



Near East University



**Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of International Relations**

Master Thesis

THE ORDER IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The Middle East after the Cold War

Supervisor:

Professor Dr. Jouni Suistola

Submitted by:

Mohammad Fawaz Ibrahim Dalloal

(20052810)

Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

2007



Mohammad Fawaz Ibrahim Dalloal : **The Order in the International Relations**

Approval of Director of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Aykut Polatoglu



*We certify that this is satisfactory for the award of degree of Master of
Arts in International Relations*

Examining Committee in Charge:

Prof. Dr. Jouni Suistola

Department of International Relations
(Chairman of the Jury)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zaliha Khashman

Department of International Relations

Dr. Bulent Evre

Department of International Relations

Near East University
Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences
Department of International Relations
JURY REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2006-2007

Student Information

Full Name:	Mohammad F. Dalloal	Nationality:	Palestinian
Institution:	Near East University	Department	International Relations




Thesis

Title	The Order in the International Relations
Description	This thesis is a part of an important discussion about a significant issue that of an order, in International Relations field and try to explain the order of IR. The first chapter introduces the International Relations and it's limited to Realism, Liberalism, Pluralism, and Marxism in the study also the meaning of International Relations. Chapter two discusses concept of the International order the question if we have order in World politics and the problems of this order and finally the balance of power. Chapter tackles one form of order, the American Hegemony and what about the world situation under this hegemony. Finally, we have a case study about the possible Iranian Nuclear Weapons. In the framework of the present world order, that of the American hegemony.
Supervisor	Prof. Dr. Jouni Suistola


Jury's Decision

The Jury has decided to accept the student's thesis. The decision has been taken unanimously.
--

Jury Members

Number Attending : 3	Date 24.01.2007
Name:	Signature:
Prof. Dr. Jouni Suistola	
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zaliha Khashman	
Dr. Bulent Evre	

Approvals

Date: 24.01.2007 	Chairman of the department Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zaliha Khashman
--	---

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my family and my advisor, Professor Dr. Jouni Suistola, for giving me the freedom to access all the possibilities.

I am grateful to the other faculty members Assoc-prof. Dr. Zeliha Khashman, Dr. Ejdan Sadrazam, Dr. Mkhaimar abu Saadeh (the chairman of Political Science Department of Al Azhar University Palestine) for their help.

Mohammad Fawaz Dalloal

1-2-2007.

Abstract

This thesis is a part of an important discussion about a significant issue that of an order, in International Relations field and try to explain the order of IR. The first chapter discusses concept of the International order the question if we have order in World politics and the problems of this order and finally the balance of power. Chapter two introduces the International Relations and it's limited to Realism, Liberalism, Pluralism, and Marxism in the study also the meaning of International Relations. Chapter tackles one form of order, the American Hegemony and what about the world situation under this hegemony. Finally, we have a case study about the possible Iranian Nuclear Weapons. In the framework of the present world order, that of the American hegemony.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	1
Abstract	2
Table of contents	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5

Chapter One

The International Order

1. The International Order	8
2. Do we have order in World Politics or not	10
3. The problems of Order and Interdependence in the World System.....	12
3.1 Order and Anarchy	12
3.2 Interdependence and the World System	13
3.3 Transnational Relations and Interdependence	13
4. Regimes and International Order	14
5. Balance of Power	18
6. The great power System (Order)	23
Conclusion of chapter One	26

Chapter Two

International relations Theories

1. International Relations theory	30
1.1 What is theory	30
1.2 International Relations theories.....	31
1.2.1 Assumptions of power of Realism	31
1.2.2 Major Actors and Assumptions of Pluralism	33

1.2.3 Liberalism	35
1.2.4 Marxist theory.....	39
2. What is the meaning of International Relations?	42
The important of theories	44
Conclusion of chapter Two.....	44

Chapter Three

The American Hegemony

3.1. Hegemonic Stability	47
--------------------------------	----

3.2. The Order and the Iranian nuclear ambitions a case study

3.2.1 Bush and the New World Order.....	58
3.2.2 The Global order and the Americans perspective.....	60
3.2.3 Iran aims at a new regional order.....	65
3.2.4 Iran as new leader of the Islamic World.....	66
Iran balancing Israeli (nuclear) power.....	68
The Iranian nuclear ambition and the order in International Relations.....	70
American administration-Iranian leadership.....	77
Conclusion of chapter three.....	80
CONCLUSION	81
Bibliography	85

Introduction

To understand what happens around us we have to keep in mind that our world has taken a new form. Great changes took place in 1989 and reformed the order of International Relations. To understand the change and the new situation we have to analyze the International Relations during the realism theory. The important questions here are as follows, why the old order collapsed. How did the new system emerge? What are the driving forces behind the new order. Who benefits out of it and who "are paying the bills". To start with, it is, of course, important to understand the theoretical foundations of the International Relations as a science-above all the concept of order.

In the field of International Relations there have been developments over the years which have influenced our life and have shaken the foundations of world politics.

To understand those changes takes a hard work in the libraries and archives. Sometimes the researcher might come up with important insights. Yet, this does not necessarily mean that we are able to solve the problems of the world with those insights. Consequently, there is a permanent obligation for the scholars to continue their efforts to understand issues like poverty, terrorism etc. And of course order, but also natural catastrophes like tsunamis, earthquakes and landslides, because they also have great international implications, it's not only about theories of International Relations. One dimension in a study of International Relations is the focus on the contemporary international order and the major changes which occurred in 1989-1991. First, the Soviet Empire collapsed then as a consequence, Germany was reunited and finally the Soviet Union itself disintegrated.

The implications in the International System were dramatic. Firstly, the development resulted the end of so-called Westphalian system, which is the Nation-State. The last phase

of that System (1945-1991) had been the bipolar balance, where two superpowers balanced each other. The period after 1991 can also be called unipolar the only when superpower, the USA, was fast in recognizing the new opportunities. Consequently, President George Bush Sr. started to draft something he called the New World Order. This concept did not of course openly mention that it was all about the American hegemony. Instead Bush painted the New World Order with the colors of democracy, free tread, liberty and market economy, which all were bound to start making great progress. As Francis Fukuyama put it, this was the end of history: the other system has won, the other system has lost. Consequently, the world was open for the New Order. Of course history did not end and the New World Order has not emerged unopposed, as such problem as terrorism, Afghanistan, Iraq, North Korea and Iran show.

The most important book in writing about the Order in International Relations was The Globalization of world politics by Joh Baylis and Steve Smith. And among many international articles I have read for instance one article by Hedey Bull, Does Order exist in World Politics was very enlightening to me. I took the Iranian Issue as a case study to elaborate further the basic idea of the order in International Relations and how this issue still has important reflections in our world. The basic idea here is to show the connection between Global and Regional orders: the USA furthering its own view of Global order and Iran opposing the American attempts to maintain the Global Order also in the Middle East. The same time Iran of course is trying to build up a regional order, where Iran itself would be the core.

Chapter one

The International Order

1- The International order

First of all, we should proceed to understand the order in the field of IR as well. In this regard, social norm theorists depart from the more traditional views of the social sciences, especially in the law and society movements, which associate the social sciences with explanations in contrast to interpretations, which they associate with literaracy, or postmodernism, or other relationship approaches like feminism, critical race theory, or critical legal studies. Explanations are traditionally linked with causality and prediction, interpretation with description and criticism.

The issue, though, is that the norm-focused explanation regarding the effectiveness of order-maintenance policing does not fit to the typical model of the political thinkers. Order-maintenance policing works, because it displaces disorder with order, and order has a different social meaning than disorder. In the case of order- maintenance policing, there is, in effect, no change in social meaning: the meaning of order and disorder remains in their same place, in sharp contrast to other meanings. Like the meaning of gang membership or gun carrying, which they seek to reconstruct, norm-focused scholars treat the social meaning of order and disorder as natural, fixed, or necessary. They do not contest the meaning of order and disorder, nor do they seek to change their meaning. This is surprising because the central insight of a constructivist approach is precisely that social meanings may be constructed and may change, but that, when the meanings are not contested, they become fixed or natural.¹

In the other words, we can say that's the order is a kind of system, specially when we are

¹ Stuart Jordan, Global issues, http://www.findarticles.com/p|articles|mi_qa3757|is_200001|ai_pg_26, visited on 11-4-2006.

talking about the order in international community or policy. In order to do something in an approach to the purpose or aim of such as the economic or political interests between different states. In addition, as we explained before, orders are about human relationship in International Relations mainly about states relationship. However, earliest clear mentionings of partial orders are probably to be found not before the 19th century. In this context the works of George Boole are of great importance. Moreover, works of Charles S. Peirce, Richard Dedekind, and Ernst Schröder also consider concepts of order theory. Certainly, there are others to be named in this context and there exists more detailed material on the history of order theory.

At the same time, the states working together by following the rules try to govern their interactions in international arena. States usually do follow the rules. The rules usually become more firmly established and institutions grow up around them. States then develop the habit of working through those institutions and within the rules, they do so because of self-interest. Given the regulations of international interactions through institutions and rules, they can realize great results, thereby avoiding the costly outcomes associated with a breakdown of cooperation between each other.²

² Joshua S. Goldstein, *International Relations*. Fifth edition, Longman, p. 261.

2- Do we have Order in world politics or not

The order in world politics may one day take the form of the maintenance of elementary goals of social life in a single world society or in a great society of mankind. It can not be seriously argued, in the other hand, that the society of all mankind is already a concern. In the present phase we are still thinking of order, or orders within states. No one would reject that there exists within some states a high degree of domestic or municipal order. It is often argued that international order does not exist, except as an aspiration, and that history of international relations consists simply of disorder or unrest. To many people the idea of international order does not suggests not anything that has occurred in the past, but simply a possible or desirable future state of International Relations, about which we might think or which we might work to bring about. To those who take this view a study of international order suggests simply a design for a future world, in the tradition of Sully, Cruce, St. Pierre and other peace theorists. This study takes as its starting point the proposition that, on the contrary, order is part of the historical record of international society. To establish this proposition, we should begin by showing first that there has always been present, in the history of the modern states system an idea of International Community, proclaimed by philosophers and publicists, and present in the rhetoric of the leaders of states.³

However the humankind can not live without order in the daily life (the order is a kind of organizer in the life).The order has an important role to control the behavior of humankind as well. In general, an order is a form of activity that advances a goal. We have order in social life if we have a pattern of activity that advances those basic goals of a society,

³ Hedey Bull, Does Order exist in World Politics.hom.etu.unuoge.ch/gradale3/spo/spo-read/1b3-bull-mathias.pdf, visited on, 15-7-2006.

namely protection against violence, keeping agreements and protecting property as well. International order is when we have a pattern of activity between states that sustains the basic goals of the society of states, which include goals of all social life such as security, preservation of state system, maintaining independence of the separate units and keeping peace. In International System, there are pluralities of states that regularly interact, so that the well-being of each depends on the conduct of others and consequently, there is a need to take the likely conduct of others into account in deciding what to do. A world order is a pattern of activity that advances the three basic goals of social life: Security, promise-keeping and stability of possessions for mankind as a whole. However, order is an important goal, but it is distinct from justice, and the protection of world order may be neither necessary nor sufficient for achieving justice. Also one form of order is a goal of the state system, but there may be other ways to achieve world order (global state, federation of states, for example).⁴

Consequently, in world politics an order can change over years according to the situation in our world, such as the bipolar balance of power between the two super powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

⁴ Carlos Avila, the system, [http://educy.com/jmusek/slo/Literatura bull lecnote /osebnost2.html](http://educy.com/jmusek/slo/Literatura%20bull%20lecnote/osebnost2.html) , visited on, 14 -7-2006.

3- The problems of order and interdependence in the world system

3-1. Order and Anarchy

In part II we have presented several central problems that have developed since the end of world war II which characterize international relations today. These problems are related with the nature of the international systems, states and sovereignty; and to the seeking for security within the changing international environment. The changing agenda forces the states to try to adapt to a new environment. That generates the political, economic and military conflict that shapes the problems noted above. The new states and other international actors have come into being and the new technologies and ideologies have changed the international actors which have adapted to these changes to maintain order within the formal anarchy of the international system. As mentioned earlier, while there is formal anarchy (the absence of a central authority with coercive power), there are intranational relations. As Hedley Bull calls it is an "anarchical society". Bull argues that such a society exists because there is Order. There are patterns of behavior that are more or less predictable and that both produce and agree to the expectations of the actors in the international system. For those of us who are interested in international politics, this is crucial because it means that order can exist without formal rules or with only a primitive system of rules. Order is difficult enough to get in domestic societies with central governmental authorities; the environment of world politics creates even more problems. The ability to create order and the frequency and risk of conflicts largely depends on the relationships among international actors. One different system and the relationship among the components of those systems is interdependence. It is necessary to understand how

interdependence both contributes to the problems of creating order and creates the conditions necessary for attaining order.⁵

3-2. Interdependence and the world system

Interdependence is a quality of all systems. We can think of world politics in terms of a system, instead of looking at one state and the foreign policy processes that go on within it. We look at the system of states and other international actors and the different networks of relationships among them. This includes the various distributions or hierarchies of attributes. In addition, to the interdependence as a quality of a system, there are always more effects than we imagine or expect that waves through the system because of the systemic thinking makes us aware that world is much more complex than we might have thought, this complexity includes the interconnectedness of our problems, our collective well-being and survival. Looking at social systems (like the International System); it is my basic theme that the human mind is not adapted to interpreting how social systems behave as Jay Forrester has pointed out.⁶ Our social systems (order) belong to the class called multiloop nonlinear feedback systems for example, weapons are produced by a superpower in order to please its armed services, and that seen as a major threat by the other superpower, which matches this development and then builds more weapons etc.

