's grand strategic approach stuck between conservative national impulses and security priorities. On the other hand, President George W. Bush's unipolar security order, regime-changing strategic visions towards aggressive states are the other failures in his grand strategy during the post-Cold War period.[330]

Robert Jervis claims the Bush doctrine as idiosyncratic due to Bush's extraordinarily ambitious goals. In addition, he separates his doctrine into four mainstream elements. These are: Spreading (Promoting) Democracy, Preventive War, Remaining Unilateral, Maintaining the American hegemony.[331] I will not mention all futures of his doctrine in this part, however, according to Jervis, the first element –promoting democracy- is the idealist characteristic of the Bush administration. On the other hand, the aim of maintaining the American hegemony in the world is something beyond justice; it is more about building an American empire.[332] Thus, in this sense, one might argue that President Bush embraced realist school of thought both in his grand strategy and political manners like his father. In addition, the promotion of democracy was not exclusive to George W. Bush, on the contrary, without distinguishing the ways of spreading American values it was inherently belongs to US Grand Strategy.

---

[328] ''National Security Strategy Report - September 2002'', *globalsecurity:* https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/national/nss-020920.htm, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002'', *state.gov:* https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[329] To see the six elements of George W. Bush's grand strategy please check: John Ikenberry**,** pp. 256-263.

[330] John Ikenberry, pp. 269-273.

[331] Robert Jervis, ''Understanding the Bush Doctrine: Preventive Wars and Regime Change'', **Political Science Quarterly**, Volume 131, Number 2, 2016, pp. 286, 289, 294, 297, 308.

[332] Robert Jervis, pp. 288, 297.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the immediate response of the US was the declaration of war against Afghanistan. Nonetheless, the most striking point was the implementation of the article 5 for the first time in NATO's history which requires the coalition and declaration of war -by the all member of NATO- against Afghanistan. In other words, when the US government declared the implementation of article 5, they declared the collective security action against Afghanistan. Therefore, one can argue that President Bush (Jr.) also needed NATO for US national interests. Besides, the non-NATO members such as China, Russia, UAE and etc. supported the Afghanistan operation.[333] At this point, in all security arrangements, the principles of multilateralism are embodied in collective security actions.[334] In other words, during the operation to Afghanistan, President George W. Bush embraced the multilateral approach like his predecessor, George H. W. Bush.

Nevertheless, one cannot say the same things for Iraq's intervention. After Afghanistan, under the umbrella of President George W. Bush's preventive war and pre-emptive strike doctrine –which requires unilateralism- the US claimed, particularly in President George W. Bush's speech in Cincinnati it was proclaimed, that Saddam Hussein has nuclear power in Iraq.[335] Nonetheless, the US could not find the support from most of its allies as it found for Afghanistan. Thus, the US started the operation only with the coalition of the UK. Besides, the Bush administration did not ask the approval of international society after the UNSC did not approve for any kind of intervention in Iraq after Afghanistan. The intervention in Iraq was discussed both in UN's assembly and UNSC more than once. Indeed after the intervention of US-UK coalition UN assembly gathered for the several withdrawal debates.[336] However, it should be noted that the national security adviser, Condoleezza Rice's statements were neglecting any disapproval of UNSC at that time. In fact, Rice claimed that with or without any approval Saddam Hussein and

---

[333] Ahmet Hamdi Topal, ''Uluslararası Terörizm ve Terörist Eylemlere Karşı Kuvvet Kullanımı'', Ankara: Beta Yayınları, 2004, pp. 234-238.

[334] ''Multilateralism'', *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/multilateralism, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

[335] ''Transcript: George Bush's speech on Iraq'', *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/oct/07/usa.iraq, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[336] ''Security Council Holds First Debate On Iraq Since Start Of Military Action; Speakers Call For Halt To Aggression, Immediate Withdrawal'', *un.org:* https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sc7705.doc.htm, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

his arsenal should be demolished.[337] Therefore, Bush exhibited unilateral approach in Iraq case. On the other hand, at the end of the war, it turned out there is no nuclear power in Iraq,[338] however, the Bush administration overthrown Saddam Hussein and interfered to Iraq's domestic politics. Thus, the Bush administration was interventionist.

During his era, President George W. Bush was surrounded by Jewish-New Yorker intellectuals also known as neoconservatives. In other words, domestic pressure groups shaped his foreign policy implementations and his worldview which automatically leads the change in his grand strategy. During his presidency, the debate between neo-cons and realist became more apparent. For instance, whereas realists saw the Iraq war as unnecessary, neoconservatives supported the war. Even Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer wrote an article named ''An Unnecessary War''[339] about it. Besides, neo-cons embraced a liberal theory of international relations which is against realist standpoint. In addition, neoconservatives are against balance-of-power politics. At this point, Mearsheimer defines their world policy approach as ''bandwagoning''.[340] According to this information, unlike his father, in most of the cases, President George W. Bush's realist, unilateral and interventionist grand strategy might seem very idealistic, especially in the 21st century where the international community and organizations were on the rise.

Apart from Afghanistan and Iraq, in his second term, President George W. Bush released another National Security Strategy in 2006. As opposed to his first term's National Security Strategy, President Bush prioritize global peace and commerce in this time, also he claimed that he cares about international cooperation. Therefore, his second term strategies demonstrate a transition from unilateralism to

---

[337] Suzanne Goldenberg, ''US will attack without approval' Zero tolerance' policy by Bush administration'', *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/nov/11/iraq.usa, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[338] ''Iraq Survey Group Final Report'', *globalsecurity.org:* https://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/2004/isg-final-report/isg-final-report_vol1_rsi-06.htm, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and ''CIA's final report: No WMD found in Iraq'', *nbcnews.com:* https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna7634313, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[339] Please see: John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt. ''An Unnecesary War''. *Foreign Policy*. 2003. pp. 50-59.

[340] Brian C. Schmidt and Michael C. Williams, ''The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives Versus Realists'', **Security Studies**, 17:2, (2008), pp. 196, 201-202.

multilateralism[341] like his predecessors George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton. Apart from this, it should be noted that President George W. Bush's realist foreign policy standpoint did not allow major changes in the previous statements of 2002 NSS in 2006 NSS of US. Moreover, with this document, the Bush Administration and US foreign policy indirectly stated that Iraq and Afghanistan are not the only enemies of US, states, such as Yemen, Sudan, Iran and even the African continent were noted on the US' ''war on terror'' list. As a matter of fact, the US started to see People's Republic of China as a potential threat, and this statement proved by National Security Strategy in 2006.[342]

On the other hand, it is possible to claim that due to his ''coalition of the willing'' policy in the aftermath of 9/11 terror attacks, he was also a moralist. This is because after he declared the ''axis of evil'' he converted the type of war, as the war of good against evils. In addition, the motivation behind the Iraq war was this.

According to George W. Bush's doctrine, one of the main objectives of his, is the promotion of liberal democracy to the world because of the fact that he believed that only promoting democracy to non-democratic states will deter them. Moreover, if they become democratic states the US will be more secure and increase its relations with those states.[343] Indeed, after the fall of communism, President George W. Bush saw that it is the right time for spreading liberal democracy where the lack of counter-ideology. On the other hand, this was not an exclusive strategy for George W. Bush. This is because the US economic interests and grand strategy were embedded on this ideology. In other words, the economic interests of US defend the security of pipelines, economic areas in order to enhance US economy and liberal values. In other words, the US believes that as the American values spread around

[341] Gökhan Öçalan, ''Soğuk Savaş Sonrası ABD Ulusal Güvenlik Stratejileri'', *Akademik Perspektif:* http://akademikperspektif.com/2014/02/20/soguk-savas-sonrasi-abd-ulusal-guvenlik-stratejileri/, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

[342] ''The National Security Strategy, March 2006'', *georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov:* https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2006/, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[343] Robert Jervis, pp. 288, 297.

the world, the free market strategy will be safer. Therefore, one can argue that it was an inevitable ‘’end’’ of political strategy and unbreakable part of US grand strategy.

6.2. Barack Obama and His Grand Strategic Approach

Barack Hussein Obama was the 44th president of the US who stayed at the office during the 2009-2017 interim. The Obama administration wanted to use smart power instead of former administration’s hard power policy implementations. In fact, there is a widespread perception among Americans that Obama will save the bad reputation of US. In this regard, the speeches that were given in Turkish Grand National Assembly[344] and Cairo by Obama are the reflectors of this belief. Especially in Cairo, President Obama emphasized the notion of multilateral actions and tried to compensate George W. Bush’s ‘’us’’ and ‘’them’’ statements with those words: ‘’The interests we share as human beings are far more powerful than the forces that drive us apart.’’[345] Yet, these were not the only examples of Obama’s endeavors for re-increasing US popularity among Arabs. President Barack Obama wanted to erase the perception of ‘’All Muslims are terrorists’’ from Western minds. Therefore, his first interview was with an Arabic TV channel, al-Arabiya.[346] In sum, it is possible to argue that President Obama preferred dialogue with Arab World, rather than discriminating and defining Muslims as terrorists. Hence, Obama tried to demonstrate his attitude towards Arab World through his political gestures.

As a matter of fact, the Obama Administration did not try to make a show while giving speeches and interviews with Arab world, on the contrary, the NSS that released in 2010 was illustrating the willing of President Obama for the cooperation with Arab world. In his 2010 NSS, it was emphasized that in order to fight with terrorist groups, such as al-Qaeda, the US has to cooperate and communicate with

---

[344] ‘’Obama TBMM'de konuştu’’, *ntv.com.tr:* https://www.ntv.com.tr/video/turkiye/obama-tbmmde-konustu,wL9_0cPUMU-Z06Bvy_wq4g, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[345] ‘’President Obama Speech to Muslim World in Cairo’’, *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B_889oBKkNU, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[346] ‘’Full transcript of Obama's Al-Arabiya interview’’, *nbcnews.com:* https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna28870724, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

Muslims in the world. On the other hand, President Obama's multilateral attitude towards foreign politics can be observed in the same NSS. According to NSS 2010, the American-led international coordination is essential for the promotion of democracy and economic development. Besides, the NSS 2010 foresaw the need for engagement with Russia, China and India as emphasizing that the US security depends on economic development.[347] Even though, external and domestic pressures occurred in his second term and the Obama administration had to change political behavior against Arab revolutions and intervened in Libya and Syria due to several reasons, Obama never stop defending multilateral approach as it can be seen in his second NSS, released in 2015. Still, it should be noted that the NSS 2015, mostly based on American supremacy and preserving national interests and values[348] due to severel incidents occurred in the world and potential American security breaches because of those revolutions and emergence of new anti-American groups, particularly ISIS.

