

УДК 327(73:55)

**Pavliuk O. I., Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine
“Bukovinian State Medical University”**

CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES OF U. S. POLICY TOWARDS THE PERSIAN GULF COUNTRIES ON THE EXAMPLE OF RELATIONS WITH IRAN

У статті досліджуються основні чинники формування політики США щодо країн Перської затоки, стратегії та механізми її здійснення на прикладі відносин з Ісламською Республікою Іран. Аналізуються концептуальні підходи політики Сполучених Штатів у регіоні Близького і Середнього Сходу. У постбіполярному світі стримування Ірану стало для США основним компонентом політики в близькосхідному регіоні. З точки зору Сполучених Штатів, це обумовлено тим, що Іран продовжує підтримувати міжнародний тероризм, прагне до експорту ісламської революції, нарощує свої військово-технічні можливості, включаючи розвиток ядерної програми, перешкоджає врегулюванню палестино-ізраїльського конфлікту. У відповідь, здійснюючи тиск на іранську економіку, США намагаються обмежити фінансові можливості Ірану спонсорувати свою протиправну активність. Автор стверджує, що стабільним і пріоритетним чинником формування політики США щодо вказаного субрегіону виступали економічні інтереси, обумовлені наявністю тут величезних енергетичних ресурсів. Найважливішим із економічних інтересів був і залишається доступ до нафтогазових запасів, а саме видобуток, переробка і реалізація арабської нафти.

Ключові слова: зовнішньополітична концепція, США, політична доктрина, Перська затока, Ісламська Республіка Іран, зовнішня політика.

In the last decades of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries the Persian Gulf region attracted considerable attention of the leading countries primarily due to the presence of significant oil and natural gas fields. This has an impact not only on the process of price-formation in the energy market, but also has a strategic importance for international processes regionally and at the global level. Since the 1970s, oil mining and exporting Gulf countries occupy a prominent place in the global system of international relations, in the balance of military and strategic counterpoise worldwide, in the development of political, cultural and spiritual traditions of the nations in the East. This region is special because of its geographical position at the crossroads of the Middle East. Setting control over it allows influencing the political processes that concern a large territory. However, the US show a significant interest in the region that produced a strategy for a number of Gulf countries in recent decades, in particular Iran.

The acuteness of the topic of our research is determined by the fact that the scientific understanding of contemporary political processes taking place in the Middle East, a comprehensive study of US influence on these processes is not possible without consideration of the impact of the largest country of the Gulf region – the Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI). The doctrine of President George W. Bush enrolled Islamic Republic to the so-called “axis of evil”, perceiving it as one of the main sources of instability [2]. The main focus of President B. Obama’s Middle East policy concerned the problems of combating nuclear-armed Iran. So it is obvious that for the US the Gulf region remains at the forefront of the global fight with terrorism and regimes that support it.

The aim of the article is the determination of the main factors in the formation of the US policy towards the Persian Gulf, as well as strategies and mechanisms of its implementation on the example of relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1970 – 2000’s. The foreign policy of the United States has always been and still is of particular interest of political scientists, historians, economists and lawyers. Among the Ukrainian researchers of the problem the works of I. M. Koval, V. V. Glebov, B. M. Gonchar, V. A. Shved, D. V. Kushnir, V. V. Grebtsov should be singled out. Among foreign researchers works of H. Kissinger, K. Katsmana, Z. Brzezinski, G. Yuldasheva, G. Sik, R. Ramasani, R. Haass, T. Flynn, M. Ledeen draw the attention. However, the US policy regarding the Gulf countries (especially Iran) has not found the proper coverage and has not become the subject of a special study in Ukrainian political science.

The US activity in the Persian Gulf in the 1970s was determined by the desire of the ruling circles

of Washington to maintain and, if possible, to increase their control over natural resources and the countries of the region. The concept of “twin pillars” on which the United States tried to implement a policy of “accommodation” in the Persian Gulf, caused the shift to Saudi Arabia and Iran’s Shah a large proportion of the burden and costs related to the implementation of the US strategy in the region [16]. Namely, based on this concept these countries had to act as instruments of US policy in the Middle East. However, development of events in the Persian Gulf forced Washington to resort to additional methods of influence, in particular, to establish relations with feudal monarchy countries, primarily the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar and Kuwait, based on “principle of partnership” which included their economic and social development under the control of the United States.