3-3. Transnational Relations and Interdependence

In the contemporary era of increasing interdependency, as Richard Falk has put it, national boundaries have become less relevant. A number of scholars, writers and even statesmen feel that to continue to view the world in terms of the traditional Westphalian

⁵ Bruce Russett. Harvey Starr, World politics. The menu for choice. Third edition, Library of Congress, p. 484.

⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, Political order in changing societies. <http://yalepress.yale.edu/book.asp?isbn-isbn>, visited on 21-9-2006.

logic is not very useful and may be downright harmful, given the nature of contemporary interdependency. These observers feel that if governments continue to look at the world in terms of these old images (including that of sovereign nation-states concerned with independent behavior and military power) such views will lead to wrong and inappropriate policies which will be possibly disastrous for humankind. This view has been most extensively expressed by political scientists who see the world in terms of transnational relations rather than international relations.⁷

The role of transnational politics forms contemporary global politics (such as the conservative ideology in the new world order, after we have only one superpower). Although non-state actors have always played a central role in shaping international relations, numerous actors including transnational corporations, transnational social movements and advocacy networks, and transnational criminal networks have got an increasing role as independent actors in world politics. This has meant the transnationalization of domestic politics, or a privatization of governance. In addition, the interaction with domestic actors and their relations to international institutions give rise to different issues and research strategies.⁸

However, the order in world politics has the most important influence to the form of our global village, and over the years the order has got more and more forms such as balance of power and finally the superpower today.

4- Regimes and International Order

A regime is the set of rules, both formal like a constitution, and informal like common laws or social norms etc. Those organize the operation of government and its interactions with

⁷ Russett, Starr, p.492.

⁸ Nicole Lindstrom. Non-state Actors in World Politics. www.ceu.hu/courses/transnalpolics.htm, visited, 15-7-2006.

the economy and society. For instance, the United States has one of the oldest regimes still in action dating to the ratification of the constitution in the 1780s. In theory, the term needs not imply anything about the particular government to which it relates, and most political scientists use it as a neutral term. But the term is often used in popular culture in a pejorative meaning, as a reference to government, such as in these contexts the word conveys a sense of moral disapproval or political opposition for example, one is less likely to hear about a democratic regime.⁹

Scholars have used the idea of regime to identify the complete set of rules that relate to some specified area of international relations. This concept helps us to understand the full array of constraints imposed by international society. Regimes have been defined as networks of rules, norms and procedures that regulate behavior and control its effects. Sets of governing arrangements, principles, norms and rules converge in given issue area. The regulation of behavior means the creation of patterns: patterns of procedures, patterns of compliance norms and rules and most especially patterns of expectations. As Keohane notes what these arrangement have in common is that they are designed not to implement centralized enforcement of agreements but to establish stable mutual expectation about others patterns of behavior. Of what do these arrangements consist and where do these common understandings come from? There are formal elements and informal components and also national components, transnational components and international components. The set of governing arrangements consists of national rules (the domestic laws) international rules and private rules, these are the formal product of governments and NGOs, but regimes also include the norms and principles that reflect patterns of behavior not yet

⁹ Regime. From Wikipedia. The free encyclopedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regime>, visited on 23-9-2006.

formally codified in law or organization. The development of International law through the custom of the actual practice of states that is accepted as a law is an important example of formal norms that act as rules to constrain behavior. Norm's principles and customary law all have a major psychological component. Consequently, the policymakers of states feel that they should act in certain ways because they are expected to do that whether or not the rule have been formalized by a treaty. Thus, we have sets of governing arrangements relating to various issues in international relations. Issues may be functional and they might thus be very wide or very narrow, paralleling our earlier discussion of functional. Regimes may also be geographic, covering the problems that arise within a specific area such as Antarctica. Some regimes have only a few members such as those overseeing North Pacific fisheries, while some are very large such as the United Nations conflict management regime.

As Oran Young notes, we live in a world of international regimes. The concerns range from monetary issues to trade issues to the management of power, to the management of outer space and the seabed. Much of the regime literature looks at economic or ecological issues. We need to recognize, that regimes apply to any set of rules, norms, expectations and organizations that deal with a common issue or problem. There have been studies of security order and conflict management as regimes.

One example of regime created to deal with ecological problem, is the one concerned with the pollution of Rhine river (a common pool resource with tragedy of common characteristics). In order to identify causes of the problem and possible remedies of pollution the effected states of Germany, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Switzerland established the international commission for the protection of

the Rhine Against pollution. In addition, as Axelord and Keohane note: international regimes do not substitute for reciprocity; rather they reinforce and institutionalize it delegitimizing defection and thereby make it more costly. Some of the most extensive analysis of regimes has focused on the post-world war II economic relations of the western industrialized countries. At the same time, in the post-world war II system, the victorious industrialized countries consciously sought to create a world Economic order that would tie the states of the world together in order to promote economic growth and peace (about the Brettan Woods System). However the story of the 1970s as it has been in the 1980s and will be in the 2010 was that of trying to build new arrangements and institutions to solve the problems posed by it in a peaceful manner, such as hegemony in the new world order and after the cold world war between United states and Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991.¹⁰

¹⁰ Bruce Russett. Harvey Starr, Ibid, p.530-534.

5- Balance of power

The most important idea in balance of power is to imagine the relations between two states (and by extension, two groups) as similar to a pair of scales, with the possibility of intervention by a third party either to restore the equilibrium or to tip the balance in favor of one of the two. Later, the notion was extended, first to three states, then to many states, poised against one another. Any basic change in the mass of one of the units required a regrouping amongst the rest if the equilibrium was to be maintained.

All this has been developed into a wider theory of international politics which makes the preservation of the equilibrium an object (sometimes even the overruling object) of policy for the purpose of preventing the indefinite expansion of a dominant member of the system; and which tends to base foreign policy on considerations relating to power. In addition, we should present here some definitions for the balance of power:

- 1 An equal distribution of power among the princes of Europe which makes it impractical for the one to disturb the repose of the other.
- 2 The Balance of power, however it can be defined, means that the States in the system consider it necessary to maintain equilibrium. There the weaker should not be crushed by the union of the stronger. This is the principle which gives unity to the political plot of modern European history.
- 3 The balance of power refers to an actual state of affairs in which power is distributed among several nations with approximate equality.
- 4 Actions by a state to prevent its neighbors to become too strong the aggrandizement of one nation beyond a certain limit changes the general system of all neighbors'. Consequently, there is a certain attention to the maintenance of a

kind of equality and equilibrium between neighboring states.¹¹

Consequently, the balance of power as the competition between the countries, All of them try to get more power (like Iran now with the possible nuclear weapons program) to have more influence in an international arena.

The functioning in the balance of power in Europe was in the first half of the eighteenth century not very efficient, because the continent was not yet integrated and it was customary to say that there were two systems; a more southern or "European" one, and another which was described as "Northern." In 1709 there was a momentary fear that they might come together by combining the War of the Spanish Succession with the Great Northern War in a struggle that would be really general.

England had a separate Secretaries of State for the North and the South, and when A. H. L. Heeren produced his *Handbuch* on the European states-system in 1809, he devoted a long narrative to "the balance of the South," and a separate one to "the balance of the North." After this the two became combined, for, after 1763, Russia had become more definitely a part of the European system, though France was still ready to regard not only Russia but also Britain as an outsider. It was held, at the same time, that within the general equilibrium of Europe, there were still also local or regional balances one in the north, one in the south, and perhaps a separate one for Germany. Also, there were some people who thought that overseas colonies might affect the maintaining of the balance.

Down to 1789, people were able to pride themselves that there was not a single power neither in the main part of the Continent nor in the Baltic there was a power capable of making a bid for "universal dominion." This might be attributed to the fact that power itself was fairly evenly distributed, but both F. von Gentz and Talleyrand (Charles Mauriel de

¹¹ Michael Sheehan, *Balance of Power, History and Theory*, London, p. 2-3.

Talleyrand) insisted that the balance of power did not need nations to be roughly equal in size. Their view was that the equilibrium might be more difficult to achieve if there was a world of exactly equal states. Frederick the Great and Edmund Burke noted that the effect of the system was to make wars general and they along with Edward Gibbon held that it made a plan of large-scale conquest no longer feasible. In the Seven Years War, the enemies of Frederick the Great planned the destruction of Prussia as a power, but the representatives of Louis XV's "secret" diplomatic system (the ablest school of diplomats that the century produced) made this an additional reproach against the alliance with Austria in 1756. They complained that such a war objective was a breach of the code and that a victory in the war would have been worse than the defeat that was actually suffered. The destruction of Prussia, they said, would have restored the Hapsburgs to their former predominance. The career of Napoleon produced, amongst his enemies, a growing insistence on the theory of balance, and in 1809 Heeren suggested that, in the long run, the system might become a global issue. The peace treaties with France at the end of the wars were an excellent demonstration of the effects of the theory. And, in the crucial cases, the Congress of Vienna (1814-1815) showed that it was more attached to the balance of power than either to dynastic rights or to nationalism.¹²

It has often been claimed that the balance of power was responsible for the partition of Poland; but it has been said equally often that it was responsible for the preservation of the Ottoman Empire. This raises the issue of the local against the continental balance; and there has never been a stronger application of the balance than between Russia, Prussia, and Austria in Eastern Europe after 1763. Perhaps it has always been true that where these

¹² Dr. Condoleezza Rice. A Balance of Power That Favors Freedom,
<http://www.manhattaninstitute.org/html/wl2002.htm>, visited on, 24 -9-2006.

bitterly rival powers could come to an agreement about anything, there existed no counterpoise in Europe that could hold them in check in their own region. At any rate, France and England could not have stopped the partition of Poland, and this might be imputed to the lack of a wider (general balance) at that moment. France and England were able to defend the Ottoman Empire against Russia because partly through their maritime capabilities-they were in a position to make the general balance effective. In addition, we can say, that the theory of balance of power basically argues that such counterbalancing occurs regularly and maintains the stability of the international order. The system itself is stable in that its rules and principles stay the same: state sovereignty not to collapse into a universal empire. This stability does not, however, imply peace, it is rather a stability maintained by means of recurring wars that adjust power relations. The war was seen as a totally acceptable instrument in international relations.

Alliances play a key role in the balance of power. Building up ones own capabilities against a rival is a form of power balancing, but forming an alliance against a threatening state is often quicker, (the alliances were made only for wartime and they broke up when the war was over) and more effective.¹³ When such a counterbalancing coalition has a geopolitical element physically hemming in the threatening state the power balancing strategy is called containment. In the cold war, the United States encircled the Soviet Union with military and political alliances to prevent Soviet territorial expansion. At the same time, sometimes a particular state deliberately becomes a balancer, shifting its support to oppose whatever state or alliance is strongest at the moment. Britain played this role on the European continent for centuries, and China played it in the Cold War; but states do not always balance against the strongest actor. However, in the post-cold war era of U.S.

¹³ Matthew Yglesias. Balance of power.htm, <http://www.tpmcafe.com/node/29258>, visited on 20-7-2006.

dominance, balance of power theory have would predict closer relations among Russia, China, and even France great powers that are not close U.S. military allies. These predictions appear to be on the mark. Russian-Chinese relations have improved dramatically in such areas as arms trade and demilitarization of the border etc. In addition, the most powerful states in the international order exert most of the influence on international events and therefore get the most attention from international relations field. By almost any measure of power, a handful of states possess the majority of the world's power resources. At most a few dozen states have any real influence beyond their immediate locality. These are called the great powers and middle powers in the international order or system. At the same time, the mean point is that the United States is the world's most powerful as a single actor. Its ability and willingness to resume a role as hegemony after World War II is an important factor that has shaped the world order.¹⁴

On the other hand, the Soviet Union was dissolved in 1991, and the successor states are a collection of 15 countries commonly dubbed as the former Soviet republics. Eleven of these states are aligned through a loose confederation known as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). This big change in our world was like an international earthquake, and everything later took a new form, after we have had a balance of powers between two superpowers tureded to unipolar situation and this situation would generate more crisis because we have got just one idology and economic system.

The changing of world order has also taken a new turn in September 2001. Condoleezza Rice, that times the Advisor to president, described the emerging Bush Doctrine to guide U.S. overseas interventions in the new era of war on terrorism. The doctrine emphasizes that states are responsible for what undergoes inside of their borders.

¹⁴ Goldstein, p. 86-87 and 92-93.

Those harboring terrorists would be targeted themselves. In Afghanistan, the Taliban regime controlling most of the country was not internationally recognized as the government, but because it held territory, it could provide a safe haven to al-Qaeda terrorist organization. In addition, the September 11 attacks arose from non-state actors operating across state borders worldwide, but the response has been focused on states. This approach follows realist principles that have shaped successive world orders for 500 years. It still constructs world order in terms of sovereign territorial states. It looks like that non central aspect of world order could change the emphasis on sovereign, territorial states as prime actors.¹⁵

6- The great power System (Order)

The modern international system is often dated back to the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which established the principles of independent, sovereign states that continue to shape the international system today. These rules of state relations did not, however, materialize at Westphalia from scratch; they took form in Europe in the sixteenth century. Key to this system was the ability of one state, or a coalition, to balance the power of another state so that it could not gobble up smaller units and create a universal empire. This power-balancing system placed special importance on the handful of great powers with strong military capabilities, global interests and outlooks, and intense interactions with each other. A system of great power relations has existed since around 1500, and the structure and rule of that system have remained fairly stable through time, although the particular members change. The structure is a balance of power among the six or so most powerful states, which form and break alliances, fight wars, and make peace, letting no single state conquer the others. The most powerful states in sixteenth-century Europe were Britain,

¹⁵ Goldstein, p. 94.