As opposed to his colleagues, Bush and Trump, President Obama led the rapprochement between Iran and US, along with the cooperation between Syria and US.[349] In this regard, after Hassan Rouhani won the elections, two leaders spoke on the phone.[350] It can be seen as the sign of high-level diplomatic engagement after the harsh US sanctions on Iran and condemning, humiliating rhetoric of President George W. Bush's political discourse towards this country. Indeed, this is another example of Obama's multilateral foreign policy approach along with his aim to compensate his predecessor's political moves. On the other hand, his multilateral endeavors concluded with a historical deal with Iran. In 2015, Iran agreed a long-

[347] ''National Security Strategy - May 2010'', *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[348] ''National Security Strategy - February 2015'', *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy_2.pdf, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[349] David Schenker, ''President Obama's First Two Years in the Middle East'', **The Washington Institute**, Dec 2010, https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/president-obamas-first-two-years-middle-east [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[350] Jeff Mason and Louis Charbonneau, ''Obama, Iran's Rouhani hold historic phone call'', *reuters.com:* https://www.reuters.com/article/us-un-assembly-iran-idUSBRE98Q16S20130928, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

term deal with world powers known as the P5+1 -the UK, China, France, US, Russia, and Germany.[351]

During the presidency of Bush, too many American soldiers died in Iraq war and Afghanistan. Due to his predecessor's reckless policies, Obama referred to ''retreat from Iraq'' so many times in his electoral campaign speech.[352] This is because everyone knows that there is nothing more important than an idea of an American soldier is celebrating New Year with his family, even he ended the war in Iraq Barack Obama stated that ''our troops will be home from Iraq by the holidays''.[353] In short, both Barack Obama's electoral campaign and political approach was inspired by American exceptionalism and Americans' religious-historical sensitivity. Whereat, this promise led him to take the office.[354] In addition, Obama also promised for fixing all the wrong policies of President George W. Bush. According to Daniel Drezner, Obama came to office with three convictions. First, he mentioned the reconstruction of domestic politics as the fundamental tool of foreign policy. Second, he claimed that the US overextended to the wrong places in the Middle East. The last one, the Bush administration's wrong policy decisions brought the US to the lowest status in the world.[355]

Drezner claims that rather than having a single grand strategy approach President Obama had two approaches. The first one was multilateral retrenchment which corresponded to regaining the reputation of the US in the Middle East and burden-sharing with allies. The other one was counterpunching[356] which corresponded to

---

[351] ''Implementation Day'', *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/foreign-policy/iran-deal, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

[352] ''Campaign Themes, Strategies, and Developments'', *icpsr.umich.edu:* https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/pages/instructors/setups2008/campaign-strategies.html, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and Michael Nelson, ''Barack Obama: Campaigns and Elections'', *millercenter.org:* https://millercenter.org/president/obama/campaigns-and-elections, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[353] Matt Compton, ''President Obama Has Ended the War in Iraq'', obamawhitehouse.archives.gov: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2011/10/21/president-obama-has-ended-war-iraq, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and Colin Dueck, **The Obama Doctrine,** Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 13-14.

[354] Ufuk Ulutaş, ''Obama Sonrası Irak ve Suriye'', *Akademik Perspektif:* http://akademikperspektif.com/2016/11/14/obama-sonrasi-irak-suriye/, [Access Date: 29.04.2019].

[355] Daniel W. Drezner, ''Does Obama Have a Grand Strategy? Why We Need Doctrines in Uncertain Times'', **Foreign Affairs**, Vol. 90, No. 4, (July/August 2011), p. 64.

[356] Daniel W. Drezner, p. 58.

‘’winning the hearts and minds’’. The second feature that the Obama administration embraced was for to re-construct the trust for the US in the Middle East which collapsed during George W. Bush presidency. On this matter, it is possible to argue that Barack Obama’s ‘’winning the hearts and minds’’ policy was a different version of George W. Bush’s ‘’promotion of democracy’’ policy with couple of differences. For instance, there is no clarification regarding the way of promotion of democracy in President George W. Bush’s strategy. As opposed to his strategy, Obama’s ‘’winning the hearts and minds’’ policy demarks the borders of American sympathy’s expansion. Particularly, in this globalized world, spreading American values, such as liberalism, American way of life –including foods, American products, lifestyle-, is much more easier, and thus it would be plausible to claim that Obama’s strategy was way more softer and easy to apply in comparison to George W. Bush’s. Yet, it should be emphasized that both of them are originally born from the same ideology.

At the ‘’winning the hearts and minds’’ point, President Obama mostly used surrogate warfare policy due to five reasons: deniability, legitimacy, urgency, costs, and capability. The Obama administration frequently referred to burden-sharing with his allies in local crises as the fundamental elements of multilateral retrenchment. During his presidency, the Obama administration cooperated with Middle East states in local crises and supported them with the US airstrikes. For instance, the US fought against ISIS with the cooperation of local powers and the US-led strikes operated in 2014 and 2015.[357] Therefore, especially with the international cooperation attitude against ISIS, the Obama administration embraced the multilateral approach in their foreign policy as opposed to President Bush Jr.

Apart from the ‘’winning the hearts and minds’’ policy, after Barack Obama got elected, the US troops retreated from Iraq and President Obama realized his electoral campaign promise.[358] Nevertheless, when they withdrew the American troops from

[357] Andreas Krieg, pp. 103-104, 106-107.
[358] Muhammed Bilal Kenasari, ‘’Obama'nın Irak karnesi’’, *AA:* http://aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/obamanin-irak-karnesi/692072, [Access Date: 129.04.2019].

the field, there is nothing much left as an option to maintain the US counterterrorism policy. In this regard, President Obama knew that he had to preserve American security interests, otherwise the public would have taken back their support immediately. Therefore, unmanned drone strikes and supporting local groups in the region became the new fashion in the Middle East according to the US national interests. In other words, the American security priorities got ahead of President Barack Obama's grand strategy approach. Indeed, numbers and rates demonstrate that the increase in drone strikes against Middle East was at its highest level during Obama's presidency.[359] In short, whereas Obama tried to satisfy Americans and indulge his grand strategic approach, he maintained and preserved American priorities. At this point, even though Krieg claims that President Obama was not an interventionist[360], and he was not a total American isolationist. This is because he maintained the policy of interference for other states through other tools. Thus, this study will define his foreign policy as semi-isolationist or semi-interventionist. In short, one can argue that even though President Obama wanted to apply softer grand strategy, the existing situation in Middle East and other regions in the world pushed him to maintain some sort of strategy against American enemies. Indeed, he was aware that both the American domestic features, such as lobbies and national interests, and American public's exceptional attitude towards the entire world would not lead him to maintain the American isolationism. Besides, it is impossible to argue that the 21st century can embrace the old American isolationism.

On the other hand, President Obama attempted to "reset" relations with Russia. Besides, with China, there was the talk of the U.S. China Strategic and Economic Dialogue becoming a "g-2". War. The administration embraced the G-20 to supplant the g-8 as the premier international economic forum.[361] At this point, it is possible to emphasize that President Obama was also influenced by the triumph of liberalism so that he tried to improve economic relations with China and Russia in order to include them into the new liberal system. Building an economic relationship and cooperation

[359] Jason Rineheart, ''Counterterrorism and Counterinsurgency'', **Perspectives on Terrorism**, Volume 4, Issue 5, (2010), p. 36 and Colin Dueck, p. 35.
[360] Andreas Krieg, p. 103.
[361] Daniel W. Drezner, pp. 64-65.

with other states is also the sign of multilateral foreign policy approach. Also, it was the sign of his liberalist personality. Actually, this might also be the sign of changing policy direction within US. In other words, the US finally sees the potential economic rivalry of China and in order to protect its economic superiority the US attention has slightly slipped from North-Atlantic axis to Asia-Pacific, starting from Obama's presidency. Yet, as it was clearly observed during Donald Trump's presidency, the change of axis has separated US policy-makers into two essential parties and in the end, due to ongoing wars and clashes in Middle East and Caucasians the North-Atlantic axis remained prior according to American interests. Besides, Russian annexation of Crimea, escalation of tension in Ukraine-Russia crisis led President Obama to turn back his attention to the heartland in his second interim.[362]

Whereas President Obama was trying to regain the old reputation of the US, it collapsed again with the Libyan intervention in 2011. At the beginning of the decision, the US got authorized from the UNSC and NATO's US-led coalition forces intervened to Libya.[363] So far, it sounds merely multilateral foreign policy approach; however, the US-led forces went further from their authorization and changed the regime in Libya. Thus, it is possible to claim that the Obama administration embraced semi-isolationist foreign policy approach. Even though he intervened in Libya with the insistence of France and the UK, at the end he intervened with the coalition forces. Still, one might argue that former secretary of state Hillary Clinton was one of the leading supporter and promoter of this intervention.[364]

On the other hand, the Arab Spring was a great security breach for US in Middle East. It complicates the US existence and control over the region. The birth of any

[362] For more information please check: Mahir Khalifa-Zadeh, ''The South Caucasus: Obama's Failed Russia "Reset" and The Putin Doctrine In Practice'', **Middle East Review of International Affairs**, Vol. 18, No. 3, (2014) and To reach the whole article please see: Michał Woźniak, ''The Ukraine Crisis and Shift In Us Foreign Policy'', **Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal**, Vol. 18, No. 2, (2016).

[363] ''Statement by the President on Libya'', *obamawhitehouse.archive.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/08/22/statement-president-libya, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[364] Molly O'Toole, ''Libya Is Obama's Biggest Regret — And Hillary's Biggest Threat'', *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/06/03/libya-is-obamas-biggest-regret-and-hillarys-biggest-threat/, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

kind of Jihadist organization which will be against American values might have endanger American way of life. Hence, the Obama administration had to intervene in Libya in order to preserve its economic and security interests. Besides, the Arab Spring might have spread to Palestinians and jeopardize Israel's existence in Middle East. Therefore, it is possible to state that the Pro-Israeli lobby in US also supported this intervention and one of the reasons of US intervention both to Libya and Syrian War was to protect Israel's existence in Middle East.[365]

Even when he was a senator, Obama embraced a realist foreign policy approach. In fact, Obama summarized his view in Pennsylvania in 2007: "The truth is that my foreign policy is actually a return to the traditional bipartisan realistic policy of George Bush's father, of John F. Kennedy, of, in some ways, Ronald Reagan." Moreover, Fawaz Gerges claims that during his presidency Obama continued to embrace a realistic policy approach.[366] Indeed, President Obama's realistic attitudes can be understood especially in the South Chinese Sea issue. During the issue, the Obama administration claimed that the actions in the South Chinese Sea were also against the US national interests,[367] therefore, the US also became part of the issue.

As it was alluded above, President George Bush's foreign policy approach towards Middle East can be located on Huntington's Clash of Civilizations thesis. By the same token, another example of this clash of civilizations thesis is the fight against ISIS during Barack Obama's presidency. ISIS is one of today's Jihadist multinational terrorist organizations which is known for its opposition to Western values and wants to establish a new sovereign state. During his presidency, the Obama administration cooperated with Middle East states in local crises and supported them with the US airstrikes. In particular, the US fought against ISIS with the cooperation of local

---

[365] Osama Anter Hamdi, p. 252 and ''Israel and AIPAC clash on Syria strike'', *aljazeera.com:* https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2013/9/12/israel-and-aipac-clash-on-syria-strike, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[366] Fawaz Gerges, **Obama and the Middle East,** Palgrave, 2013, pp. 92, 95.

