

## **The U.S- Israel Relations during Bush's Administrations and its Impact on the Middle East**

**Dr. Uzma Naz<sup>1</sup>, Syed Husnain Haider<sup>2</sup>, Gul I Ayesha Bhatti<sup>3</sup>**

### **Abstract**

Israel aspires to have a significant impact on US policy, and the United States frequently regards it as a client. The United States and Israel may benefit from each other's resources. In some ways, Israeli activities resemble Western pleasures. U.S. Mideast policy is influenced by the dispute between Western and Bedouin states and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. United States' support for Zionism has remained steadfast since the 1920s. Ancient religious precepts developed into something helpful at the beginning of the 20th century for Palestinians, making Jewish sovereignty an inseparable part of their culture and history. There seems to be a consensus among American officials that the formation of Israel fulfills an ancient prophecy from the Bible. Since World War II, Russia and the United States have engaged in proxy conflicts in the Middle East. As a result of Cold War-era alliances and collaboration, the war was influenced. On Yom Kippur, the United States aided Israel in its struggle against Syria and Egypt. US-Israel relations are centered on the protection of Israel and the safeguarding of critical US interests in Middle Eastern countries. Political changes have been put on hold due to the region's safety concerns. Hostile Western violence has become the region's major cause of misery as a required counteraction in the area. When the United States calls for constraints on Israel's policy toward its neighbors, Israel reacts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor at Minhaj University Lahore, Email: [druzma.ir@mul.edu.pk](mailto:druzma.ir@mul.edu.pk)

<sup>2</sup> Ph.D. Scholar at Minhaj University Lahore, Email: [husnainofficialdoc@gmail.com](mailto:husnainofficialdoc@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Ph.D Scholar at Minhaj University Lahore, Email: [Gulayeshajaved@yahoo.com](mailto:Gulayeshajaved@yahoo.com)

**Keywords:** Zionism, Middle East, Mutual Interests, Foreign Policy

## **Introduction**

The world's attention has shifted to the Middle East because of the discovery of a wealth of natural resources there. Russia and the United States have used the Middle East to stage proxy wars since World War II. U.S. military personnel and engineers were dispatched to Iran during World War II to maintain a land lease supply line to Russia, while American munitions and supplies were sent via Egypt to build up Allied Middle East command power. It was on this basis that following World War II, the U.S.A. strategy in the Middle East focused on Turkey, Iran, and Israel as its most important regional strategic allies. The United States enhanced its regional clout by providing military assistance to its likely allies as a result of the 1947 Truman Doctrine and the 1957 Eisenhower Doctrine. The structure of alliances and cooperation created during the Cold War continued to have an impact on the Middle East conflict. "On Yom Kippur Day, the United States helped Israel in its fight against Syria and Egypt (Mearsheimer, 2007)

On June 24, 2002, President Bush proposed the formation of a Palestinian state in return for democratic or administrative changes, as well as strong counterterrorism tactics by the Palestinian Administration. The policies of the Bush administration in the United States were, in many ways, a continuation of those of the last government. As a result of long-term strategic goals, the U.S.A.'s policy in the Middle East is a combination of Idealism and Political Realism (Allan, 2002). Even if the importance of the Middle East has changed throughout the ages, it is still significant in terms of:

1. Position
2. Resources

### 3. People

Historically, a strategic tug-of-war has raged between the Soviet Union, Western nations, communist countries opposed to the West, and neutral governments on these issues. However, the Middle Eastern countries, which were relatively weak at the time, were embroiled in the conflict. Between the Atlantic and Mediterranean seas, the Gulf of Aden, and the waters east of the Suez Canal, the Middle East is a vital connection in global trade and commerce. The growing demand for products and services must be transported across these three continents. Another reason for the Middle East's prominence is the growing global need for petroleum. The Suez Canal is just one part of a much larger transportation network that is of critical importance. The Middle East is essential not just to the United States, but to the rest of the globe as well, for the reasons stated above (Chomsky, 1999).