US Secretary of State C. Vance in the early 1970s formulated the importance of the Shah of Iran in the context of US strategic interests: his leadership ensured the necessary economic assistance to countries in the region, helped to reduce tensions in South East Asia, furthered the suppression of the rebellion in Oman, supplied oil to the West, refusing to join oil embargo of Arab countries in 1973, was a major supplier of oil to Israel [9, p. 64]. Thus, the policy of “accommodation” provided the full support of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the maximum financial and material, consultative, political and military assistance from the United States.

In the second half of the 1970s, Washington made the transition from policy of adaptation to direct pressure and attempts to legitimize the “right” of US to direct military intervention in their internal affairs. Control of the Persian Gulf area during the presidency of J. Carter (1977-1981) was seen by Washington as an integral part of the global strategy. Such actions of the United States indicated the intention of the state to make an even greater emphasis on the power factor, which was reflected in the Carter Doctrine, which declared the Persian Gulf area to be of vital interest to the United States. Under this doctrine Washington expressed readiness to use all necessary means, including military force in case any outside force attempts to gain control over the Persian Gulf [10].

The United States did not support the idea of the Islamic revolution in Iran and did not want to recognize past mistakes against the IRI, linked to boycott of Iranian oil in the early 1950s and involvement of the US in the intervention in the internal affairs of the Islamic republic, which culminated in the removal of Iranian Prime Minister M. Mosaddegh from power and converting the country to shah absolutism. Washington also suspended logistics assistance, did not consider the issue of the deportation of supporters of the shah’s regime, repatriation of R. Pahlavi’s funds and did not make serious efforts to establish cooperation with the authorities of revolutionary Iran.

One of the most important stages in the history of the US-Iranian relations was the hostage crisis, when on November 4, 1979 in response to the approval of the US leadership to host the Iranian Shah for treatment, 80 Iranian students took over the US embassy in Tehran and took hostages – 52 employees of the diplomatic mission. In response, the United States first introduced economic sanctions against the IRI. President J. Carter banned US trade with the Islamic Republic and froze \$12 million, which Tehran put into US banks. In Executive Orders of April 7 and April 17, 1980 J. Carter expanded sanctions to include a ban on all trade and tourist travel between the two countries [3, p. 73].

Carter Doctrine laid the foundation of the policy of neoglobalism, the aim of which was to achieve global influence of the US, which was supplemented in the Reagan administration (1981-1988) by the deployment of military bases’ structure, the creation of the Joint Central Command and the introduction of the nuclear deterrence element in military policy in the Gulf area. R. Reagan’s policy was based primarily on the fact that the Gulf region received absolute priority in the system of American interests [14, p. 91]. In our opinion, it is due to its geo-strategic location and the presence of significant energy and transport branches.

In January 1984, the US Secretary of State J. Schulz declared Iran a country that supports international terrorism, which further limited the development of relations with this country. Since 1984, economic restrictions on trade with Iran were steadily growing. On October 6, 1987, Congress passed a special resolution and on October 29, 1987, President Reagan signed Executive Order to ban almost all types of imports from Iran. Foreign companies that, according to the US, supply technology and military goods to Iran later also became the objects of sanctions [11, p. 85].

However, if we analyze the Middle East strategy of the US in the 1980s, it can be concluded that by the summer of 1990 the US policy towards the Persian Gulf was ineffective, as any of the negotiations or any of numerous US diplomatic initiatives with any partner in the region was not

successful. Therefore, George H. W. Bush's administration (1989-1993) received the information about the Iraq's attack of Kuwait with "some relief" as it allowed the USA to move issues of the Arab-Israeli settlement into the background [1, с. 128].

During the administrations of Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush a list of so-called "rouge states" was formed; states that violate certain international standards, including sponsoring international terrorism, provoking regional conflicts, trying to acquire weapons of mass destruction. These states were declared the "axis of evil", to which the United States included the Islamic Republic of Iran.

After the death of Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989, and after a more pragmatic politician H. Rafsanjani came to power in Iran, the US again began discussions about possible rapprochement with the IRI. However, according to American authorities, official rhetoric is at odds with the actual actions of Iran.

Efforts of Tehran to acquire weapons of mass destruction appeared to be of the particular concern to the United States [13, p. 185]. The United States were convinced that, if to maintain a strict position towards Iran, it will have to normalize relations with the West on American terms. In addition, a greater role of Washington in Middle Eastern politics began to use natural rivals of Iran – Saudi Arabia and Iraq, which gradually turned into instruments of US policy in the region.