[367] ''South China Sea: ''Obama urges Beijing to abide by ruling'', *bbc.com*: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-37267372, [Access Date: 22.05.2021] and for the statement please see: ''Pres. Obama on China's agression in South China Sea'', *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2XagaRFT-tc, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

powers and the US-led strikes operated in 2014 and 2015.[368] In this regard, it is possible to argue that the decision of Obama administration directly overlaps with the post 9/11 era US Grand Strategies.

Furthermore, President Obama's grand strategy for NATO covers sharing the military expenditures among allies because of the fact that after the end of the Cold War, NATO became a burden for the US economy rather than a buffer zone. Thus, the Obama administration wanted to share the cost of military innovations with the central European NATO members.

6.3. Donald Trump and His Grand Strategic Approach

Donald Trump came to office in 2017 as the 45th president of US. Without no doubt, a part of his electoral campaign success comes from his opposition to the Iraq War like his predecessor Barack Obama. Nevertheless, according to John R. Haines, although before he got elected, his worldview was straightforward and his aims remained constant. Indeed, he realized many of his thoughts when he became the US president. That aims as follows:

Like his predecessor George W. Bush, he believed that in order to deter North Korea they could negotiate with them. This is because President Trump claims that North Korea has the ability to strike such big cities like Los Angeles, New York and etc.[369] In fact, his relationship with the head of North Korea was relatively good in comparison to his predecessor George W. Bush.

Even before the elections, he gave the signals of his unilateralist personality. Thus, after he got elected, he declared that Iran's nuclear power is a threat to the US. Then, he withdrew from the Nuclear Treaty with Iran. Moreover, he also withdrew from

[368] Andreas Krieg, pp. 103-104, 106-107.
[369] John R. Haines, ''Divining a "Trump Doctrine", **Foreign Policy Research Institute**, 2017. p. 5.

Paris agreement on climate change and Trans-Pacific partnership.[370] Besides, he embargoed Iran. Indeed, this was not the only reason that he decided to withdraw from the treaty. As it was mentioned before in the fourth chapter, some of the scholars, like Montanaro, argue that AIPAC played the major role on this decision.

On the other hand, he clearly mentioned his standpoint regarding interventions. President Trump says that ''When we intervene in, clearly we have an only temporary impact over balance-of-power.'' Besides, he sees the necessity for interventions only when the US national interests are threatened.[371] At this point, this worldview makes him non-interventionist and also makes him realist, because of the fact that he prioritizes the American interests at the same time. As a matter of fact, according to Stephen Walt, Trump is realist, because realism serves well to his international goals.[372]

In his presidency, the US approaches to the world separated into two mainstream phenomena. The first one is Asia-Pacific focus and the other one is North-Atlantic focus. Apparently, President Trump is with the Asia-Pacific group due to his several policy implementations. When Obama was the president, he frequently referred to the burden-sharing policy with the allies of the US. Indeed, President Trump maintained this foreign policy approach with a more demanding way for offensive military expenditures from allies. For instance, in an interview Donald Trump said that NATO countries owe to US, in return of American protection, especially against Russia[373], however, he slightly changed it and he slacked off the ties with NATO allies.[374] Indeed, with his pro-Asia-Pacific approaches, his unilateralist personality is also effective in this situation. Furthermore, his anti-North-Atlantic personality led to the improvement of the Russian-American relationship. On the other hand, he was

[370] John R. Haines, pp. 1, 4. and Randy Schweller, ''Three Cheers for Trump's Foreign Policy What the Establishment Misses'', **Foreign Affairs**, Volume 97, Number 5, September / October 2018, p. 137.
[371] John R. Haines, pp. 5, 6.
[372] Stephen M. Walt, ''The Tragedy of Trump's Foreign Policy'', **Foreign Policy**, 2019, p. 2.
[373] NATOSource by Donald Trump and Jens Stoltenberg, White House, ''Trump Believes US 'Paying a Lot of Money to Protect' NATO Allies'', *atlanticcouncil.org:* https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/natosource/trump-believes-us-paying-a-lot-of-money-to-protect-nato-allies/ 8, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].
[374] Stephen M. Walt, p. 3.

one of the presidents who realized the rising Chinese economy as an opponent to US economy. Especially in his first NSS, he claimed that "Today, we are declaring that America is in the game and America is going to win,".[375] Then he added, "For the first time, American strategy recognizes that economic security is national security."[376] Due to enormous grow in Chinese economy, President Donald Trump knew that his administration had to preserve American economic interests, and thus he focused on the Asia-Pacific axis during his presidency. In addition, his Asia-Pacific policy approach led him to take some precautions against China because of the fact that President Trump sees China as the real enemy of the US. Thus, he does not want to see a strong China close to his Asian allies and the US borders. Moreover, he knows that China threatens the US economy; therefore, he took some economic precautions against China due to his economic nationalist personality.[377]

On the other hand, Donald Trump's hostility against China and Russia can be seen in the NSS 2017. In NSS, Donald Trump defined these two countries as revisionist powers and neglected environmental threats, such as climate change, that was stated in NSS 2015. Furthermore, as opposed to Obama's multilateral statements in the former NSS, Trump's NSS 2017 sees the international area as competitive[378] and full of aggressive powers, like China, Russia and anti-American organizations like ISIS.

Apart from NATO, both before and after the presidential elections he initially claimed that ISIS should be demolished. It basically demonstrates that the US war on terror is continuing during his era. However, according to Stephen Walt, Syria's internal affairs are not a vital concern of the US. Throughout the time, the former US administrations merely interested in the securitization of the pipelines and resources of the Middle East. By the same token, this target does not include any military control over the region; the only significant thing is to acquire the crucial oil point

---

[375] ''Trump labels China a strategic 'competitor''', *financialtimes.com:* https://www.ft.com/content/215cf8fa-e3cb-11e7-8b99-0191e45377ec, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].
[376] ''Trump labels China a strategic 'competitor''', *financialtimes.com:* https://www.ft.com/content/215cf8fa-e3cb-11e7-8b99-0191e45377ec, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].
[377] Randy Schweller, pp. 134-135.
[378] ''National Security Strategy of the United States of America – December 2017'', *trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov*: https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

against other strong states. Since the region separated piece by piece with the eruption of the Arab Spring the other strong powers would not control a big part of the region. Accordingly, the US should not concern about strong states. From this point on, Walt claims that retreating from Syria will be counted neither as a gain nor as a lost. Syria is just a collapsed and worthless state.[379] In other words, from Walt's perspective, there is no absolute gain for the US in Syria. At this point, Trump –as a realist- also sees that Syria is neither a part of the US national interests nor a direct threat to the US security that is why he decided to retreated from Syria. Furthermore, the other reason behind that decision is to fight against China with the full power of the US because of the fact that before the decision the US had to divide its sources and power into two different and distant areas. Like George W. Bush, he wanted to maintain the American Hegemonic stability.

Apparently, President Trump's logic is similar to offensive realists, such as Mearsheimer's thus; he no longer sees a necessity to maintain the US' NATO membership. It can also be best explained with Gilpin's hegemonic stability theory. According to this theory, President Trump wanted to maintain the US hegemony; however, dividing the US power into two regions is no longer affordable from Trump's point of view. Therefore, Donald Trump wanted to withdraw from the alliance and focus on the real enemy: China.

6.4. A Comparison of The Last Three Presidents' Grand Strategies

As it was emphasized above, the first president of post 9/11 era, George W. Bush embraced more interventionist and unilateral grand strategic approach during his first term. Indeed, even though George W. Bush's historical and political background led him to create this kind of grand strategy, one can argue that the initial reaction would be the same after 9/11 terror attacks regardless who was the US President at that time. However, as it seemed, the 9/11 was just an alibi for George W. Bush to apply

[379] ''Good Riddance to America's Syria Policy'', *Foreign Policy*: https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/12/21/good-riddance-to-americas-syria-policy/, [Access Date: 09.01.2019].

his grand strategy. Yet, in his second term, the American society pulled back their support. Accordingly, the American domestic dynamics and US Grand Strategy would not let Bush to maintain his grand strategy. Therefore, a sharp change occurred in his policies in the 2005-2008 interim.

As a matter of fact, scholars argue that there are some similarities between George W. Bush's second term strategies and President Obama's strategies.[380] Although President Barack Obama might seem softer and more multilateral in his political rhetoric and with his political applications, as American troops' withdrew from Iraq, phone call with Iranian leader Rouhani, leading the nuclear deal with Iran in 2015, and communication with Arab World, his grand strategy overlaps both with President George W. Bush's second term and US Grand Strategy. For example, working with regional power during the securitization of problematic regions is one of the features of post 9/11 era, US Grand Strategy and President Obama applied this approach during the fight with ISIS in Middle East. Moreover, one can argue that President Obama had to save US reputation in the Americans eyes, and thus his electoral campaign was based on compensating his predecessor's mistakes, like enhancing American economy as the fundamental goal of US Grand Strategy and spreading democracy through winning the hearts and minds policy rather than imposing it as the George W. Bush administration did. Indeed, in one of his nomination campaign speeches, Barack Obama stated that he has a plan to withdraw American troops from Iraq –''That's why I have a plan that will bring our combat troops home by March of 2008. Letting the Iraqis know that we will not be there forever is our last, best hope to pressure the Sunni and Shia to come to the table and find peace.''[381] On the other hand, even he was a senator he called himself as ''keeper'' and emphasized that America is a united country and there is no such thing as red and blue states, or conservatives as George W. Bush distinguished. In this regard, scholars who analyzed his speech in 2004, believed that the speech that Obama gave in 2004 is the first and the foremost motivator behind him being the

[380] Stephen Tankel, ''Has Trump Read His Own Counterterrorism Strategy?'', *foreignpolicy:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/10/12/has-trump-read-his-own-counterterrorism-strategy/, [Access Date: 24.04.2019].
[381] ''Barack Obama's campaign speech'', *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/feb/10/barackobama, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

president of US.[382] However, at the backstage, Obama knew that he had to ensure offshore security in order to protect American values and borders. Therefore, he increased drone strikes and implemented targeted killing strategy on the field instead of Bush's American troop deployment strategy. In this regard, one can argue that even during President Obama's presidency the US has not witnessed any major changes in the sense of grand strategy.

