



International
Centre for Development
Initiatives

championing excellence in skills development



corporate training
professional development

research
consulting
training
education
support



Any part of this paper may be freely reproduced with the appropriate acknowledgement. The author is responsible for the choice and presentation of the facts contained in the is book and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of ICDI and do not commit the Organization.

© International Centre for Development Initiatives (ICDI) 2014

International Development and Advocacy Sector

ICDI

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AL- ARAB LEAGUE

CE- COUNCIL OF EUROPE

EU- EUROPEAN UNION

FS- FRIENDS OF SYRIA

G8- GROUP OF EIGHT

IAEA- INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

OFAC-OFFICE OF FOREIGN ASSETS CONTROL

SNC- SYRIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL

US- UNITED STATES

UK- UNITED KINGDOM

UN- UNITED NATIONS

WB- WORLD BANK

Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	2
DECLARATION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ABSTRACT.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER ONE:	6
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.....	6
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	6
1.2 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY.....	9
1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	10
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	11
1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	11
1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY.....	12
1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	13
1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	14
1.9 RESEARCH DESIGN	15
1.10 LIMITATIONS AND ETHICAL ISSUES.....	15
CHAPTER TWO:	18
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	18
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	18
TABLE 2.01	18
2.1 UNITED STATES AS A GLOBAL ACTOR IN WORLD POLITICS AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT	27
2.2 THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY ON THE MIDDLE EAST.....	29
2.3 UNITED STATES AFFILIATION WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.....	30
2.4 THE EFFECT OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN IRAN.....	30
2.5 IRAN’S MEMBERSHIP IN THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY AND UNITED NATIONS.....	32
2.6 THE EFFECT OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN SYRIA	32
2.7 IRAN FOREIGN RELATIONS WITH SYRIA.....	34
2.8 SYRIA FOREIGN RELATIONS TOWARDS IRAN	35
CHAPTER THREE:	38
ANALYSIS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.0 UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IRAN AND SYRIA.....	38
3.1 FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO INFLUENCING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IRAN AND SYRIA	45
CHAPTER FOUR:	47

4.0 THE UNITED STATES AS AN ACTOR IN WORLD POLITICS AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IRAN AND SYRIA	47
4.1 THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN SANCTIONS TOWARDS IRAN	49
4.2 THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN SANCTIONS TOWARDS SYRIA	51
CHAPTER FIVE:	52
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	52
5.0 SUMMARY	52
5.1 EXPECTATIONS	53
5.2 RECOMMENDATION	53
5.3 CONCLUSIONS	54
5.4 FINDINGS:.....	54
REFERENCES:.....	57

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research work illustrates the roles of United States as a major and powerful actor in world politics and crisis management with a comparative analysis of Syria and Iran. The United States leadership role in world politics and its position as a superpower nation is explored in this study. The United States foreign policies towards Iran and Syria and its involvement in the relationship between these two aforementioned countries will be examined and analysed. This research study also analyses the United States concerns in the Iranian nuclear weapons programme and the Syria's civil war.

The angles at which this research study explores this topic is through the background of the study; literature reviews; theoretical frameworks; analysis of the United States involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran; the factors that contribute to influencing their relationship; and impact of the United States foreign sanctions towards Iran and Syria.

Keywords: Geopolitics, Hegemony, Superpower, Democracy promotion, Regional power, United States foreign policy, Iran, Syria, Strategic alliance.

CHAPTER ONE:

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Countries across the world interact with each other either for political, socioeconomic, military and security reasons. According to Bandyopadhyaya, communication in international relations does not mean simply the transmission of messages but includes all forms of transactions among the structural units of an international system including political, diplomatic, economic, military, cultural and technological transactions (Bandyopadhyaya, 1993, p.226).

This thesis, explores some theoretical aspects of power relations in international relations. A researcher illustrated, that constructivism has offered some essential themes in international relations in conformity with state identity, interest in global politics, and the theoretical aspects of domestic politics and culture in international politics (Linklater, 2000). According to some authors, international relations theory is closely affiliated with the Cold War in response to alterations within the dynamics of conflict (Burke, Devetak and George, 2012). Koivisto, also highlighted, that the creation of state power can be domestic in terms of 'structures of the state' and international in relations to 'state actors'. Gill, on the other hand emphasised, that the concept of power in relation to 'hegemony' as a form of power historically connects to dominance and subordination in relation to world order (Gill, 1993).

In another perspective, the United States foreign policy after the Cold War has been perceived to operate on a unilateral platform. Malone and Khong illustrated, that "unilateralism" refers to a tendency to act alone in resolving or addressing particular regional or global issues rather than participating in a collective action platform (Malone and Khong, 2003). The United States tendency to act alone in global, political issues and other related matters has made it the most dominant and influential country in the world so far.

Subsequently, it can be said that the United States has strong affiliation and influence within organizations and institutions such as the World Bank, United Nations Security Council, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Monetary Fund, European Union (EU) and others. It can be perceived that the America, represent itself as an independent sovereign nation with great influence around the world. It can also be perceived from the above that the United States preserves its interest through cooperation which serves to strengthen these organizations and institutions rather than weakening them.

According to some researchers, the United States has remained a sole superpower that adequately confronts tyranny abroad and without any remorse or apologies to promoting its own interests and values (Dably, Routledge and Tuathail, 2000 : 121). Wade in 2002, argues that the term hegemony refers to the domination of a groups capabilities to influence others to do the same thing or react in the same way as it wants or acts for itself (Wade, 2002, p.201).

This research study, examines the United States as a superpower and promoter of democracy worldwide. Smith in 1994, highlighted that the benefits of democracy globally has greatly depended on the power of America (Smith, 1994, p.10). Newman and Rich, identified that United States' promotion of democracy reflects a logical, progressing and sophisticated understanding of how to create a stable international political order and an affable security environment (Newman and Rich, 2004, p.191). However, its intentions to democratize other nations depend on its absolute involvement in the countries they intend to develop a relationship with. According to Schraeder, America's search for global democratization within periods of time, has offered an ambiguous combination of altruistic aspirations and concrete national self-interest (Schraeder, 2002, p.109).

The United States as actors in world politics has remained unchallenged in its effort at making various attempts to contribute its quota in resolving conflicts or crisis around the globe. Robert, writes that America is the only superpower that thinks and acts globally more than any other country and has made human rights an important part of its foreign policy (Robert, 1995). It can be further emphasised, that America being the most powerful state in the world intervenes in world politics and also render its assistance in periods of crisis within

and amongst states. According to Feste, “[t]he United States as sole superpower occupies a special place...existing conditions within and among countries throughout the world provide fodder for a superpower to construct new rules and policies of involvement, determining when, where, why and how to intervene” (Feste, 2003, p.1). It has also been perceived that the United States dominance within the 21st century, has created some increasing sensitivity amongst other countries with regard to the manner in which the United States uses its massive power. It can also be said that Anti-Americanism within the past year can be traced to its foreign policy since after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks (Nye, 2004).

On the other hand, the United States has been facing stiff resistance across various parts of the world in general thereby making its intervention quite difficult. Khan, writes that “[t]he United States, though a close ally to Israel, is trying hard to connect with Muslims at home and abroad. Unfortunately, anti- Americanism runs deep through the entire Muslim world, despite many Muslim governments’ alliances with the United States” (Khan, 2011, p.380).

This thesis, intends to examine the events that followed after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, particularly at the United States involvement, in the relationship between Iran and Syria, with reference to ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration and current democratic administration of President Barack Obama towards these two countries. This work, will examine explicitly, geopolitical reasons of the United States involvement in the relationship between these countries. It intends to explore the factors that contribute to influencing the relationship between the aforementioned countries, and also examine the highlights of current events between them.

1.2 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

The thesis will make use of a case study and a comparative analysis of United States foreign policy towards Iran and Syria, and the interest the United States has towards these countries. This research study will focus on Iran and Syria with emphasis on their similar interests and characteristics.

This research work will also begin by conducting a detailed description on some theoretical aspects of power relations in international relations and the United States foreign policy after the Cold War. This will be followed by examining the United States as global actor in world politics and crisis management along with two paired case studies which is Iran and Syria. This work, will also examine the events that followed after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks with particular reference to ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration along with the current Democratic administration of President Barack Obama and its foreign relations with Iran and Syria.

Chapter two will provide a literature review with a theoretical framework on America's foreign policy in Syria and Iran. The review in chapter two will also provide some insight to the United States being a global actor in world politics and crisis management; the impact of the American foreign policy on the middle east; the United States affiliation with International organizations; the effect of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States foreign policy in Syria and Iran; Iran's foreign relations with Syria; Syria foreign relation with Iran; and Iran's membership in the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency. Chapter three will give an analytical insight on the United States involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran and the factors that contribute to influencing the relationship between these two countries. This review will provide a research on the United States foreign policies and its interests in the relationship between the aforementioned countries. It will also identify certain aim and objectives of the United States foreign relations between the two nations. It will in addition attempt to identify the United States national interests and strategic aims towards Iran and Syria.

Chapter four will give a comparative case study of the topic and examine the impact of the United States foreign sanctions towards Iran and Syria while chapter five will be dedicated to summarizing expectations, recommendations, findings and conclusion.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The events since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, has created a high level of insecurity and mistrust between the Islamic world and the United States. The bilateral relationship between Iran and Syria has created tension between these two countries and the United States. In the ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration and its foreign policy towards Iran on its acquisition and enrichment of uranium, has created intense friction between the United States and the government of Iran. The George Bush's administration has constantly been preventing the Iranian government from acquiring a nuclear warhead capability, which Iran had consistently denied stating that its nuclear capabilities are only for research purposes. The Bush's Administration created minute opportunities for diplomacy between its administration and the Iranian government. The aim of Bush's administration to curb the excesses of the Iranian nuclear weapons ambition had made the administration to create strict foreign policies to which the Iranian government has refused to abide to or responds negatively. It should be noted that the nature of the United States foreign policy is to provide opportunities for dialogue and cooperation which could influence some decision making processes. However, there is some aspect of collapse in reaching a consensus where diplomacy fails to achieve its objectives. Armstrong in 2005, highlights the George W. Bush's Administration in relevance to diplomacy where states can withhold their support based on the grounds of legality and legitimacy (Armstrong, Farrell and Maiguashca, 2005). The Bush's administration towards Syria, has also consistently regarded the Syrian regime as sponsors of international terrorism and made less effort in engaging the Syrian government in a constructive dialogue due to Syria's lack of cooperation.

The current President Barack Obama's Administration inheriting most of the foreign policies of the former president George W. Bush Administration, has created further tensions between the government of Iran and Syria which has only increased with its consistent

embargoes and sanctions towards the two nations. Though there are opportunities for diplomacy however, this has become less frequent due to the sanctions and embargoes which has affected the relationship between these trios.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions will attempt to test three hypotheses in the development and test of this thesis. The three hypotheses are as follows:

- a) What is the United States involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran and what do they hope to achieve?
- b) What are the events that followed after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks with particular reference to ex-president George W. Bush Republican Administration and the current Democratic Administration of President Barack Obama towards these two countries?
- c) What are the factors that contribute to influencing the relationship between Syria and Iran?

These research questions will be explored in evaluating the objectives of the United States foreign policies towards Syria and Iran; what it hopes to achieve in its involvement; how they plan to achieve it; why they want to achieve it; the strategies adopted in bid to achieving its aims /objectives; its national interests between the countries (Iran and Syria); the effectiveness of its foreign policies in relation to its national security; the impact of its foreign-backed sanctions; its impact so far and America's role in its relationship between Syria and Iran.

