



Ellias Aghili Dehnavi ,
Professor Hossein Daheshiar,
Marzieh Iranpour

Waking Up From An American Dream



Copyright © 2020 Ellias Aghili Dehnavi , Professor
Hossein Daheshiar, Marzieh Iranpour

Publisher: tredition GmbH, Halenreihe 40-44, 22359
Hamburg, Germany

ISBN

Paperback: 978-3-347-12827-9

Hardcover: 978-3-347-12828-6

eBook: 978-3-347-12829-3

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to the publisher.

A short preface

The foreign policy of the United States is oriented by its international interactions and setting standards for the interaction of its corporations, organizations, and system citizens.

According to the Foreign Policy Agenda of the Department of State, the officially stated objectives of the foreign policy of the US, including all the Bureaus and Offices in the United States Department of State includes to build and sustain a more democratic, prosperous, and secure world for the welfares of the American international community and people". Furthermore, according to the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs, some jurisdictional goals are "export controls such as nonproliferation of nuclear technology and hardware; measures to nurture commercial interaction with foreign nations and to safeguard American business abroad; international education; international commodity agreements; and protecting American citizens abroad and expatriation". The foreign policy and aid of the U.S. have been the subject of further debate, criticism, and praise, both abroad and domestically.

In this book, we have done our best to analyze the strange but rooted method that Donald Trump has applied and imposed on his department of states' blueprints; a mixture of Jacksonism and the politics of containment can be still seen in Trump's notions; how he deals with the countries of opposition can be named as the politics of containment.

If you are interested in reading a book which depicts his strange but yet traditional politics of Donald Trump, this is your book!

Keywords : U.S foreign policy, Donald Trump, Terrorism, immigration , Department of state

**Chapter one : U.S Foreign Policy in regard to
the notions of terrorism**

To all those victims of the American Dreams who lost
their beloveds

My friends from Mexico
And their lovely children.

1. US foreign policy against terrorism

In this section, an attempt has been made to examine US foreign policy in order to confront the terrorism.

1.2 Confronting terrorists and supporting countries beyond the borders

Since the September 11 attacks were asymmetric, they naturally had certain psychological effects, including: First, they shattered the myth of American absolute security like the Twin Towers and plunged the United States into a vortex of insecurity. The attack was organized by a group of semi-civilized people who had taken refuge in the most backward country in the world. With this attack, a group came to the American war that lacked any military and technological capabilities and were not officially supported by a particular country (Bo Lafteh, Yashin: 134-136). Second, the type of weapon used in the events of September 11, apart from being a new method of terrorist operations, gave rise to the perception of how vulnerable the United States is even to non-military means. In this incident, the terrorists used non-military means to make the most horrible weapon of war and, above all, to show the vulnerability of the American security systems. Third, the most important psychological impact of the September 11 on the opinions and thoughts of leaders and the American people was the need for security. In fact, the public's fear of repeating the same events and preventing the US intelligence and security services from making mistakes has led the federal government to think of something more than increasing the security of the country. (Farshad Gohar, 2002-197-199).

It is clear that if the three elements of terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and demonic governments are involved in an asymmetric attack, the global security situation, and especially the security of the great powers and their supporters, will be much more unstable than what it is. This means that given the current state of the world, the three above-mentioned elements can work

together to carry out a threat, and even force a major power to carry out their demands. On this basis and according to an analyses which were base on the very first days after the events of September 11 and were presented by the American authorities in a more extreme way, if the terrorists were supported by extremist governments to carry out their demands and were equipped with weapons of mass destruction by these governments; therefore, the consequences of a possible attack can be easily predicted (Bund Akhtar, 2007: 140-142).

From the outset, US officials have seen confrontation with the three elements of terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and demonic governments as an inevitable necessity, and believe that their security depends on repelling and reducing these three threats. For example, Henry Kissinger, the former US Secretary of State, said after the London Underground bombing in July 2005 about the growing need to counter nuclear proliferation: "If the explosions on the London Underground were nuclear and killed several thousand people, what would have happened then?" Thus, considering the aforementioned cases after September 11 attacks, confronting the three elements that the United States has identified as unholy elements was significant as a principle of American strategy, and much of the country's foreign policy is designed to counter these three elements. (Dardaryan, 2003: 1-20).

