



Mohamed Khidher University of Biskra

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of Foreign Language

MASTER DISSERTATION

Letters and Foreign Languages English Language

Civilization and Literature

Submitted and Defended by:

HADJ YUCEF Bilal

Entitled:

The American Soft Policy towards Algeria beyond the 9/11 Attacks

Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Civilization

Board of Examiners

Mr. SEDRATI Yasser	MAA Biskra	Examiner
Dr. ELHAMEL Lamjed	MCB Biskra	Chair Person
Ms. DJAALAL Merriam	MAA Biskra	Supervisor

Academic Year: 2022-2023

University of Mohamed Khider-Biskra-
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of the English Language and Literature

Supervisor: Meriem DJAALAL

Candidate: HADJ YUCEF Bilal

Specialty: Literature and Civilization

Date: 11/06/2023

DECLARATION OF INTEGRITY

I, **HADJ YUCEF Bilal**, solemnly declare that the dissertation titled “**The American Soft Policy Towards Algeria Beyond the 9/11 Attacks**” submitted to the Department of the English language and Literature at Biskra University is entirely my own work, free from plagiarism, and has not been submitted to any other educational institution. I have appropriately acknowledged and cited all sources used, and I have conducted myself with academic integrity throughout the process. I understand the severe consequences of academic misconduct and affirm the authenticity of my dissertation.

Signature

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work to my family mainly my father who was and still there for me backing me up all the way long.

Many thanks to my siblings, to my best ever sister Hahj Youcef Imene and her little children Safia and Islam, and to my little brother Fouad Samir, thanks all for your infinite passion, unconditional love and support.

Much appreciated To Mr: Kamel Ben Zida for his appreciable hand of help during the entire journey of my Master II studies, and to my friends Femmam Mouhamed, Khaled Souiri and all my classmates thank you for everything.

To my dear friends Oumaima Sellami and Kaouthar Geuttaf words are helpless to thank you enough for the good company and encouragement.

To my uncle Bourass Nour Eddine and to my aunt Zaineab I cannot thank you enough for all what you did for me.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to all those who have supported and guided me throughout the completion of this master's thesis.

First and foremost, I am immensely thankful to my supervisor, Djaalal Meiem, for her invaluable guidance, advice and for being patient towards my attitudes. Her constructive criticism and encouragement have been instrumental in shaping this research project.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the jury members; Dr. Elhamel Lamjed, Mr. Sedrati Yasser, Mrs. Heddad Maimouna for accepting to evaluate this thesis.

I am indebted to my family for their unconditional love, patience, and constant encouragement. Their belief in my abilities and their unwavering support has been my constant source of motivation.

Finally, I am grateful to all the teachers who bore the burden of responsibility to educate and teach us all the academic years' long. Their willingness to share their expertise has been crucial in making this research meaningful.

Abstract

This research delves into the role of soft power within the context of US-Algeria relations following the events of 9/11. Following World War II, the United States emerged as the dominant global power, employing a blend of soft and hard policies to maintain its superpower status and counter the Soviet Union. While utilizing military interventions and employing hard power tactics, the US also employed soft power strategies to safeguard its interests on a global scale. By focusing on Algeria as a case study, this study investigates how the US implemented soft power measures to safeguard its interests and security in the region. Through the utilization of historical and analytical approaches, coupled with qualitative methods, the study aims to comprehend the practical application of American soft power in Algeria. The findings reveal the challenges faced by US authorities in comprehending Algeria's landscape, primarily due to its conservative ideological stance shaped by various events. Furthermore, factors such as neighboring countries' facilitation of Israeli normalization and the US recognition of Western Sahara's dependency on Morocco add further complexity to the situation. By delving deeper into American foreign policy towards Algeria beyond the 9/11 attacks, this study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.

Key Words:Algeria, Algerian Foreign Policy, American Foreign Policy, American Interests, Hard Power Policy, Soft Power Policy, the United States.

List of Acronyms

GIA	Armed Islamic Group of Algeria
GSPC	Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat
US	United States
WW I	World War One
WW II	World War Two
USSR	United Socialist Soviet Republic
EU	European Union
UN	United Nations
NSC	National Security Council
NLA	National Liberation Army
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
AQI	Al-Qaeda in Iraq
9/11	September 11, 2001
CRP	Congress Research Program
FLN	National Liberation Front

ALN	National Liberation Army
TRT	Turkish Radio and Television Corporation
WTO	World Trade Organization
OAU	Organization of African Unity
ALO	American Legion Organization
EPC	European Policy Centre
NLA	National Liberation Army (Vietnam)
TSCTP	Trans-Sahara Counter-Terrorism Partnership
IMET	International Military Education and Training
AQIM	Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb
TIFA	Trade and Investment Framework Agreement

Table of Contents

Declaration of Integrity.....	I
Dedication	II
Acknowledgments.....	III
Abstract.....	IV
List of Acronym.....	V
Table of Contents.....	VII
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Portfolio of American Foreign Policy.....	8
Introduction.....	9
1.1 Definition of Foreign Policy.....	10
1.2 Principles of American Foreign Policy.....	12
1.3 The Relationship between Domestic Affairs and Foreign Policy.....	13
1.4 The Nature of Foreign Policy and Its Various Dimensions.....	15
1.4.1 Hard Power	16
1.4.2 Soft Power	17
1.4.2.1 The Making Process of Soft Power.....	18
1.5 The American Foreign Policy Abroad US.....	20
1.5.1 Asia.....	20
1.5.2 Europe.....	20
1.5.3 Africa.....	22
1.5.4 Latin America.....	26
1.5.5 The Middle East.....	28
Conclusion.....	32

Chapter Two: Algeria's Foreign Policy vis-à-vis The United States.....	34
Introduction.....	35
2.1 Algeria: A General Background.....	35
2.1.1 A Geographical Background.....	35
2.1.2 A Historical Background.....	36
2.2 The Algerian Political System.....	40
2.3. Algeria's Foreign Policy.....	40
2.4 Historical Developments in Algerian Foreign Policy.....	44
2.5 Algerian Foreign Relationships with European Countries.....	47
2.5.1 Algerian Relationships with France.....	47
2.5.2 Algerian Relationships with the European Union.....	49
2.6 The Development of the Relations between the USA and Algeria.....	51
Conclusion.....	53
Chapter Three: Americanism and the implementation of Soft Power Policy with Algeria..	55
Introduction.....	56
3.1 Definition of Americanism.....	57
3.2 Characteristics of Americanism.....	58
3.3 The Concept of Globalization.....	59
3.4 The Notion of American Exceptionalism	60
3.5 American implementation of Soft Power Policy with Algeria beyond 9/11 Attacks.....	61
3.5.1 American Political Policies within Algeria.....	63
3.5.2 Bilateral Military and Security Cooperation.....	67
3.5.3 Trade and Economic Policies.....	71
3.5.4 Cultural and Educational Policies.....	73
Conclusion.....	77

General Conclusion.....	79
Works Cited.....	82
الملخص.....	91

General Introduction

America has been always the refuge for those who seek a new life far away from all kinds of social, cultural, political and religious persecutions. Starting with the Puritans; they fled all the way to America asking for shelter and a better life full of religious freedom and equality of chances. Literally speaking, America afforded chances to its inhabitants, and this was the core reason why America was the favorite destination for immigrants for centuries until the present day. In fact, both the American exceptionalism and supremacy were the outcome of well-defined set of political policies and decisions

First of all, America promoted concepts that were not new, but Americans were the pioneers in implementing them on the real ground. Equality, the pursuit of happiness, individualism and freedom were of the reach for everyone comes to America. Uncle Sam's country, like it is used to be called since 1813, set to strict in maintaining order both locally and overseas. It proved to be the world's policeman. The Mayflower Compact can be deemed the first real implementation of the American policies inside its geographical borders. The Founding Fathers and later on the American presidents seemed to affirm the American vision in succeeding both locally and overseas.

The United started was a group of thirteen colonies. These colonies struggled to find harmony and to establish order, yet they succeeded in doing so. The Civil War of 1861 between the south and the north was also another achievement in the American history because it united the nation. Then, America expanded westwards in an attempt to preserve its interests, but locally. The American foreign policy, in fact, shifted from isolationism into internationalism. Isolationism worked at the beginning of the American history, but America wanted to mark its presence overseas and was ready enough to act. The American interference

in WWII in 1941 was of a great influence on the position of America and its vision for the rest of the world.

When it comes to the American foreign policy towards North Africa, especially Algeria, we notice that it shifted from the use of hard power to soft power. In doing so, America gained some allies and enemies. It invaded Iraq in 2003, which resulted in developing a “negative attitude” towards America. In the case of Algeria, it can be observed that soft power and diplomacy were the appropriate approaches. It is notable that American culture intertwined with Algerian culture, showcasing a form of embodying the Algerian way of life. This is partly due to the Algerian people's openness and receptiveness towards embracing new ideas and practices.

America is more flexible than other countries when it comes to its foreign policies. America, as the rest of the world, seeks to secure and guarantee its interests overseas whatever the cost is. This is why, America varied in its usage of foreign policies from hard to soft based on certain elements like the nature of the target country and the mentality of its citizens.

Mainly, Zemouchi and Ellagoune stated that the word “hard” was used to refer to the “use” of force; however, it is no more the case. Hard power is no more associated with bombings, killings or torturing, but it shifts “(...) to address the minds and works on long-lasting objectives” (2). Both hard and soft powers were compared to each other to see whether the policies used in soft power are different to the ones by hard power. In this respect, Zemouchi and Ellagoune defined both powers as: Hard Power, as the name implies, refers to something Hard or Strong, such as military or economic power. In contrast, Soft Power is more tolerant, moderate and subtle.

The two terms Hard and Soft “you get other states to do what you want” (29). Thus, it is represented in the form of command and force. On the other hand, it is much better when you are able to “make others want what you want.” (3)

This definition sets the demarcation line between hard power when the writer relates it with using force and soft with using flexible tools. However, between the two; there is a common ground which is even soft power, is an indirect way in making you do what I want, thus it is a way of exercising an indirect power. Nye stated this when he used the term that was coined by

Melissen referring to soft power. Melissen said that soft power can be labelled "smart", thus Smart power is a combining of elements of soft and hard power (5).

One of the soft tools used by decision makers is cultural diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy is a cover of indirect underlying policies that would guarantee total obedience and exchange of cultures as a symbol of tolerance and acceptance to the non-whites. This step is very famous in the American foreign policy and it proved its efficiency in the Arabic world as examples, exchanging programs between countries such as America and Algeria. This exchange comes under the umbrella of mutual educational improvements' and development. "Making use of American soft power has always been a central element of US public diplomacy efforts in the Arab world, but changes in the working environment have led to changes in the approach" (4).

Simon Mark, indeed, defines it as, "Cultural Diplomacy is a diplomatic practice" (5). In other words, Simon helps in contextualizing the concept Cultural Diplomacy to refer to a carefully studied policy and action by decision makers. This decision comes under the umbrella of globalization and Americanization because principally, cultural diplomacy is meant to spread cultural, social, and educational values and principles to strengthen the position of any country in another country. This is the case with America in North Africa and Algeria in particular.

Due to Algeria's geostrategic and political significance as a country gate to Africa, America has consistently harbored a deep longing and aspiration for it. However, dealing with Algeria was not an easy task due to the Algerian critical background about the American intentions and its bloody history before Iraq. Since America was the reason behind the death of millions of Iraqi people when it engaged the war against Iraq, Arabs developed a negative attitude against America.

America was seen as a destructive unmerciful power. In addition, given America's awareness of this reality, it is imperative for the nation to adjust its course of action in light of this new information. Specifically, America must strive to reduce its levels of military intervention and find an alternative softer way in dealing with North African countries, especially Algeria. At this point, a drastic shift of the American hard power to the soft power was noticed. Whether, American decision makers used hard or soft powers, what is of a great importance is the secure of their interests. The American new agenda towards Algeria included cultural, social, economic, and military co-operations and cultural exchanging programs to guarantee solid American-Algerian relations. These tools and others would later strengthen the American presence within the Algerian geographical borders.

Based on the provided research background, the study investigates the following main research inquiry.

- What are the main characteristics of American foreign policy in Algeria?

This research question will be explored by examining the following subsidiary inquiries.

- How did American foreign policy policies shape and influence global relations and international affairs?
- What is Algeria's foreign policy approach towards the United States?

- What does Americanism entail, and how does America apply its soft policies in Algeria?

The aims of this study vary from theoretical to practical ones. The intended research seeks to trace back the American foreign policy both locally and abroad, looking for traces of soft power and its beginnings in Algeria. In addition, this research intends to analyze the patterns of soft power in Africa and Algeria in particular and compare these patterns to the new ones. Based on the comparison, the researcher will figure out the reasons behind any kind of shift of the American foreign tools towards Algeria. As far as Americanism is concerned, the results of the research will focus on the levels of the American influence on Algerians.

Finally, based on the principles of the American foreign policy, the research aims at knowing to what extent America could achieve the intended goals in Algeria and to what extent have the American educational, cultural and social soft patterns used in Algeria been effective in achieving their intended goals, and what factors contribute to Algeria's divergent policies and political ideology compared to its neighboring countries?

The reasons behind undertaking this research are multiple. Principally this work of investigating facts and analyzing data intends to draw the light on a critical aspect of the American-Algerian relations in recent years. This focus will try to explain why America succeeded in Americanizing the whole world and invading it without excerpting any military power. Also, this research will provide the field with extra examination of the correct reasons behind the American strong affiliations to Algeria and even the underlined parameters and techniques of the American presence within Algeria. Finally, the presented research is a portfolio of the new trend of the American foreign policies and how they are implemented within the American borders. In other words, this research is an evaluation of how America tries to engage with the Algerian culture as well.

This research is qualitative interpretative in nature. The research will be based on the eclectic approach starting with the historical approach. The historical approach is used to trace back the American foreign policy until the present day. In addition, the present research will highlight the cultural, political, social and economic tools adopted by America in North Africa, primarily in Algeria from its early roots to the present day and compare between them using the comparative approach. Along with the analytical investigation which is used to locate the important shift of the American foreign policy. Of course, the research is a library research in which various books, journals, magazines and dissertations will be used as references.

This research is structured into three chapters. The first chapter deals with the American foreign policy doctrine used to shape the policies being taken by policymakers of the nation; with a comparison towards local and abroad decisions in phase, and in the other phase if there is symmetry between them. The aim of this chapter is to highlight the motives behind different policies being taken across the world by The U.S. and how they reflected on the political stances of America.

The second chapter deals with the historical relations between Algeria and The United states of America and its origins till the present days. It aims at recognizing Algeria as a strategic country by the US authorities and some European countries in form of France equipped with ample resources to boost the economy. It also tackles the Algerian political system and its foreign policy development. Also, it discusses the progress that combined Algeria and America through time and how the standpoints' meet and across each others.

The final chapter examines the concept of Americanism as a universal concept and how it is characterized and defined according to different perspectives. As well, the American implementation of its soft power policies in what forms and fields to engrave

more the strategic relations with Algeria, due to the significance weight and role that Algeria represented it as a key player in the region of North Africa and Arab world.

Chapter One

Portfolio of American Foreign Policy

Introduction

US foreign policy refers to the US government's diplomatic strategies, actions, and decisions vis-à-vis other countries and international organizations. The interests in national security, economic concerns, and ideological convictions have all influenced US foreign policy. The overall foreign policy goal of the United States was to maintain the United States' position as a global superpower while promoting democracy, peace, and stability throughout the world. One of the distinguishing features of US foreign policy is its interventionist approach to global affairs (U.S. Department of State).

The United States has often played a proactive role in conflicts and crises around the world, often using military force to further its strategic interests. Critics argue that the United States tends to act unilaterally, often pursuing its own interests at the expense of international cooperation. In summary, US foreign policy is characterized by an interventionist approach that emphasizes the promotion of democracy and human rights. While the United States has played a leading role in solving global problems, it was a reason behind many international interventions. (White House para1)

This chapter aims to explicate the concept of "American foreign policy abroad and the transition between different strategies. Following a historical, descriptive, and analytical approach, this chapter also examines the history of the United States in terms of engaging in diverse international relations with its allies and enemies depending on the nature of the region and country being targeted. Presumably, a parallel graph is emerging with its own unparalleled social and cultural structure. Further, it emphasizes the multiple goals and interests that motivate the United States to take steps and actions in these areas, which transcend criteria of tension, conflict, and risk to U.S. interests in any part of the world.

1.1. Definition of Foreign Policy

Post WWI and WWII witnessed a turning point in the international relations. Most countries developed nation states. As a result of this development is the initiation of international relations between these states. Not only that, but with the creation of the body of the United Nations along with the process of decolonization that resulted in the liberation of many countries. John Lewis Gaddis who is an American international relations scholar, military historian, and writer, sees that: “The process of decolonization in fact accelerated the growth of relations between these states.” (Gaddis 154)

There exists a process of foreign policy that is little known by citizens and voters who do not belong to the political class for the Assistant Professor Dr. Macharia Magu, “it is unresolved, who, in a country’s political structures, influences foreign policy most and to what degree” (48). To put it simpler, it is not definite who defines the terms of the foreign policy or who participates in. Macharia also agreed on the idea that the institutions, of all kinds, and persons in authority take the responsibility to determine the form or the way the foreign policy must take. This is, of course, by taking into consideration that citizens know on whose behalf they act (48).