As one of the world's leading oil users, the United States is also one of its most powerful economic marketplaces. The reliable supply of oil in the Persian Gulf is of primary importance to the United States' position in the Middle East. The price of oil and the ease with which it may be accessed are both impacted by the political and militaristic unrest in the Middle East.

#### **Objectives**

1. This paper explores the dynamics of relations between the United States of America and Israel and how their relations impact the Middle East.
2. In the paper, it is argued that the instability in the Middle Eastern region over the past few decades has been the outcome of the United States of America's interest during Bush's Administration.

### **Historical Background of USA and Israel Relations**

These two countries' shared values and beliefs have forged a strong bond that has kept Israel and the United States as close allies. To Palestinians, Jewish statehood is inextricably linked to ancient religious ethics that morphed into something useful at the dawn of the 20th century. The United States of America appears to be supporting the view that the establishment of a Jewish state is a fulfillment of a biblical prophecy, which explains why the United States has supported the establishment and continued existence of the Modern Jewish State, as evidenced by its policies since Israel's founding. Since the 1920s, the United States has been a staunch supporter of Zionism. Because of anti-Semitic attitudes in Europe and the United States, these movements conveyed the voice of Jews for "A National Home for the Jewish People" and "The Declaration of Sympathy." When Israel became a sovereign state in 1948, President Truman was the first world leader to do so (Telhami, 2002).

A statement by John F. Kennedy said: "Since President Woodrow Wilson's administration, the United States has maintained a close relationship with Israel out of a commitment to all free countries striving for peace and respecting individual rights. It takes courage, perseverance, and dedication to achieve the better world we envision as free men in the prophetic spirit of Zionism." Schefer (2009 )

Schäfer Ronald Reagan was the first President to openly mention Israel as one of the United States' most valuable allies. He made the following statement: "Defeating Moscow's attempts to seize areas and resources critical to our national security and well-being can only be accomplished by understanding the critical role played by the State of Israel in our strategic calculus. The two countries have had an unbreakable link since the inception of Israel's democracy, he said, while highlighting the two countries' common principles. "

## **U.S Foreign Policy towards Israel**

U.S. foreign policy toward Israel has remained remarkably consistent despite some minor disagreements between the two countries on this issue. During the Sixth Day War, the United States supported Israel when Syria and Egypt launched a joint attack on the country. Richard Nixon, President of the United States at the time, hastened to help Israel in the 1973 Yom Kippur War against Egypt and Syria. America began to utilize "soft power" in the Middle East during and after the Cold War in 1993 by resolving issues between Israel and Arab governments to build a strong Middle Eastern alliance. Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat met with President Clinton on the White House Lawn for the signing of a Declaration of Principles on Palestinian self-governance in good faith. Clinton observed the signing of the Israeli-Jordanian Peace Treaty in 1994, as well. A meeting between Yasser Arafat and Benjamin Netanyahu was held at Wyes River, Maryland, under his patronage. In 1998, Netanyahu agreed to give up a portion of the West Bank city of Hebron to the Palestinians, and in 2000, he hosted discussions between Israel and Syrian officials.

In 2003, President Bush George W Bush assumed the presidency, and he repeated the thoughts of practically every president who had held the office before him. At the end of the day, "we will stand up for our beliefs and our allies throughout the globe," President Bush declared. Israel is a key ally of the United States, as President Barack Obama has said. Arafat is being "betrayed by politicians who cling to power by fueling old hatreds and ruining the good work of others," said Bush, who backed Israel is seeking to sideline Arafat. Bush believes that the unshakable kinship between America and Israel is founded on their common connection to God's word and that this bond extends beyond the boundaries of any treaty.