Many scholars, like Tankel or Drezner as it was mentioned before, argue that Donald Trump has no overall Grand Strategy. In fact most of them argue that his grand strategy was the continuation of Barack Obama's Grand Strategy.[383] From many sides this argument would be accurate. The first resemblance that proves the similarity between President Trump's and Obama's Grand Strategies is both of them embraced burden-sharing policy. Even though this was not originally something they found, on the contrary, it was something that US Grand Strategy offers along with American society's negativity on the subject of ''dealing with non-American problems''. The burden-sharing policy was initially offered by the Obama administration. On the other hand, cooperation with regional groups in Middle East for the purpose of demolishing ISIS was also the foreign policy application of President Obama. As a matter of, one of the Senate hearings demonstrate that countering terrorism in North Africa is a significant issue that remains as a fundamental concern of US.[384] Therefore, it is possible to argue that both presidents did not develop any strategy related with counterterrorism or demolishing ISIS. The US Institutions imposed and provided this strategy to President Obama and Trump. In addition, although Donald Trump frequently stressed on Chinese issue, it was also not a new problem for American economic hegemony. In fact, his predecessors took some precautions in order to balance China in Asia, especially against US' Asian allies. Nevertheless, since Donald Trump frequently emphasized Chinese economic

[382] ''The Speech that Made Obama President'', *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OFPwDe22CoY, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

[383] Stephen Tankel, ''Has Trump Read His Own Counterterrorism Strategy?'', *foreignpolicy:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/10/12/has-trump-read-his-own-counterterrorism-strategy/, [Access Date: 24.04.2019].

[384] Us Congress, Senate Subcommittee Hearing, ''Beyond ISIS: Countering Terrorism, Radicalization, and Promoting Stability in North Africa'', *foreign.senate.gov:* https://www.foreign.senate.gov/hearings/beyond-isis-countering-terrorism-radicalization-and-promoting-stability-in-north-africa-120617, [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

growth and prioritize Asia-Pacific axis during his presidency, people started to think that the US is changing its focal point. In addition, the only thing can be count as a difference is that Trump's relatively isolationist rhetoric and his shaped foreign policy around this political language. Still, it does not mean the US became isolationist during the 2016-2020 interim. Only the electoral campaign and Donald Trump's political crew embraced the Jacksonian school of thought which defends the American supremacy with an American way of isolationism. In fact, the famous electoral campaign motto of Donald Trump ''Make America Great Again!'' was the product of Jacksonian thought. Yet, one can argue that this does not mean the US Grand Strategy changed its direction according to Trump's grand strategic preferences during this term. Yet, it is impossible to see their policies as the same due to their political preferences and two opposite views they embraced, isolationist vs. multilateralist. Indeed, slight changes occurred according to Trump's leadership preferences. For instance, after Donald Trump got elected, he immediately imposed more rigid sanctions on Iran in 2019 and 2020.[385] This is because even before he got elected, Donald Trump showed his perception towards Muslim world. For instance, like his predecessor George W. Bush, Trump emphasized his concerns regarding Radical Islam through these words: ''Radical Islam is coming to our shores.'' and when Donald Trump was a candidate clearly mentioned that he sees almost all the Muslim immigrants and Muslims as terrorists with these words: "When I'm elected, I will suspend immigration from areas of the world where there is a proven history of terrorism against the United States, Europe, or our allies, until we fully understand how to end these threats."[386] Moreover, Donald Trump sees Muslims as the haters of US and American values. Even one of his interviews he said that ''I think Islam hates us…''[387]

In conclusion, there are only slight changes observed from one president's grand strategy to another's in the post 9/11 era. Contrarily, each president's grand strategy

[385] ''Iran Sanctions'', *state.gov:* https://www.state.gov/iran-sanctions/, [Access Date: 23.05.2021] and ''Sanctions Programs and Country Information'', *home.treasury.gov:* https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/financial-sanctions/sanctions-programs-and-country-information, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[386] Andrew Prokop, ''The scariest part of Trump's anti-Muslim speech: we don't know if it will work'', *wox.com:* https://www.vox.com/2016/6/13/11924648/donald-trump-terrorism-speech, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].
[387] CNN Interview, ''Donald Trump: 'I think Islam hates us''', *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C-Zj0tfZY6o, [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

was the continuation of his predecessor's and each president's grand strategy was inspired by post 9/11 grand strategic behavior of US along with domestic dynamic concerns. Nonetheless, each president had unique political rhetoric, and thus the initial reaction of people gather around the idea that ''the US is changing its policies both internally and externally. Indeed, each president tried to implement their grand strategy perspectives for the sake of US as long as domestic dynamics and US Grand Strategy have permitted.

CONCLUSION

The United States has always been a unique and determinative country for the world politics. Both its domestic politics and foreign policy approach have the power to influence even the smallest and most insignificant part of the world. Therefore, this hegemonic power of US indulged the investigation in this dissertation.

The main question of this thesis is ‘’Whether the US Presidents Can Change the Entire US Grand Strategy or Make Soft Touches?’’. The scope of this study starts with George W. Bush’s presidency and concludes with the end of Donald Trump’s incumbent era. Our findings demonstrate that due to several reasons the US Presidents have no such power to make major changes in US Grand Strategy, in particular with their personal grand strategic approaches. This research has reached its finding through referring primary resources, such as newsdtupapers, discussions held in the US Congress as well as the official documents issued from various American Administrations, speeches and statements of presidents and briefings of American-based organizations and institutions. In addition, this dissertation benefitted from notable scholars’ opinions, articles and books as secondary resources throughout research. In this study, there are so many reasons that affect this conclusion:

The first and the foremost thing I have to mention in this regard is that this study embraced Neoclassical Realism during the investigation. This is because our findings are based on the stereotype phenomena: The domestic dynamics in US are the fundamental obstacles in front of Presidents. It is important to mention that Presidents Grand Strategies are the dependent variables whereas four domestic features I mentioned in the entire study are the main determinants as independent variables in this study. As it was stated in the literature review part, Neoclassical Realism defends that a state’s behavior does not merely depend on power politics, on the contrary, several domestic features, including statesmen, have an impact on state’s aggression and its power politics. Therefore, this dissertation overlap the

thought of Neoclassical Realism with a stereotype phrase ‘’The US foreign policy is the product of its domestic environment.’’ In this regard, it is important the mention that this study does not neglect US presidents, yet, it only argues that presidents have only a little capability to change US Grand Strategy or implement their own grand strategies due to the predominance of four domestic features emphasized throughout this dissertation. By the same token, this study focuses on four domestic features and presidents’ endeavor to influence both domestic and foreign affairs in order to make a better illustration in foreign policy and grand strategy shifting. These features are, as they mentioned both in 4th and 5th chapters, historical tendencies, economic/security priorities, public opinion/elections and lobbies/interest groups.

In the third chapter of this thesis the keywords of the study illustrated within the realist theme. It was vital to allude terms such as national interests, foreign policy and grand strategy in order to prevent possible misunderstandings. This is because this study was based on realist standpoint and each term has different explanations within different ideologies. Therefore, each term embraced within the context of realist school of thought for the purpose of this study. For instance, according to our understanding the grand strategy corresponds to an overall long term strategy that formed by the gathering of short term policies. On this matter, it is important to mention even though there is no high and low politics discrimination for the explanation of grand strategy as realism defends. However, I only try to benefit from subjects of high politics whilst mentioning American Grand Strategic behavior. On the other hand, whereas national interest depends on the socio-economic system in US according to our understanding, I omit international organizations, NGOs from the definition of foreign policy. In other words, for the purpose of this study I embraced foreign policy as the interactions of states in the political system.

The fourth chapter was mainly about the historical tendencies and aims to illustrate a better scheme for the evolvement of American Grand Strategic behavior within the historical context and accepts the entire chapter as one of the domestic features that influences the US Grand Strategy. In this regard, this chapter covers American exceptionalism in order to comprehend American behavior and their domestic

responds to certain issues. Our findings show that the American citizens see themselves as superior in comparison to other nations in the world. Besides, from American nation's point of view, the American way of life and American values should be preserved or at least spread all around the world, but should not be insulted or jeopardized in any cases. Furthermore, the belief among Americans is very widespread, and thus in case of any problems or incidents, such as 9/11 terror attacks, the American society starts to interest in foreign policy and world politics, particularly the US policy towards American enemies. From certain aspects, the American exceptionalism would affiliate with socio-economic prosperity. Both in American exceptionalism and American public opinion parts it was observable that American nation-wide support for a president depends on incumbent's or candidate's economic performance. By the same token, the American expansionist movement could also associate with American security priorities. Yet, I will only emphasize the findings of American expansionism in this part. The American expansionism is another important feature of US Grand Strategic behavior within the historical context. This is because both the foundation and expansion of its borders was based on ''The Manifest Destiny''. According to Manifest Destiny, the US sees itself as a Messianic State. In other words, the US and Americans thinks that they have a purpose on this world given by God, such as promotion of democracy is their essential duty and spreading liberal values, bringing peace to conflicting areas are among the divine missions of US. Moreover, the US and Americans believe that they expanded till their natural borderlines which was also given by God. In short, the US thinks that both Canada and Mexico are the friendly neighbors that would not attack the American soils. On the other hand, the West and East coasts of America are surrounded by two big oceans of the world that prevent naval attacks to American soils. Hence, the American security priorities does not involve any kind of possible attacks from its borders, on the contrary, both its security and regional priorities see Eurasian countries –an offshore continent, as a threatening rival, excluding European powers and NATO-members. In the last part of this chapter, the search of two mainstream thoughts in the American History sheds the light both to American Presidents' grand strategic approaches and US Grand Strategy. According to this part of the dissertation, there are two mainstream thoughts that have been effective in the

American foreign affairs history, isolationism and multilateralism. Moreover, there are several sub-thoughts of this mainstream approaches such as, unilateralism and interventionism. On this matter, it should be noted that the American way of isolationism is quite different then its real meaning. According to American isolationism, the US does not live in its own shell, on the contrary, the main effort in American isolationism is to protect American hegemony in the western hemisphere, but not to involve in other issues that does not endanger or threaten the US hegemony. On the other hand, multilateralism defends the strengthening of international organizations, especially UN's and NATO's and it also supports the solutions of problems through those organizations with the American leadership. As a sub-though, the unilateral defends the opposite of multilateral approach. According to unilateral perception, the US acts solely in the international area, further, the US does not consult any of these international organizations or gets permission from the international society. The Iraq intervention in 2003 during George W. Bush's presidency can be the best example for US' unilateral action. The Bush administration intervened in Iraq despite all the objections of international community. This could also counted as an interventionist foreign policy approach of US due to the Bush administration's unjust claims on Iraq's nuclear weapon possession. After the intervention, the American claim was unfair and Iraq has no nuclear weapons. This part observes that throughout time, the US have witnessed foreign policy shifts between those thoughts and implemented the best option for the sake of American nation and American soils according to external and internal environment balances. Indeed, whereas sometimes a president had to embrace interventionist or multilateral approach even though he was inherently isolationist, some presidents benefitted from the external environment to apply their multilateral or interventionist approach and direct the American foreign policy according to their perception. For instance, President George W. Bush was inherently interventionist and most of the international relations scholars believe that he saw 9/11 terror attacks and the external environment to implement his interventionist and unilateral foreign policy approach. Contrarily, President Bill Clinton was the real supporter of multilateral foreign policy approach. Nonetheless, the domestic environment pushed him to bomb Iraq during his presidency. On the other hand, this part of the study

demonstrates that the US presidents acted according to external environment especially during the Cold War era.