Based on the conventions of the international relations that give priority to the system that impacts the way countries act towards each other, it is known that the states interests are shaped by any government international structure. One of the effective considerations in any states’ international policy is the domestic audience. In other words, the way a country deals with outside countries is the mere reflection of the domestic audience’s wishes and interests. After that, as a second step in the process of making a foreign policy, the government sets the agenda which displays the countries’ interests and preferences all of this is internal then, the immediate application of the policies starts by the states’ foreign policy (48).

Then, “foreign policy addresses the external audience, articulating the states’ interests.” According to this quote, foreign policy works on external in order to guarantee the internal affairs. Alexander George confirms the process of making foreign policy when he said that “the foreign policy of a nation addresses itself not to the external world, as is commonly stated, but rather to ‘the image of the external world’ that is in the minds of those who make foreign policy.” (48). This quote asserts the idea that the participants in the process of foreign policy take into consideration what they want from the other countries and then, they address it through their foreign policies. Decision makers have an image of their needs of the outside world; this image exists in their minds.

The American foreign policy mirrors certain strategic interests, at the same time, it articulates the values of the country that it wishes to establish, and the Trauman’s Doctrine is the best example. President Trauman gave aids to Turkey and Greece to contain communism, the goal of maintaining communism initiates the “containment policy” (49). This step guaranteed not only the US economic, security, socio-cultural interests, but also the spread of the American values as democracy and freedom. The same values were fought by America to be preserved in Europe long time (49).

Despite the fact that American foreign policy was defined differently, yet various scholars and politicians go in their definitions to say that foreign policy focuses basically on the behavior of a definite country towards others. Herman stated that foreign policy is “the discrete purposeful action that results from the political level decision of an individual or group of individuals.” Here, Herman asserts the act of taking decisions concerning foreign relations can be an individual or a body that decides the foreign policy’s agenda.

Dr. Aleya Sultana has defined foreign policy as” a set of pre-established strategies designed and implemented systematically to manage a country ‘s relations with other nations” (1). In her definition, Aleya sheds the light on how foreign policies are a group of prepared

intentions, hopes and wants that must be established on the real ground. However, George Modeleski goes in his definition of foreign policies to the fact that it is a system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of others states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment.” (1). Modeleski’s suggested a model of foreign policy is more descriptive and defines the real nature of foreign policy by being not only affecting others but also be affected by them.

1.2. Principles of American Foreign Policy

Any foreign policies taken by communities are driven by a set of predetermined interests. Every country wants to guarantee its benefits that are in scope of their diplomacy, said Allison and Blackwell. Thus, there are a set of interests that fuel the process as stated as the two Doctors Halido and Silas:

- Decrease the threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons on the American soil and its citizens
- Ensure US allies’ survival and their active cooperation in international system
- Present any initiation of hostile regimes
- Achieve productive relations (Halido and Silas 33).

The American Department of State highlighted that the American major interests are:

- To protect the US and its citizens
- Advance democracy
- Promote international relations between countries
- Support American diplomats at home and abroad (34).

1.3. The Relationship between Domestic Affairs and Foreign Policy

The influence of internal affairs on foreign affairs has always been decisive. A bright foreign policy depends on domestic support is not limited to domestic politics, but also includes legislator's appreciation and public understanding. It can be said that foreign policy is a reflection of domestic policy, via homemade debates and discussions of congress foreign policy takes its framework. According to the Former Ambassador and Head of Mission of South Africa Riaan Eksteen, Henry Kissinger believes that foreign policy begins where domestic policy ends.(para2)one of his successors to US Secretary of State Cyrus Vance Management believes that there was an interaction between the hosts politics and foreign policy and these interrelationships are becoming more and more important. (Vance para.2) not only was Vance's observation true in 1983, it remains influential till today.

It is not easy to understand a country's system unless we understand what its internal affairs represent. Shaped from believes, aspects, principles and ideologies that posses the big part of its components.The main elements and requirements of the domestic policy resonate abroad in politics. (Eksteen para.5) Once this is understood, the country's foreign policy can be understood and the mechanisms behind any decision making process are justified. This one the cover is not durable. Without local influence, it is difficult to gain foreign influence in politics (11).

Many factors interfere to shape it; lobbies, pressure groups, independent organizations and other agents took the lead too. Foreign policy will hardly succeed if it is not accepted at home. The harmony between the domestic and abroad policies must find a land of ratification to complete each other and exceed any obstacles in the way of stability. The Professor of Politics and the author Roy Macridis in a profound statement stated that “foreign policy is nothing more than a by-product of domestic politics.” shown that the domestic political decisions are the fundamental bases for the framing of foreign politics (11).

Domestic stress can manifest itself in many ways, as well as in the relationships between the foreign policy decision makers and domestic voters are partially driven social institution (para.6). Interrelationship between domestic and foreign policy correspondence of domestic events to foreign policy decisions is extremely important meaning. Therefore, consideration should always be given to domestic restrictions what foreign policy decisions are made and implemented. Societal impact local constituencies are indeed crucial in influencing foreign policy. The one domestic conditions cannot be ignored in the choice and formulation of foreign policy completed (para.6).

The Vietnam War remains perhaps the most important testimony to this reality. The war had a significant influence on congressional and American attitudes toward people. At that time Congress, especially the Senate, became fixed and decides to take a more assertive role in the formulation and implementation of American foreign policy in politics (para.7). This led to a change in foreign affairs. No more the executive branch has the right to set its own foreign policy without much power Congressional advice and support. Based on the process, if the government is now wins, it will need more confidence from the American people, as voters and via initial elections all over the states to gain the needed number of votes and representatives. This new era of human-to-human conversation representatives and administrators, which originated in the 1970s, are still common today (para.7).

The implications of this new relationship are manifold. The most important thing is to be aware that foreign policy must be understood and supported by the nation and its people congressmen representatives (para.10) without an extensive base of congressional support and among the American people, foreign policy initiatives are vulnerable to public's disappointment, misunderstandings, and denial.

To conclude, the connection between domestic affairs and foreign affairs is undeniable. Foreign policy can never be separated from the domestic environment in which

it was born, two-way flows arising from foreign policy and domestic policy cannot be ignored by foreign policy politics that have domestic sources and domestic politics that have foreign influences. When analyzing the country's foreign policy, one cannot ignore the internal aspects. They show themselves in matters of foreign policy. Domestic politics play an important role in considering strategic foreign policy decisions because they anticipated or realized threats related to national security issues.

1.4. The Nature of Foreign Policy and Its Various Dimensions

According to the author Weinbrenner Brown, power is defined in terms of the size, quality and even the quantity of raw materials or even the military power of any country (Weinbrenner 14). We see that Weinbrenner emphasizes on that the military might is given more priority, and by this, he declares that a country is so powerful only when its military so powerful. There is a widespread perception that the more you have might, the more influence you have. Although, this conception starts with the beginning of the Creation, still it is reasonable to the contemporary political system (14).

From the realist point of view of Hans Morgenthau, the German-American jurist and political scientist and John Mearsheimer, who is the opposing leader of Liberalism, power is crucial. Morgenthau emphasized on that power is necessary to secure national interests. Mearsheimer also said that there exists an international system; this is why they struggle for power and look for hegemony (15). Following the premises of this theory, Mearsheimer emphasized that America must reexamine its policies towards China. For Brzezinski and Mearsheimer, the rise of China is gradual, but to secure its interests, it will compete aggressively and intensely and this creates potentials for war. Despite the fact, China did not have the power to compete with America, but by 2025, it could (15). As a solution to the rising China, he suggested that America should maximize its power to use it against China.

This suggestion goes hand in hand with the security dilemma. All countries normally want to secure their interests, they have to improve their military power, thus military might is a certainty. In fact, the more a country secures itself militarily, the more other countries feel insecure, thus they will enter in security dilemma (15). Mearsheimer did not support American-Chinese relations. Lawrence F Kaplan was an advocate of the American war against Iraq and the use of hard power in Iraq (16). For Charles Krauthammer, America is immune of any terrorist attacks due to its interrogation techniques. Moreover, he opposes any kind of constraints of arm possession because it weakens the American defense, and thus America cannot defend itself (Weinbrenner 16).

On the other hand, the advocates of liberal internationalism argue that America has to establish relations with the rest of the world and be more open to the whole world. These advocates of internationalism, they view that what others think about America is not important because globalization demands to be open to the whole world. This is why America must establish relations and cooperation with other countries if it wants to be successful in the world of politics. Both Koahane, who is a Professor at International AFFAIRS AT Princeton University and Nye, who is a University Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University, did not support the use of power to solve economic problems (16) another example of the proponents of the use of power is Thomas Friedman (17).

1.4.1. Hard Power

Colin S Gray is a British-American writer on Geopolitics, who believes that power is a crucial concept in political theory. Joseph Nye defined hard power as “The ability to effect the outcomes you want to and, if necessary, to change the behavior of others to make this happen.” Nye held the idea that hard power refers to the capacity to change ones’ views and outcomes. Recently, scholars have differentiated between two powers: soft and hard. Hard power refers to the use of arms, direct control and obviously the use of economic means

to threaten or reward; however, soft power refers to “the ability to have influence by co-opting others to share some one of one value’s and, as a consequence, to share some key elements on one’s agenda for international order and security” (V). Compared to hard power, soft power is indirect.

1.4.2. Soft Power

Dr. Li Anshan, who works as a Professor at Peking, mentioned in his thesis that soft power, as a concept, occurred as a criticism to Paul Kennedy’s book that is entitled *Rise and Decline of the Great Powers*. For Li, who is a graduate from the School of International Studies, Kennedy declared that although America was number one in the fields of science, technology, markets and military power, but it was challenged by many things. As a consequence, the world would be ruled by many powers (multi-lateral). As a response to Kennedy’s argument of weakening American position in the world, Nye uses a new concept “soft power” to describe the policies used by America instead of using military force to achieve its interests (2).

According to Drs. Zemmouchi and Ellagoune Abdelhak, soft power refers to the capacity that a country possesses to make other countries do what it wants and gets the outcomes that they want via attraction and not coercion (4). According to William Cronin, Soft power can be based on the appeal of one's ideas or culture, especially if a state or institution can persuade others that its power is legitimate. The goal of a nation or institution is to promote the development of international standards that enable other nations or individuals to define their own interests in ways that are compatible with their own. If it is successful, the state or organization won't have to spend as much money on conventional hard power resources (economic or military) as it otherwise would to try to successfully influence its intended target or audience (5).

1.4.2.1. The Making Process of Soft Power

Different to hard power, soft power goes under a complicated process. Each soft policy should guarantee three means which are benignity, brilliance, beauty. Vuving mentioned that soft power undergoes three steps: Benignity exists in various forms, such as to be good or generous, helpful, supportive, or protective to others. Sometimes, when you are harmless or you raise people's self-esteem, you are benign. As an outcome of benignity comes sympathy and gratitude. Benignity is an insurance of good intentions and willingness to help people, thus people easily cooperate. It is paradoxical if you focus on yourself and be selfish, you will be seen as perceived and people will not be cooperative with you, nonetheless if you try to be more open to other and to care about them, you will be embraced (9).

Sometimes, in order for benignity to produce power, here should be embedded in a complex system that guarantees that is so protective and it is a mixture of both soft and hard currencies (Vuving 9).

Brilliance can take any form in international relations; it can be "a strong and awesome military rich and radiant culture or a peaceful and well-run society." (Vuving 10) Also, brilliance can refer to a successful country which in technology, science, and economy. Then the term itself, in the political context, refers to the persons who have properties and who are capable or successful. Successful people attract others because they have succeeded in problems and provide solutions. Since you are successful, you will be imitated, and people feel safe when they follow your path. Brilliance can work at many levels in soft power (10).

A powerful person means a successful person. Parallel to this, in politics, especially is international relations; some countries copy the policies and practices of capable and successful countries. Soft power can be generated by clients for agents via adopting

something from successful and capable people. Brilliance can be the reason behind the creation of power (11).

In the political context, beauty does not mean attractiveness, yet it refers to the shared ideals and values which make actors close. The resonance that binds players together over common goals, values, causes, or visions, rather than physical appearance, is what defines beauty in world politics. It instills in the performers a sense of coziness and safety, of hope and self-extension, of identification and community, and reassurance and admiration. This beauty can be found by actors when they work together to further their common goals, values, causes, or dreams. Contrary values and causes give regimes a solid foundation to view one another negatively, but common values and causes give regimes a push toward the notion that the other regime is beautiful, which in turn will foster trust, friendship, and cooperation (11).

According to the Professor at Honolulu County, United States Asia Pacific Center for Security Studies Alexander Vuving, the following summarizes the fundamental process through which this potent form of beauty manifests as soft power. Your strong conviction, compelling expression, selfless dedication, and unwavering perseverance for an ideal, value, cause, or vision may move others to share that same ideal, value, cause, or vision, which is the first step toward making you the representative or personification of the same principles. If people see you in this light, they will stick with you and turn to you for advice, leadership, motivation, and inspiration. The potential for beauty is right here. I trust that you will advance our interests, uphold our beliefs, set a good example, or give good service because you compellingly reflect our shared principles, values, causes, or visions (11).

The essential force currency that creates charismatic leaders is beauty. This applies to both people and nations. The US, the USSR, and other countries participated in the 20th century. The People's Republic of China, were undoubtedly the most endearing nations, each finding favor with a certain group of nations and people (11).

1.4. The American Foreign Policy Abroad US

US relations with the other countries range from ratifying economic treaties with certain countries to the intervening in others. The following countries are meticulously selected as landmarks of the American long history of foreign policy all over the world.

1.5.1. Asia

➤ The Vietnam War

According to the director of the EU-Asia Centre, a senior advisor at the European Policy Centre (EPC), and an adjunct professor at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin Fraser Cameron, this war started in 1964 and 1974. It was described as traumatic; America was divided and lost more than 48000 casualties and 300000 wounded. The American intervention came after the colonial master of Vietnam, France pulled out in 1945. It was decided in Geneva Conference in 1955 that Vietnam must be divided into communist north and free south (9). Some years passed before the communist guerilla in the south became active. Americans called them Vietcongs. In a hope to stop the communist swept, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, in addition to the South Vietnamese Army wanted to defeat the leader HO CHI LINH and the National Liberation Front (NLA) and the Vietcongs. America said that if the south of Vietnam could not resist communism, then all other countries will fall as well like dominoes. The American casualties were rising without any sign of winning and huge student protests were hold in America to stop the folly war (9). Based on the current situation America had to sign a treaty to succeed from Vietnam in January 1973 (10)

1.5.2. Europe

➤ Cold War

U.S. was in a dilemma during the Cold war. Pat Paterson, the author, asserted that there was two choices. From one point, realism supports the notions of democracy and preserving human rights. It was believed by most American experts that the process of

fighting communism was as an existential one as this war is between good and evil (22). However, according to Paterson, in order to contain communism from spreading, certain tough policies had to be implemented.

These decisions swept away from the known American values. George Kennan, a writer of Long Telegram asserted the tough measurement that America used when he said: “We must concede that harsh government measures of repression maybe the only answer; that these measures have to precede from regimes whose origins and methods would not stand the test of American concepts of democratic procedures” (qtd in. Paterson 22). Accordingly, it is obvious that communism is viewed out of the American norms of democracy.

For the politician and the lawyer Fraser Cameron, America stayed isolated for a century and a half, then it woke up to decide to take a role in the world and the threat was communism. The Soviet wanted to dominate the region, thus they moved and liberated Berlin in 1945 and ended the Nazis presence there, By taking this step, the Soviet became the leader After losing 20 million lives in the WWII (7). USSR was not ready to leave the front to the over wealming of the American style in Poland.

Cameron sees the Speech of Winston Churchill “the Iron Curtain” that paved the way to American to get rid of any communist presence in Europe. These different views between democratic America and Communist Russia led into a Cold War between the two poles. (8)

The author declared that the war between the two countries led to an arms race, and this had an outcome on the American foreign policy (Cameron 8). The 1974 witnessed the publication of an article signed by X which affirmed the Communism must be contained. This article was the reason behind the initiation of the Soviet Union. In May 1947 America granted Turkey and Greece 400 million to stop communism and it also, granted Western Europe with both economic and financial aids. This step came to be known as the Marshall Plan (9), President John F. Kennedy said that: “America would pay any price and bear any burden,

meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foes” (Cameron 9) Jimmy Carter as well revived the Wilsonian idealism and stated that the US “ought to be a beacon for nations who search for peace, freedom, individual liberty and basic human rights.” (qtd in. 9)

➤ **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Watson confirmed that the intervention of the United States by the UN and other actors in Bosnia and Herzegovina showed the nature of U.S. peacekeeping mission operations and served as a guide of the domestic political sentiments. Americans were unconcerned with the situation in the former Yugoslavia, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, prior to the outbreak of conflict in 1992 (6). He also ensured that this was caused in part by the conflict's lack of public awareness at the time it first broke out and by the media's lack of coverage of it. The government of Mr. George H.W. Bush which is in charge started participating only partially in Bosnia but preferred to avoid direct conflict during the conflict's first violent months. The Slobodan Milosevic regime was targeted for isolation through diplomatic action because of harsh criticism directed at the Serbian leadership in Belgrade for inciting violence in the region. (Watson 7).