1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of this research work is to determine the influence of the United States as a global actor in world politics and crisis management and its involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran. It also aims to examine certain gaps in the United States foreign policies towards its relations with these two countries. The objectives of this thesis are as follows:

- i. To provide a detailed background of the United States foreign policy towards their allies, particularly its policies towards Syria and Iran.
- ii. To examine the United States involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran.
- iii. To examine the factors that contributes to influencing the relationship between Syria and Iran.
- iv. To provide a comparative analysis between Syria and Iran.
- v. To review the relationship between the George W. Bush Administration and President Barack Obama's Administration towards Syria and Iran.

In examining a detailed background to the United States foreign policy, emphasis will relate to the events after the Cold War and America's bid to relate with countries and international organizations on a unilateral platform and how it tends to promote democracy across the world. It will also evaluate the effects of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the impact on America's foreign policy towards Syria and Iran. In determining the objectives of the United States, it will reveal its intentions to exert its influence in Iran and Syria by involving itself in their cordial and foreign relations with each other. It will examine some of the aims of the United States through its foreign policy which dictates the role it executes in the regions of Iran and Syria. These foreign policies by the United States as will be later examined, is in its bid to protect certain interests and strategic aims it has within the region.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This thesis will examine the United States foreign policy and the events that followed after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. It will also explore America's involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran; its interest and strategic aims toward them and what it hopes to achieve. This work will also examine the bilateral, multilateral, political, economic

and military relations between these countries and other state and non-state actors involved or affiliated with them. This thesis will give a broader insight to the factors that contribute to the relationship between Iran and Syria. Emphasis will be made to their past and present relations and factors as to what maintains their foreign relations with each other. On the other hand, this topic will also examine the cultural and domestic issues that have influenced the United States government foreign policy towards Iran and Syria; the difficulties that America has to endure and what it hopes to achieve through the impact of its foreign policies in Iran and Syria. A comparative analysis will be explored on Iran and Syria as well as emphasis on the multiple sanctions and embargoes imposed on the aforementioned countries.

1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This thesis will examine the history of America as an actor in global politics and crisis management and how, as an influential superpower, they tend to have a great impact worldwide. The significance of the study will reveal the United States' superiority through its foreign policies mitigated on certain state actors and non-state actors that they have a relationship with based on its own interest. It will also evaluate the impact its foreign policies has attempted to achieve since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, most especially towards Iran and Syria. It will evaluate the foreign relations and benefits that Iran and Syria has between themselves. The United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria will be evaluated and the effect of its foreign sanctions will also be evaluated. Certain factors that contribute to the relationship between Iran and Syria will also be discussed.

Based on this study of the United States being a global actor in world politics and crisis management through the implementation of its foreign policy and its relation with state and non-state actors, it will essentially provide the political class the basic understanding to diplomacy and conflict in world politics and crisis management.

1.8 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The aim of this methodology is to observe and examine the United States as a global actor in world politics and crisis management with a comparative analysis of Iran and Syria; also to explore the reaction of the two United States presidential administrations in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks towards Iran and Syria.

This dissertation will rely essentially on secondary data. The necessary extractions will be from letters, photos, newspapers, diaries, statutes, laws, personal papers, organizational papers, political speeches, ministerial records, administrative and governmental committee records. The secondary data aims at acquiring information through mediums such as journal articles, books, dictionaries, newspaper articles, encyclopaedias and other sources that are categorized as non-human which does not involve any kind of human subjects.

The use of qualitative research method in comparison to the quantitative research will be explored. The reason being, that qualitative research methods have sections and areas for collection of information and data in terms of secondary data collection. As previously mentioned, this thesis will be based on secondary data which will make the topic more exploratory in nature. Qualitative research does not key in on specific methodologies, and opportunities are given to researchers who explore this area of study in their analysis of research. This could be interpreted as a methodological diversity, which occurs within the research environment and the qualitative approaches adopted by each researcher and the method used. The researcher may also reflect some characteristics of a qualitative research method and could identify a series of decisions that follow thereafter.

Qualitative research can be said to be less expensive in comparison with quantitative research methods and is effective in terms of acquiring information. Qualitative research methods can be said to be a good choice in which information will not be collected by quantitative measures.

1.9 RESEARCH DESIGN

This research will make use of qualitative research methods. The various data will be collected from secondary research sources which include newspapers, diaries, administrative or research records, letters and other such as books, articles, journals and other sources categorized as non-human sources such as the internet-based source. Data will also be collected from quotes, codified reports and speeches of experts and individuals who are considered to be knowledgeable in the field of political science and international relations as well as acquiring some opinions on the impact of the United States foreign policies.

This thesis will largely depend on archival materials online and offline. There will also be visits to embassies in regards to the actors involved, that is the United States, Iran and Syria, to gather relevant materials for the dissertation. Official publications that will be used, will interpret some of the events and actions by these countries. There will be use of secondary sources based on bilateral and multilateral relations between Iran, Syria, United States and other allied countries involved. Evidently, sources such as journals, books, articles, newspapers, official statements and internet sources will be additionally be explored.

1.10 LIMITATIONS AND ETHICAL ISSUES

Ethical issues in this thesis will be given essential considerations due to the style of the issues observed, findings identified, the research methodology, the composition, sample and the result of the research based on its contributors. Emphasis will be applied in the literature of the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria; the values of expanding a methodology will also be improved through explicit views on the literature and the barriers that have to be overcome from the various United States policies.

The risk in the methodology may be examined in respect of the information source. The validity of the information derived, will have to come from certain sensitive or confidential materials which may be difficult to locate for reasons that it is not public materials and such document belongs to the government. Evidently, through informal and formal process of gathering information from individuals and certain officials in ministries or at the embassies,

all relevant material needed for the thesis will be assessed. However, due to time and cost constraints, every aspect of this topic cannot be fully analysed though relevant aspects of this dissertation will be explored.

CHAPTER TWO:

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Countries relate with one another across the world for political, socioeconomic military and security reasons. According to Stivachtis, “[i]nterconnectedness of the world resulting from globalization increases the cooperation between and among countries and at the same time makes countries more dependent on each other for their own economic, cultural and military security” (Stivachtis, 2007, p.85). It can also be emphasised, that contemporary states extends their political power in relating with other states which facilitates cooperation and resolution of conflicts which aims to maximize its security (Danziger, 2001).

This review, examines certain aspects of power relations in international relations. This aspect has offered some central themes in international relations in conformity with international relations theories such as classical realism, neorealism, neo-classical realism, liberalism and constructivism which is closely affiliated with the Cold War. Research by Paul, gave illustrations of certain variables and paradigms of these theories as shown below;

TABLE 2.01

Paradigm	Main Variable	Outcome
Classical realism	Balance of power, hegemonic preponderance	Stability
Neorealism	Distribution of power among major powers	Bipolarity-stability; other structures-instability
Neoclassical realism	Balance of power + domestic-level factors	Stability/ peace or conflict
Liberalism	Institutions; democracy, economic interdependence	Peace
Constructivism	Proper ideas, identity, practice	Security/ Community

TABLE 2.01:(Sourced by: Paul, 2012, p.16).

Evidently, international relations can be said to be the struggle for power and peace. Thereby only countries have power and their power in essence can only be limited by the power of other countries. An author highlighted, the struggle for power which nations aim for to secure their national interests which can however be effectively limited by the power of another nation (Vasquez, 1998, p.37). According to a researcher, the hierarchy of the international system coerces states to secure themselves which may led them to act aggressively with each other (Elias and Sutch, 2007, p.10). In their analysis Olson and Groom, gave an illustration of America with its size, resource, position and its political capabilities, has become a superpower centre of the world (Olson and Groom, 1991). The sovereignty of nations has an essential effect in the manner politics by which its executed theories of peace develops the theories of war and these concerns gave birth to theories such as liberalism and realism.

The aspect of theories within the American foreign policy can be recognized by the following central theories such as defensive realism, offensive realism, liberalism, primacy, marxism, and constructivism. In defensive realism, defensive realist within the American foreign policy theory identify that states are security maximizers. Offensive realist, argue that a state continually search and acquires more power in relative to other states. Liberalist, argue the expansion of democracy and individual liberty. The Marxist, emphasis the economic aspects of the United States which underlines capitalism. Constructivists, argue that state identity and interest executes a major role in the American foreign policy. Primacy seeks to distinguish America as an undisputed power in the international system. Research by Cox and Stokes, illustrated five sources that could influence a nation's foreign policy which includes external/ international system, societal environment, governmental structures, bureaucratic roles and individual personalities. These sources, can be identified as independent variables which collectively explains the foreign policy behaviour of America which is the dependent variable (Cox and Stokes, 2008, p.9).

This review, examines the concept of power in relation to hegemony. Gill (1993) argues, that the notion or idea of power in relation to 'hegemony' historically connects to dominance and subordination in relation to world order. It can be said to emphasis the

geopolitical and some cultural predominance of a nation upon another nation. It also means the establishment of imperial dominance where a superpower state dictates the domestic and internal politics of a subordinate state.

The United States foreign policy after the Cold War has been perceived to operate on a unilateral platform. Malone and Khong, illustrated that “unilateralism” refers to a tendency to act alone in resolving or addressing particular regional or global issues rather than participating in a collective action platform(Malone and Khong, 2003). This trend of unilateralism by the United States creates a lot of constraints between it and other countries in the aspect of conducting a multilateral framework. The reason being, that the United States in pursuit of its own national interest opt out of multilateral frameworks so as not to subject itself to a generalized principle of conduct which may be inimical to their interest. However, since September 11, 2001 the United States still adopting a unilateral military action in its “war against terrorism”, has also depended on a mix of both bilateral and multilateral trends to acquire the cooperation of its allies.

Evidently, the United States has strong affiliation and influence within international organizations and institutions such as the United Nations, United Nations Security Council, European Union, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and others. Emphasis on this can be perceived that the America tend to represent itself as an independent sovereign state with influence around the world. In essence, from the above indication it can be perceived that America preserves its own interests through cooperation which serves to strengthen these international organizations and institutions rather than weakening them. On the other hand, according to some researchers, the United States is the only superpower with military capabilities in terms of its unipolar framework and hegemony (Nye, 2004). In other words, the world in general is characterized by the United States hegemony (Fukuyama, 2006).

This review, explores America as a global superpower and promoter of democracy. However, its intentions to democratise other countries depends on its absolute involvement in the countries that they intend to establish a relationship with. Schraeder, argues that America’s pursuit of democratizing the world, historically serves an ambiguous addition of altruistic aspirations and strong national interest (Schraeder, 2002, p.109). America, has

remained unchallenged in its effort to contribute its quota in resolving conflicts around the world. The United States being the most powerful nation worldwide, intervenes in world politics and renders its assistance in periods of crisis within and between states or nations. However, the United States leadership within the 21st century has created some increasing resistance amongst countries in regards to the United States massive power. Anti-Americanism within the previous years can be traced to the United States foreign policies most especially after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks (Nye, 2004). Khan, points out that the United States has found it difficult to connect with the Muslims internally and internationally and this has made anti-Americanism to run deep through the entire Muslim world despite some alliance with the United States (Khan, 2011, p.380).

This review, further examines the ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration's policies as meted out on Iran and Syria particularly after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States. Gilpin, argues that the unfortunate behaviour of the United States towards the Middle East by the Bush administration particularly after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks has created excessive United States policies towards the Muslim world (Gilpin, 2005). This review also examines the less cordial relationship between the ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration towards Iran and Syria and the course of his administration where the former president has described the government of these two countries as an "Axis of Evil". Bardes, Shelly and Schmidts emphasised that, in the early periods of his Republican presidency, George W. Bush identified Iran as a member of an "Axis of evil"(Bardes, Shelly and Schmidts, 2008, p.518).