US military policy of this period was designed on the axis of deterrence. Also, the 9/11 incident, along with its structural repercussions and its psychological effects, is considered a new type of threat called asymmetric threat in such a large scale that this terrorist incident has also changed the concept of security. But in this section, an attempt is made to explain the transition of the US military strategy from deterrence to prevention by quoting the comments of US officials and political experts. The text of the US National Security Strategy for the 21st Century, prepared by the National Security Strategy Committee in 1998, states: "Considering the

dangers posed by nuclear weapons, genocide, and terrorism, the United States must reconsider its strong deterrent policy to any attack on its vital territory or interests." If prevention and deterrence do not work, the United States must have strong methods of defense against dangers and threats. The U.S. military, security and military forces, economic, financial, and political methods must work together to achieve the goals "(Land Akhtar, ex: 142-150) Contrary to what is stated in the US National Security Strategy for the 21st Century, no action has been taken until 2001 and the terrorist attack on September 11 attacks, especially in the military dimension. Although September 11 incidents is considered to be the beginning of a shift in US military strategy, the fundamental impact of this incident on the US National Security Strategy was to lead Washington to the field of "attack prevention" and the destruction of prominent and actual sources and bases of terrorism. The United States has changed since 9/11 and has been forced to change its military strategy in the face of this era of terrorism. (Adam, 2003: 777-778)

The term "prevention", which is also used in the context of the US National Security Strategy in 2002, indicates that the deterrent strategy is not effective in the face of new international threats, because deterrence is used against rational actors, while the actor against terrorist is not rational. Of course, this does not mean the complete elimination of the deterrence strategy, because not all threats are summed up in the terrorist threat, and as stated in the US National Security Strategy, the debilitation of deterrence does not mean the ineffectiveness of nuclear weapons which are in the hands of the US. (White House, 2002: 7-12)

"Now, every country in every region has to decide whether it is with us, or with the terrorists and from today, any country that supports terrorism will be recognized by the United States as a hostile regime ", stated Bush in the congress on September 20, 2001, nine days after the terrorist attack in the United States. With

the passage of September 11, the US military strategy was gradually completed. US officials have identified terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and demonic governments as a threat to the United States after the invasion of Afghanistan, and emphasized the need to design a preventive strike strategy to counter these three elements. "Preventing the acquisition and use of weapons of mass destruction is our next priority in the war against terrorism," stated Bush at September 11 commemoration of the Charleston Military Academy in South Carolina. But first and foremost, we want to end government support for terrorism. It is clear that demonic governments supply chemical, biological and nuclear weapons to terrorists. All countries know that we do not and will not accept that some governments harbor terrorists or provide them with financial, educational or equipment assistance. Governments that violate these principles will be considered as hostile regimes "(Hosseini, Haman, 363-368).

Following Bush's plan for a demonic axis and a limited nuclear attack on its member states, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Wolfowitz, outlined a number of principles: 1. The United States is ready to sacrifice manpower from now on in the valley of War; 2. The United States will take preventive action to defend itself; 3. Because the uncertain hazard is based on uncertainty, the threat cannot be clearly defined. On this basis and the geographical uncertainty of the threat, it is not possible to speak of specific countries; therefore, the asymmetric threat must be considered. (Zahrney: 2001, 78)

"Countries that support terrorism must be destroyed," said Wolfowitz. "This time, not only there will be no retaliatory operation, but the United States will launch a massive military offensive. The main goal is to destroy countries that support a form of terrorism." (2008, 29, Levi).

Based on the above-mentioned issues, it is clear that the United States has changed its military strategy from

deterrence to preventive in the face of terrorism under the influence of asymmetric threats after September 11 .

US defeat in confronting terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan

After the end of the Cold War, the United States became the only superpower in the world with the disappearance of its main rival and enemy. The country first achieved a decisive victory against Saddam considering the occupation of Kuwait for the first time in years, restoring the image of a powerful army and a victorious military force to the US military, and President George W. Bush after the victory over Iraq, officially announced in 1991 that Vietnam Syndrome was gone today.

The successive US defeats in Afghanistan and Iraq in the 21st century, and the heavy costs imposed on the United States, pushed the United States backward, once again, a situation like the Vietnam Syndrome once again overwhelmed US foreign and military behavior. Excessive use of the slogan of military options against Iran's nuclear program, without the slightest military use or practical success, the plan to withdraw from the Middle East, no more interference in Middle East issues, not to enter the Syrian war despite heavy allied pressure and the like, all were signs of this passivity and the failure of coercive policies.

The United States has launched a military operation in Afghanistan under the pretext of accusing al-Qaeda of attacking the World Trade Center towers on September 11. The United States occupied Afghanistan for three years under the pretext of destroying al-Qaeda; But over the years, it has failed in its proclamation and action policies. Taliban and al-Qaeda still exist not only in the Afghanistan but around the world.