Barack Obama declared that "we [America] stand with Israel as a Jewish democratic state because we know that Israel is founded of strongly held principles that we, as Americans, share: a culture dedicated to justice, a place that welcomes the weary, a people devoted to Tikkun Olam ." Furthermore, "We're going to maintain standing with our Israeli friends and allies," he stated. The true root reason for the U.S and Israel such a strong connection is the Shared Values between the two nations since the number of Jews in America is less than 6million and it is not imaginable that a country with such a minority has such a dramatic impact on America policy. Both the states enjoy a specific link based on a moral, strategic and geographical basis. In various phases, they both may confront pressure but strategic cooperation between the two nations stay comparably stanch and durable.

### **Israel Policy towards the U.S**

Former Senator James Abourezk who was a supporter Palestinian cause believes that "U.S policy on the Middle East is practically driven by Tel Aviv. So long as the public overlooks U.S Government activities in Middle East Israel will continue to dictate our policies there - hence, the only real pressure on the politicians about the Middle Eastern matter comes from the Israeli Lobby. Always capable of generating money for political elections, the lobby enlists the active help of American Jews in every state of the Union. It gets directions from Israel and then puts down the party line to the American Jewish community in several ways Newsletters, community, newspapers, and synagogue speeches. American Jews desire urgently to aid Israel, thus they depend on the Israeli Lobby to inform that how well organized, sophisticated, and continuously vigilant, the Israeli Lobby utilizes political intimidation if all fails." (Campbell, 1958).

The number of Jews in America is fewer than 6million and it is not imaginable that a country with such a minority has such a significant effect on American politics. The foreign policy of the United States in the Middle East to some extent is driven by Israel's regional policies for example the conflict between Palestine and Israel was a cause of turmoil in the region but the settlement of this issue many regional issues can also be resolved and because of the strong alliance between U.S and Israel, the feeling of Anti-Western. To prevent this sense of hostility United States began to focus on utilizing the soft power in the area this is the reason why the United States has been so mobile in addressing conflicts in the region like the Palestinian and Israeli conflict. This included strategy emphasizes collaboration rather than isolation offering comprehensive moderation to decrease regional violence (Fawcett, 2016).

In the very beginning, the State Department of the United States had advised President Truman that expressional endorsement of the construction of a Jewish State would impede the Middle Eastern Regional Stability. But on the other hand, Congress recognized an occasion for the United States to broaden support for U.S interests in the Middle East and transmit keep up with the Jewish State.

The USA in 1999 is under the same degree of Jewish dominance as Weimar Germany was under in 1929. Sir Arthur Bryant, a noted historian of the 1920s, said that while Jews were just 1 percent of the German population, in 1924 in the Reichstag they constituted 25 percent of the Social Democrats. Jews controlled 57 percent of the metal trade, 22 percent of grain, and 39 percent of textiles. Some 1,200 German stockholders were also Jewish, making up more than half of the Berlin Chamber of Commerce. Twenty-three of the city's 29 recognized theatres were run by Jews. In the past, authorship was

almost a Jewish privilege. It is estimated that in 1931, there were 144 film screenplays created and 77 of them were made by Jews. (Silverman, 2006)

### **The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)**

The Jewish community in the United States now dominates the franchising industry. In the United States today, Jews have a disproportionate amount of wealth. Estimates vary from a low of 30 percent to a high of 70%. The Israeli Lobby, often known as the Zionist Lobby, is a major force in American politics. To support Zionism, Israel, or certain government programs, it takes a varied coalition to influence US foreign policy. The lobby is made up of both secular and religious Jewish organizations in the United States. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) is the most well-known and prominent lobbying organization for Israel (AIPAC). Israel's lobby, including AIPAC and other organizations, has a significant impact on American public policy via several means such as education, response to anti-Israel criticism, and the presentation of pro-Israel views. The lobbying efforts of the Israeli government are well-known in the United States.