According to a researcher, Iran has consistently been profiled by the ex-president George W. Bush administration as an "Axis of Evil" and the former president's administration has accused the government of Iran as being "exporters of terror" and state "sponsors of terrorism" by which they constitute a global threat due to its perceived nuclear weapons ambition(Amuzegar, 2003). Cebeci (2011) emphasised, that the ex-president George W. Bush administration has perceived Iran as a constant threat which must be confronted.

This review, subsequently examines the term "Axis of Evil" which was used by the United States and its allies like Israel to identify common enemies towards America and to raise the momentum on "the war on terror". Rogers in 2008, researched that the United States has

engaged itself in a prolonged war on terror which would take in opposition any country perceived to be against them; thereby requiring their allies consistent support in ensuring a stable world in the Western image with the assured and persistent use of coercion which is available to provide stability when required (Rogers, 2008). Having emphasised on this, the Bush's administration has remained consistently focused in the perceived nuclear weapons ambition of the government of Iran which has minimised diplomatic talks by simply avoiding to hold direct talks with Iran. Fields, argues that the ex-president George W. Bush administration had in 2003 ignored Iran's offer to improve its relations with them through negotiations without conditions (Fields, 2007). The United States, has however in its course engaged the United Nations weapon inspectors and other European Union allies to initiate talks with Iran. The policies of the United States, has perceived Iran to be a "rogue nation". Litwak, illustrated that America's main objective in its foreign policy has been the containment of the term "rogue or outlaw" as asserted by some senior United States policy makers towards Iran (Litwak, 2000).

Evidently, the Bush's administration and its foreign policy towards the government of Syria had the same reaction which is quite similar to Iran. The United States policies towards the Syrian government, has identified them to be state sponsors of terrorism. A researcher in 2010, writes that the term "Axis of Evil" was commonly featured by the American government in describing the Republic of Syria (Chapman, 2010).

On the other hand, this review explores the current democratic administration of President Barack Obama. Having inherited in his first term, some of ex-president George W. Bush's administration's foreign policies and other issues like the war in Afghanistan. President Obama's administration is still having a relevant role in its involvement with Iran and Syria which in his administration is less cordial in most cases.

The United States with its influence within the United Nations and the United Nations Security Council, has associated itself with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to supervise and monitor the Iranian government nuclear weapons facilities to check on whether it is abiding to the regulations of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to which Iran is a member and a signatory to the treaty. Williams and Viotti, highlighted that the Non-Proliferation Treaty has made certain agreements for the international

containment of nuclear weapons which are consistently monitored and enforced through the United Nations (William and Viotti, 2012).

However, other writers argue that President Barack Obama's administration through its foreign policies, has sponsored foreign sanctions as a result of Iran's perceived nuclear weapons programme through its uranium enrichment activities which has caused increased tension between the two nations. Roshandel (2011) emphasised, that America and Iran has persistently engaged themselves in a "cold war" which is characterized by a continuous tension that has decreased the hope of better relations between the two nations (Roshandel, 2011). The United States, has persistently accused Iran of attempting to manufacture near weapon grade nuclear material with its direct reference to Iran's threat to Israel. According to Menashri in 2001, Israel was identified by the Islamic regime as its arch enemy and Israel had also missed no opportunity to emphasise the threat towards it and its evil character (Menashri, 2001).

Some researchers writes that Iran had emphasised its reasons for the nuclear weapons programme which is basically for energy purpose, research and medical reasons; declaring it for peaceful purposes only. Kidwai, highlighted that Iran had intended to enrich uranium that would permit it to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes (Kidwai, 2010). The United States foreign policy has however through the Obama administration made known its intentions to hold future talks with the Iranian government to curb its nuclear weapons programme. Holmes and Carafano , identified that President Obama's administration had recently made attempts to reach out to Iran still emphasising that its "doors was still open" for peace with the condition that Iran dismantles its nuclear weapons programme (Holmes and Carafano, 2010).

This review, examines the United States involvement in the Syrian war which began in 2011 evident that President Bashar al-Assad still clings to power with the hope that his regime will be of a stable, tolerant democracy. However, this is still daunted by the fear of prolonged sectarian tensions and Islamist extremist groups that may cease power after he leaves power. The United States policies towards Syria, has shown interest in the region since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. The researcher aims to identify some of these interest that describes some of the interest of the United States involvement with Syria.

The United States under the Obama's administration, has however aimed to show its interest by offering military support to the Syrian opposition which has frustrated any hope of future diplomatic talks to resolve the crisis. Lowy Institute for international policy (2010, p.10) reiterated that "support sanctions against the regime in Damascus and non-lethal support for the Syrian opposition".

The broader literature examines the George W. Bush administration and the democratic administration of President Barack Obama towards Iran and Syria. The response of the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria, has been characterized as insufficient and problematic due to persistent foreign sanctions which has created intense tension between these countries. The United States involvement has been problematic thereby creating resistance by Iran and Syria in holding direct talks with delegates from the United Nations Security Council. The United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria has only strengthened the relationship between Iran and Syria. Some writers have identified these close relationships between these two countries.

In order to demonstrate the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria, it is argued by the researcher to be for geopolitical purpose or reason. The United States with the support from its allied relations with Israel, Turkey, Jordan and others, has intentions of weakening President Bashar al-Assad regime so as to also weaken the Iranian regime that would at the same time affect Iran's and Syrian relations alongside its allies like Russia and the Hezbollah (a political and military faction in Lebanon) to gain regional power and support. Iran and the Hezbollah organization, has a close alliance with Syria. Syria on the other hand, has been a transit area for weapon shipment by Iran to aid the Hezbollah a Shiite sect in Lebanon. Syria and Iran, has supported the Hezbollah which has been a leverage against the Israeli government to achieve its regional and territorial aims.

On the other hand, writers argue that though Iran and Syria are close allies this however has not been so in the past as Syria relation with Iran had not been so cordial. The various factors that have contributed in influencing the relationship between Iran and Syria became more evident after the ex-president George W. Bush administration following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. It has also been emphasised that Iran and Syria

longstanding relationship, has been more consistent due to their animosity towards the United States administration. Lawson in 2007, illustrated the Syrian-Iranian relationship as an “alliance dilemma” (Lawson, 2007).

Evidently, Iran has been a great influence in the Syrian civil war by providing finance and weapons aid to the Bashar al-Assad regime. Davis, writes that Iran has given financial aid and support to Syria (Davis, 2003). Iran also renders its assistance to Syria, by smuggling arms to the Hezbollah military organization which is a political and military faction in Lebanon which borders Israel.

Subsequently, Iran and Syria share a common interest as they share a resentment towards the West and Israel. Rubin in 2002, highlighted the Arab and Muslim resentment towards the United States (Rubin, 2002). It is argued, that the Iranian and Syrian government share military ties and both have offered each other security at some point. According to a researcher in 2010, identified that the regional powers have pooled political and military leverage to the point of national support (Wright, 2010).

Iran, has been said to be an active participant in the Syrian war rendering technical and intelligence support by providing military equipment. Smith, highlighted that the Iranian-Syrian military aid through the Iranian regime has offered financial assistance to Syria (Smith, 2011). Sharp, also identified that the Iranian government has invested greatly in Syria through its banking and industrial sector (Sharp, 2011). Some researchers have identified that Iran and Syria through its relationships has made strong attempts to frustrate the West. Miles (2013) states, that the International Atomic Energy Agency has frequently inspected the Iranian nuclear facilities and has not accepted that Iran should be isolated on a mere allegation of a perceived nuclear programme (Miles, 2013). Leverett, highlighted the deteriorating relationship between Syria and America since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks (Leverett, 2005).

In another perspective, the Iranian and Syrian government share a common interest and also despise their common enemies as Salome in 2010, highlights how these two government share common adversaries (Salome, 2010). A research by Fisk, also states that Iran has identified America and Israel as common enemies (Fisk, 2001).

The United States foreign policy is characterized in its attempts to hold direct talks with stalled results as both the Iranian government and the United Nations Security Council have failed to reach an agreement. As Iran is still accused in its alleged nuclear weapons programme which, has resulted to both parties remaining “far apart” (Blair, 2013). The United States foreign policies towards Iran are commanded by increased foreign sanctions against Iran thereby weakening the Iranian economy. Iran on the other hand, has expanded its ability to produce uranium by increasing its centrifuge inside its nuclear plant and enriching its programme by also opening new uranium mines and yellowcake production plants (Titterton, 2013). The United States, has however through its diplomatic gestures to the Iranian government warned of a possible military action if Iran fails to suspend its acquisition of uranium for the development of their perceived nuclear weapons programme which Iran still denied developing.

On the other hand, the war in Syria has made both the United States and the European Union increase its weapons embargo on President Bashar al-Assad’s regime. The United States with some members of the European Union, has considered lifting the weapons embargo to support the Syrian opposition fighting the President Bashar al-Assad regime. Russia has however maintained its support of the Assad regime and has condemned the European Union against the lifting of the embargo to supporting and supplying weapons to foreign backed militants in Syria. Countries such as France and Britain, has offered to support the Syrian opposition by arming Syrian rebels which is on the other hand facing stiff resistance by Russia.

The United States foreign alliance with the Syrian opposition to provide non-lethal or military and financial aid to the Syrian rebels reflects a strong indication of its determination to weaken the Assad’s regime to enable them have territorial control and regional power over the government of Syria and Iran. This certain identifications are highlighted in its relationship with its allies such as Israel which, has consistently felt threatened by Iran and Syria as these countries are both affiliated to the Hezbollah in Lebanon which has constantly rendered its support and manpower in the Syrian war. The Russian and Iranian support of the Syrian war has only strengthened their ties to each other and neither Russia nor Iran is ready to relinquish its ties with Syria as they have both military and financial relationship with the other.

As identified by the researcher, attempts by the United States to collaborate with Syria has proved abortive due to the sanctions and embargos against the Syrian government which has made the Assad regime resist talks with the United States government. The United Nations on the other hand, has made strong emphasis of the war in Syria and Iran's perceived nuclear weapons programme ambition and has sent delegates in making various attempts to resolve the issues between these countries. The "humanitarian catastrophe" in the Syrian crisis has also been the centre focus for the United Nations. However, for the United States it can be said that their interest on Iran and Syria is based on regional control as they are perceived to be assisting the Syrian rebels in removing President Bashar al-Assad from power.

In conclusion, this review has attempted to highlight the main trends in the literature thereby relating it to the issues raised in this dissertation.

2.1 UNITED STATES AS A GLOBAL ACTOR IN WORLD POLITICS AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT

The United States after the cold war has remained the only superpower that has sufficient military and economic strength and is making attempts to be the major controlling power in international politics (Chatterjee, 2010, p. 56). Kellogg highlights, that after the cold war America has remained a sole superpower (Kellogg, 2010). Fabbrini (2006) also identified, that America is the only independent superpower on earth. America, has proved itself capable of great influence in global politics and worldwide dominance.

Lockard, has emphasised that America has within the hemisphere remained a dominant power (Lockard, 2006). The United States, has remained a global actor in world politics and

has been influential in both domestic and international politics of other nations. America according to some writers, has been identified to be one of the richest and most powerful country in the world (Tintero and Manacsa, 2002). It can also be emphasised that the United States, as a superpower has been capable enough to confront tyranny both within and abroad. Nye in 2004, writes that the America is the only independent power with military capabilities in the terms of unipolarity or hegemony (Nye, 2004). Fukuyama, argues that America is characterized by its hegemony which has influenced the world (Fukuyama, 2006, p.8).