France, Austria-Hungary, Spain and the Ottoman Empire which recurrently fought with the other European powers, especially with Austria-Hungary. Today, that historical conflict between the Islamic Ottoman Empire and Christian Austria-Hungary is a source of ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia. At the same time, within Europe, Austria-Hungary and Spain were allied under control of the Habsburg dynasty, which also owned the territory of the Netherlands. The Habsburg countries (which were Catholic) were defeated by mostly protestant countries in northern Europe (England and Sweden) and the newly independent Netherlands in the thirty years war of 1618-1648. The 1648 Treaty of Westphalia formed the basic rules that have defined the international system ever since. They building blocs were the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states, as equal and independent members, of an international system, or order. In the eighteenth century, the power of Britain increased as it industrialized, and Britain's great rival was France. Sweden, the Netherlands, and the Ottoman Empire all declined in power, but Russia and later Prussia emerged as major players. In the Napoleonic wars (1794-1815), which followed the French Revolution, France was defeated by a coalition of Britain, the Netherlands, Austria-Hungary, Spain, and Russia. The Congress of Vienna (1815-1815) ending that war reasserted the principles of state sovereignty. In reaction in the challenges of the French Revolution and Napoleon's empire(the concert of Europe, reflects the idea, that the European States formed such a harmonious order, that it was like an orchestra playing in a concert and the formal Attire go behind it was called the Holy Alliance). In the concert of Europe that dominated the following decades, the five most powerful states tried, with some success, to cooperate on major issues to prevent war. It was a possible precedent for today's UN Security Council. In this period, Britain became a balancer, joining alliances

against whatever state emerged as the most powerful state in Europe. In the beginning of the twentieth century, four new rising powers had appeared on the scene, the United States with the world's largest economy and Germany, Japan, and Italy. The great power system or Order became global instead of European. Powerful states were industrializing, extending the aim of their world activities and the might of their militaries. After Prussia defeated Austria, Denmark and France in wars, a united Germany emerged in 1871 to challenge Britain's position. In World War I (1914-1918) Germany and Austria-Hungary were defeated by a coalition that included Britain, France, Russia, Italy, and the United States. After 20 years, Germany, Italy and Japan were defeated in World War II (1939-1945) by a coalition of the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and China. Those five winners of World War II make up the permanent members of today's UN Security Council. After World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union, which had been allies in the war against Germany, became adversaries for 40 years in the Cold war where Europe and the world got split as contested terrains where each bloc tried to gain alliances or influences, often by sponsoring opposing sides in regional and civil wars. The end of the Cold War around 1990, when the Soviet Union collapsed, returned the international Order (system) to a more cooperative arrangement of the great powers somewhat similar to the Concert of Europe in the nineteenth century. However, new stains emerged among the European-American-Japanese allies once they no longer faced a common threat from the Soviet Union.¹⁶

¹⁶ Goldstein, p 29-30.

Conclusion

As we saw, the Order is significant anywhere and is found everywhere as well, also in economical, political, social and cultural fields.

Firstly, we can say that order is a kind of system, especially if we are talking about the order in international communities or policies. As we explained before, order is also about human relationships. However, earliest clear mentionings of partial orders are probably to be found not before the 19th century. In this context the works of George Boole are of great importance. Certainly, there are others to be named in this context and surely there exists more detailed material on the history of order theory.

Secondly, humans can not live without order in their daily life (the order is an organizer in human life), and order does have an important role in the control of the human behavior. We have order in social life if we have a pattern of activity that advances those basic goals of a society, namely, protection against violence, keeping agreements, protecting property as well. International Order is there when we have a pattern of activity between and among states. That sustains the basic goals, of the society of states, which include goals of all social life such as security, the protection of the state system, maintaining the independence of the separate units, and preserving peace. In International systems, pluralities of states regularly interact, so that the well-being of each depends on the conduct of others. As a result it is necessary to take the likely conduct of others into account in deciding what to do. So the world politics has got order and this can be changed every time according to the situation in our world over years.

Thirdly, we discussed the regimes and international order. Axelord and Keohane note: international regimes do not substitute for reciprocity, rather they reinforce and

institutionalize it delegitimizing defection and thereby make it more costly. Some of the most extensive analysis of regimes has focused on the post-World War II economic relations of the western industrialized countries. At the same time, in the post-World War II system, the victorious industrialized countries consciously sought to create an international economic order that would tie the states of the world together in order to promote economic growth and peace. In the end, the story of the 1970s as it has been in the 1980s and in the 1990s was that of trying to make new arrangements and institutions to solve the problems posed by it in a peaceful manner, such as hegemony in the new world order and at the end of the cold world war between the United states and the Soviet Union in 1991.

Finally, the balance of power was most important issue in international arena over years. The balance of power means that whatever power sets the wings of maintaining the equilibrium, it must make sure that the weaker will not be crushed by the union of the stronger; this was the principle that had given unity to the political plot of the modern European history. In other words, the balance of power refers to an actual state of affairs in which power is distributed among several nations with approximate equality. Thereby we understood the balance of power over years. It was between many countries and each state tried to get more power to become the strongest country sometimes, but in the end, the balance mostly has between two countries, as the Soviet Union and the United States of America, this balance started after the second world war where we became under two superpowers and the rally of two different theories as well. The international order became different after the collapse of the Soviet Union and after that the United States of America became the biggest empire in the world (Hegemony), and now it can take any kind of decisions without minimal consideration. We have seen this in Iraq, and also in the support

of Israel in the Middle East when it strikes against civilians in Palestine and Lebanon.

The end of the Cold War saw a plethora of obituaries pouring in to mourn the climax of the realist paradigm. Nursing the wounds through the 1990s, political realists clutched to the straws of either a European pole fortifying itself post-Maastricht, a resurgent Russia or arising China to counter Pax Americana. While none of these truly emerged as a counterweight to American power, there was the talk of a "New World Order" which fuelled debates of hyperpower hegemony and hopeful multilateralism based on the shared principles of liberal democracy, human rights, rule of law, etc.

However, the events of and since September 11, 2001, changed all that. Ironically for the realists, who concentrate on nation-states as the principle actors in international relations, it was the actions of a transnational entity that has triggered off the formation of a new multipolar world order. The limitations of American power in perception and reality exposed by the daily deteriorating situation in Iraq, the local-becomes-global nature of terror and the steady rise of regional power centers are the fundamental factors fuelling the return to real policy.

Chapter two

International Relations Theory

1. International Relations theory

1.1 What is theory?

That the word theory means different ideas and understanding to different people. It may even be different thing to the same thinker or person if the context is different. For many people theory means understanding, explanation or predicting. It is a kind of imagination and everyone can explain what he sees after observing something like natural or social phenomena. Usually the question is about a causal explanation based on certain a prior occurrences or conditions. It means that every theory tries to give an explanation about what happens around us. The idea is the same in natural and social sciences.

A theory, therefore, is an intellectual construct that helps reason to select facts and interpret them in such a way as to facilitate explanation and prediction concerning regularities and recurrences or repetitions of observed phenomena one can certainly think theoretically when it comes to explaining foreign policy processes in general or the foreign policy of a particular state. Nevertheless, in International Relations, theorists tend to be interested in patterns of behavior among various international actors; As a result, we are studying the behavior of states and other actors.¹⁷

¹⁷ Paul R. Viotti, Mark V. Kauppi, International Relations theory, 1999, Third Edition, p.3.

1.2 IR theories

Here we are going to discuss IR theories. This part provides an overview of the most important or immediately apparent distinctions among the theories of international Relations.

1.2.1 Assumptions of power of Realism.

The term "realism" comes from the German compound word "Realpolitik", the word "real" meaning "realistic", "practical", or "actual" and "politik" meaning "politics". It focuses on the balance of power among nation-states. Bismarck coined the term after following Metternich's lead in finding ways to balance the power of European empires. Balancing power meant keeping the peace, and careful realpolitik practitioners tried to avoid arms race. However, during the early 20th century, arms race (and alliances) occurred anyway, culminating in First World War.¹⁸

The main word in this theory is "power". If you have big power you can keep your property and all your territory. Consequently, should seek to obtain power.

In the other hand we can say that here the basic ideas and assumptions are:

- A pessimistic view of human nature, which considers everyone in this world as an enemy and as a result wars and conflicts become obvious.
- A conviction that international relations are necessarily conflictual and that international conflicts are ultimately resolved by war. With this view we can understand what happens today and why we have much crisis between states.
- A high regard for the values of national security and state survival, so that any state today makes anything just for maintaining national security. This is very clear today

¹⁸ Information about the Realism theory, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Realism, from wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia, I visited on 9-4 -2006.

when we look at the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, or at the First and Second World War.

- A basic skepticism about the progress in international politics that is comparable to the domestic political life, so the policymakers always have different senses also they have strong feeling about political life.¹⁹

The other highlighting point of realism theory is that the most important states in world politics are the great powers. International Relations are understood by realists primarily as a struggle among the great power for domination, and security and state survival. This is the core understanding of this theory.²⁰

Also, we should say that the realists have a high regard for the values of national security, state survival, international **order** and stability.²¹ Here we have to know the stress realism calls on order, because order as such will be main target of our inquiry later on.

Finally, there is the idea at strategic realism that concerns the way how to employ power intelligently in order to get our military adversary to do what we desire and more importantly to prevent it doing what we fear. However, the same time, we have to make a fundamentally realist point: that coercion should be effective, as a foreign policy requires that our interests and our opponents are not absolutely opposed coercion requires finding a bargain.

¹⁹ Robert Jackson, Georg Sorensen, International Relations, theories and approaches. Second edition, p.68.

²⁰ Ibid.p.69.

²¹ Ibid, p. 103.

1.2.2 Major Actors and Assumptions of pluralism

The pluralist theory (often referred to as liberalism or as a liberal construct theory) consists of a different set of assumptions. First, nonstate actors are important entities in international relations that cannot be ignored. International organizations, such as Human rights organizations, can be independent actors in their own right. The organizations own decisionmakers, bureaucrats and other associated groups have considerable influence in areas like agenda setting and determining which issues are most important politically. Similarly, other nongovernmental actors, for example environmental organization and multinational corporations (MNCs), cannot be dismissed as being of merely marginal importance, given an increasingly interdependent world economy. Indeed, in some cases they are even capable of circumventing the authority of the state, according this is a relatively new dimension of international relations, which we should consider when discuss the world order and international system.²² According to the pluralists, the state is not a unitary actor; in the other words the realist point of view considers mainly the states, but liberalism (pluralism) more also the other actors.

Pluralism in the general sense is the affirmation and acceptance of diversity. The concept is used, often in different ways and in a wide range of issues. In politics, the affirmation of diversity in the interests and beliefs of the citizenry, is one of the most important features of modern democracy. In science, the concept often describes the view that several methods, theories or points of view are legitimate or plausible. This attitude may arguably be a key factor to scientific progress. The term pluralism is also used, in several different senses, in the context of religion and philosophy.²³ However, the distinctions between the concepts of

²² Viotti, Mark V. Kauppi, p.7.

²³ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pluralism> ,from wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, I visited on 15_5_2006.

religious pluralism and religious relativism are much more blurry and ill-defined. In common usage the two terms are often interchangeable.

In other words, some thinkers of this theory are of the opinion that the enemy of pluralism is monism. It is an ancient belief that there is a single harmony of truths into which everything and everyone should be related. The result of this belief (which is something different from, but akin to, what Karl Popper called essentialism to him the root of all evil). This means that those who know should command those who do not. Those who know the answers to some of the great problems of humankind must be obeyed, for they alone know how society should be organized, how individual lives should be lived, how culture should be developed. This is the old Platonic belief in the philosopher-kings, who were entitled to give orders to others. There are thinkers who believe that if only scientists, or scientifically trained persons, could be put in charge of things, the world would be vastly improved.²⁴ Here we should stress the fact that this can be seen as a good excuse for the dictatorship of elites (meritocracy) and for the negligence of the liberties of the majority of people.

However, the pluralism had important influence on some group which have freedom to do any thing and they have right to do business at political marketplace. With this we mean phenomena called globalization that is the expiring of market economy and liberal world trade.

Finally, for the pluralist, the agenda of international politics and International Relations is extensive.

The pluralists reject the nation, where the agenda of international politics is dominated primarily by military-security issues. Foreign affairs agendas have expanded and

²⁴ <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~vl/notes/berlin.html>, Isaiah Berlin of pluralism, I visited on 15-5-2006.

diversified over recent decades to such areas as the economic and social issues, which today are often at the forefront of foreign policy debates.²⁵

1.2.3 Liberalism

Liberalism is an ideology, and political tradition which have liberty as the primary political value. Liberalism seeks a society characterized by freedom of thought for individuals, limitations on power, especially of government (state) and religion, that means The rule of law, the free exchange of ideas, a market economy that supports private enterprise, and a transparent system of government in which the rights of minorities are guaranteed. In modern societies, liberals prefer a liberal democracy in the form of either a republic or a constitutional monarchy, with open and fair elections, where all citizens have equal rights by law and an equal opportunity to succeed that is important element in liberal life. At the same time, Liberalism rejects many fundamental assumptions which dominated most earlier theories of government, such as the Divine Right of Kings, hereditary status, and established religion. In fundamental human rights the liberals support the right of life, liberty, and property without limitations. In many countries, "modern" liberalism differs from classical liberalism by asserting that government provision of some minimal level of material well-being takes priority over freedom from taxation. Liberalism has its roots in the Western Enlightenment, but the term now encompasses a diversity of political thought, with adherents spanning over a large part of the political spectrum, from left to right. In the context of economics, the term "liberalism" refers to economic liberalism.²⁶

²⁵ Paul R. Viotti, Mark V. Kauppi, p8.