It is via AIPAC that American pro-Israeli policies are shaped. It is in favor of legislation that aids and protects the State of Israel. In the United States, AIPAC is regarded as one of the most powerful lobbying organizations, and it is sometimes said that no candidate can win office without AIPAC's backing. Taking the oath of office as president of the United States requires an unwavering commitment to Israel. They are obligated to vote and defend the Jewish state on every subject in the House of Representatives. The American Zionist Council, from which it sprung, was renamed AIPAC in 1963. AIPAC monitors every election, whether it is a municipal or national one, and grades each candidate on their devotion to the state of Israel. AIPAC wields a hefty but unobtrusive fist. For decades, it has relied on the employment of



misinformation and intimidation to achieve its goals. In the 1940s, the Zionist organization went from the United Kingdom to the United States to manipulate the US Congress because it was an easier and more flexible target.

### **The Policy Shift in Bush's Administration towards the Middle East**

America's policies under the Bush administration may have been a continuation of those taken by the country's predecessors. Bush's administration reacted swiftly to al-Qaeda on September 11th, 2001. The United States must be concerned about the safety of its citizens and its religious beliefs. The Bush organization devised a strategy to eliminate terrorism from its roots to ensure the survival of its institutions and protect them from all threats, both domestic and foreign. With this in mind, Bush unveiled "The Greater Middle East Initiative" in 2004, a strategy for reclassifying nations that were aligned with America's geopolitical interests in the Arab-Islamic world and putting forth the American egalitarian model.

Initially, the war in Afghanistan was welcomed by all parties involved. The United States' claim that it was acting in self-defense was clear, and no state was left to oppose it. Only two countries on the earth have granted the Taliban Regime in Afghanistan discretionary recognition at the United Nations. For the most part, the International Community resolved the right to use force against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. The first victory, on the other hand, proved to be flawed. It was revealed in the press on June 20th that an FBI-CIA investigation "found that the war in Afghanistan failed to lessen the United States' danger. Instead, the conflict may have complicated counterterrorism operations by scattering possible terrorists over a greater geographic region. First, the Bush worldwide war on terrorism has five main elements:

1. Defeat
2. Disrupt
3. Destroy
4. Destroy
5. Bush's Preemption Doctrine

### **Greater Multilateralism, Less Unilateralism**

From 2002-to 2003, the Bush Organization picked Iraq as the first application of the Bush doctrine on Preemption. Consequently, the subject of Iraq first came to light in 2002-2003. France, Russia, and others objected to the Bush administration's use of the UN Security Council's weight to advance a military operation even as President Bush considered it for ensuring legitimacy and providing more widespread backing. Bush and his group, on the other hand, have now decided to go to war without waiting for a new UNSC vote. To a certain degree, it claimed to be real enough in light of previous UNSC decisions. Under the Bush administration's teaching of appropriation, it argued that it wasn't necessary for self-defense of the United States. The United Kingdom, under Prime Minister Tony Blair, was an important ally in the Iraq War coalition of roughly 40 countries. It is for this reason that the coalition did not have the same level of strength as it had in the Persian Gulf War or Afghanistan War that these countries were able to restrain it.

### **Bush's Preemption Doctrine**

He said, "There is no basis for a unilateral choice to resort to force, whether it is required to disarm Iraq or the desired change in this country's administration." Regardless of how things turn out today, this ultimatum calls into question the way we think about international relations generally. People's lives, regions' livelihoods, and global peace were all jeopardized.

- According to Russia's President Vladimir Putin, the Iraq War will have terrible implications and might lead to casualties and a more unstable international scenario.
- Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would not join in the war against Iraq, nor will its military forces by any means intrude into Iraqi territory, " said Crown Prince Abdullah bin Abdul-Aziz, Saudi Arabia's most senior official.
- Egypt's President Hosni Mubarak: "If this conflict ends, there will be more terrorism and a terror group would come together." Our goal is to have a hundred Bin Ladens instead of just one.