Subsequently, the United States has encouraged democracy in countries where it is tolerated and supported. A researcher, writes that America is a promoter of democracy worldwide (Orozco, 2002). The United States, being a promoter of democracy has made the respect for human rights part of its primary objective of its foreign policy. Huntington in 1999, states that America values its practices in relations to democracy and human right (Huntington, 1999). Loughlin et al (1998), write that the United States promotes democracy, constructs civil societies and assesses national economies to a neoliberal world order (Loughlin et al, 1998, p.546).

However, criticisms has been made toward the United States of its unilateral effort in promoting democracy which has been perceived to be illegitimate and a violation of the sovereignty of the target nation it intends to develop or intervene which sometimes backfires (Pevehouse, 2002). On the other hand, the United States intentions to promote democracy often depends on its absolute involvement and self- interest. According to some authors, in regards to democracy within a state, the national interest can be described to be the a set of shared priorities regarding relations with the rest of the world” (Kesley, Scott and Wittkopf, 2003, p.521).

In another perspective, the United States as global actor is known for its role in crisis management and executes its part in making an effort to intervene in periods of conflict within and amongst states or nations. Rose in 2002, writes that the United States in times of conflict has intervened militarily and through other means within regions (Rose, 2002). It can be said that the United States foreign policy since the twentieth century has mainly represented itself as an external intervener and such external intervention, is crucial in

handling the course and outcome of the conflicts (Aydin, 2012). Allison, argues that the United States intervening in regional conflicts either directly or indirectly sometimes create some opportunities for geopolitical advancement (Allison, 1990). After the cold war America, has made it paramount and a primary objective in its foreign policies to intervene (Schraeder, 1994).

In conclusion, the United States as an actor in global politics and crisis management is a relevant actor in its bid to gain absolute control and influence worldwide.

2.2 THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY ON THE MIDDLE EAST

The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in America have created tension between America and the Muslim world. The bid by the United States to promote its democracy has been curbed by anti-Americanism campaigns by those in the Islamic world. This has made the United States feel threatened by those countries in the Middle East who do not conform to its foreign policies. A researcher argues, that the unfortunate attitude of America towards the Middle East by the Bush administration had created excessive United States policies towards the Muslim world (Gilpin, 2005).

The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks catapulted promotion of democracy onto the centre of the America's foreign policy in the Middle Eastern region. America's interest felt threatened by those who oppose their interests. Dalacoura (2010, p.60) highlights this by identifying that a majorly democratic world would be a safe, sane, and more prosperous world for America where democratic nations do not engage in war with themselves, sponsor terrorism against democracies or manufacture weapons of mass destructions to threaten each other. Evidently, the perspective of such democracy promotion by America in the Middle Eastern region has created a lot of stiff resistance thereby hindering any impact of establishing cordial relations with each other.

In conclusion, the United States in using 'democracy' as its instrument of its foreign policy has made an endless surge of perpetual grievance by the Muslim world.

2.3 UNITED STATES AFFILIATION WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The United States has strong affiliation with institutions and organizations such as the United Nations, United Nations Security Council and others. According to Rice, America's interests are served by having strong allies which can be promoted within international organizations such as the United Nations and other multilateral organizations (Rice, 2000). The existence of the United States as a superpower has an indispensable element for its support of the rule of law in international affairs. It is evident as a predominant power in global affairs with an "automatic majority" and overriding influence in the United Nations and other international institutions, America is in a position to determine the law in a way that would be acceptable to it and make decisions based on the interpretation and application of the law that would be compatible with its own interest (Murphy, 2004, p.3). The United States, has remained a strong influence in the decision-making process of many international organizations and institutions and has ensured that its interests are secured. Johnson (1997) writes that, America as a significant voice within the policies of the organization tend to have a responsibility as a contributor and participant on the major committees and governing board.

Finally, the United States bid to secure its national interest within these international organizations and institutions is essential for its own foreign policies which are meted out to other countries across the world.

2.4 THE EFFECT OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN IRAN

Foreign policies meted out on Iran after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, has created intense tensions between America and Iran. Lynch and Singh, maintains that the United States and Iran have "periodically confronted themselves" (Lynch and Singh, 2008).

Iran, has been described by the ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration as members of an “Axis of Evil”(Bardes, Shelly and Schmidts, 2008). In other words, the United States has remained focused in the perceived nuclear weapons ambition of the Iranian government. Sitaraman in 2013, illustrated that heightened concerns has been given of Iran’s capabilities to deploy nuclear weapons in a few years; hence there has been increased international diplomatic efforts to curb the Iranian nuclear ambition(Sitarama, 2013).

On the other hand, the current democratic administration of President Barack Obama having inherited some of the ex-president George W. Bush’s administration’s foreign policies, has made several attempts in engaging the Iranian government in an effort to curb its nuclear weapons ambitions. There has been intentions to hold future talks with Iran with strong emphasis that the “door was still open” for a peaceful negotiation in a bid for Iran to suspend and dismantle its nuclear weapons activities.

Evidently, the United States has refused to accept a nuclear armed Iran thereby doing its own part to supporting the International community like the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the United Nations Security Council to curb Iran’s nuclear weapons ambition. As a “rogue state” Iran was presented to be a country which did not abide to International norms and has continuously contravened acceptable standard international behaviour (O’Sullivan, 2003 p.91).

Foreign sponsored sanctions and embargoes by the United States on Iran’s perceived nuclear weapons activities, has caused increased tensions between the two nations. Iran however, has vehemently denied any development of an atomic nuclear weapon; emphasising that its nuclear weapons programme is for energy, research and medical reason thereby declaring that it is for a peaceful purposes. Mauer and Mockli in 2011, highlighted that in 2006 the United Nations Security Council instructed Iran to suspend all its uranium enrichment and other related activities due to their inability to establish the certainty of Iran’s nuclear weapons programme or confront the prospect of sanctions (Mauer and Mockli, 2011, p.223).

In conclusion, the Iran-United States poor or less cordial relations has continued to be tensed due to the United States consistent pressure through its foreign policies on Iran to suspend its nuclear weapons programme.

2.5 IRAN'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY AND UNITED NATIONS

Iran, has been a centre of international politics and diplomacy since the second world war (United Nations Gupta, 2007). Iran, being a member of the United Nations, Non-Proliferation Treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency since 1958 has become a controversial international state due to its nuclear weapons programme. According to an author, Iran being of a geostrategic importance due to its central location in Eurasia is known to be a regional power; it is also a founding member of the United Nations (Usa, 2009, p.9).

Iran's membership, has given it certain privileges to enable it develop a research programme for uranium enrichment and processing facilities. Being a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty has made Iran capable to developing a nuclear weapons power plant for energy purposes which Iran claims is for a "peaceful purpose". The United Nations, also being a regulatory body for the International Atomic Energy Agency issues instructions to the Agency to supervise and monitor activities in Iran's nuclear weapons programme.

In conclusion, Iran has currently remains a member of these international organizations and has continued to progress in its development of its nuclear weapons programme.

2.6 THE EFFECT OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001 TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN SYRIA

The United States foreign policies with Syria, has created tension between itself and the Syrian government in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. The Syrian war which began in 2011, has created sectarian tensions and the rise of Islamist extremist groups in the region. President Bashar al-Assad, determination to cling to power has created an uprising against his regime by the various Syrian oppositions. The United States has shown interest by offering military support to the Syrian opposition which has frustrated

any hopes in resolving the crisis. According to Blanchard and Sharp, the United States supports the National Coalition of Revolution and the Opposition Forces which are deemed to be the legitimate representatives of the Syrian citizens and has offered non-lethal assistance to the Coalition (Blanchard and Sharp, 2013).

The ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration, had classified Syria after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States as “states sponsors of international terrorism”(Dralonge, 2008, p.110). The Bush’s administration had in their discretion minimized diplomatic talks between them and the Syrian government and created strict foreign policies; thereby making their relations tensed. This has made the Syrian government less cooperative in its relation with the Bush’s Republican administration.

On the other hand, the recent democratic administration of President Barack Obama has been relentlessly calling for the ousting of President Bashar al-Assad regime since 2011. America, has also put some pressure on the United Nations Security Council to condemn the Syrian government and find strategic means to remove President Bashar al-Assad from gaining power. However, the Syrian government and the United States have previously cooperated through its “rendition programme” whereby the United States sends suspected terrorists to prison and conduct interrogations in foreign countries. Nevertheless, Syria remains as alleged by the United States a “state sponsor of terrorism”.

America, has campaigned for various foreign sanctions and weapons embargo against the Syrian government. However, a recommendation by America and its allies Britain, France, Germany and some member of the European Union to the lifting of the weapons embargo to enable them support the Syrian opposition, has created stiff resistance by the Assad regime and Russia (an ally to the Syrian government) towards the United States. This resistance it can be emphasised has made diplomatic talks between Syria and the United States very difficult. The lack of cooperation has made it very difficult for the United States to intervene in the Syrian crisis which has so far caused instability within and outside the regions of Syria. The United Nations has on the other hand, made strong reference to the war in Syria and has perceived the war to be a “humanitarian catastrophe”.

In essence, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on America's foreign policy in Syria can be said to be an "unending diplomatic conflict" between the two nations with no signs of a possible and effective resolution.

2.7 IRAN FOREIGN RELATIONS WITH SYRIA

Iran and Syria are deemed to be close strategic allies. Syria and Iran have been described to render each other support in their diplomatic relations with each other. According to Wright, the alliance between Syria and Iran since 1979 has had a significant impact in shaping the Middle East politics and destroying the regional aims of the United States (Wright, 2010, p. 175). Though it can be said, that there has been in the past some ideological conflicts between Syria secular Arab nationalism ideology and Islamic Republic of Iran's pan-Islamist policies.

It can further be emphasised, that Iran and Syria share some common similarities; they are both authoritarian and independent both politically and economically. Iran, is a Shiite state and Syria is known to be a predominately Sunni Muslim state with an Alawite ruling family (a Shiite sect). Iran, ideology according to a researcher, is based on its strict religion and principles which is opposed to atheist communism while that of secular Syria is that of Baathist ideologies (Wright, 2010). It can also be said, that their strategic goals have helped to maintain a deep alliance between them, despite various attempts to destroy their relationships by other opposing nations. In the aftermath of the Iranian revolution in 1979 Iran and Syria, have invested in both their political and military relations with one another. These common causes, was to develop a network of "surrogate militants" to frustrate the United States and some of its allies like Israel. They also show their support for the Lebanese Shiite militants group the Hezbollah. The common cause reflects a better opportunity of survival. In other words, it can be said that they tend to achieve certain long term goals in their relation with each other. Syria on the other hand, has its intentions to regain the Golan Heights lost in the war between it and Israel in the early 1960's and maintains its veto

power in Lebanese politics. Iran's intentions can be said to be its need to remain a regional power which is of great importance to it.

The bid to protect their interests is essential in their relation with each other. Syria, deems to protect its 'Arab interest' while Iran protects its 'Islamic Interest'. The foreign relations between Iran and Syria have gone through phases since 1979 till date. The shift in balance of power, has made Iran a stronger ally till date. The Hezbollah a pro-Iranian party and militia, has also become an influential ally.

The Iranian-Syrian relation has been deemed to have survived this long due to their primarily defensive nature. Korany and Dessouki, identified that the Iran-Syrian alliance is closely tied on the basis of the evolution of challenges that has sustained their relationship till date (Korany and Dessouki, 2010, p. 138). For three decades, its aim was to neutralize Israel's capabilities and prevent America from encroaching the Middle East region.