1.5.3. Africa

➤ **Algeria**

The American Algerian relations can be described as good and stable. Along the Algerian history, Algeria did not witness an American presence within its soils. Yahia Zouhir, the Professor and Director of Research in Geopolitics at KEDGE Business School, asserts that American-Algerian relations have significantly intensified across all fronts since 1990, when compared to previous times. As a proof of these strong relations which combined America and Algeria was the visit that president Bouteflika made to America prior to 2001. What promoted this process as well is the status and importance that Algeria gained in the African Union (4). Yahia Zoubir also strongly agreed that Americans believed that the case of Western

Sahara would not be resolved without the Algerian interference. As far as the war against terrorism is concerned, it became clear to America that Algeria must be a part of this struggle. This is why, it has come to light that Louis Freeh, the Director of the FBI, made a visit to Algeria in order to contribute to the efforts against Osama bin Laden's network. (4)

Consequently, Zoubir stated that the Algerian authorities willingly furnished Washington with a list of fugitive terrorists who had sought refuge in Europe and America. Another visit by president Bouteflika took place in Washington on 5 November 2001 (4). The visit's focus was the terrorist agenda. These discussions resulted in the following: "support for the fight against terrorism in Algeria, support for the Algiers Charter on the fight against terrorism, condemnation of violent take-over of power in Africa and endorsement of Algeria's diplomacy in Africa and the Mediterranean." (4-5).

America and Algeria worked together to establish relations economically. Zoubir stated an example, in July 2001 sought a strong ratification of an economic treaty between the two countries on trade and investment (4). This economic framework established the ground for more dualities and contracts and gave Algeria "a bilateral investment agreement, mutual commercial concessions and an agreement on double taxation, enlarging access to the Algerian oil and natural gas resources to multinational corporations." (5)

For Zoubir, America wanted from this agreement to secure the biggest share of the Algerian market with regards to hydrocarbons. In fact, as a matter of reality or truth Algeria endeavored to make it easier for investors to invest in other business besides the energy industry sector. America was interested in other fields of development too, and some of them were finance, pharmaceutical products, tele-communications, and data processing (6). Due to some problems, America could not advance further in the aimed fields. Problems of the 1990s; the lack of infrastructure and bureaucracy were the major problems that slower the process of American investment in Algeria (6).

➤ **Egypt**

Dr. Sayed Amded, Historically speaking, Egypt is vital for the U.S. national security interests due to on its geography, demography, and diplomatic status. Since Egypt controls the Suez Canal, it is of a great importance because it links the Mediterranean and Red Sea (14). Sayed Ahmed asserted that from the British occupation of Egypt in 1882 to the early twentieth century, the United States had had limited involvement and interests in Egypt. For Britain, Egypt is the pearl of the Middle East because of its strategic control of the Suez Canal (15). This canal asserted its imperial " l i f e - l i n e " and world trade interests. At that time, American policy was applying the containment policy and did not have any kind of interference in the countries under European colonial rule and stayed faithful to this policy by considering "Egypt as a part of the British sphere of influence" (15). In this time focused more on strengthening itself internally and avoided any kind of controversies, especially with Britain. (15)

The period between the two world wars, Americans sought more opportunities, resulting in the increase of American-Egyptian relations. State Department, in fact, negotiated a treaty that eventually would secure the rights in Egypt. Thus, an agreement of 24 May 1930 granted American interests with unconditional rights and gave America most-favored-nation 3 treatments. During this period American enterprises such as Kodak, SoConey Vacuum, Singer Sewing Machines, and General Motors, established 4 offices in Egypt (16).

Sayed Ahmed also stated that events moved quickly at the start of the first stage following the founding of the embassies, as seen on January 27, 1947, when the Egyptian government declared the failure of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty and 50 negotiations on the issue of sovereignty over the Sudan. Additionally, it stated that it intended to present the entire case before the Security Council. Nokrashy Pasha, the then-Egyptian prime minister, asserted

complete Egyptian sovereignty over the Sudan and requested the complete withdrawal of all British forces (25).

To advance the strategic partnership between the United States and Egypt as well as regional stability, U.S. assistance to Egypt has been vital. Almost \$50 billion in military aid and \$30 billion in economic assistance have been given to Egypt by the United States since 1978. Due to the American government's financial assistance to Egypt:

- Millions of Egyptians have electricity.
- Over 25 million Egyptians have access to clean water and sanitation services.
- Polio has been eliminated in the country.
- Maternal mortality has been reduced by 78 percent.
- Over half a million smallholder farmers have increased their incomes through improved marketing and technical assistance.
- Training for 115,000 primary school teachers is positively impacting 5 million children at 16,000 schools nationwide (para.2)

A framework agreement for trade and investment between Egypt and the US has been inked, paving the way for more open trade and investment. Most areas of the Egyptian economy where American companies operate include the production and development of oil and gas, renewable energy technologies, financial services, manufacturing, construction, telecommunications and information technology, and the restaurant and hospitality sector. The amount of U.S. direct investment going into Egypt in 2020 was \$1.5 billion, bringing the total long-term stock of U.S. FDI to around \$24 billion. To establish itself as a regional energy hub, Egypt is accelerating the production of renewable energy, which presents further potential business opportunities for US companies. Egypt will host the 27th Conference of the Parties (COP-27) on climate change in Sharm el-Sheikh in November 2022 (para.3).

1.5.4. Latin America

➤ Cuba

In the case of Latin America, the international relations, if we chose an appropriate expression it would be; not stable. Sometimes the US is in peace, and in other times, they are in wars. The Cuban Civil War had wept the island especially the poor eastern areas of the Spanish colony. Since 1868, Cuban rebels sought to follow the example of the other Latin American republics in order to get their independence. There were different centers in America. For their cause, Cuban rebels raised money for their revolution against the Spanish regime, and provided the media with stories and bought weapons with the help of Americans, Cubans put pressure on the President Ulysses S Grant and made him send warships into Cuban waters and even warn Spain. The President Ulysses showed less sympathy towards the Cuban rebels and even US was disinterested in the Cuban cause as well.

According to Donald Schmidt, an author and a Political Analyst, the mid of 1890 sought a turning point in the Cuban civilwar. The civil war was acerbated by the pass of the American tariff. Thus, the McKinley tariff had placed Cuban sugar and made Cuba export its sugar to Americans without paying for. This led to the boom in the Cuban economy and thus buying more lands to produce more sugar. Cuba is known for its sugar and tobacco, but these two products rely heavily of the American government to permit the entrance of the Cuban products into the American soil and to the American consumer (33). McKinley asserted that “the Executive is brought to the end of his efforts “and “forcible to intervention of the United States as a neutral to stop the war is justified on rational ground” (Schmidt 33). This war was declared innocent; it lasted only 107 days and cost 385 lives. In fact, the war in Cuba was a just a cover because the real American intention was the Philippines. Thus, the real war was the one in Philippines and it lasted three years and cost 4200 of the Americans (Scmidt 38).

➤ Brazil

Historically, the United States and Brazil have had strong political and economic ties, but the two nations' differing views of what their respective national interests have prevented them from forging a tight alliance. Under President Bolsonaro, these opinions have slightly changed. The ruler has asked for close cooperation with the US whereas previous Brazilian administrations strove to maintain independence in foreign policy. For instance, in South America, the Bolsonaro Administration has taken a more hostile stance against Cuba and closely collaborated with the Trump Administration on steps to handle the Venezuelan crisis.

Peter Meyer is a Western Hemisphere Policy Analyst at the Congressional Research Service at the University of New Mexico, claimed that Obama's Administration views Brazil as a "major global player" and an "indispensable partner" in matters ranging from international development to climate change. Administration representatives have frequently emphasized Brazil's status as a multicultural democracy, seeing it as a natural partner with shared values and objectives with the United States. The occasionally conflicting national interests and separate foreign policies of the two countries have occasionally put a strain on bilateral relations. Following allegations in 2013 about alleged National Security Agency (NSA) activity inside Brazil, and relations between the United States and Brazil were especially tense (9).

Peter Meyer also asserted that the US Department of State confirmed the political and economic ties between the US and Brazil have historically been strong. The nations currently participate in at least 20 bilateral dialogues, which are used to coordinate policies on matters of shared interest like trade, energy, security, racial equality, and the environment (10). Peter went in his disposal to say that Brazil's desire to have a bigger influence in world events has led to increased communication between the United States and Brazil on international matters. White House Office of the Press Secretary said: "Brazil is a "important global player" and a

"indispensable partner" on topics ranging from international development to climate change, according to the Obama Administration (10).

Nonetheless, the oftentimes conflicting national interests and separate foreign policies of the two nations have occasionally resulted in troubled bilateral relations. Oliver Stuenkel is a Political Analyst, Speaker and Professor at the School of International Relations at Fundacao Getulio Vargas in Latin America affirmed that U.S. officials, for instance, have expressed disappointment at Brazil's refusal to overtly condemn the Venezuelan government's efforts to stifle political dissent as well as its opposition to international efforts to diplomatically isolate Russia after it took Crimea. Brazil opposes the Russian and Venezuelan governments' activities, but because to its opposition to sanctions and desire for negotiation, it has approached the problems very differently from the US (Meyer 10).

1.5.5. The Middle East

➤ Israel

The Conservative Reserve Program (CRP) Congress Research confirmed that the areas of interest between America and Israel are many. In accordance with a 2016 bilateral military aid memorandum of understanding, which is valid for ten years, the United States is obligated to give Israel foreign military financing worth \$3.3 billion and to invest \$500 million annually in joint missile defense programs from FY2019 to FY2028, subject to Congressional appropriations. The use of U.S. security assistance by Israel has come under heightened criticism from some members of Congress, which has fueled discussion on the issue (1).

The report covered also that In June 2021, the long-serving government of Benjamin Netanyahu was replaced by a coalition led by Foreign Minister Yair Lapid of the Yesh Atid party and Prime Minister Naftali Bennett of the Yamina party. The coalition includes a number of different parties from across the political spectrum, including an Arab-led party(1).The Congress Report also reported that the Palestinian case was among the common

ground issues that tightly link America and Israel. In hopes of preserving the viability of a negotiated two-state solution among Israelis and Palestinians, Biden Administration officials have sought to help manage tensions, bolster Israel's defensive capabilities, and strengthen U.S.-Palestinian ties that frayed during the Trump Administration (1). Administration officials regularly speak out against steps taken by Israelis or Palestinians that could risk sparking violence and undermining the vision of two states, including settlement expansion and settler violence, demolitions, evictions, incitement to violence, and payments for individuals imprisoned for acts of terrorism (1).

Violence in 2022 has triggered heightened counterterrorism measures and some controversy, including in relation to the killing of Palestinian-American journalist Shireen Abu Akleh. With the Gaza Strip still under the control of the Sunni Islamist militant group Hamas (a U.S.-designated terrorist organization), the United States and other international actors face significant challenges in seeking to help with reconstruction without bolstering the group. The United States and other international actors confront considerable problems in attempting to aid in reconstruction without supporting the Sunni Islamist militant group Hamas. The Gaza Strip is still under the control of Hamas (1).

➤ **Iraq**

According to the U.S. Department of State, Iraq is now an important region for the United States as well as the Middle East's voice for democracy and moderation. The Iraqi's Government, which includes the legislature, is active, and it has a growing positive influence on the region. On diplomatic, political, economic and security matters, the US continues its active and extensive engagement with Iraq (para.2). The Strategic Framework Agreement (SFA) between Iraq and the United States serves as the framework for the bilateral relationship between the two countries by addressing a wide range of bilateral issues, such as

political relations and diplomacy, defense and security, trade and finance, energy, judicial and law enforcement, services, science, culture and education (para.2).

The American Department of State stated that U.S. bilateral aid seeks to maintain the strategic, political, and economic significance of the U.S. Iraq alliance in the text of a Middle East that is changing. Since 2014, the United States has given displaced conflict affected Iraqis billions of dollars in stability, demining, and humanitarian help, as well as assistance to communities to have just undergone genocide (para.3).

One of Iraqi's main economic partners is the United States, and in the past ten years, U.S. business has invested more money in Iraq. Iraq has been designated as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Performance program by the United States in order to boost trade, and a number of American corporations are present in Iraq, working in energy, defense, information technology, automotive, and transportation industries, among others (para.3).

After a long history of cooperation and assistance between Iraq and U.S., the United States decided to engage a war against Iraq, driving by certain causes (para.4). According to Raymond Hennibusch, who is a Professor at the School of International Relations at ST. Andrews, asserted that the 9/11 terrorist attack on the US is crucial to understanding the war in Iraq, despite the fact that Iraq was in no way connected to the terrible threat to the US that originated in the Middle East and Muslim world that needed to be countered. Hard-liners in the Bush administration who had advocated an attack on Iraq even before 9/11 saw it as an opportunity to mobilize support for a war they believed would be decisive in changing the Middle East to suit US interests (10-11).

Raymond stated also that we must turn our attention away from security challenges and toward the Middle East's condition and its hegemony over the oil market in order to comprehend the true reasons for the war and why(14). Bush believed that attacking Iraq

would solve US problems. Secondly, there was a growing vulnerability of American oil. Because of tightening oil markets and what appeared to be a peak in world oil output, the balance of power was shifting toward oil producers. Due to these factors, an oil shock has historically proved fatal for US presidents might weaken the US economy and the global capitalist system (Henibusch14).

Due to its second-largest oil reserves and extremely low production costs, Iraq offered a defense against these possible threats. For Raymond, Saddam was expected to find a way to overcome. The potential that he might try to utilize Iraq's oil for political gain increased as he emerged from isolation. In particular, he might have tried to tie oil access to American policy in the Arab Israeli conflict. Raymond said that nonetheless, it was evident that a confrontation with Iraq held serious risks, not the least of which was the possibility of an oil market disruption that might harm both the American and global economies. In addition, neither the threats the US faced required urgent action nor were they impervious to responses that fell far short of an invasion of Iraq (Hennibusch14).

The Department of State confirmed that the U.S. and its allies invaded Iraq in March 2003 to prove the existence of Massive Destruction Weapons. Although, all reports that were sent by U.S. specialists of the non existence of any weapons, America continued its plan. In the course of the initial invasion and the ensuing combat, roughly 4400 U.S. soldiers were killed and 31,900 were injured. From around 100,000 and over half a million, according to various estimates, were Iraqi casualties (para.4). President Saddam Hussein was overthrown by the invasion, which was carried out as a part of the American strategic reaction to the terrorist events of September 11, 2001. Insurgent attacks against U.S. were launched by former regime supporters after the regime fell, and al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI). The AQI is an organization that is connected to al-Qaeda. It attacked U.S. forces in an effort to start a

sectarian civil war in Iraq. As a result, Iraq experienced significant levels of violence after the regime fell (para.5).

Presumably, Raymond asserted that the goal of the regime changed in Iraq in order to establish a country that was legitimate, stable, and supportive of the US. Nonetheless, it seems that a failed state with protracted insurgencies and civil war-like conditions would result, with pro-Iranian Shia forces reaping most of the benefits. Raymond asserted that Iraqi experts foresaw this conclusion and were able to forecast it. Since the time of its formation by Britain, Iraq has been an unstable artificial state with racial tensions (Hinnebusch17).

Conclusion

For many years, there has been discussion and disagreement regarding American foreign policy. Since the end of World War II, the United States has taken a significant part in international affairs, with its foreign policy goals primarily centered on advancing democracy, safeguarding human rights, and furthering its economic interests.

Significant geopolitical ramifications of the Iraq War also exist. It strained ties between the United States and its allies and led to a power vacuum in the Middle East that Iran and other regional players seized upon. A negative attitude towards the American presence in the area and mainly in the Arabic countries was also fostered by the war, which also fueled anti-American sentiment throughout the world. It appears that this diminished America's standing as a world leader.

To sum up, the military intervention in Mesopotamia was a critical failure for American foreign policy abroad. It illustrated the perils of employing military force without definite goals and the significance of diplomacy and international cooperation in dealing with difficult global issues. The lasting effects of the war in general and the Iraq war in particular,

has emphasized the importance of carefully weighing the pros and cons of military action and continues to influence American foreign policy.

Chapter Two

Algeria's Foreign Policy vis-à-vis The United States

Introduction

Algeria struggled under French colonial rule for decades. They were subjugated to brutal and inhumane tactics and strategies to keep them under leach and to stop any form of resistance. Algerians, however, resisted for years until they obtained their independence in 1962. The journey for a newly independent country was difficult, to say the least. For instance, Algeria was left to deal with colonial legacies since she was integrated into France for over a century. To obtain security for the country, Algeria sought to establish international relations and make allies.

The US-Algeria relations were formed soon after the independence. Throughout the years, these relations were tense. Yet, for the majority of the time, these relations bent but did not break. The main reason behind the strained US-Algerian relations is their different ideologies. To illustrate, Algeria was a socialist country that stood against any form of imperial intervention. That is to say, Algeria disagreed with any intervention in other countries' foreign affairs. The United States, more often than not, intervened in underdeveloped countries imposing its imperialist views (Metz 229).

2.1. Algeria: A General Background

2.1.1. A Geographical Background

Algeria is considered to be one of the largest countries in Africa after Sudan with an area of 2,381,740 square km. Algeria is stretched over the cost Mediterranean Sea. It is situated between Morocco to the west and Tunisia to the east (McColl 14)

The Algerian land is covered by 80% of Saharan desert. It is an extension of the Saharan Atlas for 1,500 km until it reaches the southern borders of Algeria, the frontier of Mali and Niger. The Saharan Atlas is almost an ethereal place. It is intrinsic and essential to the country. Even though the Sahara is almost covered by sand, it is diverse. To exemplify, the Saharan land consists of rocky platforms and highlands known as Ahaggar and Tassili.