²⁶ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberalism>, from wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Visited on 15-5-2006.

In general we can say that liberalism takes a positive view on human nature. Also it has a great faith in human reason and it is convinced that rational principles and economic system are the core of this theory very different from Realism theory, yet all of them important in international relations.

Liberal theorists thus believe that human reason can have a triumph over human fear and the lust of power.²⁷ At the same time, it is very important to analyze the reasons of liberalism theory. We can find many fields in this theory such as:

- **Political liberalism:** is the belief that individuals are the basis of law and society, so that everyone has a special mind and at the same time a special worldview, and that society and its institutions exist to further the ends of individuals—even above the prerogatives of monarchs. Political liberalism stresses the social contract, under which citizens make the laws and agree to abide by these laws.

Political liberalism enfranchises all adult citizens regardless of sex; race, or economic status, and it also emphasizes on the rule of law and supports liberal Democracy.

- **Cultural liberalism:** A look at the culture in liberalism theory is necessary to understand this theory. It means a focus on the rights of individuals pertaining to conscience and lifestyle, in dealing with such issues as sexual freedom, religious freedom and protection from government intrusion into private lives (liberty). Cultural liberalism generally opposes government regulation of literature, art, prostitution, abortion, birth control, alcohol. Most liberals oppose some or all government intervention in these areas. Netherlands, in this respect, may be the most liberal country in this world today.

²⁷ Jackson, Sorensen, p.107.

It is difficult to generalize the liberal view of human nature, partly because the accounts are so diverse and complex. However, there is one concept which figures consistently in liberal discussion which can act as major theme. This is the concept of individualism. Liberals have been and are formally committed to individualism. It is the metaphysical or ontological core of liberal thought and the basis of moral political economic and cultural existence. In other words, the individual's life is prior to society. This priority has been differently interpreted. It could be natural or moral. Values are also tied to the individuals, and the individuals are the criterion of morality truth. Individualism therefore tends as such towards a form of equal opportunity for every individual. Egalitarianism means. That each person is seen to be of equal value.²⁸ Also according to Frederick Hayek, there are two core elements of real liberal individualism.

- **Economic liberalism:** over and over again we should note that the economic part is very important of any theory, and we have to find it of course, in any theory. The watchword of this form of liberalism is “free enterprise”, which advocates laissez-faire capitalism. It means the removal of legal barriers to trade and cessation of government bestowed privileges such as subsidy and monopoly. Economic liberals want little or no government regulation of the market. Other argues that monopolies and cartels are caused by state action. Economic liberalism holds that the value of goods and services should be set by the unfettered choices of individuals that are of market forces. (or the invisible hand of Adam Smith) Some would also allow market forces to act even in areas conventionally monopolized by governments, such as the provision of security and courts.

²⁸ D.r. Ejdan Sadrazam, lecture on contemporary political ideologies, Near East University, 2006.

Economic liberalism accepts the economic inequality that arises from unequal bargaining positions as being the natural result of competition. As long as no coercion is used this form of liberalism is influenced by English liberalism of the mid 19th century.

- **Social liberalism:** According to Jon Dewey and Mortimer social liberalism talks about the daily life activities since individuals are the basis of fulfillment, such as education, economic opportunity, and protected should be against harmful events. These benefits are considered to be rights, (positive rights), which must be produced and supplied by other people or the society. They are qualitatively different from the classic negative rights, which require only that others refrain from aggression. To the social liberals, ensuring positive rights is a goal that is a continuous process with the general projection of protecting liberties, schools, libraries, museums, and art galleries which are supported by taxes Laws and price control ways are used as the control instruments. It also expects government to provide a basic level of welfare. It should be supported by taxation, did its aim is enable the best use of the talents of the population, or simply the public good.²⁹

Finally, as for political liberalism there is an important idea that individual life cannot be intervened, so that there is everybody intervenes in another people life. In addition, we can talk about freedom.

Therefore, cultural liberalism, has a good overview about the rights of individual lifestyle, about thinking, and believes etc.

Another dimension in economic liberalism is the idea of free enterprise. Everyone can create himself a business improve his economic life. Also at the same time, social

²⁹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/about_the_Liberalism, I visited on 23-5-2006.

liberalism has a significant idea about positive rights, educational system and of individuals from harmful things.

1.2.4 Marxism theory

Though Marxism is clearly not a recent theory, only recently it has been integrated into IR theory. Like its realist and liberal counterparts, Marxism is far from a monolithic body of thought and embodies a wide number of variants. Karl Marx was not an international relations theorist as such and wrote very little on the subject. What he wrote was confined to short and fragmentary statements. Indeed, Friedrich Engels has approached IR in a much more covering way. However it would be wrong to assume that Marx's writings are irrelevant for understanding IR. Marx's general theory was in any case a theory of everything and could therefore be applied to IR. Marx's emphasis on the MOP as the organizing principle of IR was revealed in accessional remarks, most notably in the German Ideology. There he argued that the relations between various nations or with one another depend upon the extent to which each of them has developed its productive forces. The division of labour and domestic commerce and the relation of one nation to others depend on the stage of development achieved by its production. This suggests that economic forces are the key determinants of IR. This view was faithfully applied by Vladimir Lenin in his theory of international relations.³⁰

In addition, Marx could have easily recommended that one should pay attention to the actors beyond the nation-state. Yet, there are serious doubts if Marx's stress on the role of other actors was acknowledged within IR theories. Others have declared, in the same vein, that "Marxism provides a firm basis for explaining international relations to only a very

³⁰ John M. Hobson, *The state and international relations*, Cambridge University press, p. 116-117.

limited degree. The original Marxian doctrine viewed international affairs from an exclusively national and economic angle. Marx's theory of international relations was derivative and not original.³¹ At the same time, Marx said that the thinkers have ability to understand what happen in this world and they can analyze it in depth.

Finally, the most important thing to understand in all international relations theories is that if we want to analyze our world in depth, all of the theories (Realism , pluralism, liberalism , Marxism, etc.) are necessary for us to examine and understand the world around us .

After the end of the cold war, the collapse of Communist party rule in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the global triumph of free market capitalism made it commonplace to assume that the ideas of Marx, and his numerous disciples was an experiment and had clearly failed .While communist parties retained power in China, Vietnam and Cuba they did not constitute a threat to the hegemony of the global capitalist system. Yet despite this, Marx and Marxist thought more generally refuse to go away at the end of the Soviet experiment. The apparent lack of a credible alternative to capitalism may have led to crisis in Marxism but ten years later there appeared to be something of renaissance of Marxism, Marxist walk with a renewed spring in their steps. For many Marxist the communist experiment in the Soviet Union and in its East European client states had become a major embarrassment in the decades immediately. After October Revolution, all people had felt an allegiance to the Soviet Union as the first 'Workers' state. So this loyalty had been stretched beyond breaking point by the depravities of Stalinism and by the Soviet behavior in their post-Second world war satellites. Eastern Europe's socialism was plainly not the communist utopia that many had dreamt of and that of what Marx had apparently promised made Marxists openly criticize the Soviet Union, while others just kept quiet and hoped

³¹ <http://venus.ci.uw.edu.pl/~rubikon/forum/Marxism,katia.htm>, I visited on 24-5-2006.

that the situation and the human rights record, would improve. The significance of this could be underlined when it is realized that many of the concepts and practices that are often taken as being axiomatic: Marxism does not in fact figure in Marx's writings: these include the "Vanguard party" democratic centralism and the centrally directed "command economy". Marx's social theory still keep formidable analytical purchase on the world we inhabit, the great bulk of his theoretical efforts consisted of a painstaking analysis of capitalism as a mode of production and the basic elements of his account have not been the best, the best with the ever-increasing penetration of the market mechanism into all aspects of life it is arguable that Marx's forensic examination of both the extraordinary dynamism and the inherent contradictions of capitalism is even more relevant now than in his own time. There is certainly much in his writings that are extraordinarily prescient. A particular strength of Marx works is in his analysis of crisis etc.³²

³² John Baylis and Steve Smith, the Globalization of Worlds Politics, Third Edition, Oxford University press, p230.

2. What is the meaning of International Relations?

After we discussed international relations theories, we are going to find out what does International Relations mean.

We can say that International Relations are not just a field of academic study. We all participate in and contribute to International Relations on our daily life, every time we watch the TV, vote in elections, buy or boycott goods from the supermarket or recycle our wine bottles, we are participating in International Relations. The decisions we make in our daily life have an effect on the world in which we live but, in the same time, IR has a significant impact on our lives. The ease at which students obtain employment after graduation is largely dependent on the state of the global economy, in a globalised economy. Graduate jobs are increasingly likely to involve international travel and require an understanding of the international political and economic environment in which businesses must operate. Our daily life is increasingly international in their focus, improvements in communications and transport technology means. We constantly are exposed to people, places, products, opportunities and ideas from other countries. The study of International Relations enables us to explain why international events occur in the manner in which they do and gives us a greater understanding of the world in which we live and work.³³

Therefore, International Relations can exchange all our life's without considering the natures of our daily life's and it has been an attraction for people.

International Relations is a kind of relationship between too much one ship counters, also this relationship has more forms such as economic relationships, political relationships, military relationships and culture relationships etc.

³³ <http://www.lincoln.ac.uk/policystudies/Internation%20Relations.htm>, I visited on 24 -5-2006.

At the same time this relationship can take two forms, one of them is a conflict form such as war and threatens, the other is the cooperation form which is a kind of peaceful relationship among countries and they have same works for different states.

There are some definitions for International relations such as:³⁴ However, International Relations are a branch of political sciences that is concerned with the foreign affairs of and relations among countries. So according to many thinkers of international relations. The most important in political science that it has been a key for problems in any country focuses on the nature of relationship between many countries in war or peace.

³⁴ [http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history of International Relations /A0825356.html](http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history%20of%20International%20Relations/A0825356.html) , I visited on 24-5-2006.

The importance of theory

As a conclusion we can say, first of all, it is important that we have a solid background why we study any subject in social sciences. In this chapter, we have discussed about international relations theories connected to the concept of order as such theories are intellectual constructs that help us to select facts and interpret them in a way which facilitates understanding and explanation. Theoretically there is certainly a need to think when it comes to explaining foreign policy processes in general or the foreign policy of a particular state.

The International Relations theorists tend to be interested in patterns of behavior among various international actors; and consequently we are studying the behavior states, in the same time we talked about International Relations theory and we selected some important theories in international relations such as, Realism theory, which focuses on power and it has a pessimistic view of the human nature. In addition, it has a conviction that international relations are necessarily conflictual and that international conflicts are ultimately resolved by war. There is a basic skepticism, which can be reflected in international politics which in many cases is a continuation of dogmatic politics.

The second theory talked about the Pluralism. We can say that it has the same elements with liberalism, this because both of them have the same values and cultures for political and social life. For Pluralism, the agenda of international politics and international relations is extensive. The Pluralists say that the nation is the most important issue in the agenda of international politics that emphasizes domination primer and military-security issues. Foreign affairs have expanded and diversified over recent decades especially this has happened the fields of economic and social issues, which are often at forefront of foreign

policy debates. Also Liberalism theory has been the most important thing to form our daily life. Basically the economic freedom and culture have focused on individualism. Economically, the main idea is free enterprise. Accordingly everyone can develop himself and can improve his economic life without limitations. Freedom can be used both for opening political party or a company.

The third theory, tackled is Marxism. Marx could have easily recommended that one should pay attention to the actors beyond the nation-state. Marx's theory of international relations was derivative and not original. At the same time Marx said that the thinkers have the ability to understand what happens in this world and the obligation to change it.

Also Marx's social theory still has a formidable analytical power in the world. The biggest part in his theoretical efforts consisted of a painstaking analysis of capitalism as mode of production. Indeed, he predicted the ever-increasing penetration of the market mechanism into all aspects of life. It is arguable that Marx's forensic examination of both the extraordinary dynamism and the inherent contradictions of capitalism are even more relevant now than in his own time. There is certainly much in his writing that is extraordinarily prescient. A particular strength of Marx's work is his analysis of crisis and other thing.

After that, we discussed the concept of what International Relations. It mainly is a kind of relationship between some countries; this relationship has more forms such as economical, political, military and cultural relationship etc.

At the same time this relationship can take two forms war and peaceful. The first form of conflict form can be war and threat. The second form can be cooperation which is a kind of peaceful relationship among countries.

Chapter Three

American Hegemony

(Iranian Issue as a Case study)

3.1 Hegemonic Stability

To start with we have to keep in mind that hegemony is one of World systems or World Orders. Until the end of the Cold War the goal of the US was to protect the homeland to preserve the American calms and to defend its closest allies. After the Cold War those objectives aimed at full-scale transformation of the international order. Its ultimate objective is the creation of an integrated international order based on the principles of democracy and capitalism (world economy), with the US as the ultimate guarantor of order and enforcer of norms. One part of the World accepts this but the other part thinks that this American new order is in fact a new form of imperialism. To object the new order is to object imperialism, and consequently countries like Iran try to create their own regional order³⁵. However, the dominant world role of the United States following the end of World War II has been the subject of many scholarly and conflicting analyses or wars. At the core of the different views regarding America's central position in international relations and

³⁵ Andrew J. Bacevich, *American Empire. The Relations and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy*. Harvard University Press 2002. p. 3.