In essence, the foreign relations between Iran and Syria has determined their survival thereby sustaining their longstanding alliance till date.

2.8 SYRIA FOREIGN RELATIONS TOWARDS IRAN

Syria and Iran, have maintained an enduring alliance (Yacoubia and Lasensky, 2008). According to Louka in 2011, regional politics in Syria has influenced its close ties with Iran (Louka, 2011, p.390). Freedman, also emphasised that Syria has been the only ally of Iran in the world (Freedman, 2002, p.210). Syria and Iran, have remained close allies since the early periods of the Islamic Republic and Syria, can be said to be Iran's prominent Arab ally and partner within the region. Since 2001 till date, Syria and Iran alliance has developed and deepened due to Iran's contribution and support in the Syrian war. With the Syrian's interest being protected by Iran, this also rendered Syria's support to Iran's nuclear weapons programme.

Syria and Iran have through the regimes, cooperated with each other both militarily and financially. Their diplomatic alliance has made them to have a common cause in pursuit of their interests and survival. Sharp in 2010, illustrated that the Syrian-Iranian relations has

consistently been analysed to be a union as both nations have placed higher priorities on its regional strategic interests (Sharp, 2010). Tabarani, maintains that Syria and Iran are close allies who share the same perspectives and maintain similar priorities (Tabarani, 2008). Syria and Iran, have maintained a strategic alliance with each other due to their shared animosity towards the United States and its foreign policies. According to some researchers, the relations between America and Iran is highly political and adversarial (Lodgaard and Maerli, 2007).

In conclusion, Syria has continued to sustain its relations with Iran and has so far shown no intentions to withdraw its foreign support to it.

CHAPTER THREE:

3.0 UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IRAN AND SYRIA

Since the 1979 revolution and the establishment of Iran nuclear weapons programme in the early 1950's, Iran has been a great challenge for the United States. Iran being a geo-strategic country, has had various controversies with its nuclear weapons programme, its increasing repressions and menacing rhetoric which has generated deep hostility with the Western world. As Blair has observed, that Tehran and six world powers have not reached agreement on its nuclear weapons technology with the European Union's foreign policy spokesperson Catherine Ashton emphasising that both sides still remain "far apart on substance" (Blair, 2013). According to the United States, Iran's nuclear programme has defied the international norms and has continued to pursue its nuclear ambitions (Ottolenghi, 2010).

There has been series of difficult dilemmas for the Obama administration posed by the Iranian government to nuclear weapons development (Gold, 2009). Titterton , observed that Iran under international sanctions for its nuclear enrichment programme, has opened new uranium mines and a yellow cake production plant (Titterton, 2013). This has led to increasing and multiple diplomatic sanctions and embargoes on the Iranian government. Javedanfar in 2013, has observed that sanctions in Iran have had an impact on its nuclear stance (Javedanfer, 2013). . The United States, has allegedly identified the Iranian government as sponsors of terrorism linking them to the instability of certain parts of the Middle Eastern regions.

On the other hand, in the case of the Syrian government President Barack Obama and his administration have been calling for President Bashar al-Assad's resignation since 2011 and have pressured the United Nations Security Council to condemn the Syrian Government. As McElroy has observed that, Syria is on track to be the biggest humanitarian catastrophe of the twenty-first century (McElroy, 2013). President Barack Obama's administration, has on the other hand indicated military assistance to the opposition (Sharp and Blanchard, 2013). According to Spencer, the United States moves closer to arming the rebels (Spencer, 2013).

It should be indicated however, that some Al Qaeda affiliates and other violent extremist groups have infiltrated the Syrian opposition thereby demonstrating their presence in Syria. This as a result, has limited the United Kingdom and the Obama's administration to arm the Syrian opposition groups. As Sherlock, observed that the leader of the Free Syrian Army gave a warning to the West refusal to arm its group stating that its lack of support could "hand Syria's revolution to extremist groups who already have better access to weapons" (Sherlock, 2013) . This popular uprising which has turned out to be an armed rebellion against the Assad regime, has poised to become an increasingly complex and difficult for the United States in relation to its foreign policies meted out Syria. It can be said, that the Obama administration believes and hope that a negotiated political settlement between the Syrian government under the Assad regime and the various Syrian opposition groups like the Syrian National Council/ Coalition, the Free Syrian Army and other opposition groups will possibly put an end to the crisis. As Weaver in 2013, observed that the Syrian government had agreed to hold talks at a peace conference in Geneva (Weaver, 2013).

Subsequently, in this analysis it can be said that the reason for the United States unilateral and multilateral initiatives and approach towards the Syrian regime, is to put an end to the war and demand the resignation and removal of President Bashar al-Assad to enable the United States begin a political transition to a more democratic form of government in Syria. It can further be emphasised also that the United States, has been reverently working with multilateral organizations through the United Nations and the World Bank and others, to initiate severe sanctions and weapons embargoes on the Syrian/ Assad regime though it has some stiff oppositions from countries such as Russia. Cruz , identified that Russia, has frequently made use of its veto power in the United Nations Security Council in support of sanctions against Damascus (Cruz, 2012, p.429). It should be noted that the United States, continues to use non-military approaches towards the Syrian civil war.

It can be observed in this analysis, that the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria is basically for its geopolitical interests, strategic aims, to achieve territorial power, international order and regional dominance and control. Also, it can be said that the United States, has attempted to democratize these regions particularly Iran, for its own national interests and security. As Miller, identified that America attempts to bring democracy to the region (Miller, 2007).

In furtherance, the Islamic Republic of Iran has a crucial role in the current Syrian conflict. Iran, is the Syrian regimes greatest supporter; even more so than Russia. The Iranian bond with Syria has historically been based on shared strategic interests which includes relinquishing the United States power in the Middle East. Iran, in a strategic and ideological conflict is in a bid to liberate Syria from the United States hegemonial grip, by supporting the Syrian regime with military weapons, finance and energy supplies. This support by Iran, has been confronted by some oppositions such as the 'Friends of Syria' who has called on Iran and its Hezbollah ally to withdraw fighters from Syria territory; describing their armed presence in the country as a threat to regional stability (Weaver, 2013) . It can be said, that the United States aim to oust President Bashar al-Assad is a geopolitical struggle against Iran and Russia.

Evidently, the United States major cause of concern is to achieve a transition for a more democratic form of government in Syria through the removal of President Bashar al-Assad with the same hope of restoring the region without totally relinquishing the authority of the Syrian state. It can be emphasised, that the need for stability in the Syrian region reflects some imperialist concern particularly for the United States who deem it fit to gain control. The United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria will somehow assist in stabilizing the Middle East and its regions such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine and Lebanon. It should be noted, that the United States had accused Iran and Syria of being "state sponsors of terrorism" thereby causing instability in some of the Middle Eastern regions.

In another perspective, America perceives Iran to be a prominent regional rising power and sees it as a major threat and challenge to America's influence across the region; thereby authorizing some intensive foreign policies and increasing sanctions to weaken the Iranian regime. It can be further emphasised that, the United States has intentions to weaken the Iranian influence in the Middle Eastern region where it has some regional control and also to obstruct its nuclear weapons programme.

Iran, can be perceived to be a challenge for the United States and represents a strategic danger for the main United States ally in the region; Israel. On the other hand, Syria has its

own role in its regional display of dynamics which the United States have unfailingly tried to resolve.

The United States, is seeking to weaken and further isolate Iran thereby making a further attempt to breaking the Damascus- Tehran axis which could possibly be a positive step towards the right direction. America, has also been making attempts to neutralize any alliance that Russia has in Iran and Syria.

It can be reiterated that, the United States hegemonic ambition in the region is aimed at reducing Iran and Syria influence and promote its own influence in the Middle Eastern region. In essence, the current geopolitical initiatives have analysed states of the Middle East region such as Iran and Syria to be far short of the 'Western ideal' of a democratic national state (Wilson and Donnan, 2012). The United States quest through its strategic means is to gain absolute control and influence across the region without being challenged. The cause to gain total control is basically for their own national interest, security, strategic aims and to achieve an international world order. It can be perceived on the other hand that, the United States is making great attempts to prevent any alterations of balance of power within and outside the entire region. In view of this America, still wants to remain very relevant in world politics and is doing all it can through its own means to make certain that it retains its reputation as the only independent superpower nation.

As reiterated, the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria is for its geopolitical interest and strategic aims. This is in order to achieve territorial power, international order and regional dominance. America's support from allies such as Israel, Jordan, Turkey, France, United Kingdom, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and others, has the intentions to weaken the regime of President Bashar al-Assad in which they hope will weaken the Iranian-Syrian ties. They also hope that their actions will reduce Iran's influence towards Syria and also aim at weakening the two regimes which would at the same instance affect their relationship with its allies such as Russia and the Hezbollah (a political and military faction in Lebanon). It should be noted that the Hezbollah organization and the Iranian government has a close tie with the Syrian government. It can be said that Syria, has been a main transit route for war shipment by the Iranian government to render military aid to the Hezbollah which is a Shiite sect in Lebanon and a pro-Iranian support organization.

Iran and Syria, has rendered its support to the Hezbollah which has evidently been a leverage against the Israeli government to achieve their own regional and territorial aims.

Consequently, the United States involvement can be characterized as being insufficient as it has only assisted to create a diplomatic gap between its self, Iran and Syria. Its involvement, has only strengthened the relationship between Iran and Syria thereby allowing the two regimes to have a “common cause” and “common enemies”. This has not been good for the United States the reason being that the two regions have refused to any of the resolutions offered by the United States which is due to heightened tensions caused by the multiple sanctions and embargo by the United States towards these two countries. However, America is hoping to extend some form of diplomatic friendship with these two regimes in order to resolve the conflict between the three of them.

It can be said that, America’s involvement in the relationship between Iranian regime and Syrian regime has been problematic. Reason being that, America has not yet found a lasting solution for a strong resolution between itself and Iran on its nuclear weapons ambitions and the Syrian civil war. It has been presumed to be an endless journey of rhetoric, direct talks and diplomatic resolutions with the hope of bringing an end to Iran’s and Syria’s ambitions. Blair, observed that talks between Iran and the United Nations over allowing nuclear inspections inside sensitive military site have been “going around in circles” (Blair, 2013). The role of the United States in its involvement with Iran’s nuclear weapon activity is to put in check Iran’s agreement with the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to which Iran is a signatory to. Iran, on the other hand has maintained due to alleged accusation by the United States that it is developing its nuclear weapons programme for peaceful purposes. Alexander and Hoenig, identified that Iran stated continuously that its nuclear programme is for peaceful and civil purpose and not for arms (Alexander and Hoenig, 2008). It can be emphasised, that the United States is determined not to allow Iran compete with it in becoming a nuclear warhead regional power. The United States, in its allegations against Iran is to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability as it may feel threatened in relations to its national interest and security within and outside the region.

Subsequently, certain objectives of the United States foreign policy towards Iran and Syria is for the Iranian government to suspend its acquisition of uranium enrichment and end its

participation in the Syrian war; ending the war in Syria and ousting President Bashar al-Assad regime through its foreign backed allies (Friends of Syria). It can be said, that America hope to achieve an international order and stability in these regions. However, the United States foreign policies have only created chaos for instance, the United States need to offer its friendship in terms of treaties and alliances and secondly since the American government rotates from one Republican/Democratic rule to another only makes it difficult for these aforementioned countries (Iran and Syria) to trust the actual objectives of these current foreign policies of the United States.