The elevation in these lands could reach 2,000 meters. Ahaggar is surrounded by plateaus of sandstone which are shaped by ancient rivers (Metz 73). Algeria had various geographic regions other than its Sahara. The Tell is one of the most significant regions in Algeria. It is fertile, and it contains many Algerian cities. The Tell is located in the narrow coastal region, and it consists of plains and hills. The Tell of Atlas is a chain of mountains that stretches over Algeria, and it ends with the Moroccan east border (Metz 72).

2.1.2. A Historical Background

Algeria has one of the most awe-inspiring histories of all time. Yet, one of the most significant moments in history was the Algerian resistance against their colonizer. Before the revolutionary war that began in 1954, Algeria endured a brutal invasion that lasted 132 years. In the beginning, the French invasion did not colonize Algeria as a whole. France feared Muslim reactions. Therefore, they worried about the Algerian resistance that would ruin the French plans. Consequently, when the French Troops invaded Algeria back in 1830, they came in small, calculated numbers. By 1839, the European troops numbered 25,000, less than half consisted of French military personnel while the other half consisted of Spain, Malta, Italy, and Germany (Evans14).

When the French troops attempted to expand their control over Algeria, they were faced with multiple problems. To begin with, not only the land was vast and difficult for the French, the structure of the Algerian society was complex. At that time, the Algerian society consisted of 3 million individuals. While an ample majority was of Barber origin, the Arabs who lived in Algeria perceived themselves as belonging to the Middle East. This complex society had over a thousand years to flourish. Languages varied under the barbaric society. Only 30% of the Algerian community could speak multiple of these variations. The rest of the population spoke Arabic, while a minority of the religious elite spoke classical Arabic (Evans 10).

Before the French invasion, Algeria was under Ottoman rule. In 1505, Algeria called on the help of the Ottoman Empire. At that time it became apparent that Spain was endeavoring to institute bases from Oran to Algeria. The pirate Muslim brothers Aroudj and Khair Eddin entered Algeria to provide that help. After the death of Aroudj in 1518, his brother replaced him as a military commander in Algeria. Then, he was appointed as provincial governor and was granted 2,000 soldiers by his Empire. Given the power he possessed, Algeria became the path that helped the Ottoman Empire to the Maghreb. This indicates that Algeria became the center of the Empire's operation in North Africa. In 1587, the Ottomans introduced a different political system when they appointed different governors every three years. Since Algerians did not wish to be ruled by the Ottoman Empire, they rebelled twice in 1659 and 1671. This led to the appointment of new leaders called Deys, who demanded Algerian independence regime in 1710. As the domination of the Ottoman Empire abated, the authority of Deys became significant, and it lasted until the French invasion (Oakes 8).

Like many countries, Algeria was colonized under the illusion of civilization. A lawyer and a politician named Gustave Mercier maintained that the moment France invaded Algeria, "truly marked the beginning of a new era". 'Like the discovery of the New World', he wrote, this new age had brought 'a new continent . . . into the orbit of civilization" (qtd. in McDougall 49). This shows that rather than celebrating and glorifying diversity in Algeria, said diversity was frowned upon and perceived as uncivilized. France had other motives for colonizing Algeria other than civilizing its indigenous people. Algeria was an asset to the French economy. Peter Bechtold remarked that:

In general, French interest in North Africa was to colonize in large numbers for the obvious purpose of developing and especially exploiting local resources for

the benefit of the colons and the home industry. In addition, the French, being French, felt obliged to carry out a *mission civilisatrice*.”(qtd. in Kesseiri38)

In the name of civilization, France committed heinous crimes against humanity. The brutality of the French troops was present throughout its colonization. The atrocities of 8 May 1954 fed the rage and desperation of Algerians when they realized there would be no more compromises. This particular day is considered the turning point for many. It exemplifies the inhumanity of France and embodies the martyrdom and sacrifice of Algeria. This day was the spark that urged Algerian Nationalists to struggle for their liberation (Charef).

On May, the 8th of 1945, the world celebrated the defeat of the Nazis. Yet, Algerians left their homes to demonstrate in various regions. As France attempted to repress those demonstrations, 45,000 Algerians were killed in the process, and approximately 100 French settlers. French historians alleged that only 15,000 Algerian were killed during that day. It should be remarked that at that time, there was no war in Algeria. The settlers and Algerians were coexisting at that point. All those victims in various regions in Algeria were merely civilians. They carried no firearms, nor were they ready for battle. It also should be mentioned that a week before the day of the massacre, demonstrations for May the 1st were dismantled by force, which led to many deaths as well (Charef).

The genocide in Algeria left the country in disbelief and shock. It had shaken Algerians to their core. KatebYassin stated that:

That my sense of humanity was affronted for the first time by the most atrocious sights. I was sixteen years old. The shock which I felt at the pitiless butchery that caused the deaths of thousands of Muslims, I have never forgotten. From that moment my nationalism took definite form. (qtd. in Horne 41)

This passage shows that the impact of what happened on the 8 of May is greater than imagined. The trauma Algerians faced was never forgotten, and it fueled them with rage to rid their tormentor of their precious land.

The war that marked the beginning of the end of French rule in Algeria erupted between 1954 and 1962. The Algerian Revolution represented one of the most violent and brutal wars in the 20th century. At that time, France lost many of its colonies, such as Morocco, Tunisia, and Indochina. That left Algeria as its most convenient prize and its oldest colony in Africa. Thus, France was not ready to leave the Algerian lands. On the contrary, it was adamant to keep it under its control, and that was unacceptable to Algerians. The Algerian National Liberation Front, which was created days before the revolution, sought to eliminate the French troops and guerrillas in Algeria. It also appealed to the world to see that the French colonization of Algeria was illegitimate. France answered that by sending two million experienced soldiers in various war tactics such as aerial bombings, massive displacement tactics, and acute propaganda to win the locals (Vince 1).

During the revolution, combatants were not the only ones who lost their lives. Many women and children were killed and tortured by the French troops which marks the atrocities Algerians endured. France implemented various strategies to suppress and erase the Algerian identity, "the colonizer aspired at erasing our national identity by destroying our language so as to be able to control our country and its resources" (Houari Boumédiène) (qtd. in Kesseiri 95). It can be said that France not only terrorized Algerians during the colonization, but it also attempted to destroy the very core of their being. That made Algerians fight their oppressor harder until the day they got their independence in 1962.

Algeria's independence was glorified and celebrated because a million and a half lost their lives for its freedom, and their blood was spilled to paint the future of the new generations. President Houari Boumédiène declared that "the Revolution aims at freeing the

Algerian people, each Algerian citizen from misery, disease, starvation, ignorance and the fear of what is to come and above all the exploitation of man by man"(qtd. in Kesseiri 94). Hence, Algerians during the French colonization period suffered for over a century. Revolting against the French authorities was their only hope to have a chance to live a dignified life.

2.2. The Algerian Political System

Algeria's first constitution was adopted and approved in 1963. It was amended several times, and the most significant alterations were in 1976 and 1989. The current constitution Algeria abided by was adopted in 1996 and then amended in 2008. Algeria is a state which supports multiple political parties. In fact, almost 60 political parties were established after the political liberation in 1988. These parties have to be inspected and examined by the Ministry of the Interior. Algeria is considered a constitutional republic where the executive branch is represented by the president. The president is elected through universal suffrage for a term that lasts 5 years. The legislature consisted of two houses. An upper house is known as the Council of the Nation and it contains 144 parliamentarians. A lower house called the National People's Assembly consists of 389 members. The Judicial Council is chaired by the president. This council appoints judges and supervises the development of their careers. The State Supreme Courts also determine cases of high treason perpetrated by either the president or the head of the government (Save the Children Sweden 16-17).

2.3. Algeria's Foreign Policy

As an independent state, Algeria embraced a foreign policy that was considered rather radical. Nonetheless, it was indispensable to the socioeconomic development of the country. Soon after its liberation, Algeria was associated with the states that were considered the most active. The leaders of Algeria believed that the creation of independent foreign policy was one of the most integral parts and responsibilities of any country's sovereignty (Mortimer 1).

Before the revolutionary war, three political parties sought to urge their country to fight their colonizer. These nationalist political trends fought for the rights of Algerians. The Liberals, the revolutionaries, and the radicals called for the independence of Algeria. Regardless of their efforts and plans, they were not successful until the establishment of a revolutionary party (FLN) and the beginning of the war in 1954. Political leaders who advocated for Algeria urged international organizations to aid Algeria in gaining its independence (Kesseiri 38). They believed that international intervention and support is necessary for Algeria to get its independence.

During the colonial era and between 1957 and 1962, Algeria was assimilated as a French department into European Economic Community. After the independence, Algeria's membership in the community continued until the date of the first agreement on 26 April 1962. This agreement was altered with another on April 22, 2002. The agreement of 2002 determined the mutual relations that were also defined in the Euro- Mediterranean relations. Also, Algeria is included in the network of regional relations linked to the Arab League, the Arab Maghreb Union, and the African Union. These relations have a great impact on Algerian policy in the Mediterranean area (Zoubir 172).

It is worth to mention that the Algerian revolutionary war shaped the future of the country and its foreign policy. Relations between Algeria and the Arab world began to form during the seven-year struggle for liberty. In other words, the ultimate moral and physical support of the Arab countries during the most difficult times for Algeria would not be lost or forgotten after its independence. Algeria sought to strengthen and build ties and relations with the Arab world after its independence. Thus, integrating into the Arab was a significant part of its political agenda (Kesseiri 51-52).

The Tripoli program was drawn up for the future of Algeria. To clarify, after the independence, President Ben Bella and those under his leadership contradicted over the way

to build a state. Ben Bella was against dividing the power between the party and the state, for he believed that a mass party would include the populace in the decision-making process. Moreover, he firmly believed that policy-making should be done by the party. This proved to be the point of disagreement. Ferhat Abass and the President could not identify the roles of the FLN and the General Assembly (Kesseiri 40). After the Tripoli congress was conducted in 1962, Ben Bella declared in an interview that:

According to the Tripoli program, it is the FLN that should elaborate policy in independent Algeria. Furthermore, the ALN is a mere state institution that should not be confused with the party. The relation between the Party and the State is defined as follows: the party [should] elaborate the political thought of the state. (qtd. in Kesseiri 40)

The Tripoli program maintained the roles of the party and the state. The FLN will be responsible for making the policies of the state. The program also declared the National Liberation Army (ALN) as an organization not a political party.

The Tripoli project was also vital in shaping Algerian foreign policy. To illustrate, The National Council of the Algerian Revolution, which continuously fight against colonization, introduced central and significant principles for the Algerian foreign policy. Furthermore, both constitutions of 1976 and 1989 respectively, integrated the principles of non-alignment and non-interference within the Algerian foreign policy. These principles asserted that Algeria would not interfere in any matters beyond its borders (Mestek 3). Furthermore, the Tripoli Program drafted its major objectives, which are represented in fighting colonization and Imperialism. It also prompts the movements for unity, including the Maghreb unity. The foreign policy of Houari Boumédiène had to acknowledge these objectives (Kesseiri 51).

In the beginning, the foreign policy of Algeria was concerned with three spaces. In other words, Algeria attributed its foreign policy to Maghreb, Arabs, and Africans. Houari

Boumédiène stated, "The Maghreb region between Cairo and Dakar represents a security zone for Algeria, and it cannot get any change in this area without an agreement with Algeria" (qtd. in Mestek 3). This specific description included Algeria in three spheres. It left it an essential part of the Arab, Maghreb, and African worlds, slightly including the Mediterranean.

When Algeria joined the international scene, it adopted a stance which is considered innovative. The international relations perceived by Algeria should parallel the doctrine adopted by the leaders. That is to say, there should be conformity between international relations with the socialist orientation of Algeria. Domestic policies should find their counterpart in foreign policy. Most importantly, the ambition of Algeria to become a key player in the Third World was the force behind its foreign policy (Mestek 3-4).

Since gaining independence, Algeria has endeavored to cultivate diplomatic ties and align itself with the global community. Thus, it was no wonder that Algeria aspired to be the chief of the Third World. President Ben Bella was fixated on the domestic sphere. Furthermore, he concentrated his efforts to repair the damages and the colonial legacies that were interwoven securely with Algeria. Houari Boumédiène also focused on the domestic front at the beginning of his presidency. Yet, Algeria was active when it came to its support of liberation movements in Africa. The concentration of the domestic front also benefited Algeria on the international level. In other words, nationalizing the oil and reforming agriculture were considered domestic repairs. However, these domestic reforms had regional and international impacts. These reforms helped Algeria become the spokesman for the Third World. Not only that, the control over its natural resources marked the beginning of the socialist revolution the country promised after its independence in 1962 (Ghettas 91).

Third Worldism shaped international foreign policy and created a new dimension in said politics. During the cold war, Third World countries congregated and adopted principles of Non-Alignment. This policy chosen by Third World countries allowed them to take a

neutral stance between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The underdeveloped sides of the globe focused on the progress of their own countries since the majority of them were recently independent. They were neither capitalist nor socialist, which prompt them to maintain their stance of neutrality. Algeria's endeavor with the movement of Non-Alignment portrayed the Third World's struggle to survive. Algeria's state man Boumédiène, pursued for international security and world peace for Third World countries. He also believed that said countries have the right to assist in the decision-making process on the international scene. Therefore, the President felt it was his duty to advocate for the rights of the underdeveloped world (Kesseiri 188).

2.4. Historical Developments in Algerian Foreign Policy

Algeria's foreign policy after independence followed a distinct set of principles, which were influenced by the long colonial struggle. Hence, it was no surprise that Algeria adopted those principles on the international level. It promoted liberation, independence, and non-interference. That is to say, the foreign policy adopted by Algeria firmly disagreed with any military intervention of any kind. To expand its geostatic influence Algeria's policy implemented anti-colonial causes as an instrument (Ghebouli).

As it was mentioned before, international relations were perceived as vital for the sovereignty of a newly independent Algeria. Thus, the Algerian leaders attempted to establish strong relations. As former President Ben Bella focused on the foreign affairs of the country, Houari Boumédiène concentrated on the domestic sphere. The neglect of the domestic front led to criticism of Ben Bella's regime. In 1969, the government conducted a Four-Year strategy for industrialization. To guarantee the success of Algeria's industrialization, President Boumédiène shifted the foreign policy to make certain its funds are accessible (Zoubir 20). On the national level, Boumédiène's strategy intended to restore the economy and society of the country. It also endorsed eradicating any regional imbalances (Kesseiri 47).

Indeed, Algeria was able to prove itself in the international sphere ever since its independence until the 1980s, when a civil war marked the end of the foreign policy aspiration. Algeria's situation during the following years certainly did not help the reestablishment of the foreign policy, which did not change for almost 30 years. That is to say, ten years of terrorism had impacted the country greatly. Thus, the government focused on the domestic front, trying to maintain the security of the country and revive its economy. Besides, 20 years under the previous President Abdelaziz Bouteflika raised the question of whether the Algerian voice concerning anti-colonization cases was perceived or even heard (Ghebouli).

With its nonaligned principles, Algeria perceived that the role of mediator fits it best because of its neutrality. Algeria also desired to establish a Third World coalition that would challenge the economic and political power of the capitalist world. The role of mediation Algeria sought was suitable for the agenda. Thus, Algeria became connected to various third-world countries through mediation (Entleis199). The country also mediated the crisis between Iran and the US in 1979. To illustrate, as the United States of America received its former ally Shah of Iran when he was exiled to Mexico in 1979, the American Embassy was attacked by 400 students who demanded the return of the Shah to stand trial in Tehran. Only two hours under a siege on the American Embassy, 63 hostages and other administrative staff were taken. The objective behind this operation was clear. It was for the exchange of the Shah with the hostages (Chikhaoui).

Many countries attempted to mediate between the US and Iran. Delegates representing an array of countries, including Western Germany, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Libya, and several others of additional countries were there. Yet, the Iranian government declined because the government believed all these lacked the "legitimacy of an official endorsement". Only Yasser Arafat was allowed to act as a mediator. He succeeded, albeit partially, in freeing

thirteen hostages on 18-19 November 1979. The other had 52 hostages and had to wait another 444 days (Slim 206-207).

In 1980, almost a year later from the beginning of the siege, Iran declared Algeria to be the designated mediator between the two conflicting sides. Algeria's role during the negotiation was of great significance because, at the time, the Prime Minister's spokesperson disclosed that there would be no direct communication between Iran and the United States of America. Between 4 November 1980 and 20 January 1981, the Algerian Government appointed high-ranking experts to shuttle between the US and Tehran to ensure communication between the two (Slim 207).

As the Algerian mediators began to work, they not only attempted to facilitate the negotiation, but they also focused on finding a solution both governments would approve. The negotiation abruptly stopped at the two sides disagreed over the Iranian assets that are controlled by the USA. The mediator recommended an idea that would establish the "independent obligations" of the two countries rather than their previous bilateral agreement. Both countries signed the agreement on January 19. The hostages were released to Algeria the day after, and they left for their country a week later, on the 27th of January 1981 (Chikhaoui).