During the administration of W. Clinton (1993-2001) the basis of the US policy in the Gulf region was the concept of "dual containment", which included a set of economic, political and, if necessary, military measures to neutralize the negative impact on security in the region by local power centers, Iraq and Iran. The concept of "dual containment" was radically rethinking some starting points of Carter Doctrine, but the continuity of the basic points of the two concepts suggests that it is a modification of its predecessor, being a response to political changes in conditions of the regional system of international relations functioning [12, p. 14].

With the formation of independent republics in Central Asia the conservative leadership of Iran gained new opportunities to export Islamist ideology and strengthen its position in the Islamic world through the including the countries of the region in the sphere of its influence. Thus, Iran is trying to create a new power center in the Middle East by involving Central Asia and Transcaucasia [9, p. 63].

In the light of these events, on January 10, 2007 the US President George W. Bush in the State of the Union accused IRI of trying to create weapons of mass destruction, supporting terrorist organizations (Hamas, Hezbollah), supporting the Shiite militia, which arranged the attacks in Iraq and appeals to destroy Israel. [15]

After the events of September 2001 global terrorism was recognized as the main threat to the US security, and in 2002 a new concept of national security of the United States was adopted, known as the Bush Doctrine. It has become an ideological and conceptual core of US policy in the region and was further developed and specified in the strategy of "promoting democracy" in the Middle East [21].

The Iranian issue, especially after the election of Iranian President M. Ahmadinejad – the representative of the radical wing – became one of the most important and the most difficult ones for the United States in the Middle East. This is primarily due to Tehran's nuclear program, which, according to American government, aims to develop nuclear weapons, as well as Iran's attempts to become a leader not only in the Middle East but throughout the Muslim world. US National Security Strategy of 2006 clearly states that no other country poses such a threat to the US as Iran [22].

In order to fulfill its tasks concerning Iran the US make the main bet on intensifying integrated pressure against the Iranian regime. This pressure includes a wide range of activities – from the creation of powerful strike group of the US Navy with several aircraft carriers and permanent "emissions" in media reports about the alleged planned attack against Iran's nuclear facilities, to a more comprehensive sanctions regime which includes economic, financial and technological sanctions.

At the same time, the US demonstrates the increasing support of the official opposition human rights, national, cultural and other organizations; this support also includes engagement in extensive information and propagation work aimed at Iran. In addition, the United States actually managed to form a military-political alliance, consisting of eight leading Sunni Arab countries, the six member countries of the Cooperation Council of Arab Gulf States, Egypt and Jordan – "6 + 2". This alliance has a clear focus and anti-Iranian direction that is designed to prevent the spread of influence of Tehran in the Arab world, especially in the "crucial" states such as Iraq, Lebanon and Palestine.

According to the State Department in 2002, the United States spent \$1.5 million on support of

Iranian human rights, humanitarian and other non-governmental organizations. In 2006 the size of these allocations has been increased to \$10 million, and in 2007 the Congress passed a law to allocate \$75 million to development of democracy in Iran [20].

After B. Obama came to power, American foreign policy toward the Middle East has undergone some changes, in particular, it was announced that the President and the government will actively work on the final settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the existing interdependent problems of Afghanistan and Pakistan [4, p. 7].

In this case, Iran will act as a factor of stability in the region. The newly elected president said he plans to make progress in talks with Iran's nuclear program by the end of 2009. In his Cairo speech he expressed his intention to resume dialogue with Tehran and to find approaches to solve its problems through negotiations. He promised economic assistance to the Iranians if they modify their nuclear program and stop supporting Hamas and Hezbollah [17, p. 23]. However, the proposal of Washington found no response from the Iranian leadership.

In October 2009 the plan that called for sending most of Iran's uranium to another country for enrichment was developed in Vienna by the United States, Russia and France. This could have significantly reduced the concerns about the opportunities of the Islamic Republic to create its own nuclear weapons. However, Tehran refused to accept the plan, playing for time and actively continuing its nuclear development [4, p. 9].

Unable to reach progress in the negotiations regarding Iran's nuclear program and progress towards normalization of US-Iranian relations, Barack Obama initiated the introduction of new, more stringent economic and political sanctions against Iran in 2011, thus recognizing the ineffectiveness of the US earlier strategy, which managed to cause significant damage to the US interests. In our opinion, the policy of dialogue with Iran has significantly ruined the friendly relations of the US with the Middle East countries such as Israel and the Arabian monarchies, for which the regional ambitions of Iran are a direct threat to their national security. In addition, failure to stop Iranian nuclear program significantly increased the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the region, pushing other Middle Eastern countries to accelerate finding an adequate response to Iran, which certainly increases the potential for regional instability.