Evidently, the strategies adopted by America in its bid of achieving certain objectives in its involvement between Iran and Syria is its effort to hold direct diplomatic talks with them through international and multilateral organizations. It can also be emphasised, that the United States interest in its involvement between these two nations is to gain some influence on them through impacting some of its own western ideologies and gain regional control of these nations regions.

In another perspective, the United States is making some serious impact alongside with its foreign backed allies through the creation of sanctions and weapons embargoes against Iran and Syria and is continuously seeking and campaigning for their continuous support to make certain that it gains some form of “monitory control” over these countries. However, creating these sanctions and embargoes has only created an increased tension between the United States, Iran and Syria thereby making any form of diplomatic negotiations nearly impossible. As Borger, Roberts and Traynor observed that peace talks in Syria is in jeopardy as each sides entrench its positions (Borger, Roberts and Traynor, 2013).

In this analysis, the United States interest or involvement between Iran and Syria is to try in its own right to severe the relationship between these two nations in order to bring some form of stability in the region. America, can be said to be achieving this by providing non-military support and assistance to the Syrian opposition groups in order to weaken the regime of President Bashar al-Assad. This they hope could have some effect to the relationship between Iran and Syria.

The effect of United States foreign policies towards Iran and Syria in relations to its national security is its attempts to achieve some form of stability around the regions of these

countries. America's involvement basically is to secure its interest in the region and protect its citizens from possible external threats since America had identified both countries as an 'Axis of Evil' and state sponsors of terrorism. However, it can be said that the United States is still making some attempts to a diplomatic truce with Iran and Syria in order to end the disagreements and ease tension between them.

On the other hand, the United States has been threading softly in its approach in the Syrian war and has pleaded for Iran the Syrian government to end the conflict. As Robert in 2013, observed that President Obama's careful approach to the intervention in Syria has sparked a rising concern given its records in the Middle Eastern region (Robert, 2013). Consequently, the Syrian government has refused to cooperate; accusing the United States of giving military support to the opposition groups and Al Qaeda affiliates. As The Telegraph, observed that President Assad had accused the West of "backing Al Qaeda" (The Telegraph, 2013). It should be noted that, the United States proposed intentions to intervene militarily has been due to the use of chemical weapons attacks by President Bashar al-Assad regime. Syria, according to America having contravened international law through its alleged chemical attacks, feels that it is its obligation to respond as a world leader. Alexander in 2013, observed that America is ready to act against the Syrian regime as Tehran warns of 'harsh consequences' (Alexander, 2013). Foster, Raf and Swain (2013) also observed that America reiterated the need for the world to act on Assad's gas attack outrage. On the other hand, the United States has indicated to tread cautiously so as not to present itself as a tyrant nation.

It can be said that the United States, has been making attempts to influence Iran and Syria through its affiliation with the European Union and The United Nations but to no avail so far. This is all in the United States bid to protect its own national interest and achieve an international order in the two regions. In essence, it can be reiterated that the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria and its quest for regional dominance, has not brought any lasting resolutions but instead tension and resistance which continues to increase daily between these countries.

3.1 FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO INFLUENCING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IRAN AND SYRIA

The Iranian-Syrian axis, can be traced the 1979 revolution and early 1980's. Iran and Syria relations, can be said to be as a result of its ideological alignment, strategic considerations and its need to be reliable political partners to one another.

Factors that contribute to influencing the relationship between Iran and Syria, is that both are strategic allies. Iran and Syria have had a strategic alliance due to their common resentment with the United States. However, during the Syria independence in the early 1940's and the 1979 Islamic revolution, the diplomatic relationship between Iran and Syria was not cordial. On the other hand, after Iran's political transformation in the late 1970's Syria and Iran have maintained a close relationship.

Iran and Syria, have a military cooperation against what they emphasize as "common threat" and "common enemy" towards the United States. It can be said, that Iran considers Syria's security as its own. A writer identified that "[t]he whole world should know that Iran will stand behind the Syrian nation to the end" (Gelbart, 2010, p.37).

Iran, has invested financially to the Syrian economy and the civil war by providing military arms and manpower. Iran, can also be said to be involved in some of Syria's industrial projects which includes, cement factories, car assembling lines, power plants and silo construction. Iran, has also set up a proposed joint Iranian- Syrian bank for its future economic ties. It can be said, that Iran has provided technical and personnel support to the Syrian civil war. It has also provided to the Syrian government a large military base and intelligence monitoring techniques.

The Syrian leadership belongs to the Alawite sect which is a branch of the Shi'a Islam. Iran and Syria with its extensive multifaceted political, economic and religious relationship, have remained steadfast in their assistance and support to one another. This includes Syria's support of Iran's nuclear weapons programme and also Iran's support of the civil war in Syria. These two regions, have maintained their close ties for both geopolitical and ideological reasons. The reason being, that both have invested a lot politically and economically towards the interests of their country.

It can be emphasised that their intention to counter Western hegemony, has made them form an “Axis of resistance” towards the West particularly towards the United States. Iran and Syria, have a shared ideology of Anti- Americanism which only became heightened after the September 11, 2001 terrorists attacks thereby regarding America as their “common enemy”; this in regards makes them bound to each other. Their show of support to each other, is reflected in their support to the Hezbollah which is a Shiite military political organization and pro-Iran through which it gets military aid through the Syrian border where weapons are smuggled by Iran.

In conclusion, the Iran-Syrian alliance can be said to be intimate and is set to preserve and endure the foreseeable future for as long as it takes for them to do so.

CHAPTER FOUR:

4.0 THE UNITED STATES AS AN ACTOR IN WORLD POLITICS AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IRAN AND SYRIA

This dissertation, explores the United States as a global actor in world politics and crisis management with a comparative analysis of Iran and Syria. The United States, remains unchallenged as a sole superpower and exercises its influence across the world. It can be said, that America exerts its influence on the countries of the world to do or react in the same manner or way as it wants for itself. The United States, leadership role in the world to make decisions that affects the destiny of other countries, has been what has distinguished it from other countries thus far.

The United States, being a sole superpower nation and a promoter of democracy across the world has greatly depended on its ability to involve itself in the world's international politics. It has as a nation and without fear demonstrated its dominance in world politics most especially after the Cold War.

As a promoter of democracy the United States, has made attempts with its influence to democratize as many nations as it deems possible so long as it serves its own ambitious national self-interest and security. It also has in history, made certain on its involvement in the domestic politics of countries that they are affiliated with through certain multilateral and international organizations like the United Nations Security Council and others. The United States, determination to create a stable international order, has been one of its basic priorities. Its intention to protect its national interest and secure the lives and welfare of its citizen has been made them as a nation set certain standards of how the world should be governed.

The United States hegemonic powers and its historical imperialist ideologies, has made it the most powerful nation on earth. According to a writer, America's hegemony and global supremacy is the motivating force in global affairs (McCormick, 1995, p.1). It can be said, that its ability to intervene and render its assistance in period of crisis within and amongst nations sets it apart from other countries.

The United States dominance has however shown increasing concerns among some countries of the world on the use of its massive power and influence. Stiff resistance across various parts of the world, has made it quite difficult for America to connect to certain regions. America's foreign policies most especially after the September 11, 2001 terrorists attacks, has created enmity between itself and the Muslim world causing increased tension and distrust.

A comparative analysis of Syria and Iran reflects such instances of resistance towards the United States. The United States, has made various significant attempts to exert its influence and control in its involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran. Being an actor in global politics and crisis management America, has tried to show its 'soft power' through a diplomatic means in order to resolve the animosity it endures through its foreign relations with Iran on its nuclear weapons programme and the Syrian civil war.

It can be said that the alleged accusations that America, has meted out to Iran's intention of developing an atomic nuclear warhead, created a less friendly foreign policy that has created increasing tension between them. Syria on the other hand, has extended no significant form of relationship with the United States and this has only reflected its intentions to continue to show resentment towards Americas' foreign policies towards it. The effect of the United States foreign policies towards Iran and Syria, has been problematic though certain engagement and strategies has been adopted by the United States to protect its national interests and security.

The strategies of the United States in adopting ways to thwart the relationship between Iran and Syria has been through its foreign policies. The United States, has also made attempts to gain foreign support from its affiliates such as the United Nations, United Nations Security Council, International Monetary Bank, World Bank and others. This is in order to gain ground in any decision-making process on the issues involving the Iranian nuclear programme and its support of the Syrian war and the ousting of the Syrian President Bashar al- Assad. It should be noted however, that the United States exerts its strong influence whenever it feels threatened by any external force which may obscure its interest or national security.

In conclusion, it can be said that the United States still remains a strong global influence across the world and in international politics. Its attempt to resolve crisis through its soft power tactic and cooperation is still a work in progress though it still endures stiff resistance from certain regions of the world.

4.1 THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN SANCTIONS TOWARDS IRAN

The increasing tensions between America and Iran, has been its ever increasing sanctions and embargo towards the Iranian government. It can be said that, Iran longstanding violations of its obligations with regards to the nuclear programme are “irrefutable” (United States Embassy-London, U.K, 2013). America, as a result has imposed various import embargoes and foreign sanctions against Iran (United States Department of the Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control, 2012).

Evidently, since the ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration and its effort to suppress the Iranian nuclear programme through its “war on terror”, the Obama Democratic administration has however made an attempt to engage and impose aggressive sanctions in Iran in order to halt the country’s enrichment of uranium (Kawakami, 2011, p.33).

Subsequently, the United States, has emphasised its commitment to intensify pressure against Iran by not only adopting new sanctions but actively enforcing such sanctions and preventing evasions. On the other hand, the United States still extends its willingness to reaching a diplomatic resolution that will resolve the international community’s concerns about Iran’s nuclear weapons ambitions.

The United States has, reemphasised that Iran will not be allowed to obtain a nuclear weapon. It can be said that, the United States, has resolved within itself to use its power to

achieve that objective. America, has also emphasised that as Iran being one of the major signatories to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, it has a responsibility to the International community; and its blatant disregard for those responsibility has made Iran a subject of the United Nations Security Council resolution to impose mandatory sanctions on it. Consequently, it can be said that Iran is isolated and the international community along with America is united in its determination to prevent Iran developing a nuclear weapon.

However, the new Iranian regime under President Hassan Rouhani, has reiterated his concerns to engage the United States for a “serious and substantive” negotiation in order to resolve the impasse over Tehran’s nuclear programme (Dehghan, 2013). Iran’s willingness to engage the United States shows a minimal form of cooperation in its bid ease tensions and to prove that it has no intentions as alleged by the United States to manufacture a nuclear weapons atomic war head.

On Syria, Iran has reemphasised its strong support of its “closest ally” and will “stop at no cost” to boost its support of President Bashar al-Assad’s regime. Iran, as a result of its aiding and abetting the Assad regime in coordination with the Hezbollah, has provoked some of these foreign backed sanctions and embargoes by the United States and its affiliates.

The impact of these foreign policies has not brought any lasting resolution but has continued to create doubt as to the achievement of the United States in its attempt to gain control within the region. Its national security at stake America, relentlessly look for loopholes to thwart Iran’s nuclear weapons programme completely and without conditions. America’s need to remain the only nuclear superpower nation along its allies is one of the determinant in its bid to curb Iran’s nuclear weapons ambition.

In conclusion, the United States has the hope that its foreign backed sanctions will provide a possible resolution for Iran to cede in its quest of its nuclear weapons ambitions.