Algeria also attempted to end the conflict between Iran and Iraq in 1975 with the Algerian Accord. The relations between the two countries were tense over issues with their borders. Thus, Algeria intervened to resolve that issue. Both the Iranian leader Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi and Iraq's then-vice president Saddam Hussein signed the Algerian Accord on March 6, 1975. Said Accord highlighted two main points; the separation of land and river borders and the action of strictly controlling those borders. The Accord also prevented Iraq from assaulting the Kurds in the northern part of the country. In other words, Saddam Hussein wanted the Arab population to increase in Iraq. Thus, they planned an

offensive alimentation of the Kurds. Years later, however, the attack on the Kurds was even more brutal than anticipated. The Algerian Accord came to an end when Iraq claimed that it lost its lands to Iran in 1979 (TRT World). Since the First Gulf War broke out in 1980, Algeria attempted to terminate the conflict between the two sides. The mediator at the time, the foreign Minister Mohamed Seddik Benyahia, and twelve of his finest advisers lost their lives on the jet that was taking them to Tehran (Entleis 200).

2.5. Algerian Foreign Relationships with European Countries

2.5.1. Algerian Relationships with France

A complicated relationship between France and Algeria was bound to happen after over a century of antagonism and colonization. Yet, France kept its popular position in Algerian foreign affairs. After the independence, Algeria could not simply cut ties with its former colonizer because of a social and economic integration that lasted decades. Therefore, it was no surprise that Algeria realized its dependency on France in the first years after its independence. The French colonization impacted Algeria after its liberation. The preexisting trade ties and connections, the unknowledgeable government officials, and the military occupation were conditions for Algerian independence. The ambiguous relations changed during the presidency of Houari Boumédiène.

The President strived to nationalize the Algerian resources and industry, and as a result Algeria took over its resources, which were controlled by France such as the extraction of petroleum. In an attempt to keep their relations reciprocal, France almost instantly withdrew its military units from Algeria. In an effort to find other trade partners, the newly independent country disregarded France as a partner. That shortly changed when the first man of the country and the French government concluded that both countries wanted to reestablish their diplomatic relations. France wished to maintain its economic and strategic position, while Algeria aspired for financial and technical aid (Metz 231).

Even after the Algerian liberation, France continued to conceive it as an extension of its homeland. To elucidate, France never acknowledged the Algerian war before 1990. It was often referred to as an Algerian event. Benjamin Stora asserted that "for France calling it a war would be tantamount to accepting the possibility of a legal separation, the break-up of the One and Indivisible Republic" (qtd. in Halil 704). It was in 1999 that the National Assembly formally recognized that what happened in Algeria was indeed a war (Halil 704).

Tension characterized Algerian-French relations throughout the years. The worst for said relations came with the legislation of the 2005 law. This particular law declared the positive impact of the French presence in North Africa. The National Assembly declared in paragraph 2 of article 4 That : "Les programmes scolaires reconnaissent en particulier le rôle positif de la présence française outre-mer, notamment en Afrique du Nord, et accordent à l'histoire et aux sacrifices des combattants de l'armée française issus de ces territoires la place éminente à laquelle ils ont droit." (Cahiers d'histoire)

Halil provided the translated version of this paragraph. She maintained that "school curricula specifically acknowledge the positive role of the French overseas; especially in North Africa, and the history and sacrifices of the French soldiers from these territories shall be given their rightful prominence" (707). This law appealed that the French colonization granted their previous colonies enormous investments in education, infrastructure, and health, which eased their advancement. This statement enraged many and caused controversy in Algeria and France. To calm the situation, French historians signed a petition demanding the law of 2005 be repealed. Even though President Jacques Chirac ordered the appeal of the law at the end of 2006, the damage was already done. The image of France was impaired internationally. The denial of what happened in Algeria during the colonization period caused a serious backlash against the French government when the French public critiqued their country's action (Halil 707).

2.5.2. Algerian Relationships with the European Union

Generally speaking, Algeria has always been keen on having relations with Europe. However, the times of unrest and security problems in the Mediterranean made the 1973 Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe of great interest to Algeria. Later, yet, it turned out that the issues raised at the conference did not relate to or include the issues of the Mediterranean. As Algeria hinted at this, many countries of the Mediterranean as well as Syria and Egypt represented an interest in these issues. The notion of a conference of Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean was only prompted in 1990 with an initiative from Spain and Italy. The conference became an inter-parliamentary conference in 1992 (Zoubir 309). The EU Mediterranean Association commenced in Barcelona in 1995, and it proudly declared its large number. Thus, the EU partnership included all EU countries, as well as Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Malta, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Israel, Cyprus, and Turkey. The EU-Mediterranean partnership also encouraged ample opportunity for cooperation. To show, the EU cooperation contained free trade arrangements, discussions of security, and civil and cultural discussions (Lesser et al. 33-34).

At the dawn of its independence, Algeria sought to form relations with its neighbors as well as Europe. It occurred under the claim that it supports any form of cooperation unless it becomes a threat to any country's domestic policy. This particular principle of Algeria made her distrust any initiation made by countries in the same region. Algeria had a contract with the EU in 2005, which allowed gradual tariff dismantling and a free trade area by 2014. This date was delayed until 2017 when Algeria made the request. The Algerian government also maintained a negotiation agreement with the World Trade Organization (WTO). The authorities declared that there will be no free trade until Algeria becomes a member of the WTO. The former Minister of Finance Djoudi asserted that, "Algeria is not there to follow a fashion phenomenon, but to ensure an upgrading of its economy and to be a good partner for

the European Union" (qtd. in Mestek 12). The Algerian government also had been in contact with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization concerning political discussions over the Mediterranean (Mestek 12-13).

2.6. The Development of the Relations between the USA and Algeria

The US-Algerian relations could be traced back to 1795 when the US signed the Treaty of Peace and Amity with Algeria. After the independence in 1783, the US had to find a way to keep pirates from the Barbary States of its ships. The only way to do this was to form a treaty that would benefit both sides. The United States of America signed 10 treaties to keep the peace in exchange for an annual payment. The Treaty of Peace and Amity was one of the first four treaties which were not respected often. That led the USA to declare two wars on the Barbary States. The first war was between the US and Tripoli and it ended with a treaty four years later in 1805. The second war involved Algeria. It began in 1815 and ended with two other treaties on June 30 and July 3, 1815, and on December 22 and 23, 1816. The last four treaties were signed with Tunisia in 1824 and Morocco in 1836 (Benguetaf 285-286).

The US-Algerian relations could only be described as complex and competitive. The objectives behind foreign policies were not compatible. Nonetheless, over time they gradually became closer. Furthermore, Algeria's socialist regime and its commitment to fight imperialism and Western capitalism irritated the US and made the relations between them tense. America was the embodiment of all that Algeria was against. The United States of America preserved its close relations with France during and after the war while it overlooked its relations with Algeria. The diplomatic relations between the two countries became trouble in 1967 when the war between Israel and most of its neighbors broke out (Metz 229). The Algerian President at the time, Houari Boumédiène, condemned the US for supporting the imperialist motives of Israel toward the Middle East. Even though the American-Algerian

relations broke, the US maintained communications because it was anxious over the possibility of the impact of the USSR on Algeria (Kesseiri 213).

Over the next decade, American-Algerian relations turned bitter. The US intervened in Vietnam and other countries, while Algeria financed guerrillas and other revolutionary units. The United States' support for Israel and its clear sympathies for Morocco over the Western Sahara issue made the political and diplomatic relations worsen (Metz 229). Algerian foreign policy was described as pragmatic after the death of the president in 1978. The transformation of foreign policy was best remarked in American-Algerian relations. To illustrate, after the Six-Day War between Israel and the Arab world, Algeria disapproved of the actions made by the US and its policies regarding Israel. The diplomatic relations were indeed strained, but the same could not be said for their economic relations. Algeria's views on the American stance did not prevent it from economically cooperating with the West, including the United States of America (Leonard 1166).

The Algerian stance towards the US altered at the end of the 1990s. Moreover, when Abdelaziz Bouteflika became president in 1999, the US- Algerian relations improved significantly. The president visited the US twice in an attempt to revive the relations between them in 2001. This was best illustrated when Algeria backed the US in its mission on terror (Leonard 1166).

It did not escape Washington's notice of Algeria's increased involvement in the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In addition to the role it played in the Algeria-Nigeria South Africa axis. Furthermore, even before the attacks of 9/11, Washington recognized the importance of Algeria in its war on terror. In fact, in March 2001, the director of the FBI, Louis Freeh visited Algerian soil requesting the government's support against Al Qaeda. Even though the 9/11 attacks devastated the American nation, they also accelerated its reconciliation with Algeria, even if that was on matters of security. Algeria also complied to

be part of the coalition that was led against the war on terror. Not only that, the Algerian government provided a list of hundreds of Islamic Algerian suspects who reside in America and Europe. In exchange for secret services from the US, Algeria proposed cooperation on security matters (Zoubir 4-5).

The US-Algerian relations that were friendly for years grew to be tense again when Donald Trump's administration acknowledged the sovereignty of Morocco over Western Sahara. This particular issue is highly sensitive to the Algerian government since it supports the Polisario Front, which prompted independence for Western Sahara. It did not sit well with Algeria when the Biden administration did not even revise that decision. Any aspiration that the US would support Algeria on this issue evaporated when the Secretary of State Antony Blinken stated that the US would support the United Nations to find a solution to the Western Sahara dispute. The Secretary of State's statement convinced the Algerian government that Biden's administration would not change Trump's policy concerning Western Sahara. Thus, it is safe to say that the Algerian government was disconcerted with the US government over Western Sahara (Aftandilian).

Another point that caused more tension in US-Algerian relations was the Abraham Accords. These Accords were an American attempt to encourage some Arab countries to build diplomatic relations with Israel. The United States recruited all its means and efforts in the sake of "Normalization" with Israel. After Emirati and Bahraini officials signed the contract with Israel in 2020, the US aimed to make other countries. The US persuaded Morocco because it had been working with Israel behind the scenes for years. Morocco joined the Abraham Accords in exchange for the US's recognition of Moroccan sovereignty over Western Sahara. The Algerian government was astonished and outraged by the US policy. It, which has long backed the Palestinian cause, saw Israeli-Moroccan relations as a danger to its security after the military alliance between the two nations. (Aftandilian)

The relations between the US and Algeria were troubled even further due to Algeria's relationship with Russia. After the Russian invasion of Ukraine, Algeria maintained its neutrality to the situation. At the United Nations General Assembly in March of 2022, the US wanted the international community to condemn Russia. However, Algeria was the only Arab country that refrained from the resolution outlined by the US. The pressure practiced by the US on Algeria over its relationship with Russia certainly was not missed by Algeria, nor was it welcomed (Cafiero and Milliken).

Conclusion

After its liberation, Algeria concentrated on its domestic front. Gradually, it reclaimed the assets which were still controlled by France, and it nationalized its resources. Algeria did not neglect the international scene, for the former president Houari Boumédiène had other ambitions for the region and Africa. To illustrate, he believed that Third World countries could be a part of the decision-making process concerning universal events. He firmly believed that Third World countries should have that right. Furthermore, Algeria became the spokesman for the Third World soon after its independence. Algeria was resolute against imperialism and the capital world. It prompted and supported the liberation movement of Third World countries, which made other underdeveloped countries trust the country to speak for them.

After being subjugated for over a century, Algeria sought to establish international relations soon after its independence. The diplomatic relations between the United States of America and Algeria were formed after the liberation of Algeria in 1962. However, it was no wonder these relations would be put to multiple tests throughout the years. The fact that both the US and Algeria had different ideologies made them competitive. Their goals were seldom aligned because the US was everything Algeria stood against. In other words, the ideology that shaped American policies and foreign relations contradicted those of Algeria.

Interventionism was one of the many issues both countries could not seem to agree on. For instance, while the US intervened in many underdeveloped countries, Algeria condemned the act as illegal and unjust. The difference in this fundamental basic between the two countries made strained over the years.

Chapter Three

Americanism and the implementation of Soft Policy with Algeria

Introduction

The United States has remained at the forefront of international affairs as the world's superpower. Americanism or the expansion of American ideologies abroad, is one of the main tenets of American foreign policy; the U.S. in the two previous decades has launched a variety of soft policies towards Algeria, in an effort to improve relations between the two countries (U.S. Embassy in Algeria). Soft policies that tended to be using them with Algeria are non-coercive actions that aim to sway other nations through what it was being mentioned by the U.S. Ambassador to Algeria John Desrocher in his first speech at Diplomatic and International Relations Institute on January 15, 2018, when he stated that “We will continue to work with our Algerian partners to foster people-to-people ties and dialogue on topics across the spectrum of our relationship. Of course, diplomatic, political, and economic issues are keys, but we hope to broaden our relations in cultural and educational areas as well” (Desrocher para.3-4).

The execution of American foreign policy by virtue of soft power strategies with Algeria is demonstrated via a number of projects and programs, including the U.S. Department of State-sponsored cultural exchange programs, university institutions' facilitation of educational cooperation, and business alliances between American and Algerian enterprises (U.S. Department). These initiatives help to strengthen the bilateral relationship overall by boosting collaboration, increasing trust, and finding common ground.

Finally, in this chapter we seek to explore how in recent years the standpoints of the two states progressed. Mainly after the attacks of the 9/11 and its role as a corner stone that fueled the new era of bilateral relationships. The American spirit and soft policies have played an essential function in molding US-Algeria ties. How The United States seeks to enhance understanding with Algeria and encourage more profound ties between the two countries by promoting American concepts and principles through non-coercive tactics.

3.1. Definition of Americanism

As stated by the American Legion Organization (ALO), a veterans' organization that was founded in 1919, Americanism refers to the set of values, beliefs, and cultural practices that are characteristic of the United States of America. It encompasses a broad range of political, economic, social, and cultural ideas that have evolved and reflect the country's unique history and identity (para.1). This term that appeared in the 19th century due to the world one and two has various angles to define the concept on the basis of the following background: The Merriam-Webster dictionary offers one definition of Americanism, characterizing it as "a distinguishing trait of American English, especially as contrasted with British English." (Merriam-Webster understanding, n.d.) This concept, however, only embodies a limited component of Americanism connected to linguistic distinctions.

As per the American historian and professor of history, Michael Kazin, Americanism is a "cluster of ideas and symbols that form a culture of individualism, liberalism, and democracy that sets the United States apart from other nations." (465). Kazin contends that the three beliefs of Individualism, Liberalism and Democracy constitute the cornerstone of Americanism, and that they are expressed in a collection of symbols and behaviors that are distinctive to American culture. The American flag, the Constitution, or specific national festivals such as the Fourth of July are examples of such symbols. Overall, Kazin's definition argues that Americanism is a deeply rooted cultural and political philosophy that forms American identity and distinguishes the country from others.

A whole other standpoint on Americanism is provided by political scientist Seymour Martin Lipset, who contends that Americanism is founded on a set of essential ideals such as individualism, equality, and populism. As he depicted in his book "A Double-Edged Sword" in 1997, these ideals have been critical to America's success as a democracy and a capitalist society. According to Lipset, Americanism is "a double-edged sword," with both positive

and negative consequences for American society (Lipset 2). A sword having two edges—one with a negative edge and the other with a usable edge.

3.2. Characteristics of Americanism

Americanism is a broad concept that covers a variety of cultural practices, values, and beliefs. The following are some standard American traits:

- 1. **Belief in individualism:** Commonly associated with Americanism is individualism, which encourages self-reliance and personal independence. In which it is assurance that individuals are free to achieve their goals and ambitions without disturbing the external forces (Lipset 11).
- 2. **Democracy:** "Americanism emphasizes the importance of democracy, understood as a system of government in which power is held by the people through free and fair elections" (Kazin 465). The quotation also suggests that Americanism views democracy as a role model for other countries to adopt, highlighting the need of advancing democratic ideas internationally.
- 3. **Freedom:** Americanism celebrates freedom as a central value, including political freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion (Bellah et al. 178). From his perspective, the American sociologist and the Elliott Professor of Sociology Robert Neelly Bellah suggests that Americanism places great emphasis on individual liberties and personal freedom (179).
- 4. **Patriotism:** Americanism values patriotism, which is the love and devotion to one's country (American Legion). According to the veteran organization, to be patriot is a duty and a commitment of every American towards the nation. They strongly embrace the ideology that it is a sense of love, devotion, and loyalty towards one's country and a willingness to defend and support its interests, values, and institutions. (Oxford English Dictionary).

- 5. Capitalism: In more recent definitions, capitalism is described as a system of economic organization that is “based on the private ownership of the means of production and the creation of goods and services for profit in a competitive market” (Mankiw 26). Mankiw continues to contend that capitalism is defined by incentives to create new things, put in a significant, and invest money, all of which promote economic progress and higher living standards.
- 6. Equality: Americanism emphasizes the ideal of equality, which is the belief that all people are created equal and should have equal rights and opportunities (Schudson 146).

3.3. The Concept of Globalization

According to the political scientist David Held, who is specialized in political theory and international relations, and the professor of International Relations Anthony McGrew, both of them defines globalization as “a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions—assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity, and impact—generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power” (Held and McGrew 2). Held and McGrew's definition of globalization emphasizes that it is a fundamental reorganization of social relations and transactions, not merely a phenomenon of increased international trade or cultural exchange. This transformation is distinguished by its broad, intense, and quick nature, as well as by the substantial global impact it has. (Held and McGrew 3). This entails the construction of activity, interaction, and power networks and flows that transcend national boundaries, as well as the creation of fresh forms of governance and regulation to control these processes.