The chapter five mainly discussed the other three features which were selected as the domestic features that have an impact on US Grand Strategy. Starting from the economic and security priorities this chapter illustrates why American presidents have to act according to domestic incentives and cannot easily make major changes with their personal grand strategies. According to American economic priorities, the US' first and the foremost economic goal is the prosperity within the entire country. The economic growth of US equals to increase in military expenditures and enhancing the capabilities of American forces. Thus, it eases the promotion of democracy all around the world which was given by God as the fundamental duty. On the other hand, according to this part, American security priorities are based on physical security like homeland and borderline security. Indeed, as it was stated above the US has reached its natural borders and has no rivals alongside its borderlines. Therefore, this part argues that the US has always been looking for an offshore enemy that threatens American values and liberal thoughts. For instance, during the Cold War era, the USSR was the real enemy due to its contradicting ideology. In the end of Cold War era, Samuel Huntington's ''The Clash of Civilization'' thesis gained incline and the US used this thesis successfully. Accordingly, the real enemy became Jihadist and radical Islamist terrorist groups which against American values and disturbs democratic evolvement around the world. Nowadays, former American President Donald Trump proclaimed China as the rival of US due to Chinese aggressive economic developments against American economic hegemony. In the following part, the lobby and interested group effect on American decision-making process were tackled. Results show that there is an undeniable impact of lobbies on American foreign policy. As a matter of fact, even behind the American interventions and withdrew decision lobbies located in US soils played role. For instance, as it was mentioned both in chapter 5 and 6, scholars like Montanaro and McCormick, argue that AIPAC played role on President Donald Trump's withdrew decision from Iran nuclear deal in 2018. Additionally, some scholars, like Hamdi as cited above, argue that one of the fundamental goals of

Israeli Lobby is to ensure the state of Israel's regional security. Therefore, some of the US interventions in the Middle East occurred due to ensuring Israel's regional security. Indeed, the Obama administration's policy change during the second term and the decision of US involvement to Syrian civil war can be explained within this scope. Eventually, the last part of this chapter illuminated the public opinion effect on presidential elections and presidents decision-making processes. According to results, the electoral campaigns have only a little influence on the change in American public opinion. Conversely, the electoral campaigns are shaped by the existing public opinion. The American public mainly concerns about socio-economic stability within their country. Therefore, a candidate's or incumbent's election-year economic performance and protectionist policy towards American jobs and American democracy are the main determinants of public opinion. Results illustrate that Americans rarely interested in foreign affairs and are not the big fan of warfare. Indeed, according to Paul Gronke, Darius Rejali, Dustin Drenguis, James Hicks, Peter Miller and Bryan Nakayama, even during George W. Bush's presidency American society condemned the torture policy of the government whereas they were supporting the war in Afghanistan in the post-9/11 era.[388] Still, this chapter is one of the main consolidative parts of our argument, US presidents cannot make any major changes in US Grand Strategy with their personal grand strategies. Therefore, this thesis takes the argument of Neo-Classical Realism one step further and argues that although leaders' tendencies constitute an important aspect of domestic factors, these tendencies are limited by lobbies, public opinion, national interests and historical tendencies.

The last chapter of this dissertation discussed the grand strategies of the last three presidents of US, excluding Joe Biden as newly-elected president. In the beginning of this chapter, I looked for different kind of perceptions for US Grand Strategy. According to gathered-information scholars believe that the US Grand Strategy has transformed from time to time and there are three possible definitions stands for US Grand Strategy since the early 1940s. In this regard, each scholar evaluates US

[388] Paul Gronke and others, ''U.S. Public Opinion on Torture, 2001–2009'', **PS: Political Science and Politics**, July 2010, Vol. 43, No. 3 (July 2010), pp. 437-444.

Grand Strategy according to his theoretical point of view. For instance, whereas Mearsheimer claims that US Grand Strategy is based on offshore balancing which advocates the security in the offshore countries ensures American values and Homeland's security, Christopher Layne argues that American Grand Strategy has embedded on extraregional hegemony and embraced ''Open Door Policy'' in order to ensure the notion of promotion of democracy. Regardless, there are some scholars who try to define US Grand Strategy within the liberal scope. For example, Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley argues that the American way of grand strategy follows a liberal-international standpoint. Nevertheless, our standpoint for US Grand Strategy is between Mearsheimer's and Layne's perception along with Audrey Kurth Cronin's understanding of US Grand Strategy in the post-9/11 era. In certain ways, American presidents applied particular policies according to her definition of US Grand Strategy in the post-9/11 era and according to our findings.

Eventually, our findings indicate that there are only slight changes observed from one president's grand strategy to another's in the post 9/11 era. Contrarily, each president's grand strategy was the continuation of his predecessor's and each president's grand strategy was inspired by post 9/11 grand strategic behavior of US along with domestic dynamic concerns. Nonetheless, each president had unique political rhetoric, and thus the initial reaction of people gather around the idea that ''the US is changing its policies both internally and externally. Indeed, each president tried to implement their grand strategy perspectives for the sake of US as long as domestic dynamics and US Grand Strategy have permitted.

In conclusion, I argue that due to several reasons the US Presidents have no such power to make major changes in US Grand Strategy, in particular with their personal grand strategic approaches. Consequently, an individual's grand strategy has no power against US domestic dynamics and US Grand Strategy. Eventually, the US Grand Strategic behavior will prevail the president's own strategy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Almond, Gabriel A. **The American People and Foreign Policy**. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950.

Arı, Tayyar. **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri**. MKM Yayınları, (2013).

Beasley, Ryan K. and others. **Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective Domestic and International Influences on State Behavior.** CQ Press, Second Edition. 2013.

Bektaş, Buket. ‘’11 Eylül 2001 Terörist Saldırısı Neticesinde ABD’nin Güvenlik Algılamalarındaki Değişiklik’’. Master Thesis, Ankara. 2007.

Berinsky, Adam J. **In Time of War Understanding American Public Opinion from World War II to Iraq**, The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Bishop, George F. **The Illusion of Public Opinion: Fact and Artifact in American Public Opinion Polls**, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2004.

Brezinski, Zbigniew. **The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives.** Basic Books 1st Edition. (2016).

Burchill Scott. **The National Interest in International Relations Theory.** Palgrave Macmillan. (2005).

Campbell, James E. **The American Campaign: U.S. Presidential Campaigns and the National Vote**. Texas A&M University Press. 2000.

Carter, Ralph G. and James M. Scott. **Choosing to Lead: Understanding Congressional Foreign Policy Entrepreneurs. Duke University Press**. 2009.

Christensen, Thomas J. **Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958.** Princeton University Press. 1996.

Dueck, Colin. **The Obama Doctrine**. Oxford University Press. 2015.

Dumbrell, John, David M. Barrett. **The Making of US Foreign Policy.** Manchester University Press. 2nd Edition. 1997.

Erikson Robert S and Kent L. Tedin. **American Public Opinion: Its Origins, Content and Impact**. Routledge. 2015.

Gelpi, Christopher Peter D. Feaver, and Jason Reifler, **Paying the Human Costs of War**, Chapter 1. Princeton University Press. 2009.

Gerges, Fawaz. **Obama and the Middle East**. Palgrave. 2013.

Gilpin, Robert. **War and Change in World Politics**. Cambridge University Press. 1981.

Grimmett, Richard F. **Foreign Policy Roles of the President and Congress**. Congressional Report Service Report for Congress. 1999.

Haines, John R. ‘’Divining a “Trump Doctrine”. **Foreign Policy Research Institute**. 2017. pp. 1-12.

Halperin, Morton H. and others. **Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy**. The Brookings Institution. Second Edition. 2006.

Harris, John F**. The Survivor: Bill Clinton in the White House**. Random House Trade. 2005. Ch. 36.

Hoover, Dennis R. **Religion and American Exceptionalism**. 1st edition, Routledge, (July 19), 2013.

Ikenberry, John. **Liberal Leviathan The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order**. Princeton University Press. 2011.

Kitchen, Nicholas. **Neoclassical Realism In European Politics: Bringing Power Back In (Chapter 5: Ideas Of Power And The Power of Ideas)**. Edited By: Asle Toje and Barbara Kunz. Manchester University Press. 1. Edition. 2012.

Kissinger, Henry. **Amerika'nın Dış Politikaya İhtiyacı Var mı?**. Hazırlayan: Mehmet Özaydın. Metu Press. Ankara, 2002.

Kissinger, Henry. **Diplomacy**, Reprint. Simon & Schuster. 1995.

Layne, Christopher. **The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present.** Cornell University Press. 2006.

Little, Douglas. **American Orientalism**. The University of North Carolina Press. 2002.

Lippmann, Walter. **Public Opinion**. Martino Fine Books. 2012.

Lippe, John M. Vander. ''The "Other" Treaty Of Lausanne: The American Public and Official Debate On Turkish-American Relations''. **The Turkish Yearbook**. 1993 Vol. XXIII. pp. 31-63.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. **American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword**. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 1997.

Lobell, Steven E., Jeffrey W. Taliaferro and others. **Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy.** Cambridge University Press. 2009.

Macmillan, Margaret. "World War I: The War That Changed Everything". **Wall Street Journal.** June 20. 2014.

Madsen, Deborah L. **American Exceptionalism**. Illustrated edition. University Press of Mississippi. (July 1, 1998).

Manela, Erez. **The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism**. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007.

Martel, William C. **Grand Strategy in Theory and Practice**. Cambridge University Press. 2015.

McCormick, James M. **Ethnic Interest Groups in American Foreign Policy**. Political Science Publications. Iowa State University. 2012.

Mearsheimer, John J. and Stephen M. Walt. **The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy**. Vol. 28, No. 6. London Review of Books. (March 23, 2006).

Mearsheimer, John J. **The Tragedy of Great Power Politics**. W.W. Norton & Company. 2001.

Milner, Helen V. and Dustin Tingley. **Sailing the Water's Edge: The Domestic Politics of American Foreign Policy.** Princeton University Press. 2015.

Monroe, James. **Seventh Annual Message.** December 2, 1823.

Morgenthau, Hans J. **Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace**. McGrawHill. 7th Edition. 2005.

Mountjoy, Shane. **Manifest Destiny: Westward Expansion**. Infobase Publishing, 2009.

Page, Benjamin and Robert Shapiro. **The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences.** University of Chicago Press. 1992.

Potter, Philip B.K. ''Methods of Foreign Policy Analysis''. **Oxford Research Encyclopedia, International Studies**. March: 1-28. 2010.

Sayle, Timothy Andrews. ''Defining and Teaching Grand Strategy''. **Part of the FPRI-Temple University Consortium on Grand Strategy.** Vol. 4 January. (2011).

Siniver, Asaf. **Nixon, Kissinger, and U.S. Foreign Policy Making: The Machinery of Crisis.** Cambridge University Press. 2008.

Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. **This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity**. UNC Press Books. 2010.

Sönmezoğlu, Faruk. **II. Dünya Savaşı'ndan Günümüze: Türk Dış Politikası.** Der Yayınları. 2006.