4.2 THE IMPACT OF THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN SANCTIONS TOWARDS SYRIA

The impact of the United States foreign sanctions towards Syria, has caused increasing tensions between the two countries. This is as a result of the various sanctions(economic and financial) and embargoes levied against Syria through the office of foreign assets control by the United States (Office of Foreign Assets Control, 2013). It can also be said that, these various sanctions by the United States is basically to deal with the Syrian policies, its support in terrorism, its acquisitions of weapons and missiles and the ongoing war and human rights abuses in Syria.

However, there has been some proposal by France, America, Britain, Germany and others in lifting certain weapons embargoes in order to aid the Syrian opposition groups. Spencer in 2013, observed that the United Kingdom and France will review their attempts in lifting the European Union weapons embargo on the Syrian rebels (Spencer, 2013). The United States, has also made attempts to provide non-military aid to the Syrian oppositions. This is in an attempt to strategically remove President Bashar al-Assad from power.

In another perspective, it can be said that the Syrian sanctions has been as a consequence of it undermining America and the International community. Syria's resistance towards America's foreign policy has made the United States to implement tough economic sanctions against Syria. Syria's lack of cooperation has only intensified more sanctions and embargo by the United States through the assistance of its affiliates such as the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations.

It can be emphasised that America's national security feels threatened due to the instability in the region and the Syrian government's unwillingness to secure its people and provide a more democratic and stable government within the region. This lack of cooperation by the Syrian government through President Bashar al-Assad regime has continued to threaten the national security of America and its interest within the region.

In essence, America is determined through its foreign backed sanctions and embargoes to provide a lasting solution to the war in Syria in the hope of stabilizing the region.

CHAPTER FIVE:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0 SUMMARY

In summary the United States, has been an active participant in world politics and crisis management. As reiterated, the United States remains a sole superpower and promoter in championing democracy worldwide. It has been reflected from above that anti-Americanism has gained resentment and resistance from certain part of the Muslim world in the Middle Eastern regions. These resistances, has created some level of difficulty for the American government to penetrate and intervene in domestic and international political issues in such region. In a comparative analysis of Syria and Iran, America in the period of ex-president George W. Bush Republican administration and the current Democratic administration of President Barack Obama has made various attempts in providing a lasting resolution to the Iranian nuclear weapons programme and Iran's involvement in the Syrian civil war and Syria's civil war and the ousting of its President Bashar al-Assad. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, has created a significant benchmark in the foreign relations between the United States, Iran and Syria. The Iran and Syria relations, has been significant in the United States involvement in their relationship on the basis of national interest and security of America and its citizens.

The United States foreign backed multiple sanctions has created a lot of controversies and diplomatic tensions between the three nations. This has brought about resistance and stalled negotiations by the Iranian and Syrian government. The impact of these foreign policies has continued to create difficulties between America, Iran and Syria.

It can be said that nothing, has changed significantly in the ex-president George Bush's Republican administration and the current Democratic administration of President Barack Obama in its involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria. However, the new Iranian regime has shown some sign of cooperation by indicating its concerns and showing

its willingness to direct talks if the United States is ready to show some “goodwill” and “constructive move” to end the stalemate over its nuclear programme but has not given any emphasis to end its relations with Syria. Syria on the other hand, has remained adamant in its bid under President Bashar al-Assad to cling to power.

5.1 EXPECTATIONS

There are certain expectation which can be raised in America’s foreign policy towards Syria and Iran. America, expects Iran to abide to the treaties and obey the International norms. The United States also expects Iran to curb its nuclear weapons ambition and abide to the regulations of the International committee. America, also expects Iran to withdraw its support to the Syria civil war and assist in ousting President Bashar al-Assad from power.

In another perspective, Iran expects the United States to negotiate without conditions and reduce its sanctions and embargoes to prevent further resentment and hostility or lack of full or moderate cooperation. It can be said that, the change of power under the new Iranian regime has extended some form of cooperation and willingness to negotiate at some level.

In the case of Syria, the United States expects President Bashar al-Assad to resign from power to enable a more democratic process of the region and stability within and outside the region. The Syrian government on the other hand, expects the United States not to meddle in its domestic affairs and extends lack of cooperation and unwillingness to negotiate.

5.2 RECOMMENDATION

In terms of recommendation given, there is the need for a “constructive dialogue” by the three nations that is the United States, Iran and Syria. The need for this constructive resolution is to ensure peace and stability to the regions. America and its affiliates like the

United Nations and others on the other hand, are to provide a cogent and long lasting solution through a more transparent foreign policy in resolving the issues it has with Iran and Syria rather than dwelling on its interests which has resulted to lack of trust between these three nations. The need for a constructive dialogue and cooperation is essential to enable those involved to negotiate without accusations and find a lasting resolution to bring a lasting peace or reduced conflict to the barest minimum.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it could be argued that America still remains an actor in world politics and crisis management. Its bid for absolute power and control across the regions and various parts of the world has made the United States a hegemonic and influential state which has remained criticized but unchallenged. America's intentions through its foreign policies in Iran and Syria only reflects its need to remain the dominant actor in world politics and crisis management. It is America's only hope that Iran and Syria will be willing to cooperate fully to ensure peace and lasting regional order within and outside its regions.

5.4 FINDINGS:

H1: What is the United States involvement in the relationship between Iran and Syria and what do they hope to achieve?

Hypotheses is Null:

The United States involvement in the relationship between Syria and Iran, has raised a lot of controversies as to the mission or intentions of the United States regional presence within Iran and Syria. The United States involvement has been so far insufficient to resolving the crisis between itself, Iran and Syria. It can be said that, the diplomatic tensions between America, Iran and Syria due to foreign backed sanctions has raised some cause of concern within the International community. The United State involvement, has been deemed to be

problematic as it has only stirred more resentment and heightened more uncertainties due to lack of trust and rhetoric coming from each countries responses to the crisis.

America's hope to achieving its aim of international order and regional control totally depends on the cooperation of Iran and Syria as they as a nation are attempting to gain its own regional power in totality. Iran and Syria has their own intention to preserve its own regional interests.

The United States, perceiving itself as hegemonic and superpower country hopes to remain at that pinnacle of power for as long as they are not challenged or resisted by other nations through its democracy promotion strategy which it feels is beneficial to its national interest and security.

H2: What are the events that followed after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks with particular references to ex-president George W. Bush Republican Administration and the current Democratic Administration of President Barack Obama towards Iran and Syria?

Hypotheses is valid:

The events that took place in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and its effect in the Republican administration of ex-president George W. Bush and that of the current Democratic administration of President Barack Obama has led from one controversy to another due to its foreign relations between Iran and Syria. The Bush's administration had perceived Iran and Syria to be Axis of Evil and state sponsors of terrorism and had extended a minute form of diplomacy with them while the Obama administration also perceives the same though extending some form of diplomatic truce in trying to resolve the crisis and relieve tensions.

H3: What are the factors that contribute to influence the relationship between Iran and Syria?

Hypotheses is valid:

Certain factors, has been previously analysed above as to the factors that contribute to influencing the relationship between Syria and Iran. The main notion of 'common causes'

and 'common enemies' in the foreign ties between Iran and Syria towards the United States has been a force that has encouraged both countries to remain bonded and close allies.

REFERENCES:

- Armstrong, D., Farrell, T. and Maiguashca, B.(2005) *Force and Legitimacy in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aydin, A. (2012) *Foreign Powers and Intervention in Armed Conflicts*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Allison, R. (ed.) (1990) *Superpower Competition and Crisis Prevention in the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexander, H.(2013) 'America Ready to Take Action against Syria as Iran Warns of Harsh Consequences', *The Telegraph*, 25 August [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/Syria/10264962/America-ready-to-take-action-against-Syria-as-Iran-warns-of-harsh-consequences.html> (Accessed: 26 August 2013).
- Amuzeger, J.(2003) 'Iran's Crumbling Revolution', *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 82, February[Online]. Available at: <http://www.istor.org/stable/20033427> (Accessed: 18 February 2013).
- Alexander, Y. and Hoenig, M. (2008) *The New Iranian Leadership: Ahmadinejad, Terrorism, Nuclear Ambition and the Middle East*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Blair, D. (2013) 'Iran Nuclear Talks End without Agreement', *The Telegraph*, 6 April [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/9976580/Iran-nuclear-talks-ends-without-agreement.html> (Accessed: 9 April 2013).
- Bardes, B.A, Shelly, M.C., Schmidt, S.W. (2008) *American Government and Politics Today: The Essential*. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bandyopadhyaya, J. (1993) *General Theory of International Relations*. New Delhi: Allied Publications Limited.
- Borger, J., Traynor, I. and Roberts, D. (2013) 'Syria Peace Talks in Jeopardy as both sides Entrench Positions', *The Guardian*, 29 May [Online]. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/29/Syria-peace-talks-in-jeopardy?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487> (Accessed: 2 June 2013).
- Blair, D. (2013) 'Iran Nuclear Inspection Talks Going Around in Circles', *The Telegraph*, 3 June [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/10096310/iran-nuclear-inspection-talks-going-around-in-circles.html> (Accessed: 6 June 2013).
- Cox, M. and Stokes, .D. (2008) *United States Foreign Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Chatterjee, A. (2010) *International Relations Today: Concepts and Applications*. Delhi: Dorling Kindersley.
- Cebeci, M.(ed.) (2011) *Issues in EU and US Foreign Policy*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Cruz, L.D. (2012) *Unmitigated Disaster*. Bloomington: Xlibris Corporation.
- Chapman, C. (2010) 'Syrian/United States Relations: Explaining the Failure of the Relationship and Suggestion on How to Repair it', volume, March[Online]. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/ugthese> (Accessed: 18 February 2013).
- Davis, S.C. (2003) *The Road from Damascus: A Journey Through Syria*. Seattle: Cune Press.
- Devetak, R., Burke, A. and George, J. (2012) *An Introduction to International Relation*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Department of the Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control() Syria Sanctions Program. Available at: <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-centre/sanctions/programs/Document/Syria.pdf>
- Danziger, .J. (2001) *Understanding the Political World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science*: Longman.
- Dralonge, R.N. (ed.) (2008)*Economies and Geopolitics of the Middle East*. New York: Nova Science Publisher, Inc.
- Dehghan, S.K. (2013) 'Iran Ready to Talk if US Shows Goodwill', *The Guardian*, 6 August [Online]. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/aug/06/iran-ready-to-talk-us-goodwill-hassan-rouhani?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487> (Accessed: 9 August 2013).
- Duncan, R.W, Jancar-Webster, B. and Switky, B. (2008) *World Politics in the 21st Century*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.
- Elias, J. and Sutch, P. (2007) *International Relations: The Basics*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Embassy of the United States-London,U.K (2012) Ambassador Dicarolo at the United Nations on Iran. Available at: <http://www.london.usembassy.gov/iran.html> (Accessed: 18 August 2013).
- Fukuyama, F. (2006) *America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power and the Neoconservative Legacy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fabbrini, S. (ed.) (2006) *The United States Contested: American Unilateralism and European Discontent*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Freedman, R.O. (ed.) (2002) *The Middle East Enters the Twenty-First Century*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

- Fisk, R.(2001) *Pity the Nation: Lebanon at War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feste, K.A. (2003) *Intervention: Shaping the Global Order*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Gilpin, R.(2005) 'War is too important to be left to Ideological Amateurs', *Sage Journal*, volume 19, March [Online]. Available at: <http://ire.sagepub.com/content/19/1/5> (Accessed: 18 February 2013).
- Gelbart, J. (2010) 'The Iran-Syria Axis: A Critical Investigation', *Stanford Journal of International Relations*, Volume 22, Issue 1 [Online] Available at: http://www.stanford.edu/group/sjir/12-1/fall10-final_5.pdf (Accessed: 12 August 2013).
- Gill, S. (ed.) (1993) *Gramsci Historical Materialism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopf, T. (1998) 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Theory', *International Security*, Volume 23, Issue 1 [Online] Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539267> (Accessed: 16 July 2013).
- Huntington, S. 'The Lonely Superpower', *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 78, Issue 2[Online]. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20049207> (Accessed: 20 July 2013).
- Holmes, K.R. and Carafaro, J.J (2010) 'Defining the Obama Doctrine, Its Pitfalls and How to Avoid Them', *Backgrounder*, volume 2457, September [Online]. Available at: <http://report.heritage.org/bg2457> (Accessed: 24 February 2013).
- Johnson, H.J. (1997) *United Nations: US Participation in Five Affiliated International Organization*. Darby: Diane Publishing Co.
- Javedanfar, M. (2013) 'Sanctions in Iran have had an Impact on its Nuclear Stance', *The Guardian*, 22 April [Online]. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/apr/22/sanctions-iran-nuclear-stance> (Accessed: 26 April 2013).
- Kellogg, W.O .(2010) *E-Z America History*. New York: Barron's Educational Service, Inc.
- Korany, B. and Dessouki, A.E.H. (eds.) (2010) *The Foreign Policies of Arab State: The Challenge of Globalization*. New York: The America University in Cairo Press.
- Khan, A.L .(2011) 'A Portfolio Theory of Foreign Affairs: U.S. Relations with the Muslim World', *Selected Works*, volume 20, July [Online]. Available at: <http://works.bepress.com/abukashif/76> (Accessed: 24 February 2013).
- Kidwai, S.M. (2010) *US Policy Forward the Muslim World: Focus on Post 9/11 Period*. Maryland: University Press of America, Inc.