Thus, US policy in the sub-region of the Persian Gulf and the Middle East has been formed under the influence of multiple determinants of circumstances, including political, military-strategic and ideological factors and interests.

Modification of the regional policy largely concerned the relations of the US and Iran, as the "Iranian factor" has been one of the most important ones in the regional system. The dynamics of the evolution of US political thought on the role of Iran in the regional system is similar to the Middle East transitional official concepts on this issue. With some convention the following periods of evolution can be distinguished: 1) 1950-1979 – period of prevalence of the pro-Iranian sentiments. 2) 1979-1993 – drastic transformation of the perception of Iran, which is regarded as one of the main opponents of the US in the region. 3) 1993-2001 – dominance of tough anti-Iraq positions with the gradual development of a more balanced approach to the region-wide processes. 4) 2002-2012 – commitment to military intervention to solve the problem of nuclear weapons of IRI. 5) 2013-2015 – intensive negotiations to halt Iranian nuclear program and preparation to sign the agreement.

It should be noted that during the study of the US security interests in the Persian Gulf, American political scientists put forward various plans of action that have later been used by Washington in other parts of the world (in Somalia, Bosnia, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, etc.).

Moreover, the economic interests, due to the presence of huge energy resources in this region, have been the priority and a constant factor in shaping the US policy during the studied period. The most important part of the economic interest was and remains the access to oil and gas reserves as well as production, refining and selling of Arab oil.

References:

1. Близький Схід: міжнародна безпека, регіональні відносини та перспективи для України: Монографія / Рада нац. Безпеки і оборони України, Нац. ін.-т пробл. між нар. безпеки; Відп. Редактор Б. О. Парахонський. – К.: ПЦ «Фоліант», 2008. – С. 159
2. Бртерский М. В. Политика США в отношении стран «оси зла»/ М. В. Братерський // США – Канада: Экономика. Политика. Культура. – 2003. – №4. – С. 39-57

3. Геттемюллер Р. Иран и американо-российское сотрудничество/ Геттемюллер Р. // Pro et Contra. – 2008. - №4. – С. 70-80
4. Захарченко А.М. Близькосхідна стратегія Б. Обама: традиції та інновації в американських підходах до регіону / А.М. Захарченко // Науковий вісник Одеського державного економічного університету. – 2010. - №11 (112). – С. 3-15.
5. Ініціативи Ширшого Близького Сходу і Північної Африки, 20 червня 2005 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://www.iimes.ru/rus/stat/2005/20-06-05.html>
6. План “Дорожня карта” - единственный путь к достижению мира на Ближнем Востоке, 23 Июня 2004 [Електронний ресурс] / Цент новостей ООН. – Режим доступу: <http://www.un.org/russian/news/printnews.asp?newsID=2201>
7. Швед О. В. Близький і Середній Схід у контексті Стратегії національної безпеки США: висновки для України / О. В. Швед// Стратегічна панорама. – 2006. – № 2. – С. 88-97
8. Хаас Р. Новий Близький Схід [Електронний ресурс] / Р. Хаас. – Режим доступу: <http://www.centrasia.ru/newsAphp?st=1165917600>
9. Юлдашева Г. И. Ирано-американские отношения: история и современность / Г. И. Юлдашева // США-Канада: Экономика. Политика. Культура. – 2008. – №3. – С. 53-71 [С. 64]
10. Cambanis T. The Carter Doctrine: A Middle East strategy past its prime, 13 October 2008 [Електронний ресурс] / Cambanis T. // The Boston Globe. – Режим доступу: <http://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2012/10/13/the-carter-doctrine-middle-east-strategy-past-its-prime-the-carter-doctrine-middle-east-strategy-past-its-prime/xkDcRIPaE68mFbpsUoARI/story.html>
11. Clawson P. U.S. Sanctions on Iran / P. Clawson. – Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, 1997. – P. 85
12. Klare M. T. The Clinton Doctrine / T. M. Klare // The Nation. – 1999. – 1 April. – P.14
13. Lieber R. Eagle Rules? Foreign Policy and American Primacy in Twenty-First Century / Lieber R; U.S. Prentice Hall. – Pearson Education, Inc, 2002. – p. 185
14. Pratt L. The Reagan Doctrine and the Third World / L. Pratt // Socialist Register . – 1987. – March. – P. 91
15. President Bush’s Address to the Nation, 10 January 2007 [Електронний ресурс]// The New York Times. – Режим доступу: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/10/world/middleeast/10cnd-ptext.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
16. Ravenal E. G. The Nixon Doctrine and Our Asian Commitments [Електронний ресурс] / Ravenal E. G. // Foreign Affairs. – 1971. – January. – Режим доступу: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/24219/earl-g-ravenal/the-nixon-doctrine-and-our-asian-commitments>
17. Schenker D. Obama in Cairo: Another Step toward Rapprochement? / D. Schenker // Washington Institute for Near East Policy Watch № 1523. – 2009. - May 29. – P. 11-26.
18. Shenon P. North, Poindexter and 2 others indicted on Iran-Contra fraud and theft charges [Електронний ресурс] / P. Shenon // The New York Times. – 1988. – 17 березня. – Режим доступу: <http://www.nytimes.com/1988/03/17/world/north-poindexter-and-2-others-indicted-on-iran-contra-fraud-and-theft-charges.html>
19. Singh M. Broadening the U.S. Approach on Iran / M. Singh // Washington Institute for Near East Policy Watch № 1578. – 2009. – September 15. – P. 57-68.
20. Supporting Human Rights and Democracy 2005 [Електронний ресурс] / U. S. Department of State. – Режим доступу: <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/shrd/2005/63942.htm>
21. The National Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002 [Електронний ресурс] / The White House. – Режим доступу: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
22. The National Strategy of the United States of America, March 2006 [Електронний ресурс] / The White House. – Режим доступу: <http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/nss2006.pdf>
23. Zbigniew Brzezinski: How Jimmy Carter and I Started the Mujahadeen [Електронний ресурс] / Interview of Zbigniew Brzezinski// Le Nouvel Observateur. – 1998. – 15-21Jan. – p. 76. – Режим доступу: <http://consultingbyrpm.com/blog/2010/02/zbigniew-brzezinski-how-jimmy-carter-and-i-started-the-mujahadeen.html>