Spencer, David Ralph, and Judith Spencer. **The Yellow Journalism: The Press and America's Emergence as a World Power**. Northwestern University Press, Ch. 6. 2007.

Topal, Ahmet Hamdi. **Uluslararası Terörizm ve Terörist Eylemlere Karşı Kuvvet Kullanımı.** Ankara. Beta Yayınları. 2004.

Trubowitz, Peter. **Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy**. The University of Chicago Press. 1998.

Walker,, Jack L. Jr. **Mobilizing Interest Groups in America: Patrons, Professions, and Social Movements**. University of Michigan Press. 1991.

Wilson, Woodrow. **Commencement Address at the U.S. Military Academy**. West Point, June 13, 1916, in ibid.,vol. 37.

JOURNALS

As, Bojang. ''The Study of Foreign Policy in International Relations''. **Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs**. (2018), (6)4. pp. 1-9.

Bingman, Charles F. and Bernard T. Pitsvada, ''Perceptions of Federal Management In The Clinton Era''. **Public Administration**. Vol. 76, Winter 1998. pp. 761-777.

Blower, Brooke L. "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941". **Diplomatic History.** (April 2014), (38)2. pp. 345-376.

Bobo, Lawrence D. ‘’Racism in Trump’s America: reflections on culture, sociology, and the 2016 US presidential election’’. **The British Journal of Sociology**, Volume 68, Issue S1, 2017. pp. 85-104.

Bowman, Albert H. ‘’Jefferson, Hamilton and American Foreign Policy’’. **Political Science Quarterly**. Vol. 71, No. 1 (Mar., 1956). pp. 18–41.

Brands H. W. "The Idea of the National Interest". **Diplomatic History**. (1999). (23)2. pp. 239-261.

Brandt, Mark J., Daniel C. Wisneskib, and Linda J. Skitka. ‘’Moralization and the 2012 U.S. Presidential Election Campaign’’. **Journal of Social and Political Psychology**. Vol. 3(2), 2015. pp. 211–237.

Drew, Dan and David Weaver. ‘’Voter Learning Did the Media Matter? In The 2004 Presidential Election’’. **J&M Quarterly**. Vol. 83, No. 1. 2006. pp. 25-42.

Drezner, Daniel W. ‘’Does Obama Have a Grand Strategy? Why We Need Doctrines in Uncertain Times’’. **Foreign Affairs**. Vol. 90, No. 4. 2011. pp. 57-68.

Drezner, Daniel W. ‘’The Realist Tradition in American Public Opinion’’. **Perspectives on Politics**. Vol. 6, No. 1, (Mar., 2008). pp. 51-70.

Dumbrell, J., ‘’Was There a Clinton Doctrine? President Clinton's Foreign Policy Reconsidered’’. **Diplomacy & Statecraft**. 2002. pp. 43-56.

Enns, Peter K. and Julianna Koch. ‘’Public Opinion in the U.S. States: 1956 to 2010’’. **State Politics & Policy Quarterly**. 13(3), 2013. pp. 349-372.

Gholz, Eugene Daryl G. Press, and Harvey M. Sapolsky. ‘’Come Home, America: The Strategy of Restraint in the Face of Temptation’’. **International Security**. Vol. 21, No. 4. (Spring, 1997). pp. 5-48.

Gomez, Adam. “Deus Vult: John L. O’Sullivan, Manifest Destiny, and American Democratic Messianism”. **American Political Thought**. 1, no. 2, 2012. pp. 236–262.

Gregg, Heather S. ‘’Divided They Conquer: The Success of Armenian Ethnic Lobbies in the United States’’. **Inter-University Committee on International Migration, Rosemarie Rogers Working Paper Series**. 13. 2002.

Gronke, Paul and others. ‘’U.S. Public Opinion on Torture, 2001–2009’’. **PS: Political Science and Politics**. July 2010, Vol. 43, No. 3. (July 2010). pp. 437-444.

Hamdi, Osama Anter. "American Foreign Policy toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Strategic Transformations". **Insight Turkey**. 20, no. 2. (2018). pp. 251-272.

Haney, Patrick J. and Walt Vanderbush. ‘’The Role of Ethnic Interest Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the Cuban American National Foundation’’. **International Studies Quarterly**. Vol. 43, No. 2. (Jun., 1999). pp. 341-361.

Holbrook, Thomas M. "Campaigns, National Conditions, and U.S. Presidential Elections". **American Journal of Political Science**. 38, no. 4, (1994). pp. 973-998.

Huntington, Samuel P. ‘’The Clash of Civilizations?’’. **Foreign Affairs**. Vol. 72, No. 3. (Summer, 1993). pp. 22-49.

Isernia, Pierangelo Zoltán Juhász, and Hans Rattinger. "Foreign Policy and the Rational Public in Comparative Perspective". **The Journal of Conflict Resolution**. 46, no. 2. (2002). pp. 201-224.

Jervis, Robert. ‘’Understanding the Bush Doctrine: Preventive Wars and Regime Change’’. **Political Science Quarterly**. Volume 131 Number 2. 2016. pp. 285-311.

Khalifa-Zadeh, Mahir. ‘’The South Caucasus: Obama’s Failed Russia “Reset” and The Putin Doctrine in Practice’’. **Middle East Review of International Affairs**. Vol. 18, No. 3. (2014). pp. 32-45.

Krieg, Andreas. ‘’Externalizing the burden of war: the Obama Doctrine and US foreign policy in the Middle East’’. **International Affairs**. 92:1. (2016). pp. 97–113.

Kurth Cronin, Audrey. ‘’U.S. Grand Strategy and Counterterrorism’’. **Orbis**. (2012). pp. 1-23.

Leogrande, William M. ‘’Normalizing US–Cuba Relations: Escaping The Shackles of The Past’’. **International Affairs**. 91: 3. 2015. pp. 473-488.

Lindsay, James M. and Randall B. Ripley. "How Congress Influences Foreign and Defense Policy". **Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.** (47)6. 1994. pp. 7-32.

Mearsheimer, John J. and Stephen Walt. ‘’An Unnecessary War’’. **Foreign Policy**. 2003. pp. 50-59.

Mearsheimer, John J. and Stephen M. Walt. ‘’Is It Love or The Lobby? Explaining America's Special Relationship with Israel’’. **Security Studies**. 18:1., pp. 473-488.

Minar, Sarwar J. ‘’Why States Need Grand Strategy’’. **Ourtime.** June: 1-3. (2018).

Moei Terry M. William G. Howell. ‘’Unilateral Action and Presidential Power: A Theory’’. **Presidential Studies Quarterly.** *(*29)4 (December). pp. 850-873.

Newhouse, John. ‘’The Influence of Lobbies on U.S. Foreign Policy’’. **Foreign Affairs**. Vol. 88, No. 3. (May/June 2009). pp. 73-92.

Nye, Joseph S. "Redefining the National Interest". **Foreign Affairs**. (78)4. (1999). pp. 22-35.

Nye, Joseph S. ‘’The American National Interest and Global Public Goods’’. **International Affairs**. (78)2. (2002). pp. 233-244.

O’Sullivan, John L. “The Great Nation of Futurity”. **The United States Democratic Review**. 6, no. 23 (1839). pp. 426–430.

Page, Benjamin and Robert Shapiro. “Foreign Policy and the Rational Public”. **Journal of Conflict Resolution**. 32, no. 2. (1988). pp. 211–247.

Panagopoulos, Costas. ‘’All about that base: Changing campaign strategies in U.S. Presidential elections’’. **Party Politics**. Vol. 22(2). 2016. pp. 179–190.

Pérez, Louis A. Jr. “Incurring a Debt of Gratitude: 1898 and the Moral Sources of United States Hegemony in Cuba”. **The American Historical Review**. 104, no. 2. (1999). pp. 356–398.

Pham, J. Peter. ‘’What Is in the National Interest? Hans Morgenthau’s Realist Vision and American Foreign Policy’’. **American Foreign Policy Interests**. (30), (2008). pp. 256-265.

Powlick, Philip J. and Andrew Z. Katz. ‘’Defining the American Public Opinion/Foreign Policy Nexus’’. **Mershon International Studies Review**, Vol. 42, No. 1. (May, 1998) pp. 29-61.

Restad, Hilde Eliassen. ‘’Old Paradigms in History Die Hard in Political Science: US Foreign Policy and American Exceptionalism’’. **American Political Thought**. Vol. 1, No. 1. (Spring 2012). pp. 53-76.

Rineheart, Jason. ‘’Counterterrorism and Counterinsurgency’’. **Perspectives on Terrorism**. Volume 4, Issue 5. (2010). pp. 31-47.

Rojecki, Andrew. ‘’Rhetorical Alchemy: American Exceptionalism and the War on Terror’’. **Political Communication**. 2008. pp. 67-88.

Rose, Gideon. ‘’Review: Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy’’. **World Politics**. Vol. 51, No. 1. (1998). pp. 144-172.

Schlesinger, Stephen. ‘’The End of Idealism: Foreign Policy in the Clinton Years’’. **World Policy Journal**. Vol. 15, No. 4. (Winter, 1998/1999). pp. 36-40.

Schweller, Randy. ‘’Three Cheers for Trump’s Foreign Policy What the Establishment Misses’’. **Foreign Affairs**. Volume 97 Number 5. September / October 2018. pp. 133-143.

Schmidt, Brian C. and Michael C. Williams. ‘’The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives Versus Realists’’. **Security Studies**. 17:2. (2008). pp. 191-220.

Schwindt, Karen Elise. ‘’The Obligation for Patriotism: Why Congress Passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution’’. **Research Paper**. (2009). pp. 1-53.

Scott, James M., Ralph G. Carter. ‘’Acting on the Hill: Congressional Assertiveness in U.S. Foreign Policy’’. **Congress & the Presidency**. (29)2. (2002). pp. 151-169.

Smith, Tony. ‘’Wilsonianism’’. pp. 617-626.

Steff, Reuben and Alan Tidwell. ‘’Understanding and Evaluating Trump’s Foreign Policy: A Three Frame Analysis’’. **Australian Journal of International Affairs**. 2020, pp. 394-419.

Sümer, Gültekin. ‘’Amerikan Dış Politikasının Kökenleri ve Amerikan Dış Politik Kültürü’’. **Uluslararası İlişkiler**. Cilt 5, Sayı 19. (Güz 2008). pp. 119-144.

Türkmen, Füsun. ‘’Turkish–American Relations: A Challenging Transition’’. **Turkish Studies**. 10:1, pp. 109-129.

Waltz, Kenneth N. “Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory”. **Journal of International Affairs.** 44(1) (Spring/Summer). (1990). pp. 21-37.

Wattal, Sunil and others. ‘’Web 2.0 and Politics: The 2008 U.S. Presidential Election and an E-Politics Research Agenda’’. **MIS Quarterly**. Vol. 34, No. 4. December 2010. pp. 669-688.

Williams, William Appleman. ‘’The Legend of Isolationism in the 1920's’’. **Science & Society, Vol**. 18, No. 1. (Winter, 1954). pp. 91–104.