We can add here that Andrew Bacevich reconsiders the assumptions and purposes governing the exercise of American global power. Examining the presidencies of George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton as well as George W. Bush's first year in office he demolishes the view that the United States has failed to devise a replacement for containment as a basis for foreign policy. He finds instead that successive post Cold War administrations have adhered to a well-defined "strategy of openness." Motivated by the imperative of economic expansionism, that strategy aims to foster an open and integrated international order, thereby perpetuating the undisputed primacy of the world's sole remaining superpower. Moreover, openness is not a new strategy, but has been an abiding preoccupation of policymakers as far back as Woodrow Wilson. Although based on expectations that eliminating barriers to the movement of trade, capital, and ideas nurtures not only affluence but also democracy, the aggressive pursuit of openness has met considerable resistance. To overcome that resistance, the U.S. policymakers have with increasing frequency resorted to force, and military power has emerged as never before as the preferred instrument of American statecraft, resulting in the progressive militarization of the U.S. foreign policy. Neither indictment nor celebration, American Empire sees the drive for openness for what it is a breathtakingly ambitious project aimed at erecting a global imperium. Large questions remain about that project's feasibility and about the human, financial, and moral costs that it will entail. By penetrating the illusions obscuring the reality of U.S. policy. <http://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog/BACAME.html>, visited on 6-1-2007.

affairs over the past half century has been the relationship between the American primacy and the world economy. In the opinion of most American analysts, there is no connection between the dominant political position of the United States and the nature of the postwar international economy. Political and economic developments, according to this position, can of course occasionally touch on one another. In addition, politics and economics are said to exist in two separate spheres and are not logically connected to one another, whereas in the opinion of Marxists and leftist writers, politics and economics are deeply linked. The insatiable hope of capitalists for continuous accumulation of surplus and growth has been the driving force behind politics in every capitalist economy. The interesting expression of this conception of political and economic affairs is Immanuel Wallerstein's concept of the Modern World System. However, the international political system has an important influence over the nature and functioning of the international economy. A basic expression of the perspective is what has been called the theory of hegemonic stability.³⁶ To be precise, the hegemony is a kind of domination, from a big country to other countries; at the same time this big country has enough power to control the other countries.

Hegemony is power superiority of one state in the international system. Consequently that can alone catch or dominate the rules and arrangements by which international political and economic relations are conducted. Such a state is called hegemony. The Italian Marxist

³⁶ Robert Gilpin. *The Rise of American Hegemony*. Edited by Patrick Karl O'Brien and Armand Clesse. www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/ipe/gilpin.htm. Visited on 2-10-2006.

Since regimes depend on state power for their enforcement, some International Relations scholars argue that those regimes are most effective when power in the international system is most concentrated and when there is hegemony to keep order. This theory is known as hegemonic stability theory. When one states power is predominant, it can enforce rules and norms unilaterally, avoiding the collective goods problem. In particular, hegemony can maintain global free trade and promote world economic growth.

theorist Antonio Gramsci used the term hegemony to refer to the complex of ideas that rulers use both consent and force to accomplish the same goal. By extension, such a concept in International Relations refers to the hegemony of ideas such as democracy and capitalism, and to the global predominance of the American culture. In the other hand, most studies of hegemonic idea try to explain two examples in the history. The first one is England in nineteenth century and second one is the United State after World War II. Britain's predominance followed the defeat of its archrival France. All the time Britain ruled the waves. The United States predominance followed the defeat of Germany and Japan in 1945. In addition, the United States industry led the world in technology and productivity and the citizens of United States enjoyed the world's highest standard of living. As the extreme power disparities resulting from major wars slowly diminish (states were rebuild over years and decades), hegemonic decline may occur, particularly when the hegemony has difficulties with costly military commitments. International Relations scholars do not agree about how far or fast American hegemonic decline has proceeded, if at all and whether international instability will result from such a decline. And beyond the U.S. and British cases, international relations scholars do not agree on which historical cases were instances of hegemony. Some see the Netherlands in the early seventeenth century, or Spain in the sixteenth, as cases of hegemony. However, from the perspective of less powerful states, of course, such hegemony may seem an infringement of state sovereignty, and the order it creates may seem unjust or illegitimate. For instance, China chafed under United States imposed economic sanctions for 20 years after 1948, feeling itself encircled by the United States of America military bases and hostile alliances led by

the United States. To this day, Chinese leaders use the term hegemony as an insult, and the theory of hegemonic stability does not impress them.

Even in the United States itself there is an important ambivalence about the U.S. foreign policy which has historically alternated between internationalist and isolationist moods. It was founded as a breakaway from England in 1776 its growth in the nineteenth century was based on industrialization and expansion within North America. The United States acquired overseas colonies in the Philippines and Puerto Rico in 1898 but did not relish a role as an ordinary imperial power. In the First World War, the country waited three years to weigh in and refused to join the League of Nations After the first World War American isolationism peaked in the 1920s; public opinion polls late in that decade showed that 95 percent of the United State public opposed to participation in a future great European war, and about 70 percent opposed to joining the League of Nations or joining with other nations to stop aggression.³⁷

Internationalists, such as Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, favored the United States leadership and activism in world affairs. These views seemed vindicated by the failure of isolationism to prevent World War II (or to allow the United States to stay out of it). The United States leaders after the war became alarmed of the threat of the Soviet Union and then Chinese communism and drummed up the U.S. public opinion, to favor a strong internationalism during the Cold War; The United States became an active, global superpower. In the post-Cold War era, United States internationalism became tempered by a new cost consciousness, and by the emergence of a new isolationist camp born in reaction to the displacements caused by globalization and free economy. However, the attack of 11

³⁷ Joshua S. Goldstein. *International Relations*. Seventh edition, Pearson International edition, Longman, P. 82-83.

September 2001 discredited the idea of the United States disengagement from world affairs, and renewed public support for American interventionism in distant conflicts that no longer seemed so distant. In addition, multilateral approaches working through international institutions increase the United States power and reduce costs, but they limit the U.S. freedom of action. For example, the United States can not always get the citizens to do what it wants such as attacking against any countries. Polls in the 1990s showed that a majority of United States citizens supported working through the United Nations and other multilateral institutions.

However, a third aspect of ambivalence of American hegemony is that of morality. Should the United States be a moral guiding light for the world pursuing goals such as democracy and human rights or should it concentrate on its own national interests, such as natural resources and geostrategic position. The American citizens do not like to act as a policeman in this world, and some resent paying for the security of allies such as Japan and Europe. After the international earthquake, the collapse of the Soviet Union, efforts to win congressional approval of foreign aid for Russia had to be couched in terms of the U.S. interests, not humanitarian assistance or moral obligation to help a nation to achieve freedom and democracy. Yet, the American people also think of themselves as a caring nation and a beacon of hope for the world. Presidents continue to say things such as where people are hungry, we will help. We are the United States.³⁸

However, the American administration considered a change in this foreign policy approach first after ww2, then after the Cold War, and finally after 9|11 that is why we have nowadays the American Global presence in everywhere or in any international crisis such as the war in Iraq or Afghanistan and in the Iranian Issue. The U.S. became the biggest

³⁸ Ibid, p. 48.

power and consequently it can play a leading role in the international community.

Consequently it is a kind of hegemony and we can see that clearly.

We can quote one basic message which was delivered by President Bush to the United States Congress on 6 March 1991 in the immediate aftermath of the Gulf War:

*On the night I announced operation Desert Storm, I expressed my hope that out of the horrors of war might come new momentum for peace. Twice before in this century, an entire world was convulsed by war. Twice this century, out of the horrors of war hope emerged for enduring peace. Twice before, those hopes proved to be a distant dream ... Until now, the world we have known has been a world divided a world of barbed wire and concrete block, conflict and cold war. Now we can see a New World coming into view. A world in which there is the very real prospect of a new world Order... We have learned the hard lessons of history. The victory over Iraq was not waged as a war to end all wars. Even the New World Order can not guarantee an era of perpetual peace. But enduring peace must be our mission.*³⁹

At the same time, we can get a good understanding about what happens around us and according to American leadership they have to control and keep our world without crisis (American benevolent hegemony) and it must be a peaceful world.

In addition, this feeling became more strong basically after the 11 September, and the neo-conservative ideology started to take an important role in International Relations and policy inside the Oval office. We are in the new world order, and that is not the

³⁹ Stephanie Lawson, International Relations. Short introduction, p. 67.

world after the Second World War, but in a new World after 11 September. The main dimensions of the American new world order are:

- The biggest national economy
- High technology supremacy
- Strongest Military power
- Strongest Industrial power

Those are also the tools of the United States hegemony and with these it can do almost anything. In other words, the meaning of hegemony is the dominance of one nation over the others. Also there is another definition of hegemony, a situation in which one state or country controls the others. In the other hand, hegemony means power and control exercised by leading state over other states.⁴⁰

Also two main types of international action in the economic field are being required; on the one hand, many governments will need help in solving their problems of national reconstruction. However, the attempt must be made to construct a framework of organization which will facilitate the flow of good and international and capital among nations.⁴¹ Therefore all of them can establish a big power and form an international hegemony.

At the same time, the United States interventions beyond Europe during the Cold War did not create fear of Western intervention and antipathy toward the West in areas that had

⁴⁰ John Baylis and Steve Smith, *The Globalization of World Politics, An Introduction to International Relations*, Third edition, p. 46.

Hegemony (pronounced he'jem.ə.ni or hə'dʒe.mə.ni) (greek: ηγεμονία) is the dominance of one group over other groups, with or without the threat of force, to the extent that, for instance, the dominant party can dictate the terms of trade to its advantage; more broadly, cultural perspectives become skewed to favor the dominant group. The cultural control that hegemony asserts affects commonplace patterns of thought: hegemony controls the way new ideas are rejected or become naturalized in a process that subtly alters notions of common sense in a given society.

⁴¹ *Pioneers in world order*. Columbia University Press, New York 1954, p.157.

experienced colonialism. The European domination lied dormant throughout the territory, subject to exploitation by demagogues and autocrats. In the Middle East the continuing the American identification with the unresolved Israeli-Palestinian issue makes the exploitation possibility especially real. The clash between Washington's perceptions of an issue, created by the inevitable interplay of politics, pressures, and interests, that characterize United States foreign policymaking and the different reality seen by observers on the ground will never end. The result of Cold War policies can not be reversed but sitting forth the consequences of the limitations. That understanding can also demonstrate how difficult it is to foresee the long-term consequences of actions.⁴² Consequently, we can understand what happened after the Cold War. The end of the cold War was an important victory for American leadership and the biggest consequence of that victory was that the United States became the biggest power (for example dollar hegemony). Dollar hegemony in the international markets and world economy (the term is used by Liu) specifically describe a geopolitical phenomenon of the 1990s in which the Americans dollar, a fiat currency, assumed the status of primary reserve currency in the international finance architecture. Three developments allowed dollar hegemony to emerge over a span of two decades. The Bretton Woods system was established in 1945. One part of it was a fixed exchange rate regime based on a gold-backed dollar. It did not view cross-border flow of funds necessary or desirable for boom of the trade or economic development. In 1971, President Nixon rejected the Bretton Woods system and suspended the dollar's peg to gold as the United States fiscal deficits from overseas spending caused a massive drain in US gold holdings. The second development was the denomination of oil in dollars after the 1973 Middle East

⁴² Hans J. Morgenthau. *Politics among Nations*, seventh edition: Ambassador, David Newsom. Did the States win the Cold War, p. 627.

oil crisis, when the most Arab oil producing countries stopped to export the oil as a protest about the war between Arabic countries (Egypt and Syria) and Israel.

The third development was the emergence of deregulated global financial markets after the Cold War that made cross-border flow of funds a routine.⁴³ A general relaxation of capital and foreign exchange control in the context of free-floating exchange rates made speculative attacks on the exchange rates of currencies a regular occurrence. These three developments permitted the emergence of dollar hegemony in the 1990s. All central banks have since been forced to hold more dollar reserves than they otherwise need to ward off sudden speculative attacks on their currencies in financial markets. Thus Dollar Hegemony stopped the exporting nations from spending domestically the dollars they earned from the US trade deficit and forced them to finance the US capital account surplus, thus shipping real wealth to the US in exchange for the privilege of financing United States debt to further develop the US economy.⁴⁴ In other words, that is how the American economic hegemony became stronger everywhere, both in economic and in political fields. This strengthening has been a subject of discussions for example in the frameworks of globalization theory, the end of history, discussion the clash of civilizations and dollarization. Those discussions have stressed the strengthening of the United States.

⁴³ For more information read about the future of Globalization, Jonathan Michie, the Handbook of Globalization, Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication.

⁴⁴ Henry C.K. Liu. Dollar Hegemony, www.answers.com/topic/dollar-hegemony, visited on 9-10-2006.

Huntington writes

*It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future.*⁴⁵

In addition, the clash of Civilizations theory can be a clear example of this hegemony, and the cultural hegemony is a very important part in the conservative ideology of the American leadership.

⁴⁵ Samuel P. Huntington, The clash of civilizations, Foreign Affairs. Summer 1993, v72, n3, p22, from the Academic Index, the next pattern of conflict, <http://www.alamut.com/subj/economics/misc/clash.html>, Visited on 11-10-2006.

2.2.1 Bush and the New World Order

The Bush administration's view of the New World Order was shaped by the September 11 attacks, which it perceived as a direct challenge to the United States' leadership in the world. The administration's response was to launch a global war on terror, which it framed as a fight for the New World Order. The administration's view of the New World Order was also shaped by the September 11 attacks, which it perceived as a direct challenge to the United States' leadership in the world. The administration's response was to launch a global war on terror, which it framed as a fight for the New World Order. The administration's view of the New World Order was also shaped by the September 11 attacks, which it perceived as a direct challenge to the United States' leadership in the world. The administration's response was to launch a global war on terror, which it framed as a fight for the New World Order.