"President Bush revisited imperialism," claimed Yemeni political scholar Nasser Sahah. Under the guise of democracy and freedom, he declared his plans to reign over the Arab world. An earlier assessment by Sherle Schwenninger of the New America Foundation said that "The core of U.S. policy over the previous three decades has been hostile to Arab democracy and self-determination." This was before Bush ever introduced the Greater Middle East Initiative. In all those years, the United States' strategy in the Middle East has been motivated by two at times conflicting goals: the backing of Israel and (indirect) control over the global oil market,"

"Every U.S. president since Lyndon Johnson has pursued the key three-part plan," she said, "first, subsidizing Israel's security and promoting some form of the peace process between Israel and its neighbors and more lately, between Israel and the Palestinians. By supporting pro-American regimes in Egypt and Jordan, these countries are no longer considered hostile frontline nations, which is a significant achievement (Selby, 2005).

Third, the development of a tight relationship with the royal families of the Persian Gulf oil-producing nations, particularly Saudi Arabia's royal family. It has only exacerbated U.S. legitimacy issues, she added, since the invasion of Iraq in 2003. As one observer put it, "It seems as though the United States is more concerned about preserving its dominating military position than it is with the well-being of Iraqi citizens. Iraq suffered the most as a result of Bush's Middle East action, with Saddam Hussein, the country's late president, being toppled.

### **War Against Terrorism**

To combat Islamic extremism in the aftermath of 9/11, the Hedge group devised a structure to spread vote-based norms. The United States aimed to legitimize its political and military control over the Middle East in the same manner that a mighty power would over its provinces. Majority rule government and wonderful administration; building a learning society; and expanding monetary open doors were three of the most notable Center East activities (Jones, 2012).

To defeat Islamic radicalism, America recognized the Middle East's isolation from modernity, high unemployment, and aggravated lack of monetary open doors as well as unchecked defilement, nepotism, and imperialism, all of which were contributing factors to the rise of terrorism. Concerning the Middle East and the "Islamic district," the United States had to make certain adjustments. U.S. policymakers instead tried to impose a pre-defined political, financial, and social model on a population that was radically different from their own. Military intervention in Iraq had a domino effect in the area and sparked the formation of force vacuums. In the Middle East, radicals have taken advantage of America's political narcissism to strengthen their grip on strategic tomahawks (Mabon, 2015).

### **Situational Analysis**

The United States often sees Israel as a client. Israel, on the other hand, wants to have a major effect on US policy and is prompted by the need to show up arrangement makers in the US. They conclude that Israel, initially with the English in Palestine and now the United States after Bedouin Israeli War, is an enlargement of Western colonialism. In the eyes of Middle Easterners, this administration can maintain its provincial influence in the region. The United States may be more acceptable to Israel as a partner than as an arbiter of regional peace. The United States had to deal with the Palestinian uprising, the development of political Hamas, and the Hezbollah-IDF conflict in the midst. Making Israel a key resource for the United States may be desirable, and vice versa. In the context of Israel's relationship with the United States, Israeli pastimes might be seen as a mirror of Western pastimes. To a certain extent, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the conflict between Western and Bedouin nations, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict influence the United States' policy in the Middle East (Anderson, 2013).

The relationship between the United States and Israel is centered on the protection of Israel and the preservation of vital American interests in the Middle East. Security concerns in the area have pushed political reforms to the back burner. Hostile Western violence has trumped the area's primary source of pain as a necessary counteraction in the region. The relationship between the United States and Israel is one of remarkable quality. Because Israel needs the United States to support its interests in the region, it responds to demands for restrictions on the country's policies toward its neighbors. Israel serves as a signal for the United States in the region. The special relationship between the United States and Israel has always included a dual system (Yaqub, 2016).