Walt, Stephen M. ‘’The Tragedy of Trump’s Foreign Policy’’. **Foreign Policy**. 2019. pp. 1-5.

Woźniak, Michał. ‘’The Ukraine Crisis and Shift In Us Foreign Policy’’. **Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal**. Vol. 18, No. 2. (2016). pp. 87-102.

PUBLISHED SOURCES AND OTHERS

Abuzarova, Farida. ‘’The USA's Russian policy during George W. Bush's and Barack Obama's terms’’. **Istanbul University, SBE.** (2018).

Allison, Graham T. and Robert Blackwill. **America’s National Interests A Report from The Commission on America’s National Interests.** The Commission on America’s National Interests. (2000).

Coşkun, Sema. ‘’Foreign policy comparison of Obama and Bush’’. **Bahçeşehir University, SBE.** 2016.

Dağdelen, Merve Dilek. ‘’Differing conceptualizations - overlapping policies: A comparison of Bush and Obama doctrines’’. **Marmara University, SBE.** 2019.

Özcan, Nihan. ‘’The role of arms trade in American Foreign Policy: A comparative analysis of Middle East policies in Bush and Obama periods’’. **Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. SBE.** 2019.

Şar, Batuhan. ‘’The Impact of Domestic Factors in US Foreign Policy Towards Turkey during the AKP Era’’. **Marmara University. SBE**. 2020.

Yaşar, Meysune. ‘’The comperative analysis of the period president George W. Bush and Barack Obama in the context of Iranian policy’’. **İstanbul Medeniyet University. SBE.** 2015.

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

‘’ABD Bölgesel Genişleme - 1803 Louisiana Satın Alınması’’. *Storyboardthat:* https://www.storyboardthat.com/tr/storyboards/tr-examples/abd-bolgesel-genisleme---1803-louisiana-satin-alinmasi [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

‘’Acquisition of Florida: Treaty of Adams-Onis (1819) and Transcontinental Treaty (1821)’’. *HistoryStateGov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/florida [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

‘’Ad Against Iraq War by 33 IR Scholars, Appearing on Op-ed Page of New York Times, September 26, 2002’’. *sadat.umd.edu:* https://sadat.umd.edu/sites/sadat.umd.edu/files/iraq_war_ad_2002_2.pdf [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’AHI Sends Letter to President George W. Bush Regarding The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Times and Turkey’’. *heleniccomserve.com:* https://www.helleniccomserve.com/ahi_letter_to_bush.html [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

AIPAC Issue Brief, ‘’Hezbollah’’. *aipac.org:* https://aipacorg.app.box.com/s/bvsyb7lm12smg6saintu6mtr7o54zrna [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’AIPAC Statement on Proposed Iran Nuclear Agreement’’. https://fedweb-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/fed-72/229/Additional%2520Statements%2520on%2520Iran.pdf [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

AJC tweet: Twitter. https://twitter.com/AJCGlobal/status/1075888607422930946?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1075888607422930946%7Ctwgr%5E%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.timesofisrael.com%2Ftrump-decision-to-pull-troops-from-syria-puts-pro-israel-groups-in-a-bind%2F. [Acces Date: 23.05.2021].

Alasdair Roberts. ‘’Grand Strategy Isn’t Grand Enough’’. *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/20/grand-strategy-isnt-grand-enough/ [Access Date: 07.08.2020].

American Hellenic Institute, "*Sanctions On Turkey Long Overdue" AHI's Letter To President Trump”*. 25 May 2019. https://www.ahiworld.org/press-releases-1/2019/5/25/sanctions-on-turkey-long-overdue-ahis-letter-to-presidenttrump?rq=TURKEY [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

‘’Amerikan Tarihinin Ana Hatlari’’. *USEM:* http://www.usemb-ankara.org.tr/ABDAnaHatlar/Tarih.htm#b3 [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

Andrew Glass. ‘’Clinton orders airstrike on Iraq: Dec. 16, 1998’’. *politico.com*: https://www.politico.com/story/2016/12/clinton-orders-airstrike-on-iraq-dec-16-1998-232571 [Access Date:17.04.2021].

Andrew Prokop. ‘’The scariest part of Trump's anti-Muslim speech: we don’t know if it will work’’. *wox.com:* https://www.vox.com/2016/6/13/11924648/donald-trump-terrorism-speech [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’Annexation of Hawaii, 1898’’. *Stategov:* https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/gp/17661.htm [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

Anthony Zurcher. ‘’Three reasons behind Trump ditching Iran deal’’. *bbc.com*: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-43902372 [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Barack Obama's campaign speech’’. *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/feb/10/barackobama [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

BBC. ‘’House of Representatives votes against US Libya role’’. *bbc.com* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-13908202 [Access Date: 21.08.2020].

Britannica. ‘’Foreign Policy’’. *britannica.com.* https://www.britannica.com/topic/foreign-policy [Access Date: 15.07.2020].

Britannica. ‘’Grand strategy’’. *britannica.com.* https://www.britannica.com/topic/grand-strategy [Access Date: 05.08.2020].

Britannica. ‘’The development of the foreign ministry and embassies’’. *britannica.com.* https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy/The-spread-of-the-Italian-diplomatic-system#ref233744 [Access Date: 22.07.2020].

‘’Bush’s Brave New World Order’’. *airforcemag.com:* https://www.airforcemag.com/article/0807keeperfile/ [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

‘’Bush’s Foreign Policy’’. *history.state.gov:* https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/bush [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

‘’Bush, Iraq, and the World’’. *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/Bush-Iraq-and-the-World-916775 [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

‘’Bush 'Out Of These Troubled Tımes . . . A New World Order''. washingtonpost.com: https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1990/09/12/bush-out-of-these-troubled-times-a-new-world-order/b93b5cf1-e389-4e6a-84b0-85f71bf4c946/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Campaign Themes, Strategies, and Developments’’. *icpsr.umich.edu:* https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/pages/instructors/setups2008/campaign-strategies.html [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’CIA’s final report: No WMD found in Iraq’’. *nbcnews.com:* https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna7634313 [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

CNN Interview. ‘’Donald Trump: 'I think Islam hates us''’. *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C-Zj0tfZY6o [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’Cold War Timeline’’. *spartacus-education:* https://spartacus-educational.com/ColdWarChron.htm [Access Date: 14.12.2020].

‘’Congressional Action on Iran Since the JCPOA’’. *aipac.org:* https://www.aipac.org/resources/congressional-action-on-iran [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

Conor O'clery. ‘’Carter defends Taiwan move 20 years ago’’. *irishtimes.com:* https://www.irishtimes.com/news/carter-defends-taiwan-move-20-years-ago-1.169073 [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Corina Lacatus. ‘’Long Read: Trump’s Electoral Rhetoric Has Become Self-Interested, Nativist Policy’’. *USAPP:* https://bit.ly/33n5X2z [Access Date: 18.04.2021].

David Schenker. ‘’President Obama's First Two Years in the Middle East’’. *The Washington Institute:* Dec 2010, https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/president-obamas-first-two-years-middle-east [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

Domenico Montanaro. ‘’Trump Derails 1st Presidential Debate With Biden, And 5 Other Takeaways’’. *npr.org*: https://www.npr.org/2020/09/30/918500976/trump-derails-first-presidential-debate-with-biden-and-5-other-takeaways [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Eric Cortellessa. ‘’Trump decision to pull troops from Syria puts pro-Israel groups in a bind’’. *timesofisrael.com:* https://www.timesofisrael.com/trump-decision-to-pull-troops-from-syria-puts-pro-israel-groups-in-a-bind/ [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’First 2020 Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden’’. *youtube*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wW1lY5jFNcQ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Foreign Policy Association. ‘’How U.S. Foreign Policy Is Made’’. *fpa.org* https://fpa.org/features/index.cfm?act=feature&announcement_id=45&show_sidebar=0 [Access Date: 12.08.2020].

‘’Full transcript of Obama's Al-Arabiya interview’’. *nbcnews.com*: https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna28870724 [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’George H. W. Bush’’. *whitehose.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/presidents/george-h-w-bush/ [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

‘’Good Riddance to America’s Syria Policy’’. *Foreign Policy*: https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/12/21/good-riddance-to-americas-syria-policy/ [Access Date: 09.01.2019].

Gökhan Gökçe. ‘’What’s behind Joe Biden’s “Armenian Genocide” Statement?’’. *politicstoday.org:* https://politicstoday.org/what-behind-joe-biden-armenian-genocide-statement/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Gökhan Öçalan. ‘’Soğuk Savaş Sonrası ABD Ulusal Güvenlik Stratejileri’’. *Akademik Perspektif*: http://akademikperspektif.com/2014/02/20/soguk-savas-sonrasi-abd-ulusal-guvenlik-stratejileri/ [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

‘’H.Res.296 - Affirming the United States record on the Armenian Genocide’’. *congress.gov:* https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/296?q=%7B%22searc [Access Date:24.05.2021].

History.com. ‘’Gulf of Tonkin Resolution’’. *History.com:* https://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/gulf-of-tonkin-resolution-1 [Access Date: 21.11.2020].

History.com. ‘’President Clinton orders air attack on Iraq’’. *history.com:* https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/clinton-orders-air-attack-on-iraq [Access Date: 22.11.2020].

‘’Implementation Day’’. *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov*: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/issues/foreign-policy/iran-deal [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’Iran Sanctions’’. *state.gov:* https://www.state.gov/iran-sanctions/ [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’Iraq Survey Group Final Report’’. *globalsecurity.org:* https://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/2004/isg-final-report/isg-final-report_vol1_rsi-06.htm [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Isolationism’’. *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/isolationism-foreign-policy [Access Date: 17.03.2019].

‘’Isolationism-The triumph of isolationism’’. *AmericanForeignRelations:* https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Isolationism-The-triumph-of-isolationism.html [Access Date: 17.03.2019].

Jackie Headapohl ‘’Reactions to President Trump’s Decision to Withdraw From the Iran Nuclear Deal’’. *thejewishnews.com*: https://thejewishnews.com/2018/05/17/reactions-to-president-trumps-decision-to-withdraw-from-the-iran-nuclear-deal/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Jeff Mason and Louis Charbonneau. ‘’Obama, Iran's Rouhani hold historic phone call’’. *reuters.com:* https://www.reuters.com/article/us-un-assembly-iran-idUSBRE98Q16S20130928 [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

Jonathan Masters. ‘’U.S. Foreign Policy Powers: Congress and the President’’. *cfr.org:* https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/us-foreign-policy-powers-congress-and-president [Access Date: 21.08.2020].

Katie Reilly. ‘’5 Reasons President Obama Hasn't Been Able to Close Guantanamo Bay’’. *time.com:* https://time.com/4179278/state-of-the-union-guantanamo-bay-president-obama/ [Access Date: 21.08.2020].

‘’Kronolojik Sırayla Dünden Bugüne Görev Almış ABD Başkanları’’. *Listelist:* https://listelist.com/sirasiyla-abd-baskanlari/ [Access Date: 21.03.2019].