The order and the Iranian nuclear ambitions

A case study

3.2.1 Bush and the New World Order

We should keep in mind that the New World Order has been used to refer to a new period of history evidencing a dramatic change in world political thought and the balance of power and we became in different world. The corporate portion of the NOW is dominated by international bankers, oil barons and pharmaceutical cartels, as well as other major multinational corporations. The Royal Family of England, namely Queen Elizabeth II and the House of Windsor, (who are, in fact, descendants of the German arm of European Royalty-the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha family-changed the name to Windsor in 1914), are high level players in the oligarchy which controls the upper strata of the NWO. The decision making nerve centers of this effort are in London. Basel Switzerland and Brussels (NATO headquarters). The United Nations, along with all the agencies working under the United Nations umbrella, such as the World Health Organization (WHO), are full time players in this scheme. Similarly, NATO is a military tool of the NWO. The leaders of all major industrial countries like the United States, England, Germany, Italy, Australia, New Zealand, etc. (members of the "G8") are active and fully cooperative participants in this conspiracy. In this century, the degree of control exerted by the NWO has advanced to the point that only certain hand-picked individuals, who are groomed and selected, are even eligible to become the prime minister or president of countries like England, Germany or The United States⁴⁶. However, the first usages of the term surrounded Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and call for a League of Nations following the devastation of World War I. The phrase was used sparingly at the end of the Second World War when describing the plans for the United Nations and Bretton Woods system, in part because of the negative

⁴⁶ New World Order definition. Introduction, <http://www.threeworldwars.com/new-world-order.htm#who>, visited on 24 -12-2006.

association to the failed League of Nations the phrase would bring. In retrospect however, many commentators have applied the term retroactively to the order put in place by the Second World War (WWII) victors as a "new world order."⁴⁷ The most recent, and most widely discussed, application of the phrase came at the end of the Cold War. Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George H.W. Bush used the term to try and define the nature of the post Cold War era, and the spirit of great power cooperation that they hoped might materialize. Gorbachev's initial formulation was wide ranging and idealistic, but his ability to press for it was severely limited by the internal crisis of the Soviet system. Bush's vision was, in comparison, much more circumscribed and pragmatic, perhaps even instrumental at times, and closely linked to the First Gulf War. Perhaps not surprisingly, the perception of what the new world order entailed in the press and in the public imagination far outstripped what either Gorbachev or Bush had outlined, and was characterized by nearly comprehensive optimism. In addition, what happened in Malta Conference of 2-3 December 1989 was very important to reinvigorated discussion of the new world order. Various new concepts rose in the press as elements of the new order. Thus expected the replacement of containment with superpower cooperation. This cooperation might then tackle problems such as reducing armaments and troop deployments, settling regional disputes, stimulating economic growth, lessening East-West trade restrictions, the inclusion of the Soviets in international economic institutions, and protecting the environment. During superpower cooperation, a new role for NATO was forecast, with the organization perhaps changing into a forum for negotiation and treaty verification, or even a wholesale dissolution of

⁴⁷ World War II (abbreviated WWII), or the Second World War, was a worldwide conflict fought between the Allied Powers and the Axis Powers, from 1939 until 1945. Armed forces from over seventy nations engaged in aerial, naval, and ground-based combat. Spanning much of the globe, World War II resulted in the deaths of over sixty million people, making it the deadliest conflict in human history. The war ended in 1945 with an Allied victory.

NATO and the Warsaw Pact following the resurrection of the four-power framework from WWII (such as the United States, United Kingdom, France and Russia).⁴⁸ The basic point of the policy of constructive chaos is, at present, the Middle East situation. Although U.S. military action in the region has for the time being subsided, America's military power will remain a critical determinant in the future of that vital zone of conflict. American military power is aimed at securing undisputed control over the vast reservoir of oil-not at necessarily fostering any permanent alignment of local states or combinations of regional interests also the President George Bush and his fellow true believers are successful. The United States will be first among equals in the New World Order. This is their goal. It is also the quest of the Bonesmen of the Order of Skull and Bones-America's warrior aristocracy although the American hegemony will be like a leader higher than any power in the New World Order.

3.2.2 The Global Order and the Americans perspective

In the Americans perspective the most important area in the world is the Greater Middle East which is a Muslim region. The American leadership believes that global terror is rooted in the Muslim and Arabic countries. In the other hand, democracy should be introduced to this region because it is religious regimes, such as Iran and Saudi Arabia, or authoritarian regimes, such as Syria, that are feeding terror. Terror channels will be blocked to the extent that these countries are democratized and integrated into the democratic world. The Greater Middle East (GME) project can not be regarded solely as an initiative related to resources such as oil in the Muslim countries, and the GME is one central part of the American World order in the Middle East. In addition the US leadership is thinking

⁴⁸ New World Order. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_world_order. Visited on 24-12-2006.

about this world as a great aim to make good business for American companies. The United States uses much of its moral power to spread its worldview desires and achieve its goals with the least amount of cost. America's moral hegemony is not the target of its massive military power, or its great economy. It is the outcome of the images of democracy, good life, and human rights according to the American style. But these basics are contradicted by America's efforts to spread its values by force if needed. America's use of force to spread its values will lead to deterioration of its moral domination and that is why the world crisis is growing bigger than before and we have an increasing instability in international relations.

However, about this project we can say that the Arab world, with all its political, cultural, official and popular components, has never agreed on anything as much it has on rejecting the Greater Middle East project proposed by the United States administration as a tool for democratic reform and modern society in Arabic and Islamic countries. There are three elements of motivation for rejecting the American project led by three political and cultural entities in the Arab and Islamic world.⁴⁹

- The first stance stems from a cultural-ideological rejection of the concept of democracy and political pluralism and respect for the opinions of others, is based on the illusion of knowing the truth and having supremacy of opinions, and is represented by Islamic parties, nationalists and some other leftist groups that are opposed to all proposals put forth by the United States.
- The second stance is that of the official Arab regime that is afraid for its political gains and privileges from foreign pressures and wants to defend oppression and the

⁴⁹ Report about the Greater Middle East Initiative. March 2004. www.Globalsecurity.org. Visited on 8-12-2006.

absence of freedoms and pluralism by pretending to defend so-called "Arab distinctiveness" from foreign change basically from the US as the biggest state.

- The third stance is that of the neo-liberal democratic leftist groups in the Arab world, who believe that democracy, pluralism, public freedoms, justice and development are the only way to bring reform to the Arab world, but who are confident that the United States could never be a credible leader on this path. Rejecting the reform from this perspective is the right thing to do. Also many people are of the opinion that project will further more protection to the American and Israeli interests in the Middle East.

In addition, political and cultural reform, which we understood as inclusive part of political pluralism, launching public freedoms, combating corruption, educating society and strengthening the self-making abilities of the Arab world, is demanded by the Arab world. It also includes the rebuilding of their societies as modern societies according the American model.

Many American diplomatic sources in Washington say that the aims behind the Greater Middle East Initiative are:

- Deviate attention away from the Arab-Israeli conflict towards reform and democracy in Arab-Islamic countries, the problem is that many political analysts are rethinking the conflict. Consequently, they might stop to continue the American project in the Middle East and also the American friends in Arabic World might stop advising American leadership to find solutions to this conflict. This might challenge the stability in this world. Stability-that is the Order the Americans are aiming at- in this part of the World.

- Establish a new mechanism for partnership between the U.S. and Arab countries
- The decision not to consult with Arab countries over the Greater Middle East Initiative might have been deliberate in order to place the Arab countries in a defensive position and consequently get approval on all projects that are in the Americans interests. This is anyway typical for Bush's administration, which has many times applied a unilateral approach in the actions of the American foreign policy.
- Keep the Middle East area under the American order and exploit the natural sources, especially the oil, and the territory and benefit the population of the region a big market for the American production.

In addition, the concept of the Middle East has always been subject to change from the roots. In general, it includes all the Arab countries and Iran, Turkey and Israel. Geographical, religious, and ethnic factors help to make the Middle East the world's most unstable area. Situated at the crossroads of three continents, with abundant amounts of oil, the region has experienced many internal conflicts and foreign interventions. At the same time, the US greater Middle East initiative, based upon Arab human development reports, sponsored by the American President George W. Bush and adopted by G8 summit in June 2004, is centered on three main axes: promoting democracy and good governance according to liberalism theory, building an information society and make the people there educated, and expanding the economic opportunities. At the same time, this may be what the American neo-cons want. In this line the attack against Iran night is the next logical step if the American order is the Middle East is not reached through the other means.

Consequently, Iran was originally designated as part of the **(axis of evil.)** Ever since the war in Iraq started Iran has been under a steady attack. Supposedly, Iran was letting the Iraqi opposition fighters to cross the borders to prevent the American success. The western American claim is also that Iran is developing nuclear weapons. They are a threat to American interests and the instability in the region. In a May 1, 2003 in an article of William Kristol on Bush's speech that day aboard the USS Abraham Lincoln, he noted; the president said on Thursday night, any outlaw regime will be confronted. That is Iran, above all. On the outcome of the confrontation with Tehran, more than any other, rests the future of the Bush Doctrine and, quite possibly, the Bush presidency and prospects for a safer world. On April 10, 2004, Bush reiterated his resolve and his theme for wars in his radio address, stating. "Our decisive actions will continue until these enemies of democracy are dealt with." The United States has made a formal request to Iran to help ease mounting violence in Iraq.⁵⁰ One part of the New World Order certainly is to prevent new states to start nuclear programs which might lead to nuclear bombs. This is, of course, also an obligation of so-called Non-proliferation Treaty (1971), the watch dog of which is IAEA. Yet, we have to remind here about the fact that Israel has developed a nuclear bomb and has at the probably 200 bombs.

⁵⁰ D. Lindley Young, The use of American power to set a course for the 21st Century.
<http://www.themoderntribune.com>. Visited on 7-12-2006.

3.2.3 Iran and a new regional order

After September 11 attacks, the hostile policies of the American leadership against the Islamic Republic of Iran entered a new more serious era. This policy which became the official strategy of the Bush Administration under the label of the “Axis of Evil” has been pursued and emphasized at numerous times. After the tales accusations about Saddams connections to terrorist and his weapons of mass destruction, all what was left behind was the idea of “regime change”. The new Iraq became the center stage of America’s pressure and threat against Iran. As George W Bush himself has stressed on various occasions the new different Iraq is a pressure tool against Iran in order to make this to country change its political orientation. After the regime change the new Iraq would serve as the prototype for regimes in the region according to the US. The dangers of adopting such an enemy policy are primarily subjected to the Islamic Republic. The major challenge for the Islamic Republic would be how not to be threatened by the US through Iraq. There is lot of evidence on the American determined state of mind to conduct their regional policies in order to minimize Iran’s stance and influence that is to further their new world order. In the recent speech made by the US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld he reversed the initiator and aggressor in the Iran-Iraq war by saying that if Iran once again decides to go to war with Iraq, the latter would need time to have enough power to deter Iran. Again another example of the US’s hostile approach towards Iran is its espionage above the Iranian borders by their spy airplanes over Iraqi territory; this of course is a serious violation of the Iranian air space and a threat the Iranian sovereignty⁵¹. On the other hand, we can say that the Iranian leadership tries to gain the leadership in the Middle East and

⁵¹ Kayhan Barzegar. Iran and the New Iraq: Security Challenges and Foreign Powers, <http://www.alternativesjournal.net/volume5/number3/barzegar.pdf>, visisted on 11-12-2006.

consequently dominate this region. This is of course against the American project the greater Middle East and of course against Israeli interests.⁵² Thus the American world order and the Iranian regional order are by definition on the clashing line. Furthermore, it is important to note that the American presence around Iran has grown dramatically after 2001. At the moment the US has got totally about 200 000 soldiers at the eastern borders of Iran in Afghanistan and at western borders in Iraq. From the Iranian perspective it might look that in building the American order in the Middle East the US has effectively put Iran in a siege. Thus, the Iranian possible nuclear ambitions can be seen as an attempt to strengthen the Iranian hand in this position.

3.2.4 Iran as the new leader of the Islamic World

What happened in 1979 was an important event to understand the Islamic republic of Iran even today. However, the Islamic revolution there was strong and it changed everything in Iran. Before this revolution Iran was one of the strongest American allies in the Middle East but after this revolution the situation became different. In the other words, the Islamic Republic Revolution of 1978-79. The opinion that in both the agricultural, industrial and army spheres too much had been tried to achieve too rapidly and that mistakes had been made and expectations broken, was manifested in demonstrations against the government in 1978. Many people were killed, and martial law was imposed in the major cities in September. In Tehran, the wide appeal of Khomeini, who arrived in Iran, was proved by the enthusiastic welcome of the people on February 1, 1979. Ten days later Prime Minister Bakhtiar went into hiding, eventually to find exile in Paris. In addition, Anti-American

⁵² We can add here that Iran as a country has abundant energy resources, with reserves of natural gas second only to those of Russia and substantial oil reserves. But it faces the challenge of providing hundreds of thousands of new jobs for its youthful population in oil Iran holds nine per cent of world reserves and it has a population of: 70.7 million (UN, 2005).

sentiment was strong, and Shah's admission to the United States for medical treatment touched off a huge demonstration in Tehran demanding his extradition.⁵³ The Iranian Revolution (The Islamic Revolution) transformed Iran from a constitutional monarchy, under Shah (King) Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, to a populist theocratic Islamic republic under the rule of Ayatollah (or Imam, as he is known in Iran) Ruhollah Khomeini.