Pavliuk O. I. Conceptual Approaches of the U. S. Policy towards the Persian Gulf Countries on the Example of Relations with Iran

The article studies the main formative factors of the U.S. policy toward the Persian Gulf, strategies and mechanisms for its implementation on the example of relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran. The conceptual approaches of the United States' policy in the region of the Middle East are analyzed in the paper. In the post-bipolar world containment of Iran was a major component of the US policy in the Middle East. According to the United States, it is due to the fact that Iran continues to support international terrorism, seeks to export the Islamic revolution, increasing its military and technical capabilities, including the development of a nuclear program and prevents the settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In response, making pressure on the Iranian economy, the US is trying to limit Iran's financial capacity to sponsor its illegal activity. The author argues that a constant priority factor in shaping US policy in this subregion was given to economic interests, determined by the presence of huge energy resources here. The most important economic interest was and remains the access to oil and gas reserves, such as production, refining and selling of Arab oil.

Keywords: foreign policy concept, the USA, political doctrine, the Persian Gulf, the Islamic Republic of Iran, American foreign policy.

Павлюк О. И. Концептуальное обеспечение политики США в отношении стран Персидского залива на примере отношений с Ираном

В статье исследуются основные факторы формирования политики США в отношении стран Персидского залива, стратегии и механизмы ее осуществления на примере отношений с Исламской Республикой Иран. Анализируются концептуальные подходы политики Соединенных Штатов в регионе Ближнего и Среднего Востока. В постбиполярном мире сдерживания Ирана стало для США основным компонентом политики в ближневосточном регионе. С точки зрения Соединенных Штатов, это обусловлено тем, что Иран продолжает поддерживать международный терроризм, стремится к экспорту исламской революции, наращивает свои военно-технические возможности, включая развитие ядерной программы, препятствует урегулированию палестино-израильского конфликта. В ответ, осуществляя давление на иранскую экономику, США пытаются ограничить финансовые возможности Ирана спонсировать свою противоправную активность. Автор утверждает, что стабильным и приоритетным фактором формирования политики США в отношении указанного субрегиона выступали экономические интересы, обусловленные наличием здесь огромных энергетических ресурсов. Важнейшим из экономических интересов был и остается доступ к нефтегазовым запасам, а именно добыча, переработка и реализация арабской нефти.

Ключевые слова: внешнеполитическая концепция, США, политическая доктрина, Персидский залив, Исламская Республика Иран, американская внешняя политика.