Law.Cornell. ‘’Article II’’. *law.cornell.edu:* https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/articleii [Access Date: 19.08.2020].

Lawrence J. Korb. ‘’The Promised Withdrawal from Iraq’’. *americanprogress.org:* https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2009/02/27/5520/the-promised-withdrawal-from-iraq/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Map of American Expansion: https://worldview.stratfor.com/article/united-states-territorial-expansion-0.

Matt Compton. ‘’President Obama Has Ended the War in Iraq’’. *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2011/10/21/president-obama-has-ended-war-iraq [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Melissa Healy. ‘’Helms Stirs Furor With Warning to President: Politics: Senator says Clinton ‘better watch out’ if he visits N. Carolina bases. He later admits to ‘mistake.’’’. *latimes:* https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1994-11-23-mn-691-story.html [Access Date: 22.11.2020].

Michael Nelson. ‘’Barack Obama: Campaigns and Elections’’. *millercenter.org:* https://millercenter.org/president/obama/campaigns-and-elections [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Molly O’Toole. ‘’Libya Is Obama’s Biggest Regret — And Hillary’s Biggest Threat’’. *foreignpolicy.com*: https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/06/03/libya-is-obamas-biggest-regret-and-hillarys-biggest-threat/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Muhammed Bilal Kenasari. ‘’Obama'nın Irak karnesi’’. *AA:* http://aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/obamanin-irak-karnesi/692072 [Access Date: 12.04.2019].

‘’Multilateralism’’. *Britannica:* https://www.britannica.com/topic/multilateralism, [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

Murtaza Hussain. ‘’Aipac Distorts U.S. Policy On Israel, Obama Admits In Book’’. *theintercept.com:* https://theintercept.com/2020/12/01/obama-book-israel-aipac-iran/ [Access Sate: 23.05.2021].

‘’National Security Strategy - February 2015’’. *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy_2.pdf [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’National Security Strategy - May 2010’’. *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov*: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’National Security Strategy of the United States of America – December 2017’’. *trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002’’. *state.gov:* https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’National Security Strategy Report - September 2002’’. *globalsecurity:* https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/national/nss-020920.htm [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

NATOSource by Donald Trump and Jens Stoltenberg. White House. ‘’Trump Believes US ‘Paying a Lot of Money to Protect’ NATO Allies’’. *atlanticcouncil.org*: https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/natosource/trump-believes-us-paying-a-lot-of-money-to-protect-nato-allies/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’North Dakota History’’. https://www.familysearch.org/wiki/en/North_Dakota_History [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

‘’Obama TBMM'de konuştu’’. *ntv.com.tr:* https://www.ntv.com.tr/video/turkiye/obama-tbmmde-konustu,wL9_0cPUMU-Z06Bvy_wq4g [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

Osama Anter Hamdi. p. 252 and ‘’Israel and AIPAC clash on Syria strike’’. *aljazeera.com:* https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2013/9/12/israel-and-aipac-clash-on-syria-strike [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Patrick Wintour. ‘’Trump's decision on Iran is not as black and white as it seems’’. *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/may/08/trump-iran-decision-sanctions-waiver-nuclear-deal-continue [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Paul Blumenthal. ‘’Trump’s ‘Make America Great Again’ Myth Reaches Its Catastrophic Conclusion’’. huffpost.com:https://www.huffpost.com/entry/trump-make-america-great-again-riot_n_5ff8dc13c5b691806c490ecd [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’PBS Crucible of Empire’’. *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UmKSPyTptis, [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

Peter Hartcher. ‘’Why Trump has become China's enemy ... with benefits’’. *smh.com.au:* https://www.smh.com.au/national/why-trump-has-become-china-s-enemy-with-benefits-20201102-p56aod.html [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Pres. Obama on China's agression in South China Sea’’. *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2XagaRFT-tc [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Presidential Election Process’’. *usa.gov:* https://www.usa.gov/election#:~:text=In%20other%20U.S.%20elections%2

C%20candidates,electors%20comes%20from%20the%20Constitution [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

‘’President Obama Speech to Muslim World in Cairo’’. *youtube*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B_889oBKkNU [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’Primaries and Caucuses’’, th.usembassy.gov: https://th.usembassy.gov/summary-of-the-u-s-presidential-election-process/primaries-and-caucuses/, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

‘’Public opinion’’, britannica.com: https://www.britannica.com/topic/public-opinion, [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

‘’Purpose’’, canf.org: https://www.canf.org/about-us/purpose, [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Sanctions Programs and Country Information’’. *home.treasury.gov:* https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/financial-sanctions/sanctions-programs-and-country-information [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

Scott Bomboy. ‘’The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the limits of presidential power’’. *Constitutioncenter.org:* https://constitutioncenter.org/blog/the-gulf-of-tonkin-and-the-limits-of-presidential-power [Access Date: 21.11.2020].

‘’Second 2020 Presidential Debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden’’. *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bPiofmZGb8o [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Security Council Holds First Debate On Iraq Since Start Of Military Action; Speakers Call For Halt To Aggression, Immediate Withdrawal’’. *un.org*: https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sc7705.doc.htm [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Sep 2, 1901 CE: Big Stick Diplomacy’’. *NationalGeographic*: https://www.nationalgeographic.org/thisday/sep2/big-stick-diplomacy/ [Access Date: 21.03.2019].

‘’Six Years After the JCPOA, Much Has Changed’’. *aipac.org:* https://www.aipac.org/resources/six-years-after-the-jcpoa-much-has-changed [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’South China Sea: ‘’Obama urges Beijing to abide by ruling’’. *bbc.com:* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-37267372 [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Statement by the President on Cuba Policy Changes’’. *obamawhitehouse.archives.gov:* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/17/statement-president-cuba-policy-changes [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

‘’Statement by the President on Libya’’. *obamawhitehouse.archive.gov*: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/08/22/statement-president-libya [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Stephen M. Walt. ‘’The Myth of American Exceptionalism’’. *foreignpolicy.com:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism/ [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

Stephen Tankel. ‘’Has Trump Read His Own Counterterrorism Strategy?’’. *foreignpolicy:* https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/10/12/has-trump-read-his-own-counterterrorism-strategy/ [Access Date: 24.04.2019].

‘’Strategic Arms Limitations Talks/Treaty (SALT) I and II’’. *history.state.gov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1969-1976/salt [Access Date: 23.05.2021].

‘’Summary of the U.S. Presidential Election Process’’. *th.usembassy.gov*: https://th.usembassy.gov/summary-of-the-u-s-presidential-election-process/ [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

Suzanne Goldenberg. ‘’US will attack without approval' Zero tolerance' policy by Bush administration’’. *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/nov/11/iraq.usa [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Text of President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address’’. *washingtonpost.com*: https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.html [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Theodore Roosevelt's Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine (1905)’’. *Ourdocuments:* https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=56 [Access Date: 17.03.2019].

‘’The Axis of Evil Speech by George W. Bush’’. *wheelersburg.net:* https://www.wheelersburg.net/Downloads/Bush%20Axis%20of%20Evil.pdf [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’The National Security Strategy, March 2006’’. *georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov:* https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2006/ [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’The National Security Strategy of the United States of America’’. *state.gov:* https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’The Oregon Territory, 1846’’. *HistoryStateGov:* https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/oregon-territory [Access Date: 16.03.2019].

‘’The 'Realists,' the 'Idealists' and Clinton’’. *baltimoresun*: https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-xpm-1994-05-02-1994122033-story.html [Access Date: 05.05.2019].

‘’The Speech that Made Obama President’’. *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OFPwDe22CoY [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Thom Shanker. ‘’Campaign Promises on Ending the War in Iraq Now Muted by Reality’’. *nytimes.com:* https://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/04/us/politics/04military.html [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Tom Phillips. ‘’China urges Trump: be our friend, not our enemy’’. *theguardian.com:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jan/20/china-urges-trump-be-our-friend-not-our-enemy [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Toni Johnson. ‘’Congress and U.S. Foreign Policy’’. *cfr.org* https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/congress-and-us-foreign-policy [Access Date: 28.08.2020].

‘’Transcript: George Bush's speech on Iraq’’. *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/oct/07/usa.iraq [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Trump labels China a strategic ‘competitor’’’. *financialtimes.com:* https://www.ft.com/content/215cf8fa-e3cb-11e7-8b99-0191e45377ec [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

‘’Trump v Biden: The Final Debate’’. *youtube:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yGPfKkjDIts [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Tucker Higgins. ‘’In a bad sign for trade talks, Trump deploys a new label for China’s Xi – ‘enemy’’’. *cnbc.com:* https://www.cnbc.com/2019/08/23/bad-sign-for-trade-talks-trump-calls-china-president-xi-enemy.html [Access Date: 22.05.2021].

Turkish Coalition of American (TCA). *tc-america.prg*: https://www.tc-america.org/

Ufuk Ulutaş. ‘’Obama Sonrası Irak ve Suriye’’. *Akademik Perspektif*: http://akademikperspektif.com/2016/11/14/obama-sonrasi-irak-suriye/ [Access Date: 29.04.2019].

Uri Friedman. ‘’’American Exceptionalism’: A Short History’’. *foreignpolicy.com*: https://foreignpolicy.com/2012/06/18/american-exceptionalism-a-short-history/ [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

US Congress, House. ‘’The Future of U.S. International Nuclear Cooperation’’. *foreignaffairs.house.gov:* https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/2010/5/future-us-international-nuclear-cooperation [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

US Congress, House. ‘’The President’s New Cuba Policy and U.S. National Security’’. *foreignaffairs.house.gov:* https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/hearings?ID=60B70686-B0CD-4C8E-8B6E-1E7A14FBF70A [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

Us Congress, Senate Subcommittee Hearing. ‘’Beyond ISIS: Countering Terrorism, Radicalization, and Promoting Stability in North Africa’’. *foreign.senate.gov:* https://www.foreign.senate.gov/hearings/beyond-isis-countering-terrorism-radicalization-and-promoting-stability-in-north-africa-120617 [Access Date: 24.05.2021].

‘’US Election 2020’’. *bbc.com:* https://www.bbc.com/news/election/us2020/results [Access Date: 24.04.2021].

Warren F. Kuehl and Gary B. Ostrower. ‘’Internationalism’’. *AmericanForeignRelations:* https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Internationalism.html [Access Date: 17.03.2019].

‘’What, exactly, is 'American exceptionalism'?’’. *theweek.com:* https://theweek.com/articles/654508/what-exactly-american-exceptionalism [Access Date: 10.12.2020].

Whitehouse. ‘’The Executive Branch’’. *whitehouse.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/the-executive-branch/ [Access Date: 19.08.2020].

Whitehouse. ‘’The Legislative Branch’’. *whitehouse.gov:* https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/the-legislative-branch/ [Access Date: 21.08.2020].

‘’Why Obama's 'targeted killing' is worse than Bush's torture’’. *theguardian:* https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/jan/20/why-obama-targeted-killing-is-like-bush-torture [Access Date: 27.04.2019].