Consequently, when this revolution became so successful many thinkers started to talk about Iran as the leader of the Islamic World. This view was strengthened, for example by the feat that basically in any occasion the Iranian leaders considered the Palestinian issue as an Islamic one in the context of this issue they clearly consider Iran as the leader of the Islamic world and thus Iran had a duty to act against the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian land. According to many Iranian leaders they have a right to dominate the Middle East and make the American soldiers outside. In addition, the leaders of Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf States were also alarmed by the Iranian revolution, as a Shi'a minority also exists among their nations (except in Iraq and Bahrain where Shi'a are the majority) and could ignite a civil war. Under the slogan "neither East nor West" (meaning that you should follow neither Soviet nor American/European models but just the Islamic model), revolutionary leaders in Iran gave and sought support from to non-Islamic as well as Islamic Third World countries for example, it established close relations with Palestinian liberty Organization PLO, Cuba and in South Africa. Iranian revolutionaries called for an end to social injustice, monarchy, Western influence, and corruption in the Middle East and the rest of the world. The emergence of a radical Shia-dominated theocracy and its calls to overthrow monarchies and replace them with Islamic

⁵³ Iranian Revolution, <http://www.answers.com/topic/iranian-revolution>, visited on 11-12-2006.

republics scared many of its Sunni Arab neighbors. Thus, in 1980, Iraq (politically controlled by Sunnis at this time), invaded Iran in an attempt to seize the oil-rich predominantly Arab province. This began the eight years Iran-Iraq War, one of the most destructive and bloody wars of the 20th century⁵⁴. Those, more ideological goals can be seen as some kind of ethical foundation of the Iranian order.

- **Iran balancing the Israeli (nuclear) power**

When we are talking about the Iranian nuclear weapons we have to keep in mind that is the main immediate threat of a nuclear Iran is toward Israel and according to the Israeli leadership they consider that weapons will be the end of Israeli superiority in the Middle East. Iranian nuclear bomb will change the balance of power in the Middle East dramatically, and consequently Israel might try to stop the Iranian nuclear project even with military means.

Thus, the impact of a nuclear Iran to Israel can not be emphasized enough. President Ahmadinejad's strong rhetoric at Israel is barely short of an open declaration of war. How seriously Israel takes these direct threats is up to anyone's guess, but with the hardliners gaining political ground in Israel it is possible that they might take them quite seriously or use them as a pretext. If those threats are real and if Iran gets the bomb, Israel is might be doomed. In this case it might be prudent for Israel to act pre-emptively and try to stop Iran's bomb efforts before they come to fruition even if it means that they have to attack with conventional weapons against Iran and its allies. Israelis are most certainly doomed even then and can only hope for the American help if Iran or other Muslim states retaliate.

⁵⁴ Iranian Revolution, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia - Cite This Source, www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Iranian_Revolution, visited on 12-12-2006.

This just might give them better prospects of surviving another fifty years than having an Islamist state dedicated to the demise of Israel with the bomb within missile range. However, the balance of power in Middle-East is extremely fragile and a nuclear Iran would shatter it with potentially catastrophic consequences. But how to stop Iran is a question inside American and Israeli leaderships as well.

This is a massive failure of the non-proliferation movement and of the UN. Whether or not Iran will build a nuclear weapon is not in question; how a nuclear Iran will affect the balance of power in Middle-East should be. Israel will be thrust into an even more precarious situation than it is in already.⁵⁵ At the same time this balancing of power in the greater Middle East according to the US project will be unacceptable that's mean the confrontation will be strong because every part has got military power at least can destroyed something important in the other part but the balancing of power going to be in the Middle East because the Islamic Republic of Iran could build a good strategy about front of the American and Israeli influence of the international relations and front the American hegemony even today and front the Israeli superiority in the Middle East.

⁵⁵ By MotorMachineMercenary in Politics. Iran -The Next Nuclear Power, <http://www.kuro5hin.org>, visited on 12-12-2006.

- **The Iranian nuclear ambition and the order in International Relations**

The Iranian issue is now reaching a flash point with a number of reports coming out of the Bush administration of a military strike and even the possible use of nuclear "bunker" bombs to destroy Iran's nuclear capabilities. Even if the nuclear scenario is discounted, the move to bring Iran under Chapter VII sanctions in the Security Council and then legitimise future unilateral US military action under the fig leaf of a United States resolution brings the whole issue. Once again we have unsubstantiated reports of weapons of mass destruction and ratcheting up of war hysteria on a future threat to the "civilized world" from a nuclear-armed Iran, followed by another possible United State military problem in West Asia.

Such a military strike is unlikely to be a one-of affair as was Israel's air strike on Iraq's nuclear plant. A simple war game would show that such a strike must be followed up by continuous aerial bombardment of the type we saw in Yugoslavia and a complete destruction of Iran's industrial and military capabilities. Otherwise, Iran could inflict heavy damage to the American interests in West Asia and to Israel as well.

For a sane, this is a horrifying scenario. The world is maybe already dealing with the collapse of Iraq as a country, a major humanitarian disaster, along with the loss of oil that it used to supply to the world economy. An attack on Iran could conceivably lead to Iran blocking the Strait of Hormuz through which 70 per cent of world's oil passes. At the very least, it will mean Iran's supply dwindling for the foreseeable future and oil prices climbing well beyond US\$100 per barrel.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ For more information read about the Globalization and how the United States became the biggest power Mehdi Heravi, Dynamics of international relations, p. 203.

The case against Iran is that it has installed a cascade of 164 centrifuges in Natanz for enrichment of uranium, which opens the way for an Iranian bomb. The argument that the United States and the European Union have been advancing for some time by enriching uranium. Iran will acquire bomb making capability, which they cannot accept. What they do not say is that Iran has the right to enrich uranium for their nuclear power program under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

In addition, if we look at the last three years of manufactured crisis on Iran, it will become clear that it has little to do with the actual violations of international treaties that Iran might have committed, but to use such allegations to deny Iran its rights under NPT to the nuclear fuel cycle. Since such a denial would be patently illegal under the NPT, the case put before the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is that Iran did not make full disclosure earlier about its nuclear program and therefore the onus of proving that there is no continuing clandestine program is on Iran and till that time, it should be denied this right. Even though after investigations, the IAEA has accepted that the violations are procedural and reporting violations and not one of Iran carrying out activities in violation of Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

In the other words, Iranian nuclear weapons issue is complex, and many times we have some international reactions on this program, and we do not have a general acceptance of international community to this Iranian dream. At the same time, some countries like Russia try to help Iran to proceed with that program. Some of them are clearly against this dream like United States and Israel.

At the moment the Iranian leadership has an intention to continue the nuclear program. We can feel here the American hegemony, how it supports the Israel military power including

the nuclear weapons but at the same time its unacceptable if another country tries to proceed with this program.⁵⁷

In addition, when Iran started this program it conflicted with the United States and Israel. At the same time there has been a strong support from Iranian society for this program. Consequently, we can say that there is a competition between the Iranian leadership and the American administration. It is important to note that here we can find some reasons to help Iran to continue the program. At the same time we should understand the society there and why Iran has intention to get nuclear weapons?

1. After the war in Iraq on 2003, the old regime collapsed. Consequently, the Iranian leadership had a political sense to become the next aim for American power. After the 2003 war this power was also near to the Iranian territory, with the new government in Iraq, and tried to support any movement against American occupation. In addition Iran has got good friends in Iraq (the Shias) and they will not accept any attack against Iran.
2. The Turkish leadership will not allow the American forces to use Turkish territory against Iran as was the case in 2003 against Iraq, because they have a strong relationship with Iran and both of them try to cope with a Kurdish minority. At the same time any war against Iran will be not good for Turkish economy and Turkish national security. "Our role aims at facilitating compromise over the Iranian issue" said Turkish Foreign Minister & Deputy Prime Minister Abdullah Gül.
3. Afghanistan: also Iran has a friendly relationship there, and Afghanistan's society

⁵⁷ To get good understanding go and read this book about Hegemony. Bill Ashcroft and Helen Tiffin. Post-Colonial Studies, the key concepts, 1998 by Routledge, p.116.

has same culture and they will not accept any aggression against Iran.

4. Pakistan: we can say that after the war in Afghanistan and after Pakistani leadership helped American forces against Taliban movement Pakistan has troubles especially in the interior policy. Consequently, the leadership will not do that again, and Pakistan has strong Islamic parties and they will reject any war against Iran.
5. Arabic Gulf States: any attack against Iran will be unacceptable, because Arabic societies will not agree and will not tolerate instability in the Middle East.
6. China has a veto at the United Nation's Security Council; China has become the key obstacle to putting international pressure on Iran. During a visit to Tehran this August, Chinese Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing signaled that China doesn't want to see the Bush administration to press the Security Council to debate Iran's nuclear program. The United States officials fear that China's veto power could make Iran more stubborn in the face of American pressure. The burgeoning relationship is reflected in two huge new oil and gas deals between the two countries that will deepen the relationship for at least the next 25 years, analysts say.
7. Russia is the most important player in this situation.⁵⁸ There is of course cooperation, especially in economic projects. Russia tries to get economic benefit from Iran and the Iranian leadership also tries to get support in the Security Council and in high technology nuclear programs. Consequently, Russia might be against

⁵⁸ Russia has two strategic goals in pursuing a military relationship with Iran: keeping its own military-industrial complex solvent and building a coalition in Eurasia to counterbalance U.S. military superiority. Russia has found in Iran a large, oil-rich customer for its military-industrial complex, which supports over two million jobs. Russian leaders hope that the export revenues would allow them to save the research and development capabilities and technology base they inherited from the Soviet Union that could be used to develop new major weapon systems for the Russian armed forces, and foreign customers. To achieve economies of scale however, Russia needs access to large arms markets, such as China or Iran.

any decision in the Security Council or any international action against the Iranian republic. In addition China knows that any unrest in the Middle East is not good for its energy security. As a result China will not accept any attack there.⁵⁹ In addition, the cooperation between Moscow and Tehran increased and became better after the election of President Vladimir Putin. One consequence was Moscow's November 2000 renunciation of the 1995 Gore-Chernomyrdin Agreement.⁶⁰ Anticipating lucrative arms sales, a large number of Russian hard-line politicians and generals have endorsed Russia's rapprochement with the Islamic Republic. For its part, Tehran sees Russia as a valuable source of military technology that Western states have declined to provide since Iran's 1979 revolution. The nuclear reactor in Iran is build by the Russians.

The Iranian leadership has understood the potentials which the United States can control in the area. Especially that has happened after the last war on Iraq, which is still engaging the American power. As a result Iran continued rapidly its nuclear program because it has the belief that the USA is still suffering in this war and it can not get involved in a new war.

In addition, the Iranian leadership has control, influence, military power and political power in the Middle East to con front the American hegemony in international affairs.

⁵⁹ For more information about Klaus Knorr. *The Nuclear Age. On the use of military power in the Nuclear age.* New Jersey, Princeton University Press 1966.

⁶⁰ On October 13-1995, The New York Times reported that Vice President Gore had reached an agreement with Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin to allow Moscow to precede with already-contracted arms sales to Iran in return for a cessation of all transfers by December 31-1999. The story alleged that the agreement - in the form of an aide memoire dated June 30, 1995 - was at variance with 1992 US legislation, The Iran-Iraq Non-Proliferation Act, mandating the imposition of sanctions for "destabilising" arms sales to either Baghdad or Tehran. In addition, a 1996 amendment to the 1962 Foreign Assistance Act likewise requires sanctions to be imposed on countries supplying arms to states considered by the US to be sponsoring terrorism, into which category Iran falls. <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd51/51iran.htm>. visited on 10-12-2006.

The Iranian petroleum minister said in Tehran that "Iran would use its oil levers, if international sanctions or any attack were imposed against the Islamic Republic".

Kazem Vaziri Hamane, who is an official of Iranian government, said that Tehran would use all its possibilities, including the oil, as a retaliatory measure, if Iran's interests were infringed upon. Hamane said that oil prices would jump to \$100 per barrel, if sanctions were imposed against Iran's oil sector. The petroleum minister said that oil sanctions against Iran were unrealizable because it was difficult to find an alternative to 2.5 million barrels of oil produced by Iran daily. Hamane said that Iran could use its oil weapon only if Tehran would face threats and its national interests were infringed upon.

Hamane also said that the use of the oil weapon would mean a great challenge to the world. But if the country was in danger, the use of this weapon would be one of the instruments, which Iran would employ decisively. But here we can not forget the Greater Middle East project of the US leadership. This dream of the Iranian government will be unacceptable for the White House and the situation will be more complex because every party has a strong idea about his interests. There is always a possibility of dramatic events in the Middle East but on the other hand, a possibility of reforms.

8. Syrian republic: Syria has a strong relationship with Iranian leadership and both of them are on the American black list. Also according to the American administration both of them are supporting international terrorism. As a result we can see that the relationship between Iran and Syria to be aimed at the American interest.

9. Lebanon: Lebanon also has strong Islamic party (Hezbollah). This party has loyalty to Iranian Islamic Republic. Also Iran is helping this party against Israel (as in the war in

2006).⁶¹

10. Palestinian movements; especially, the Islamic struggle movements, have got support from the Iranian leadership. All of them are against the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza strip. At the same time Iran knows that the movements can act against Israel in the case Israel tries do something against Iran. Furthermore, Fathomer Iran supports the Islamic issues and specially the Palestinian issue.