"Given the inconsistency in the interests, the goals and sources of victory on the battlefield of Afghanistan were preposterous for the United States, and this can in fact be considered as the main reason for the prolongation of the

war in Afghanistan and the unsatisfactory end of it." Stephen Walt wrote in an article in Foreign Policy magazine entitled The Real Cause of US Failure in Afghanistan (Walt, 2013).

Iraq was another geography for the military occupation of the Middle East in 2003. This time, the presence of chemical and microbial weapons is an excuse. Three weeks after the occupation of Iraq, the government and the army collapsed and no weapons of mass destruction were found. "We were very concerned about the presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq," said the Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who made numerous statements about the existence of chemical, microbial and nuclear weapons in Iraq after the occupation; "but when the war came to an end, we did not see the discovery of any arsenal "(Williams, 2015)

The occupation of Iraq lasted eight years. The United States, at great expense and with a large number of military casualties, finally returned to the United States in 2001, and the defeat in Iraq was described as a defeat for the United States and its foreign policy. The Harvard Research Center considers the Iraq-Afghanistan war at \$ 4 trillion to \$ 6 trillion (Biles, 2016). "The failure of the US government to secure the presence of US troops in Iraq is a defeat for the US and its foreign policy, and this is a strategic victory for our rivals, especially Iran in the Middle East," said Senator McCain. In fact, the formation of a Shiite state was not what the United States was looking for (Mikkin, 2008).

The public view of the United States today is very pessimistic about cross-border military operations as a result of the Afghanistan-Iraq war. Initially, public opinion supported the decision to invade Afghanistan; But when the war did not achieve its goals and the death toll rose, opposition to the war continued to grow. In Iraq, in recent years, 50% believe that the decision to launch a military strike was wrong, and 5% still support it. As a result, in the post-war period of Afghanistan-Iraq

war, due to the high cost and casualties of these wars and the failure to achieve the goals of foreign policy, the efficiency of the military forces in achieving the goals of foreign policy was once again questioned. As examined, public skepticism about military action returned to a post-Vietnam War-like situation, while operational experience in both countries led other countries to believe that the use of asymmetric or irregular military strategies Such as guerrilla warfare or terrorist acts can complicate the situation for Western forces and can lead to their helplessness. The Americans also realized that they could no longer achieve low-cost victory by relying on their air power; So threats and the use of force are either of little use or require a high-risk operation in which ground forces have to participate for a very long time, as we see in Afghanistan and Iraq. The guerrilla strategy has thwarted US military superiority.

Revolution in attitudes toward military affairs and the return of the American paralysis, especially in the Middle East, the revolution in military affairs which is known in Iran, deals with the vast changes that technological advances in military affairs have made. The revolution that technology has created in all areas of battle, and especially in power, fire accuracy, guided weapons, accurate and timely information and management, etc., has made the power of destruction to be very effective and meaningful, precise and much more terrible than before, which has caused a great leap in military effectiveness, and wars have a new meaning and effect, and also caused wars and the use of military options to gain a new meaning and effect. This concept is well known to Iranian thinkers.

The second revolution in Iran is not desined to mean a revolution; although everyone is aware of it. This revolution, as a "revolution in the attitude towards military affairs", looks at the developments resulting from the society's attitude towards military affairs and has caused serious effects that have greatly affected the "behavior" and strategy of countries, especially the

United States. Demographic change, the expansion of information, the networking of society, the growing role of the people in decisions and even military decisions and the change in the views of the people, are part of this new revolution. The proliferation of social networks has such far-reaching implications that its results in social life as well as strategic issues need to be seriously reconsidered. The spread of information, awareness and the departure of official sources and traditional media from the only source of information and delineation of public opinion are only part of this effect (Aminian: 2017, 354); For example, while decades ago each family had several children, war and the death of one or two of them in the war, though unfortunate, were likely to occur. In recent times, most families have only one child, and due to other social developments, the death of one person is very heavy and unbearable, and therefore the tolerance of society to casualties in wars is very limited and countries like the United States have become very vulnerable. News of civilian casualties is also spreading rapidly even in the target communities, and as in previous wars, their censorship has been lost, and public opinion has become extremely sensitive, even to civilian casualties in the target communities. As a result, the supporters of every war have become very hated. This has left military and strategic decision-makers with dramatic and innovative constraints, so their only option would be to turn to wars with limited casualties, or paralysis.

This has led to options such as the use of coercive diplomacy, the air force and strong technology, and the absence of military conflict and the non-use of infantry on the battlefield. The pattern of Kosovo war, in which only the air force was used, although it has become very desirable, but the real world is not a limited option. Under the influence of the revolution, the United States, which has limited practical options in its approach to military affairs, has been forced to retreat and not engage, for example, in the face of a power like Iran. Any superpower or even power, if it refuses to use military force, and limits itself to low casualties war, will not be

able to maintain its empire and sphere of influence, and to have a lasting and enduring power.