By the same token, the English sociologist *Anthony Giddens* who is known for his theory of structuration and his holistic view of modern societies, reveals that “the

intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (Giddens 64). Giddens calls for the fact that the world becomes as a crossroads as the societies meet and melt in intersections with each other. This indicates that social linkages between remote communities are deepening and spreading to the point that local events in one region can have an influence on local events in another region, and vice versa. This emphasizes the notion that cross-national social, cultural, and political interconnections are also important components of globalization, in addition to economic and technical connections. (Giddens 64)

To underscore, another definition of the concept is given by the two American professors Pr: Steger D, Manfred and his colleague Paul James professor of globalization and cultural diversity manifested In their book, “Globalization: A Very Short Introduction” ,who define globalization as “a complex and multidimensional process involving the rapid expansion of economic, political, and cultural interconnections across national borders” (Steger and James 4). This quote highlights the complexity and diversity of the globalization process. It includes topics such as economy, politics and culture. The procedure encompasses numerous cross-border interactions and activities and it is not exclusive to one sector or area of expertise (Steger and James 5)

3.4. The Notion of American Exceptionalism

One general definition of American exceptionalism is provided by the American sociologist and political scientist Seymour Martin Lipset, who argues that it is “the view that the United States is unique in its democracy, egalitarianism, individualism, and a laissez-faire economy” (Lipset 18). He also sees that the core of the latter notion is rooted in the country's democratic values, individualism, and religious beliefs (Lipset 18). The individual's role and character have a significant impact on shaping and influencing the unique qualities and characteristics observed in others. Another scholar, John D. Wilsey, defines American

exceptionalism as “the belief that the United States is qualitatively different from other nations and has a special role to play in world history” (Wilsey 1). In other words, what has been stated by the previous scholars is that American exceptionalism is a belief that the United States is a special and unique country compared to other nations. It is often associated with American values such as democracy, equality, individualism, and a free-market economy. Some people also think that the US has a special role to play in world history.

On the other hand, other scholars view American exceptionalism in a more critical light, arguing that it can lead to a dangerous form of nationalism and imperialist foreign policy. For instance, Professor of International Relations at the Harvard Kennedy School at Harvard University and a political scientist Stephen M. Walt argues that American exceptionalism has “encouraged a willingness to intervene in other countries and promote regime change, often with disastrous results” (Walt 2). Some academics believe that American exceptionalism is a bad thing because it can lead to harmful patriotism and a foreign policy that strives to control other countries.

To summarize, American exceptionalism is a complicated idea that academics have interpreted in many ways. Some consider it a source of national pride and strength, while others see it as a potentially destructive ideology that may lead to detrimental laws and behaviors.

3.5. American Implementation of Soft Power Policy with Algeria beyond the 9/11

Attacks

Algeria and the United States maintain a multifaceted relationship that involves politics, economy, military, and education. The fundamental goals of this bilateral partnership are to strengthen security and military cooperation, enhance economic and commercial ties, and foster mutual understanding via educational and cultural exchanges between the peoples

of both nations. Algeria and the United States hope to deepen their relationship and encourage collaboration in a variety of disciplines by focusing on these topics.

To put the record straight, for a considerable period, the United States, alongside numerous European nations, characterized the acts of terrorism carried out by different armed Islamist factions such as Armed Islamic Group of Algeria (GIA) and The Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat, (GSPC) in Algeria as political violence. They also viewed it as a somewhat understandable, almost justified response to the violence perpetrated by the Algerian regime, which disrupted the electoral process on January 11, 1992 (Zoubir 280-300). These standpoints put Algeria in a sort of political blockade; whereas the country meanwhile was in need of every kind of help to get out of the bloody quagmire of civil war. This means that what attracts attention and fetch of any country to come and invest in Algeria; is their interests and security, and The United States serves as a prime illustration of this phenomenon in the coming paragraphs.

First, The United States' soft power policy in Algeria is the intentional employment of non-coercive and persuasive strategies to distribute ideas, develop relationships, and influence decisions. The political scientist Joseph Nye explained in his book what the core meaning of soft policy is, “*Soft power: The means to success in world politics. Public Affairs*” that soft power is a concept which refers to the ability of a country to attract and persuade others through cultural, ideological, and diplomatic means, and the implication of this soft policy too (Nye 43). Peter Bachrach, an emeritus professor of political science and his colleague, economic consultant, writer, and academic researcher Morton Baratz, both of them adopted the significance of the other side of the power rather than the traditional one. In their illustration, they proclaimed:

Everyone is familiar with hard power. We know that military and economic might often get others to change their position. Hard power can rest on inducements

(“carrots”) or threats (“sticks”). But occasionally, you can get the outcomes you want without tangible threats or payoffs. The indirect way to get what you want has sometimes been called “the second face of power.” A country may obtain the outcomes it wants in world politics because other countries— admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness—want to follow it. In this sense, it is also important to set the agenda and attract others in world politics, and not only to force them to change by threatening military force or economic sanctions. This soft power—getting others to want the outcomes that you want—co-opts people rather than coerces them. (Bachrach and Baratz 632–42)

What is mentioned above is accurately the path that the United States of America adopted with the type of countries that are not favored to use hard power policy with them, and Algeria is a perfect example. However, the September 11 attacks were devastating, with the reality of America’s lack of experience with such events. Fear, confusion, and overreaction were understandable responses in the short run (Randall 304). This reoriented policymakers in America toward Algeria to acquire valuable intelligence and military expertise to effectively combat the menace of international terrorism.

3.5.1. American Political Policies within Algeria

The United States and Algeria have shared strong relations with each other since diplomatic relations began in 1962 following Algeria’s independence from France (Ott para.8). The US continues to work with Algeria on diplomatic, law enforcement, economic, and security concerns due to its strategic location, and particularly within the domain of security and the fight against terrorism. It is worthy to mention “students and professionals who can participate in educational and cultural exchange programs offered by the American Embassy in Algeria; these programs range from one-week short-visit programs to two-year long-visit programs (U.S. Embassy in Algeria).

The political diplomatic links were intensified more notably beyond the aftermaths of the terroristic hijack attacks of 9/11, in sectors of security, military, and counterterrorism. They have had a long-standing relationship that has developed over the years, characterized by close collaboration on regional and international issues of mutual interest. (BUREAU OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS). In 2002, President George W. Bush announced in *the United States National Security Strategy Report* that “We will continue to encourage our regional partners to take up a coordinated effort that isolates the terrorists. Once the regional campaign localizes the threat to a particular state, we will help ensure the state has the military, law enforcement, political, and financial tools necessary to finish the task” (The White House).

This policy emphasizes the indication of a coordinated approach to assure the effectiveness of counterterrorism measures and represents the United States' strategy and commitment to working with regional allies and assisting them in their efforts to combat terrorism, and to get over these issues and tensions in between. In 2004, the Commander of the United States European Command, General James L. Jones, affirmed that: “Just like Morocco and Tunisia and the new members of Eastern Europe, other nations could provide invaluable training bases for American military forces.” (Anthea Jonathan). Regardless of their simplicity, these bases have runways, barracks, and electricity. Supports to the region's states took different forms in various fields to obtain the stability of security and politics.

In the same context, went Geoff D. Porter the president of North Africa Risk Consulting, when he depicted the significance of the crucial position that Algeria possesses by exploring that: “The United States recognizes the importance of Algeria for its influence on counterterrorism efforts, migration flows, energy disruption, and regional stability. Although the United States has minimal direct diplomatic, economic, and military exposure to Algeria, it has security and investment partnerships there.” (Porter 1)

Considerable exchanged visits between the two presidents, in addition to senior officials who have stated a desire to deepen and broaden bilateral ties of interests. President Bouteflika's initial visit took place in July 2001, marking the beginning. Professor of history Emeritus, Rutgers University, projected the lights on the programmed meeting with President George W. Bush in Washington D.C to discuss counterterrorism cooperation and bilateral relations (Kelley 165). Followed by a second meeting in November 2001, a meeting in New York in September 2003, and President Bouteflika's participation at the June 2004 G8 Sea Island Summit, is indicative of the growing relationship between the United States and Algeria (Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs). As well, the American president, George W. Bush, steps down in July 5, 2004. On His African tour, He met with President Abdelaziz Bouteflika to take dialogues on regional security and economic interests (Smith 64).

In the Beginning of 2006, there were multiple opportunities between senior officials and foreign ministers of the two nations. In 2006, the Foreign Minister Bedjaoui met with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. The meeting was under the mutual signed agenda of war on terror and to affirm the will of partnership to crack down on the transitional terror. Additionally, it is crucial to cut off the financial and logistical support to terrorist organizations, particularly in the southern regions of Algeria and countries within the Sahel region (ennaharonline).

In September 2008, Secretary Rice paid a visit to Algiers, where she engaged in discussions with Algerian officials. In March 2009, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton held a meeting with Algerian Foreign Minister Mourad Medelci, alongside the Foreign Ministers of Morocco and Tunisia, during the donor conference in Sharm-el-Sheik, Egypt. In December 2009, Secretary Clinton met with Algerian Foreign Minister Medelci in Washington, DC. Additionally, in April 2010, Attorney General Eric Holder traveled to Algiers to formalize the

signing of a Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty with Algerian Justice Minister Tayeb Belaiz. (Algerian Embassy)

The relationship took a massive step forward in 2012; when the two states agreed to launch “Bilateral Strategic Dialogue” to officially raise the level of military collaboration and intelligence to another five in coming meetings through the upcoming years to work hand in hand to reach mutual security, military, economic and civil interests. These visits were from the Algerian side. On the other side, the American position was dynamic too according to the rate of reciprocity, which remarkably increased through the years due to the economic, security and civilian American interests (Arieff 1).

The pace and scope of senior-level visits has accelerated, by the visit of April 3, 2014. Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika meets with President Barack Obama at the White House. The discussions focus on security cooperation, counterterrorism efforts, and economic ties (Gerges 125). The frequency of American visits to Algeria, as it was mentioned, departed by the visit of the president George w. Bush, and to be followed by others in the form of The Secretary of State, held a strategic dialogue with Algeria’s Foreign Minister in April 2015, and the Deputy Secretary of State visited Algeria in July 2016. (qtd. in Ott para.4). The Strategic Dialogue sessions held in Algiers in 2014 and Washington in 2012, 2015, and 2019 have proven to be effective tools in establishing a framework and direction for bilateral relations. Both Algeria and the United States are currently committed to enhancing and broadening the reach of this mechanism to foster greater strength and growth in the Algerian-American relationship (The Department of state).

Despite of the friendly links between the two states, and based on the professor/director of research in geopolitics Yahia H. Zoubir, who exclaimed that: "Algeria’s position on the Palestinian issue, the Western Sahara, Syria and on other questions of an

international nature is often in opposition to America's "(qtd. in Zoubir 11). This political attitude raised the tension between the two countries where Algiers and Washington have serious disagreements and puts the US-Algeria relations at the lowest points in years (Cafiero para.1-4).

Some analysts suggest that the recent normalization between Morocco and the Zionist entity was influenced by American pressure, with the understanding that the United States would recognize Western Sahara's integration into Morocco in return. He also notes that "it does not seem that cooperation is as thorough as one is led to believe, especially on the political level." However, rumors persist that the United States is interested in a military base in Algeria for use in case of major antiterrorist action against al-Qaeda elements in the Sahel. (Zoubir12). However, these rumors didn't see the light since Algeria strongly refused any kind of military existence in Algeria.

3.5.2. Bilateral Military and Security Cooperation

Since the 9/11 attacks, terrorism and the subsequent efforts to combat it have remained prominent issues in political discourse and the "War on Terror." (Mansour-Ille 654) Mansour-Ille a Senior Research Officer within the Politics and Governance programme at the Overseas Development Institute reveals that those attacks made the security alarm sounded in America and in the world over the risks of transcontinental terrorism during the Bush administration, there was a notable securitization of policies at the national, regional, and international levels. Similarly, under the Obama administration, the situation in the Maghreb region grew increasingly intense and complex, particularly in the political sphere, as the Arab Spring unfolded, marked by widespread protests against ruling regimes.

For a considerable period, Algeria's efforts to address the threat of terrorism and advocate for international cooperation fell on deaf ears, only after that tragic event when America opened the doors widely to security and military collaborations with Algeria, in the

coming years. The aftermath of 9/11 not only paved the way for significant bilateral military cooperation between the United States and Algeria but also enabled the inclusion of Algeria in two security frameworks: the NATO -Mediterranean Dialogue in the northern region and the Sahel region in the south. (Zoubir 14)

These dialogues and providing military support from the NATO and America are the main objectives of the president Bouteflika's previous visits. Former President George W. Bush stated in July 2005 that: "America continues to rely on Algeria as its partner in its fight against terrorism, and in our common objective of promoting democracy and prosperity in your region and in the world." (*Algérie Press Service*). During her visit to the Maghreb region in September 2008, former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice reiterated the same view (U.S. Department of State). On several occasions, the US has shown its openness to reconsider its position on delivering armaments to Algeria.

The military cooperation between Algeria and the United States is steadily strengthening, with frequent exchanges and high-level visits. Algeria has hosted senior U.S. military officials, including visits from General James L. Jones, the NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe and Commander of U.S. European Command, and then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. Notably, the countries held formal joint military dialogues in Washington, DC in May 2005, Algiers in November 2006, and another in October 2008. (DOS)

Furthermore, bilateral naval and Special Forces exercises have been conducted, and Algeria has welcomed visits from U.S. Navy and Coast Guard ships. Another form of collaboration illustrated by Professor Berkuok where he pictured in that:

The provided support military training, the United States maintains the International Military Education and Training (IMET) Program, which allocated \$824,000 in FY 2006 to train Algerian military personnel in the U.S. Additionally, Algeria actively participates

in the Trans-Sahara Counter-Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP), further highlighting their collaborative efforts in countering terrorism.(Berkouk para.8)

The presence of bilateral military cooperation is clearly evident through active collaboration on the ground. Apart from the training of Algerian officers in the United States, the Algerian and U.S. military closely cooperate in the vast expanse of the Algerian Sahara desert.

Yet, the monetary value of U.S. military assistance to Algeria remains relatively small. In 2007, Algeria received \$806,000 through the international military training and education program (IMET), and a mere \$731,000 for counterterrorism efforts. The alleged presence of U.S. bases in the Algerian desert, supposedly aimed at combating Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM), has sparked considerable speculation, despite both nations denying their existence. While military aid in 2008 slightly increased to reach \$1 million (Zoubir 16).

Mr. David Pearce, the U.S. ambassador to Algeria, emphasized the significance of maintaining strategic relations with Algeria when he expressed that:“Algeria’s stability and prosperity are critical to the stability of the entire region,” Expanding upon that the United States is cooperating “with Algeria in combating terrorism and extremism, as well as in consolidating a culture of tolerance and moderation.” He expressed his hope that the bilateral relation between the two countries will be a “democratic partnership that serves peace, prosperity, and stability of bilateral relations.” (Pearce 64)

The Obama Administration has made efforts to broaden and enhance the bilateral relations, notably through the initiation of the Bilateral Strategic Dialogue in 2012. Amidst the terrorist siege in In Amenas in January 2013, then-Secretary of State Clinton affirmed that:“it is absolutely essential that we broaden and deepen our counterterrorism cooperation going forward with Algeria and all countries of the region,” adding that, “I made clear to the Prime

Minister that we stand ready to further enhance the counterterrorism support that we already provide.”(State Department)

Hence, and prior to the declaration made by the American President and among other things, reportedly in 2017, a mutual defense meeting took place in Washington, D.C., wherein the United States made offers to enhance intelligence sharing and foster military cooperation between the two nations. The overarching objective of this meeting was to strengthen their collaborative endeavors in countering terrorism in the Maghreb region. The US delegation was led by Justin Siberell, who represented the Departments of State, Defence, and National Security. Algeria's delegation was led by Abdelkader Messahel, Minister of African Affairs and the Arab League. The meeting's principal goal was to strengthen the US-Algeria collaboration in the fight against regional terrorist threats and international terrorist combatants. Algeria, recognised for its skills as an essential partner in this sector, actively engaged in discussions on resolving the issues posed by terrorism in the region. (U.S. Embassy in Algeria)These productive meetings serve as a united front against terrorist attacks, as both countries demonstrate their willingness to enhance cooperation through counterterrorism exchanges.

In January 2019, to emphasise the Algerian cooperation with the USA's led coalition against terrorism, another strategic dialogue was held in Washington, D.C. between the Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and Minister of Foreign Affairs Abdelkader Messahel leading their respective delegations. In which they discussed maintaining their effective military cooperation to sustain the security in the region, advance shared interests, and most fight extremist organizations such as: AQIM and ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria). They also reviewed economic interests, and future military programs to stress their engagement in their longstanding promising relations (U.S. Embassy in Algeria).This meeting once again highlights the significance of Algerian military forces in maintaining peace in the region. The

United States holds unwavering confidence in the capabilities of the Algerian military and their intelligence efforts in combating terrorism.

The American military and security relations with Algeria during Presidents Trump and Biden administrations have been influenced by shifting geopolitical tides and security priorities. The conflict over Western Sahara, the Abraham Accords, Syria's crisis, and Iran's nuclear program are some of the most sensitive regional issues where Algiers and Washington have serious disagreements. That is why the two American administrations did not witness a dynamical movement in two-ways with Algeria.