However, Iran has the ability to achieve something. Also as we have seen in 1980-1988, that Iran has got a great stamina to stay against an attack. To conclude Iran has:⁶²

- 1 One of the biggest economies in the Middle East
- 2 High technology
- 3 Military power
- 4 Relatively big international power
- 5 Oil
- 6 Experince: Iran is one of the few countries that has experienced chemical warfar

⁶¹ Hezbollah (Arabic: حزب الله *ḥizbu-llāh*, meaning "party of God") is a Shi'a Islamist militant and political organization based in Lebanon. It follows a distinct version of Islamic Shia ideology developed by Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, leader of the Islamic Revolution in Iran. And this party is fighting Isreal and we saw the last war between Israel and this Islamic party. Israel had become militarily involved in Lebanon in combat with the Palestine Liberation Organization who moved into Southern Lebanon after being ousted from Jordan. The PLO was attacking Israel from Southern Lebanon in the lead up to the 1982 Lebanon War, and Israel had invaded and occupied Lebanon to protect its Northern border. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hezbollah#Background>, visited on 30-10-2006.

⁶² Still, Iran has been described as having the most powerful military in the Middle East, according to the senior U.S. commander in the region. Iran's defence budget for 2005 is estimated to be \$6.2 billion by London's International Institute for Strategic Studies. This is \$91 per capita, less than other Persian Gulf nations. Iran also spends less as a percentage of gross national product than any other Persian Gulf nation, except the United Arab Emirates. The armed forces have three branches: Ground Forces, Navy, and Air Force.

- **The American administration and the Iranian leadership**

First of all, the Bush administration's pledge to talk with Iran about its nuclear ambitions should be evaluated against the backdrop of massive American nuclear superiority. Iran appears at most to be assuming at a nuclear weapon that could be produced 5 to 10 years from now. By contrast, in January 2006 the United States had 5,735 active nuclear warheads, with another 4,235 held in reserve. To put it mildly, the nuclear scorecard is rather heavily tilted towards Washington: U.S. 10,000, Iran zero. This Do as I say, not-as-I do-approach to nuclear weapons will not serve the U.S. well in negotiations with Iran.

Even given this major flaw in the American stance, the Bush administration's decision 2006 to offer the possibility of direct talks with Iran is a potentially a good sign. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice had to fight a fierce internal battle with Vice President Dick Cheney to get an offer of talks of any sort on the table.

That being said, there are clear downsides to the idea of 'diplomacy' conceived by the Bush administration. For example, one administration official has suggested that a part of the point of the U.S. overture was the hope that Iran would reject it, thereby freeing up the administration to take more forceful action, up to and including U.S. air strikes. Given this background, the opponents of United States military action need to support talks with Iran while pointing out the challenges involved.⁶³

⁶³**Secretary Rice:** "[We] have got to get the international community focused on making sure that Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. And for that, you can use negotiations if the Iranians are prepared to negotiate. If they're not prepared to negotiate, then you have to use sanctions." US department of State, <http://www.state.gov/p/nea/ci/c2404.htm>, visited on 29-10-2006.

centrifuges to enrich uranium. Maybe the negotiations will only start if Iran suspends all nuclear projects.

The offer also holds out the hope that Iran might one day be allowed to enrich uranium on its own soil, if it meets the United Nations Security Council and International Atomic Energy Agency standards of proof that it is not seeking nuclear weapons, a process that American administration officials suggest could take years, if not decades. It should be no surprise that this new package has not convinced Iran to suspend its nuclear program. If the US really wants to make progress, it should give the negotiating process months or years, not weeks, to bear fruit. Non-aggression pledges by the United States and Israel should also be part of the mix. Given that an Iranian bomb is at least five to ten years away, there is plenty of time to talk.

But United States talks with Iran should involve genuine diplomacy; not political maneuvering designed to set the stage for American military action.

Conclusion

Finally, we can conclude that, it is not a coincidence that on the day before the Security Council of United Nations met to discuss Iran's nuclear enrichment activities, Tehran announced the plans to build two more nuclear reactors, and that the Russians will likely be the leading contractor. And at least one powerful Republican, Senate Armed Services Chairman John Warner, appears resigned to the eventuality of an Iranian nuclear weapon. American diplomats, who are set to join the European Union in direct talks with Iran, will not have an easy time considering Tehran's skillful diplomatic maneuvering.

In addition, Iranian leadership still has political statecraft to understand what happens around it. Also it can be against any crisis from international arena and confront the American hegemony as well. That is because the Iranian Islamic Republic is a good player of game. It can play without forfeiture with the biggest country in our world, especially with the United States of America.

According to me we can be sure, that the Iranian republic one day will have nuclear weapons, because of the political statecraft that what we have inside the Iranian Leadership and becomes of the elements which are supporting this dream, such as oil and military power. Once Iran has got nuclear weapons, no country will threaten Iran.⁶⁴ At the same time, the American hegemony will not be able to stop the ambitions of one of the biggest countries in the Middle East.

⁶⁴ The same happened in Korea. Since 1945 North Korea's relationship with the United States has been marked by almost continuous confrontation and mistrust. North Korea views the United States as the strongest imperialist force and as the successor to Japanese imperialism. The Korean War only intensified this perception. The United States views North Korea as an international outlaw. North-Korea-the United States, country studies North Korea, www.state.gov/p/nea/ci/c2404.htm, visited on 29-10-2006.

Conclusion

In the first chapter we tried to explain the International order and how the balance of power had been in an important role in international policy that was created after the Second World War, between the United States and the Soviet Union. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 was like an earthquake changing the international arena. At the same time the order in international relations took new form, and the restructuring process made the United States of America as the only super power and this power got a special understanding about our world. That is why America is now acting like a policeman to control our world. The American leadership has got a feeling or a responsibility to fix any crisis and even use the power to finish the crises, but the world has become more complex than when we had two powers, before the collapse of Soviet Union in 1991. Also To understand the order in International Relations we should know some of the most important theories of International Relations. Thus why we explained some theories in chapter two. The American hegemony became the strong hand above any other power and of course this hegemony has got almost everything needed to control our world and to create an order of its own liking. We can here stress some main points of the order in International Relations:

- One way to understand the American leadership might be the new form of the International Relations theory especially the theory of capitalism. The US could aim to get the world under American order. One way to conclude the whole world history of 20th century could be: the US has eliminated all the competitors for the American world order⁶⁵.

⁶⁵ Bacevitch, p.115.

- U.S. administration could put all countries in American hand including the European countries, that's why the European Union can not take any decision independently from the United States.
- The American leadership could cooperate with the international organizations well, especially with the United Nations and the Security Council. Yet it is clear in many cases that this leadership does not care for example about the Security Council; for example the War in Iraq was without decision or mandate from the Council.
- In the case of one of the most important issues, the Palestinian issue, the U.S. administration supports Israel to destroy everything in Palestine without any consideration of the Security Council Resolutions or any other international organization. The same is true in the case of the last War between Lebanon and Israel. We can say that this kind of "order" of the United States often supports only one party. This of course happens because of American interests and because of the American order.
- No countries especially in the Middle East can get the high technology connected to the nuclear weapons, which is an important long-term aim of the American administration. In addition, it's not allowed one of the Arabic or Islamic countries to proceed with nuclear ambitions come true The United States strategy does not allow this partly because of Israeli national security and to keep the Middle East under the control from the United States that is to maintain and further the American order.

- After the Cold War, the American foreign policy became aggressive in many crises. The number of armed conflict has come down from 50 to 30 after the Cold War. Yet what is obvious is that the US is getting easier involved to them, because there is no threat of Russian actions as it was during the Cold War, when there was always even the view of full-scale nuclear war with the Soviet Union.

After these points we might give some advice to the American administration to get better and to deserve respect:

- The American order one day will decline and finally collapse thus the American administration should change their ideology and policy line to adjust better to that coming decline and the rise of the Chinese World Order.
- The American administration should support the political justice, by giving the people their right to choose their future.
- The American foreign policy should show real leadership, the US should change the policy to be nearer to the people especially when we speak about the problems of developing poor countries. In addition, the imbalance in the American foreign policy today helps the instability to become stronger. Thus we may face many international crises between United States and the other countries.
- In the case of the Iranian issue, Iran is not same as Iraq. Consequently the American administration should find peaceful ways to solve the problems, because the Iranian leadership got a strong army and they can threaten the world economy with their oil and gas weapon after any attack and the situation there could get out of control. At the same time the American administration should know that the Iranian leadership has got supporters in international policy. Finally, we have to keep in mind that the

goal of Iran is to build up its own regional order as the leader of the Middle East and the Islamic World.

There is discrimination in our global village, abuse of rights even in the United States of America. Unfortunately, the people will face these kinds of problems also in the future. The rights of the people must be in power without any discrimination, because all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. We shall hope that any future order will be based on these principles.

Bibliography

Books

- Ashcroft Bill and Tiffin Helen, Post-Colonial Studies. The key concepts. Routledge 1998.
- Bacevich J. Andrew, American Empire. The Relations and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy. Harvard University Press 2002.
- Baylis John and Smith Steve, The Globalization of world's politics. Third Edition. Oxford University press, 1995.
- S. Mathis William, Presidency of the United States. Nova chapter 10 Nova science Publishers, 2002.
- Goldstein S. Joshua, International Relations. Fifth edition, Longman 2001.
- Goldstein S. Joshua, International Relations, Seventh edition. Longman 2005.
- Heravi Mehdi, Dynamics of international relations. Ibex publishers, 2005.
- Jackson Robert, Sorensen Georg, International Relations. Theories and Approaches. Second edition. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Johanson N. Michelle and Columbus Frank, America in the 21 century. Political and Economic Issues. Nova science publishers 2003.
- Knorr Klaus, On the Uses of Military power in the Nuclear age. New Jersey, Princeton University Press 1966.
- Lawson Stephanie, International Relations. Short introduction. Polity press, 2003.
- Hobson, M. John. The state and international relations. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Mogenthau J. Hans, Politics among Nations. Seventh edition. Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.
- Michie Jonathan, the Handbook of Globalization. Cataloging in Publication, 2003.
- M. Snow Donald, Cases in International Relations. Portraits of the future, University of Alabama, Longman, 2003.
- Viotti Paul R. Kauppi Mark V. International Relations Theory. Third Edition, Maxwell Macmillan Canada, 1999.
- Russett Bruce, Starr Harvey, World politics. The menu for choice. Third edition. W. H. Freeman, 1980.
- Sheehan Michael, Balance of Power. History and Theory. London, Routledge, 1996.
- World Order, Columbia Univesity Press. New York 1954.

Articles and other sources

Sadrazam Ejdan, Lessons about the Contemporary Political ideologies, Near East University, 2006.

The new nuclear threats, International politics, transonic edition, the Journal of German council on foreign relations, political analysis, 2006.

Charles D. Freilich, National security Decision-making in Israel, The Middle East Journals. 2006.

Burton Paul: Mahmoud Ahamadinejad: what lies beneath. Political analysis. Islamic Affairs and how he said Israel should be wiped off the planet, 2006.

Web pages

- En.wikipedia.org/wiki/Realism, from wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, visited on 9-5-2006.
- <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~vl/notes/berlin.html>, visited on 15-5-2006.
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/wikipedia>, the free encyclopedia, visited on 15-5-2006.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/about_the_Liberalism, visited on 23-5-2006.
- http://venus.ci.uw.edu.pl/~rubikon/forum/Marxism_katia.htm, I visited on 24-5-2006.
- <http://www.lincoln.ac.uk/policystudies/htm>, visited on 24-5-2006.
- <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history/A0825356.html>, I visited on 24-5-2006.
- www.findarticles.com/p|articles|mi_qa3757|is_200001|ai_pg_26, visited on 11-7-2006.
- [ch\gradale3\spo\spo-read\1b3-bull-mathias.pdf](http://ch.gradale3.spo.spo-read/1b3-bull-mathias.pdf), visited on, 15-7-2006.
- http://educy.com/jmusek/slo/Literatura_bull_lecnote/osebnost2.html, visited on, 14-7-2006.
- <http://yalepress.yale.edu/book.asp?isbn-isbn>, visited on 21-9-2006.
- www.ceu.hu/courses/transnlpolicies.htm, visited, 15-7-2006.
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regime>, visited on 23-9-2006.
- <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/wl2002.htm>, visited on, 24-9-2006.
- <http://www.tpmcafe.com/node/29258>, visited on 20-7-2006.
- www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/ipe/gilpin.htm. Visited on 2-10-2006.
- www.answers.com/topic/dollar-hegemony, visited on 9-10-2006.
- <http://www.alamut.com/subj/economics/misc/clash.html>, visited on 11-10-2006.
- http://www.econ.canterbury.ac.nz/personal_pages/paul_walker/gt/hist.htm, visited on 31-10-2006.

- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hezbollah#Background>, visited on 30-10-2006.
- <http://www.state.gov/p/nea/ci/c2404.htm>, visited on 29-10-2006.
- www.state.gov/p/nea/ci/c2404.htm, visited on 29-10-2006.
- <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd51/51iran.htm>, visited on 10-12-2006.
- www.Globalsecurity.org, visited on 8-12-2006.
- <http://www.themoderntribune.com>, visited on 7-12-2006.
- <http://www.alternativesjournal.net/volume5/number3/barzegar.pdf>, visited on 11-12-2006.
- <http://www.kuro5hin.org>, visited on 12-12-2006.
- etu.unuoge.ch/gradale3/spo/spo-read/1b3-bull-mathias.pdf, visited on 7-1-2007.
- www.brookings.edu. Visited on 9-1-2007.