## Conclusion

In the Cold War, Israel may have been a significant resource. After the 1967 war, Israel acted as a go-between for the United States, limiting Soviet expansion in the region and delivering humiliating defeats to Soviet allies like Egypt and Syria. Russia was forced to spend more money on transferring its lost clients because of Israel's military might (like Jordan's King Hussein). Additional information concerning Soviet capabilities was provided by Israel. However, it is important not to overestimate Israel's importance at this time. In the end, the decision to support Israel was not a poor one, and it enmeshed America's ties with the Arab world. It is worth noting that, for example, the US decision to offer Israel \$2.2 billion in crisis military aid during the October War set off a Middle Eastern oil blockade and generation decrease that wreaked enormous economic havoc on Western countries. In addition, Israel's military was unable to keep the United States out of the area. During the Iranian Revolution of 1979, the United States could not rely on Israel for the security of the Persian Gulf oil supply. A "Quick Sending Power" was required in Washington (Shikaki, 2020).

Although Israel may have been a critical resource during the Cold War, the first Gulf War (1990-1991) revealed that Israel was becoming a major weight. Israeli bases were essential to prevent Tel Aviv from doing anything that jeopardize the anti-Iraqi alliance, and the US had to divert resources to prevent Tel Aviv jeopardizing from the coalition. In 2003, history was rewritten even again. No matter how much Israel wanted the US to attack Saddam, US President George W. Bush couldn't ask for their assistance without triggering the Middle Easterner prohibition. As a result, Israel remained on the sidelines again (Freedman, 2008).

Support for Israel has been justified since the 1990s and especially after 9/11 when terrorist groups in the Bedouin or Muslim world and "maverick

expressions" that support these gatherings' hunt for WMD were cited as evidence of the debilitation of both governments by the terrorist groups. In the eyes of some, this reasoning means that the United States should allow Israel a free hand in handling the tenants and groups like Hezbollah, and should not pressure Israel to make compromises until all Palestinian terrorists have been captured or eliminated. As a result of this, it proposes that the United States should follow countries like the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, and Syria. As a result, Israel is considered a crucial ally in the fight against fear since its antagonists are deemed to be rivals of the US.

### **Findings of the Study**

1. Even though this new line of thinking seems to be effective, Israel poses a danger in the fight against fear and the broader effort to govern rebel nations that follows.
2. In the first sense, "terrorism" is a technique used by a broad range of political groups; it is not a single opponent. Hamas and Hezbollah aren't a threat to the United States, unless when the United States mediates against them (as in Lebanon in 1982). The Palestinian terrorism is also a response to Israel's long-term struggle to occupy the West Bank and Gaza Strip, rather than random violence directed against Israel or the "Western" world.
3. The causal connection is reversible when claiming that Israel and the United States are linked by a shared terrorist threat. The United States may have a terrorist problem in large part because of its strong ties to Israel, rather than in a different manner.
4. As a result of U.S. support for Israel, winning the war on fear will be more difficult, but it is not the primary source of anti-American terrorism. Osama bin Laden is one of several al-Qaeda leaders

who have been inspired by Israel's proximity to Jerusalem and the plight of Palestinians.

5. U.S. 9/11 Commission reports state that the purpose of Receptacle Loaded on September 11, 2001, was to openly rebuke American policies in the Middle East, particularly support for Israel. He even tried to schedule the attacks so that they would draw attention to the problem
6. Furthermore, unrestrained US backing for Israel makes it easier for extremists like Container Loaded to mobilize popular support and recruit. Surveys show that Bedouin populations are deeply hostile to American support for Israel, and the Consultative Gathering on Open Tact for the Middle Easterner and Muslim World found that "natives in these nations are upset at the predicament of the Palestinians and what they perceive us to be doing," according to the US State Department.
7. When it comes to so-called "maverick" Middle Eastern countries, they represent no threat to U.S. interest another from the U.S. obligation toward Israel.
8. Washington's obsession with Iran, Baathist Iraq, and Syria would be much less intense if it weren't so firmly rooted in its support for Israel, although the United States has direct problems with these regimes.
9. Even if these countries get atomic bombs, which is certainly not attractive, it would not be a critical mistake for the United States to have them in its possession.
10. The danger from Iran is evident, their explicit objective to demolish our great ally Israel," President Hedge said recently. To be sure, this threat is magnified by Israel's and America's respective atomic obstacles.