3.5.3. Trade and Economic Policies

According to the Department of State, Algeria is the United States' second to third-largest trading partner in the Middle East/North African region. In a similar vein to the growth observed in security and military exchanges, the economic relations between Algeria and the United States have experienced substantial expansion. Zoubir explored that: "During President Bouteflika's visit to the United States in July 2001, the two countries signed a Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA)" (qtd. in Zoubir 20). A consultative process on trade and investment was established, leading to the development of a bilateral treaty encompassing investment, trade benefits, and taxation. This agreement facilitated an increased focus on multinational corporations in Algeria's oil and gas sector. The primary aim of the treaty was to double the volume of trade between the two nations and enable American companies to gain a greater market share in Algeria, particularly within the oil industry. Presently, the United States holds the position of the largest investor in this sector. (Arab Center Washington DC)

Within the framework of the U.S.-North African Economic Partnership (USNAEP), the United States provided about \$1.0 million in technical assistance to Algeria in 2003. This program supported and encouraged Algeria's economic reform program and included support

for World Trade Organization accession negotiations, debt management, and improving the investment climate. In 2003, USNAEP programs were rolled over into Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) activities. (State of the Department) These initiatives offer financial support for political and economic development programs in Algeria. In addition to that, in March 2004, President George W. Bush designated Algeria a beneficiary country for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). (Global Security Organization). The U.S. President chose this path as a result of economic and political considerations in order to strengthen and expand the environment for investments and business.

The cooperation between the two nations witnessed another step forward back in 2007, Algeria and the United States signed an agreement to collaborate on using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, even though there are no current plans for a U.S. reactor in Algeria. U.S. exports to Algeria totaled \$1.2 billion in 2008, and U.S. imports from Algeria reached \$19.3 billion in 2008, primarily in the form of crude oil and gas. (Algerian Embassy in the United States)

Thus, over the following years, the United States had imported almost what worth \$10 billion from Algeria, and the bilateral exports amounted to \$1.4 billion. Economic relations have grown beyond the energy sector, extending into fields like financial services, pharmaceuticals, and various industries. Nonetheless, U.S. investors continue to encounter hurdles tied to bureaucratic procedures and policy restrictions (qtd. in Arief 15). The political professor Arief shows that the enhancement in the statistics regarding exchanges and commercial transactions between the two nations is evident, next to the Algerian agriculture producers are now customary participants to Miami agricultural fair, where the country has been in 2015 the Guest of Honor, in the same year the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act

(FATCA) was signed in Algiers to target non-compliance by U.S. tax payers using foreign accounts.

As of 2018, Algeria has attracted the presence of 190 American companies, primarily engaged in the hydrocarbons sector, with longstanding and fruitful partnerships with Algerian counterparts. Recognizing new avenues for collaboration, both nations have identified additional prospects in sectors such as agriculture, dairy cattle, energy equipment, and public works machinery, expanding their areas of interest. The Statistics and numbers of the Algerian market depict how it is promising and fertile for investments.

3.5.4. Cultural and Educational Ties

Decision-makers in Washington have observed that America, particularly during the two terms of President George W. Bush, has been exporting fear and anger instead of promoting hope and optimism. In light of this, they have promptly taken measures to employ soft power as a means to shape opinions and cultivate mutual understanding between America and the international community. These efforts involve significant annual funding directed towards exchange programs that aim to export the American model. (Foreign Affairs)

Actually, American involvement in Algeria extends beyond politics, the economy, and the military fields. The bilateral relations aim to achieve three primary goals: fostering a security and military alliance, enhancing economic and trade interactions, and fostering educational and cultural connections between Algerians and Americans. Lecturer and ESL Writing Director at Baruch College Kamal Belmihoub mentioned that there is a considerable percentage of Algerian students use English language in different ways and places, with a prediction that it is going to be improved with years. As well, there is a growing inclination among university students in various disciplines in Algeria to learn the English language, indicating a significant rise in demand for English language education. (Belmihoub 8)

According to the U.S. Embassy in Algeria which stated that: “there are more than 50 projects and programs offered by the US government and American non-government institutions for Algerians, these programs are in the form of scholarships and professional training fully sponsored, Algerians who want to participate in such programs do not pay any costs including traveling, housing, and living. US exchange programs for Algerians are considered great chances for Algerians and Americans to exchange their culture and create an atmosphere of mutual understanding” (U.S. Embassy in Algeria).

This considerable number of varied programs reveals how the American intention and potential to spread its American soft power web across the world and mainly in Algeria. Here is a list of US Embassy ongoing projects and programs that aim to promote and facilitate English language learning: Teacher’s College, Columbia University. With the joint effort Columbia University, the program is underway to support the Ministry in establishing a conducive environment where students, professors, and researchers regularly utilize English as the primary means of communication. By closely working with Algerian English language specialists, the project seeks to provide training for teachers in utilizing English within the field of sciences, develop online English resources accessible to the wider Algerian population, and modernize university language centers to become advanced hubs for language acquisition

Another project provided by the American Embassy in Algeria is creating a research hub for Algerian higher education. In a period of three years, the U.S. Department in collaboration with University of Notre Dame in Indiana are working on establishing a “research hub” that will link Algerian research institutes with their US counterparts in five crucial areas: artificial intelligence; applied mathematics; climate change and renewable energy; health sciences; and pharmaceuticals; as well as agriculture. Its primary aim is to encourage the exchange of ideas and individuals, enhancing the research capabilities of

Algerian universities and creating crucial partnerships between Algerian researchers and the private sectors. (American Embassy in Algeria)

In addition to other projects which provide crucial numerous programs such as: The Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistantship (FLTA), The Access Micro Scholarship Program, The Forward Project, Algeria Network for English as a Second Language. We should mention that The United States has implemented university linkage programs of moderate scale initially in 1993. It has deployed two English Language Fellows to assist the Ministry of Education in developing English as a Second Language (ESP) courses at the Ben Aknoun Training Center. Again in 2006, Algeria received a grant through the Ambassadors' Fund for Cultural Preservation, amounting to \$106,110, for the restoration of the El Pacha Mosque in Oran. Additionally, an \$80,000 grant was allocated to Algeria for micro-scholarships, enabling the creation of an American English-language program for high school students in four major cities (U.S. Embassy in Algiers). Based on the same source, in 2009, the U.S. Government initiated a pilot program at Mentouri University in Constantine, Algeria. The program's objectives encompass facilitating the transition from university to the workforce, combating unemployment, and providing English and business management training to Algerian university professors and students. This initiative aims to equip graduates with the necessary skills to secure meaningful employment opportunities.

The claim that the main driver of America's great power is its military strength is untrue. Given that this is illogical to understand, the United States cannot invade every nation that disagrees with or rejects its policies. Instead, the United States primarily wields other strong instruments of power through the export of American culture, ideology, and way of life. By taking advantage of the English language's widespread use in daily communication, trade, and technology, the United States has amassed a sizable amount of influence and the spread of American customs and norms. Today, hundreds of millions of

people use English as a language of business and technology, a sign of sophistication and elitism, as well as how they dress and eat. They also enjoy American music and movies. Soft power in the United States is largely due to the involvement of its civil society and non-governmental organizations, as well as the government.

As per the information shared by the U.S. Embassy in Algeria, the United States actively backs the Algerian civil society by executing exchange programs that offer valuable training prospects. These programs cater a wide range of individuals, encompassing journalists, businesspeople, female entrepreneurs, parliamentarians, legal professionals, and non-governmental organizations. Notably, there are over 5,000 alumni who have participated in U.S. government exchange programs in Algeria. The primary focus of these initiatives lies in nurturing youth entrepreneurship, augmenting English language learning and teaching skills, empowering women, encouraging media involvement, and strengthening cultural associations. (U.S. Embassy in Algeria)

The Algerian president Abdelmadjid Tebboune announced in July 2022 that English would be taught in primary schools. Given that English is used as the primary language of instruction in university programs like engineering and medicine, the president emphasized the value of launching English instruction earlier in the educational process. (Rouaba para.1) A Multimedia journalist at BBC, Mr. Rouaba sees in Tebboune's statement that time is up now for Algeria to take off the French language outfit. The President mentioned that: "French is a spoil of war, but English is an international language." This suggests that English assumes significant importance and becomes essential for the Algerian context. The British linguist, academic, and prolific author David Crystal, explains in his statement how important is the status of English language in the world, saying that: "The changing economic policies and the openness to the world raises the need for English as a common language and a medium of a great deal of the world's knowledge, especially in areas such as economy, science, and

technology.”(Crystal V-Vi).As an outcome, both the Algerian government and learners are becoming increasingly aware of English prestigious standing as a leading world language.

According to the Algerian Youth Leadership Programs (2022), the U.S. cultural exchange programs in Algeria are an objective for the participants to develop a more profound awareness of their rights and duties as citizens in a democratic society by applying an interactive approach during the workshops and in various public and community contexts.

Through their involvement in these activities, participants in cultural and educational exchange programs can increase their self-awareness and deepen their understanding of the others, enhancing their knowledge of different cultures and strengthening international ties.

In addition to the above description of the explicit purposes of these programs, US cultural exchange programs may include hidden agendas. The article published by the American diplomat, public official, and foreign policy expert who served also as Under Secretary of State, Paula Dobriansky, brought attention to how all of those programmes and projects are more than just social and educational collaboration between countries. They are, however, an agenda with political objectives. Dabriensky and her colleagues depicted that:

One of America's most effective soft power tactics has been recognised as the incorporation of US exchange programmes into foreign policy strategy and planning. These programmes seek to promote and represent the best of American principles, while also growing US influence and propagating democratic ideas across the world. Furthermore, they contribute to the strengthening of economic and commercial interests while providing a unique and remarkable insight into the core of the United States as a nation. (Dobriansky para 2-5)

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are several of distinct qualities that make up Americanism and have influenced the way that the country is perceived around the world. From its founding

ideals of liberty and democracy to its acceptance of cultural diversity, America has evolved into a symbol of globalization, influencing and being influenced by the entire world. Additionally, the nation has used its influence in a variety of fields thanks to American exceptionalism, which is based on the notion that the country has a special destiny.

The United States has implemented soft power policies with Algeria as part of its global engagement strategy, which also includes political, military, economic, cultural, and educational initiatives. Politically speaking, the U.S. has tried to promote communication and collaboration with Algeria, understanding the value of diplomatic relations in forming long-lasting alliances. In the context of defense, the U.S. has sought to support and assist with security to improve regional stability. In terms of the economy, the U.S. has aimed to promote business and investment opportunities, realizing the chance for shared prosperity.

Furthermore, cultural and educational initiatives have been instrumental in fostering deeper intercultural understanding and enhancing people-to-people exchanges. Through these varied strategies, the United States has used soft power to forge a solid bilateral relationship with Algeria, advancing shared values, fostering economic ties, and creating a bridge between the two countries. These initiatives highlight the value of positive engagement and cooperation in achieving shared objectives and strengthening the ties between the United States and Algeria as the world continues to change.

General Conclusion

These three chapters provide a comprehensive overview of American foreign policy and its impact on Algeria, providing insight into these matters.

Moreover, the United States has had a lengthy record of bilateral relations with Algeria that are founded on shared dynamics and interests. The two countries have gone through times of cooperation and difficulties, with common goals in areas like security, energy, and regional stability. A complex relationship that has developed over time is the result of historical ties, cultural affinities, and diplomatic engagements.

One-third, the United States has adopted specific soft power strategies towards Algeria in the years following 9/11, hoping to promote understanding, cooperation, and mutual gain. These regulations cover economic collaborations, interpersonal interactions, and cultural and educational exchanges in addition to security issues. The United States appreciates the importance of soft power in establishing long-lasting bonds and achieving common objectives, and this strategy has been crucial in fostering closer ties between the two countries.

Overall, the United States' foreign policy portfolio, historical ties to Algeria, and targeted soft power initiatives in the nation show a multifaceted strategy for global engagement. The United States seeks to expand its influence, forge alliances, and open doors for cooperation with Algeria through a variety of diplomatic, economic, military, and cultural initiatives. This all-encompassing strategy reflects the complexity of international relations and emphasizes the significance of consistent efforts in upholding solid and beneficial ties.

The relations between these two countries were mainly active in the cultural, social, and military domains. Throughout my research journey, I did considerable efforts to

find any kind of other collaborations especially religiously. However, all was in vain. Accordingly, The Americo-Algerian relations can mainly be seen in the academic and linguistic campaigns (events) like what the American embassy is always presenting to high school pupils and university students as well. We find that the two countries sign in many occasions military treaties to assist the army potential and control.

Findings regarding the American foreign policy portfolio and the use of soft power by the US in Algeria can be classified in the final phase of this. At the end of the inquiry journey, here are some reached and confirmed results that are revealed in the following notes and lines:

- **Public diplomacy:** To sway opinions and advance its values in Algeria, the United States uses public diplomacy initiatives. In order to promote understanding among people and foster favourable perceptions of the United States, this also includes cultural exchanges, educational initiatives, and media outreach.
- **Economic Engagement:** As a tactic for soft power towards Algeria, the United States engages in economic engagement. This entails trade alliances, investment opportunities, and assistance programmes for the economy that strengthen bilateral ties while also advancing Algeria's economic growth and stability.
- **Development Assistance:** The United States uses development assistance as a tool of soft power in its relations with Algeria. To raise living standards and promote goodwill between the two countries, this aid is directed at several areas, including infrastructure, healthcare, education, and governance.
- **Security cooperation:** In terms of Algeria and American foreign policy, security cooperation is a key component. By working together on counterterrorism initiatives, intelligence sharing, and military training, the United States improves Algeria's security capabilities and fosters a sense of partnership in addressing shared security challenges.

- **Support for Democracy and Good Governance:** The United States uses soft power strategies to advance democracy and sound governance in Algeria. To strengthen democratic institutions and principles, this includes assisting civil society organisations, advancing human rights, and offering technical support for electoral processes.
- **Educational Exchanges and Scholarships:** Algerian students can study at American institutions thanks to exchange programmes and scholarships provided by the United States. These opportunities help to promote intercultural understanding, academic collaboration, and the development of strong ties between Algeria and the United States.

American arts, music, movies, and literature are promoted in Algeria as part of American cultural engagement with that country. This cross-cultural interaction strengthens cultural ties between the two countries and reduces cultural gaps.

These findings highlight the various ways that Algerian soft power is used by the American foreign policy portfolio. The United States seeks to forge positive relationships, sway perceptions, and advance its interests in Algeria by using public diplomacy, economic engagement, development aid, security cooperation, humanitarian assistance, and support for democracy, educational exchanges, and cultural engagement.

Works Cited

- Aftandilian, Gregory. "US-Algeria Relations Remain Troubled, but Neither Side Wants a Break." *Arab Center Washington DC*. 25 Jan. 2023. Web. 08 Apr. 2023.
- "Algeria–United States relations." Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, 7 June 2023, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Algeria–United_States_relations. Web. 15 May, 2023
- "Algeria." U.S. Department of State. 12 Feb. 2008. Web Archive. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20080212231627/http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/8005.htm>.
- "Algeria-US Relations." Global Security.org, 5 August 2011, web. 18 Apr, 2023, <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/algeria/forrel-us.htm>
- "Algeria – Visits by Foreign Leaders – Department History – Office of the Historian." History.state.gov. Retrieved 24 Mar. 2017. Web. 15 May 2023.
- American Legion. "Americanism." American Legion. n.d. Web. 10 April 2023.
- American Legion. "Americanism." American Legion. American Legion, n.d. Web. 15 Apr, 2023. <https://www.legion.org/americanism>.
- "Algeria Youth Leadership Cultural Exchange Program 2022." Opportunities for Africans, www.opportunitiesforafricans.com/algeria-youth-leadership-cultural-exchange-program-2022/. Web. 26 May, 2023.
- Anshan, Li. "Soft Power and the Role of Media: A Case Study of PKU African Tele-Info (Draft)." *World Economy and Politics*. No. Volume, no.4, 2008, pp. 6-15. Web 02 Dec, 2022.
- Arieff, Alexis "Algeria: Background and U.S. Relations" Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service, 26 Oct. 2018. Web. 15 May, 2023.
- Arieff, Alexis. "Algeria: Current Issues." Congressional Research Service Report, 18 November 2013, pp. 15.

- Azzouz, Souad. "This is her first visit since her appointment years ago... Condoleezza Rice in Algeria before the end of Ramadan", *Ennaharonline*, August 30, 2008. <https://www.ennaharonline.com/تعتبر-الزيارة-الأولى-لها-منذ-تعيينها-ق/>.
- Bachrach, Peter, and Morton Baratz. "Two Faces of Power." *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 56, no. 4, 1962, pp. 632–42.
- "Background Note: Algeria". U.S. Department of State. October 2007. Archived from the original on February 12, 2008. Web. 14 May, 2023.
- Bartkowski, John P. "A Global Political Society? The Challenge of Globalization to Cultural Nationalism." *Culture and Society*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2001, pp. 9-34.
- Bellah, Robert N., et al. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. University of California Press, 1996, pp. 178-179.
- Belmihoub, Kamal. "English in a Multilingual Algeria." City University of New York (CUNY), CUNY Academic Works, 2017. Accessed [insert date accessed], https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1271&context=bb_pubs.
- Benguetaf, Hafid A. *The Barbary Treaties Between the USA and Algiers, 1795-1816*. 2010. Web. 09 Apr. 2023.
- Boyd, Charles G. "Making Peace with the Guilty: The Truth about Bosnia." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 74, no. 5, 1995, pp. 22–38.
- Brookings Institution. "America's Bosnia Policy: The Work Ahead." Brookings, 9 July 1998, www.brookings.edu/research/americas-bosnia-policy-the-work-ahead/.
- Brookings Institution. "Decision to Intervene: How the War in Bosnia Ended." Brookings, n.d., www.brookings.edu/articles/decision-to-intervene-how-the-war-in-bosnia-ended/
- Cafiero, Giorgio, and Emily Milliken. "How Long Can Algeria's Neutrality in the Ukraine War Last?" *The New Arab*. The New Arab, 30 Nov. 2022. Web. 09 Apr. 2023.