- Koivisto, M. (2012) *Normative State Power in International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Katzman, K. (2009) *Iran: U.S Concerns and Policy Responses*. Congressional Research Service. Darby: Diane Publishing Co.
- Kawakami, k.(2011) 'U.S Sanctions and the Threat of Nuclear Iran', *Agathai Quarterly Journal*, Volume 1, Issue 2, Winter.
- Lynch, T.J and Singh, R.S. (2008) *After Bush: The Case for Continuity in America Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lockard, C.A. (2008) *Societies, Networks and Transitions: A Global History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Louka, E. (2011) *Nuclear Weapon, Justice and the Law*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Litwak, S.R. (2000) *Rouge States and the U.S Foreign Policy: Containment After the Cold War*. Washington DC: The Woodrow Wilson Centre Press.
- Linklater, A. (ed.) (2000) *International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science*. London: Routledge.
- Lawson, F.H. (2007) 'Syria's Relations with Iran: Managing the Dilemmas of Alliance', *Middle East Journal*, volume 61, Winter [Online]. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4330355> (Accessed: 28 February 2013).
- Leverett, F.L. (2005) *Inheriting Syria: Bashar's Trial by Fire*. Washington. D.C: The Brooking Institution.
- Lowy Institute for International Policy (2012) 'Audacity of Reasonableness: Barack Obama, Mitt Romney, US Foreign Policy and Australia'. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.lowyinsitute.cachfly.net/files/fullilovetheaudacityofreasonablenesso.pdf> (Accessed: 1 March 2013).
- Menshari, D.(2001) *Post-Revolutionary Politics in Iran: Religion, Society and Power*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.
- McElroy, D. (2013) 'Syria could be a "Catastrophe of the 21st Century"', *The Telegraph*, 11 April [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/9987774/William-Hague-syria-on-track-to-be-catastrophe-of-the-21st-century.html> (Accessed: 16 April 2013).
- Murphy, F.J. (2004) *The United States and the Rule of Law in International Affairs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mauer, V. and Mockli, D.(eds.) (2011) *European-American Relations and the Middle East: From Suez to Iraq*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Maerli, B.M and Lodgaard, S. (eds.) (2007) *Nuclear Proliferation and International Security*. Oxon: Routledge.
- McCormick, T.J.(1995) *America's Half Century: United States Foreign Policy in the Cold War and After*.2nd edn. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Miles, A. (2013) *US Foreign Policy and the Rogue State Doctrine*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Malone, D. and Khong V.F. (eds.) (2003) *Unilateralism and United States Foreign Policy: International Perspectives*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Miller, B. (2007) *States, Nations and the Great Powers: The Sources of Regional War and Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newman, E. and Rich, R. (eds.) (2004) *The UN Role in Promoting Democracy: Between Ideals and Reality*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Nye, J.S. (2004) 'Soft Power and the American Foreign Policy', *The Journal of Public and International Affairs*, volume 119, Issue 2 [Online]. Available at: <http://www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2307/20202345/abstract> (Accessed: 28 April 2013).
- Nye, J.S (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Perseus Books Group.
- Olson, W.C and Groom, A.J.R. (1991) *International Relations Then and Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation*. London: Harper Collins Academics.
- Orozco, M. (2002) *International Norms and Mobilization of Democracy: Nicaragua in the World*: Ashgate.
- O'Loughlin, J., Ward, M.D, Lofdahl, C.L, Cohen, J.S, Brown, D.S, Reilly. D, Gleditsch, K.S and Shin, M. 'The Diffusion of Democracy 1940-1994', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Volume 88, Issue 4[Online]. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2564092> (Accessed: 20 July 2013).
- O'Sullivan, M.L. (2003) *Shrewd Sanctions: Statecraft and State Sponsors of Terrorism*. Washington: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Ottolenghi, E. (2010) *Iran The Looming Crisis: Can the West Live with Iran's Nuclear Threat?*. Exmouth: Profile Books Limited.
- Paul, T.V (ed.) (2012) *International Relations Theory and Regional Transformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pevehouse, J.C. (2002) 'Democracy from the Outside-In? International Organizations and Democratization', *International Organization*, Volume 56, Issue 3 [Online]. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3078587> (Accessed: 20 July 2013).

Roshandel, J. (2011) *Iran, Israel and the United States: Regime Security vs. Political Legitimacy*. Santa Barbara: ABC-LLIO,LLC.

Robert, B. (1995) *Order and Disorder After the Cold War*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rubin, B.(2002) 'The Real Roots of Arab Anti-Americanism', *Foreign Affairs*, volume 81, December [Online]. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2003345> (Accessed: 28 March 2013).

Rogers, P. (2008) *Global Security and the War on Terror: Elite Power and the Illusion of Control*. Oxon: Routledge.

Rose, E.A. (2002) *Dependency and Socialism in the Modern Caribbean: Superpower Intervention in Guyana, Jamaica and Grenada 1970-1985*. Lanhan: Lexington Books.

Rice, C. (2000) 'Promoting the National Interest', Volume 79, Issue 1[Online]. Available at: <http://www.heinonline.org>

Robert, D. (2013) 'Obama's Cautious Approach to Syrian Intervention Sparks Growing Concerns,' *The Guardian*, 30 May [Online]. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/30/syria-obama-cautious-approach-intervention> (Accessed: 3 June 2013).

Spencer, R. (2013) 'US Moves Closer to Arming Rebels', *The Telegraph*, 10 June[Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10111571/Syria-US-moves-closer-to-arming-rebels.html> (Accessed 14 June 2013).

Sherlock, R. (2013) 'David Cameron Accused of Betraying Syrian Rebels', *The Telegraph*, 15 July [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10180820/David-Cameron-accused-of-betraying-syrian-rebels.html> (Accessed: 19 July 2013).

Smith, T.(1994) *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Spencer, R. (2013) 'Britain and France Renew Efforts to Lift Arms Embargo on Syrian Rebels', *The Telegraph*, 21 April [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10008809/Britain-and-France-renew-effort-to-lift-arms-embargo-on-syrian-rebel.html> (Accessed: 26 April 2013).

- Schraeder, P.J. (ed.) (2002) *Exporting Democracy: Rhetoric vs. Reality*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Schraeder, J.P. (1994) *United States Foreign Policy Towards Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivachtis, Y. (ed.) (2007) *International Order in a Globalizing World*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Sitaraman, S. (2009) *State Participation in International Treaty Regimes*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Sharp, J.M. and Blanchard, C.M (2013) *Armed Conflict in Syria: U.S and International Response*. Congressional Research Service. Darby: Diane Publishing Co.
- Spencer, R. (2013) 'U.S Committed to Provide Non -Lethal Aid to Syrian Rebels', *The Telegraph*, 21 April [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10008468/US-committed-to-provide-non-lethal-aid-to-syria-opposition.html> (Accessed: 26 April 2013).
- Sharp, J.M. (2010) *Syria: Issues for the 112th Congress and Background on U.S Sanctions*. Congressional Research Service. Darby: Diane Publishing Co.
- Salome, L.J. (2010) *Violence, Veils and Bloodlines: Reporting from War Zones*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Tintero, F.L and Manacsa, F.R (2002) *World Geography Affected by Upheavals*. Quezon: Katha Publishing Company Limited.
- Titterton, S. (2013) 'Iran Opens New Uranium Mines and Yellowcake Plant', *The Telegraph*, 9 April [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/9980777/iran-opens-new-uranium-mines-and-yellow-cake-plant.html> (Accessed: 12 April 2013).
- Tabarani, G.G. (2008) *How Iran Plans to Fight America and Dominate the Middle East*. Bloomington: AuthorHouse.
- The Telegraph* (2013) 'Assad Accuses West of Backing al-Qaeda', 17 April. *The Telegraph* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10002289/Bashar-al-Assad-accuses-West-of-backing-al-Qaeda-in-syria.html> (Accessed: 22 April 2013).
- Tuathail, G., Dalby, S. and Routledge, P. (eds.) (2006) *The Geopolitics Reader*. Oxon: Routledge.

United Nations Gupta (2007) *International Nuclear Diplomacy and India*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors Limited.

Usa, .I. (2009) *Iran: Doing Business and Investing in Iran Guide*. Washington : International Business Publication.

United States Department of the Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control (2012) *What you need to know about U.S Economic Sanctions: An Overview of O.F.A.C Regulations involving Sanctions Against Iran*. Available at: <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-centre/sanctions/programs/documents/iran.pdf> (Accessed: 21 August 2013).

Viotti, P.R. (2010) *American Foreign Policy: War and Conflict in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Vasquez, J.A (1998) *The Power of Power Politics: From Neo Classical Realism to Neo Traditionalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vang, P. (2008) *Five Principles of Chinese Foreign Policies*. Bloomington: AuthorHouse.

Weaver, M. (2013) 'Friends of Syria Call on Iran and Hezbollah to Withdraw', *The Guardian*, 23 May [Online]. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/middle-east-live/2013/may/23/syria-crisis-friends-of-syria-urge-iran-hezbollah-withdraw?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487> (Accessed: 27 May 2013).

Wittkopf, E.R., Kesley, C.W and Scott, J.M. (2003) 6th edn. *American Foreign Policy*. Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, Inc.

Weaver, M. (2013) 'Syria Agrees to take Part in Peace Conference', *The Guardian*, 24 May [Online]. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/24/Syria-agrees-to-peace-conference?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487> (Accessed: 28 May 2013).

William, R.E and Viotti, P.R. (eds.) (2012) *Arms Control: History, Theory and Policy Volume 1*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO,LLC.

Wright, R. (ed.) (2010) *The Iran Primer: Power, Politics and U.S Policy*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Wade, R.H. (2002) 'US Hegemony and the World Bank: The Fight over People and Ideas', *Review of International Political Economy*, volume 9, Issue 2 [Online]. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177420> (Accessed: 28 April 2013).

Yacoubia, M. and Lasensky. S. (2008) *Dealing with Damascus: Seeking Greater Return on U.S-Syria Relations*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