11. Because a renegade state with atomic weapons could not extort either country, the blackmailer could not take the risk without accepting powerful retaliation.
12. To terrorists, an "atomic handoff" poses a comparable faraway threat. An insurgent government couldn't guarantee that it would go unnoticed or that it wouldn't be denied quickly after the exchange.
13. It is also more difficult to negotiate successfully with these countries because of the United States' affiliation with Israel.
14. As Israel's nuclear arsenal serves as an incentive for its neighbors, weakening them by changing their administrations only heightens their desire for atomic weapons. Israel, on the other hand, is of little use to the United States if it decides to use military force against these regimes.
15. To put it another way, seeing Israel as America's most important ally in the fight against terrorism and organized fascism in the Middle East misrepresents Israel's ability to assist with these problems and ignores how Israeli methods make U.S. efforts more difficult.

## References

- Abu-Lebdeh, H. S. (1997). *Conflict and peace in the Middle East: National perceptions and United States-Jordan relations*. University Press of America.
- Allan, J. A. (2002). Hydro-Peace in the Middle East. *SAIS Review (1989-2003)*, 22(2), 255-272.
- Anderson, E. (2013). *Middle east: Geography and geopolitics*. Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. South End Press.
- Fawcett, L. L. E. (Ed.). (2016). *International relations of the Middle East*. Oxford University Press.
- Freedman, R. O. (2008). The Russian invasion of Georgia—its impact on Israel and the Middle East. *Caucasian Review of International Affairs*, 2(4), 179-186.
- Jones, C. A. (2013). *Soviet Jewish Aliyah, 1989-92: Impact and Implications for Israel and the Middle East*. Routledge.
- Jones, T. C. (2012). America, oil, and war in the Middle East. *The Journal of American History*, 99(1), 208-218.
- Kamrava, M. (2018). Multipolarity and instability in the Middle East. *Orbis*, 62(4), 598-616.
- Karaosmanoglu, A. L. (1983). Turkey's security and the Middle East. *Foreign Aff.*, 62, 157.

- Khani, A. B. (2013). Egyptian–Israeli Relations, History, Progress, Challenges and Prospects in the Middle East. *Journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies (in Asia)*, 7(3), 93-120.
- Mabon, S. (2015). *Saudi Arabia and Iran: Power and Rivalry in the Middle East*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- MALEKI, M. R., & MOHAMMADZADEH, E. F. (2010). THE US-ISRAELI SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP AND OBAMA’S MIDDLE EAST POLICY.
- Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. (2007). *The Israel Lobby and US foreign policy*. Macmillan.
- Miller, J. C. (1975). African-Israeli relations: Impact on continental unity. *Middle East Journal*, 29(4), 393-408.
- Milton-Edwards, B. (2018). *Contemporary politics in the Middle East*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Pollack, K. (2008). *A path out of the desert: a grand strategy for America in the Middle East*. Random House.
- Reich, B. (2006). Support Any Friend: Kennedy's Middle East and the Making of the US Israel Alliance.
- Selby, J. (2005). The geopolitics of water in the Middle East: fantasies and realities. *Third World Quarterly*, 26(2), 329-349.
- Shikaki, K. (2020). Annexation, the Trump Plan, and the Future of Palestinian-Israeli Relations. *Middle East Brief*, 138.

Spiegel, S. L. (1985). *The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict: Making America's Middle East Policy, from Truman to Reagan* (Vol. 1). University of Chicago Press.

Telhami, S., & Barnett, M. N. (Eds.). (2002). *Identity and foreign policy in the Middle East*. Cornell University Press.

Yaqub, S. (2016). *Imperfect Strangers: Americans, Arabs, and the US–Middle East Relations in the 1970s*. Cornell University Press.