Acceptance of reality by the Obama administration, handing over tasks to regional actors (JCPOA, emphasis on East Asia, etc.) and trying to play a role as a manager and mediator in explaining this second revolution in many cases by recalling the Vietnam Syndrome model indicates the weakness of a power similar to that of the United States highlights how unrealistic and consequently ineffective those threats are, using the military option for confronting a country like Iran.

The set of weaknesses and problems was that the United States, during the Obama presidency, decided to avoid engaging in Middle East issues and gradually reduced its commitment to the region. Basically, Obama went to the White House with the discourse of limiting the use of military power, and even agreed to question the hegemony and power of the United States and its departure from the role of superpower. He called for the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, the closure of Guantanamo Bay, the improvement of US relations with major industrial, economic, military and financial crises, as well as the resolution of the Arab-Israeli crisis and the adoption of an appropriate approach to Iran.

In his new US security strategy, Obama distanced himself from George W. Bush's approach of using deterrent wars to counter emerging threats, adding: "Our long-term security is not achieved through the ability to impregnate others with fear, rather, it is achieved through our capacity to respond to their hopes (Khosravi and Imani, 2011: 131).

During this period, with the release of the new US National Security Strategy, it was also emphasized that although the use of military force is sometimes necessary, the Obama administration will use all other options before engaging in warfare, and will carefully evaluate its

costs and risks with the costs and risks of not using military force (Khosravi and Imani,2011: 132)

These were one of the fundamental changes in the US approach to Iran. Obama refrained from Bush's one-dimensional confrontational stance, which was unsuccessful, opting for a multidimensional strategy of "diplomacy, punishment, and deterrence" and making numerous and unprecedented proposals to Iran; Such as the famous speech "Open Hands" to Tehran in order to find a political solution to break the deadlock in the Iranian nuclear case (Phillips and Betiza, 2010: 14). At the same time, Barack Obama, by constantly chanting the slogan "All options are on the table" and imposing international sanctions, tried hard to continue to pursue a coercive policy against Iran (Goldberg, 2012: 2). Thus, although Iran was considered the most important strategic enemy of the United States in the Middle East, there was an impression during this period that another attack would further damage the reputation of the United States; Therefore, changing Iran's behavior on a specific issue through interaction (diplomacy) and pressure (sanctions) became the main priority, that the agreement of the Iranian nuclear community can be interpreted in this regard on July 14, 2015, after almost 13 years of crisis over the nuclear activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In general, as stated in the US National Security Doctrine in 2012, the Asia-Pacific region has been declared as a security priority for the country, and a reduction in the number of troops in the Middle East is one of the consequences of this decision. One of the most important consequences of this case is the reduction of the military presence, the change of the American interventionist model in this region, and the increase of the map of the allies in this region.

Despite all the pressure from its allies, the United States refused to intervene directly in the "Syrian" conflict and to deploy troops there. In the next step, with the slogan of more priority, East Asia, withdrew its forces from the region and tried to reduce its role to that of

balancing or managing issues. The United States even played a passive role in confronting terrorist groups and even tried to use them as a balancing tool. Some even consider the Obama administration's insistence on concluding the JCPOA as a step in reducing US security commitments in the region. In the grievances of Arab countries, especially Saudi Arabia, in expanding Iran's role in the region, Obama warned that you must accept Iran's role and solve your own problems.

Donald Trump came to power as the 45th President of the United States at a time when one of his top priorities in the election campaign was portraying US military defeat and the failure of its foreign policy following this inability. The resurgence of military power and the restoration of military authority in his election slogans, as well as his belligerent stance, suggest that Trump's role could be to act as an agent to overcome the post-war syndrome of Iraq- Afghanistan.

Trump acknowledges the US defeat in regional wars and blames Bush and Obama administrations for "spending" the huge costs and failures of the last decade. "We have inherited a nationwide debt that has doubled in eight years to 23 thousand billion dollars," he said speaking at the US Conservative Congress. We have a legacy of foreign policy that we are witnessing various catastrophes, one after another. We do not want another catastrophe. When was the last time we won? Have we won a war? Have we won somewhere? (Trump, 2016). Trump took control of the White House today, rebelling against these repeated defeats and retreats under the administration of Obama while chanting "America's return to a glorious era of supremacy."

3-4- Trump's foreign policy strategy in action

Trump's foreign policy can be articulated in the form of two strategies: "America First" and "America Revitalization."