Cafiero, Giorgio. "Why US-Algeria Relations are at Their Lowest Point in Years." TRT World, 19 May, 2023, www.trtworld.com/opinion/why-us-algeria-relations-are-at-their-lowest-point-in-years-52926.

Cameron, Fraser, 2nd ed. *US Foreign Policy After the Cold War: Global Hegemony or Reluctant Sheriff?* Routledge, 2005.

Charef, Abde. "The Tragedy That Paved the Way for Algerian Independence - Rosa-luxemburg-stiftung." *Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung*. 06 May 2022. Web. 09 Apr. 2023.

Chikhaoui, Arslan. "40 YEARS LATER: THE ROLE OF ALGERIAN DIPLOMACY DURING THE IRAN HOSTAGE CRISIS." *Near East South Asia Center*. Web. 10 Apr. 2023.

Crystal, David. "Contents." *English as a Global Language*, edited by David Crystal, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. V-Vi.

Desrocher, John. "First Speech of U.S. Ambassador to Algeria John Desrocher at Diplomatic and International Relations Institute." Embassy of the United States of America, Algiers, Algeria. 15 Jan. 2018. Web. 20 May, 2023.

Dobriansky, P., Gabriel, E., & Lino, M. "The soft but unmatched power of US foreign exchange programs." *The Hill*, 2021, <https://thehill.com/opinion/international/540262-the-soft-but-unmatched-power-of-us-foreign-exchange-programs/>. Web. 27 May, 2023.

DuBois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Signet Classics, 2015, pp. 45.

Embassy of Algeria in the United States. "Algeria-US Bilateral Economic Relations." Algerian Embassy, 2020, <https://www.algerianembassy.org/economy/AlgeriaUs-Bilateral-Economic-Relations-Algeria-Us-Bilateral-Economic-Relations.html>

Entelis, John P. *Algeria: The Revolution Institutionalized*. United States: Westview, 1986. Web. 10 Apr. 2023

Erksteen, Riaan. "Relationship between Domestic Affairs and Foreign Affairs." Institute of Peace and Diplomatic Studies & Riphah Institute of Public Policy, Riphah International University, n-peace.net, 6th August, 2020.

Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*. University of Chicago Press, 1962, pp.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Cold War: A New History*. Penguin Books, 2006.

Garding, Sarah E. "Bosnia and Herzegovina: Background and U.S. Policy." *EveryCRSReport*, EveryCRSReport.com, 15 Apr. 2019, www.everycrsreport.com/reports/R45691.html. Web. 27 Mar, 2023

Gerges, Fawaz A. "Obama and the Middle East: The End of America's Moment?" St. Martin's Press, May 22, 2012.

Ghebouli, Zine Labidine. "Algeria's Foreign Policy: Between Hope and Reality." *Middle East Institute*. 08 Mar. 2023. Web. 11 Apr. 2023.

Giddens, Anthony. *Sociology*. 5th ed., Polity Press, 2013.

Gray, Colin S. *Hard Power and Soft Power: The Utility of Military Force as an Instrument of Policy in the 21st Century*. Strategic Studies Institute. April 2011. <http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil>. Web: 01 Jan, 2023.

Halido, Agaba and David Silas. "Fundamentals of America's Foreign Policy" *International Affairs Quarterly*, Vol. 3, no, 1, August 2022, pp.29-38. Union by political science journals.Com. Ng. Web: 2/11/2023.

Halil, Aybüke Rabia. "The Relations Between Algeria And France In The Shadow Of Colonial Legacy: A New Page Possible?*" (2021): 701-25. Web. 11 Apr. 2023

Held, David and Anthony McGrew. *Globalization/Anti-Globalization: Beyond the Great Divide*. Polity Press, 2007.

Horne, Alistair. *A Savage War of Peace: Algeria, 1954-1962*. New York: New York Review, 2006. Print.

- Kazin, Michael. "Americanism." *Encyclopedia of American Studies*. Ed. Simon J. Bronner. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018, pp.465.
- Kazin, Michael. "Americanism." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., edited by James D. Wright, vol. 1, Elsevier, 2017, pp. 465-46.6.
- Kazin, Michael. *American dreamers: How the left changed a nation*. Alfred A. Knopf, 2011, pp. 206
- Kelley, Donald R. *United States Presidents and Foreign Policy: From 1945 to 2017*. University Press of Kentucky, 2018, pp. 165.
- Keohane, Robert O. "Hegemony and After: Knowns and Unknowns in the Debate Over Decline." *Foreign Affairs* 91 (2012): pp. 114-18.
- Kesseiri, Radia. "Ideologised Foreign Policy and the Pragmatic Rationale: The Case of Algeria under HouariBoumedienne, 1965-1978." *Ideologised Foreign Policy and the Pragmatic Rationale: The Case of Algeria under HouariBoumedienne, 1965-1978* (2005). Web. 11 Apr. 2023
- "La Loi Du 23 Février 2005 : Texte Et Réactions." *Cahiers D'histoire. Revue D'histoireCritique*. Association Paul Langevin, 03 Apr. 2009. Web. 08 Apr. 2023.
- Leonard, Thomas M. *Encyclopedia of the Developing World*. Vol. 1. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis, 2006. Google Books. 13 Apr. 2023
- Lesser, Ian O., Jerrold Green, Stephen Larrabbe, and Michelle Zanini. "The Future of NATO's Mediterranean Initiative: Evolution and next Steps." (2000): 1-63. Web. 12 Apr 2023.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword*. W. W. Norton & Company, 1997, pp. 2.
- London, Douglas. "High Cost of American Heavy-Handedness." *Foreign Affairs*, 20 Dec. 2022, Web. 26 May 2023.<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/united-states/high-cost-american-heavy-handedness>.

- Macridis, Roy. "Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics." *Foreign Policy in a Democracy*. Ed. Joseph S. Nye Jr. and Samuel P. Huntington. New York: Columbia UP, 1972, pp 26-28.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory. *Principles of Microeconomics*. Cengage Learning, 2015, pp. 26.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory. *The Politics of Algeria: Domestic Issues and International Relations*. London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2020. Web. 14 Apr. 2023.
- Mansour-Ille, Dina. "Counterterrorism Policies in the Middle East and North Africa." *International Review of the Red Cross, International Committee of the Red Cross*, February 2022, <https://international-review.icrc.org/sites/default/files/reviews-pdf/2022-02/counterterrorism-policies-in-the-middle-east-and-north-africa-916.pdf>.
- Marshall, Randall et al. "The Psychology of Ongoing Threat: Relative Risk Appraisal, the September 11 Attacks, and Terrorism-Related Fears." *American Psychologist*, vol. 62, no. 4, 2007, pp. 304.
- Martin, Evans. *Algeria: `France's Undeclared War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. Google Books. Web. 12 Apr. 2023
- McColl, R. *Encyclopedia of World Geography*. Vol. 1. New York: Fact On File, Inc, 2005. Google Books. Web. 12 Apr. 2023.
- McDougall, James. *A History of Algeria*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. Google Books. Web. 12 Apr. 2023
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Americanism. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Web. 15 Apr, 2023, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Americanism>.
- Mestek, Yahia Mohamed Lamine. "The Algerian Foreign Policy Facing Upheavals in the Mediterranean Region." *The Algerian Foreign Policy Facing Upheavals in the Mediterranean Region 2.7* (2017). Web. 12 Apr. 2023
- Metz, Helen Chapin. *Algeria: A Country Study*. 5th ed. Library of Congress, 1994 Web. 11 Apr.2023

- Mortimer, Robert Amsden. "Foreign Policy in a New State." *Foreign Policy and Its Role in Nation-building in Algeria*. Ann Arbor: U Microfilms International, 1968. 1-14. Google Books. Web. 12 Apr. 2023.
- Nye, Joseph S. "Soft Power." *Foreign Policy*, no. 80, 1990, pp. 153–71. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1148580>. Web. 16 March, 2023
- Oakes, Jonathon, *Algeria: The Bradt Travel Guide*. OUP Oxford: United Kingdom, 2012. Google Books. Web. 10 Apr. 2023
- Ott, Zachary. "How U.S. Relations with Algeria Help Both Countries." Borgen Project, 23 Apr. 2018, <https://borgenproject.org/how-us-relations-with-algeria-help-both-countries/>. Web. 22 May, 2023.
- Paterson, Pat. Origins of US Foreign Policy Perry Center Occasional paper (William J. Perry Center for Hampshire Defense Studies National Defense University.
- Porter, Geoff .D "Political Instability in Algeria." Center of Preventive Action, Council on Foreign Relations, 7 March 2019, <https://www.cfr.org/report/political-instability-algeria>.
- Recchia, S (2015). Bosnia, 1992–95: Keeping the U.S. Military from “Owning” It. In *Reassuring the Reluctant Warriors: U.S. Civil-Military Relations and Multilateral*
- Rezig, Nadia. "Teaching English in Algeria and Educational Reforms: An Overview on the Factors Entailing Students' Failure in Learning Foreign Languages at University." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 29, 2011, pp. 1327-1333. ScienceDirect, doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.370.
- Rice, Condoleezza. "Remarks after Meeting with Algerian President AbdelazizBouteflika." 6 September 2008. U.S. Department of State, Web. 20 Feb, 2023. <https://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2008/09/109230.htm>.

- Rouaba, Ahmed. "Algerian Leader in Bold Move to Promote English at Junior School." BBC News, 31 July 2022, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-62368931>. Web. 26 May, 2023.
- Safrawi, Fatima, and TaoufikBouachba "American Foreign Policy towards Algeria after the Events of September 11, 2001." *Al-Mieyar*, vol. 7, no. 2, 31 Dec. 2016, p. 166, www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/58507. Web. 15 May, 2023.
- Save the Children Sweden. "Country Profile of Algeria." *Country Profile of Algeria A Review of the Implementations of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child* (2011). Web. 11 Apr. 2023.
- Schmidt, Donald E. *The Folly of War*. Algora Publishing, 2005.
- Schudson, Michael. "The Varieties of Americanism." *American Quarterly*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1995, pp. 144-146.
- Slim, Randa M. Introduction. *Mediation in International Relations: Multiple..* By Jacob Bercovitch. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993. 206-31. Web. 13 Apr 2023.
- Smith, S. Bayne. "The United States and the Arab World: The American Foreign Policy" Library since 1945. Harvard University Press; 3rd edition, January 1, 1975, pp. 64.
- Steger, Manfred B. and Paul James. *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Sultana, AleyaMousami. "Indian Foreign Policies and the Contemporary WorldUnitThree. Indian and Japan: A Study of Bilateral Relationship. <https://cbpbu.ac.in> › STUDY_MAT › POL_SC. Web: 23/5/2022.
- Sutton, Keith, Brown, L. Carl, Chanderli, Abdel Kader and Zaimeche, Salah. "Algeria". Encyclopedia Britannica, 20 Apr. 2023, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Algeria>. Web. 7 May, 2023.

Szasz, Paul C "*The Dayton Accord: The Balkan Peace Agreement*," Cornell International Law Journal: Vol. 30: Iss. 3, Article 8.

"The National Security Strategy of the United States of America." The White House, Washington DC, September 2002. Available at:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2002>. Web. 25 Apr, 2023.

TRT World. "What's the Algiers Agreement between Iran and Iraq About?" *What's the Algiers Agreement between Iran and Iraq About?* TRT World, 14 Mar. 2019. Web. 13 Apr. 2023.

United States Department of State. "U.S. Foreign Policy." U.S. Department of State, 20 Apr. 2021, <https://www.state.gov/u-s-foreign-policy>.

U.S. Department of State. "American International School of Algiers - Special Needs Profile." U.S. Department of State, Web. 25 May, 2023, <https://www.state.gov/american-international-school-of-algiers-special-needs-profile/>.

U.S. Department of State, "Background Note: Algeria." Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs., October 2007, <https://2001/2009.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/8005.htm>.

U.S. Department of State. "November 1995: The Dayton Accords." Diplomacy: Ending a War - The Dayton Accords, U.S. Department of State, n.d., diplomacy.state.gov/online-exhibits/diplomacy-ends-a-war-the-dayton-accords/november-1995-the-dayton-accords/

US Department of State. The U.S. - Egypt Relations. Office of Spokesperson January 28, 2023. <https://www.state.gov/the-u-s-Egypt-relationship>. Web. 24 Feb, 2022.

U.S. Department of State. The U.S. - Iraq Relations. Bilateral Relations Fact Sheet. <https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-iraq>." Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs. June 6, 2022. Web: 08 Dec, 2022

- U.S. Department of State. "Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment." U.S. Department of State, Web. 22 May, 2023, <https://www.state.gov/bureaus-offices/under-secretary-for-economic-growth-energy-and-the-environment/>
- U.S. Department of State. "U.S. Relations with Algeria." U.S. Department of State, Web. 20 May 2023, <https://www.state.gov/u-s-relations-with-algeria/>.
- U.S. Department of State. U.S. Relations with Israel. Fact Sheet. Office of the Spokesperson. January 30, 2023. Web: 31 Jun, 2021.
- U.S. Embassy in Algeria. "Exchanges." U.S. Embassy in Algeria, Web. 26 May, 2023, <https://dz.usembassy.gov/education-culture/exchanges/>.
- "U.S. Officials Propose Sharing Drone Surveillance Data with Algerians." The New York Times, 26 Jan. 2013.
- Vince, Natalya. *The Algerian War, The Algerian Revolution*. Switzerland: Springer, 2020. Google Books. Web. 08 Apr. 2023.
- Vuving, Alexander L. "How Soft Power Works." Paper presented at the panel. "Soft Power and Smart Power." American Political Science, association annual meeting. Web: 02/02/2023.
- Walt, Stephen M. "The Myth of American Exceptionalism." *Foreign Policy*, no. 176, 2010, pp. 2-3.
- Watson, Bruce W. "Yugoslavia's Wars." *Balkan Odyssey: A Personal Account of the International Peace Efforts Following the Breakup of the Former Yugoslavia*. Ed. David A. Andelman. New York: Praeger, 2005, pp. 25-56.
- Weinbrener, Brown. *Soft Power and Hard Power Approaches in U.S. Foreign Policy: A Case Study Comparison in Latin America*. 2007. University of Central America. PhD Thesis.

Wilsey, John D. *American Exceptionalism and Civil Religion: Reassessing the History of an Idea*. IVP Academic, 2015.

Yahia, Zoubir "American Policy in Maghreb: The Conquest of a New Region."WP. 2006
Area: Middeterranian and Arab World. Web: 10/02/2023.

Zoubir, Yahia. "American Policy in Maghreb: The Conquest of a New Region."WP.2006,
pp.11-12.

Zoubir, Yahia H. "American Policy in the Maghreb: The Conquest of a New Region?" (2006)
pp 1-16. Web: 14 Apr. 2023

Zoubir, Yahia. "Resilient Authoritarianism, Uncertain Democratization, and Jihadism in
Algeria." In *Democratic Development and Political Terrorism: The Global Perspective*,
edited by W. J. Crotty, Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 2005, pp. 280-300.

Zoubir, Yahia. *The United States and Algeria: A New Strategic Partnership?* *Journal of
Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies (in Asia)*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1-17.
Doi:10.1080/19370679.2011.12023188.

الملخص

تستكشف هذه الدراسة دور القوة الناعمة في العلاقات بين الولايات المتحدة والجزائر بعد أحداث 11 سبتمبر. فبعد الحرب العالمية الثانية، ظهرت الولايات المتحدة كقوة عالمية مهيمنة، حيث استخدمت مجموعة من السياسات الناعمة والقوية للحفاظ على وضعها كقوة فائقة لمواجهة الاتحاد السوفيتي. فبجانب الاستخدامات العسكرية والتكتيكات القوية، اعتمدت الولايات المتحدة أيضًا استراتيجيات القوة الناعمة لحماية مصالحها في جميع أنحاء العالم. ومنه تركز هذه الدراسة بشكل خاص على الجزائر كدراسة حالة، حيث تحلل كيفية تنفيذ الولايات المتحدة لتدابير القوة الناعمة لحماية مصالحها وأمنها في المنطقة. و من خلال استخدام النهج التاريخي والتحليلي، جنبًا إلى جنب مع الأساليب الكمية، تهدف الدراسة إلى فهم التطبيق العملي للقوة الناعمة الأمريكية في الجزائر. تكشف النتائج عن التحديات التي تواجه السلطات الأمريكية في فهم المنظومة الجزائرية نظرًا لموقفها الأيديولوجي المحافظ المتأثر بالأحداث المختلفة. فالوضع بين الدولتين ازداد تعقيدًا بسبب تسهيل الدول الجوار المتمثل في المغرب للتطبيع مع إسرائيل واعتراف الولايات المتحدة بتبعية الصحراء الغربية للمغرب أدى بالعلاقات الأمريكية الجزائرية الى أن تشهد شدا وتجادبا سياسيا حول ماهية هاته القرارات على الساحة الدولية والمحلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجزائر، السياسة الخارجية الأمريكية، السياسة الناعمة، السياسة القوية، الولايات المتحدة،

المصالح الأمريكية.