

## The Hegemonic Influence of the United States in the Middle East Case Study: Israel's Security

EdrisHassanpour<sup>1</sup>, Hamid Sarmadi<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>M.A. Student of International Relations, Department of Law and Politics, Bonab branch, Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran.

<sup>2</sup>PhD in Political Science, Department of Law and Politics, Bonab branch, Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran

**\*Corresponding Author:** Hamid Sarmadi. PhD in Political Science, Department of Law and Politics, Bonab branch, Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran

### ABSTRACT

At the foreign policy level of hegemonic power in the post-Cold War international system, ideas play a pivotal role in justifying the goals of U.S. foreign policy as hegemonic power in the international system and, consequently, guide the country's performance on the universal stage. In this respect, US foreign policy during recent decades has been based on comprehensive support and absolute alignment with Israel's interests in the Middle East and at the level of the international system. This article aims at examining the hegemonic influence of the United States in the Middle East with a focus targeted at Israel's security. The most important legacy of US foreign policy over the Middle East has been Israel's strategic shift toward building security of Israel in the Middle East. On the other hand, unilateralism based on Israel's security has been at odds with security in the Middle East.

**Keywords:** United States, Israel, Jewish lobby, foreign policy - unilateralism, hegemony, realism

### INTRODUCTION

The unilateralism of the United States after the collapse of the bipolar structure of the Cold War is the most important structural challenge to the post-Cold War international system. This unilateralism, due to the lack of balance of power between the great powers, has had consequences for the establishment of order in the context of the international system. The central role of the United States and its willingness to intervene in the overall process of maintaining order in the contemporary international system. This order is based on American unilateralism, which is called the hegemonic order. As a result, after the collapse of the bipolar structure of the Cold War, the country tried to expand its hegemony in the international system, according to its interpretation of some treaties, international regimes. Reconsider international law, which was the legacy of the structure of the international system of the Cold War. Due to its potential geopolitical and geostrategic capacities, West Asia has always been considered and intervened by global and trans-regional powers, and a significant part of the security order of this region and its evolution is the manner of entry

and exit and the type of action and strategy of trans-regional powers. It depends on it. The mode of entry and exit and the type of action and strategy of supra-regional powers in the equations of this region have been influenced by two factors: First, the prioritization, level, and extent of the benefits that trans-regional powers define for themselves in this region; And second, the desire of the countries of the region to benefit from supra-regional powers to enter the equation of regional competition. Given the situation in the region, the rapprochement with Israel over the past half-century has been one of the most important issues in US foreign policy. The Cold War's foreign policy in the Middle East was defined primarily by its macro-strategy, especially the influence of the Soviet Union and its satellites, and its reflection in the Middle East put a kind of conservatism and protection of the status quo on the political elite's agenda.

Foreigners put this country. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, and especially the events of September 11, 2001, brought about changes in American foreign policy that we have seen directly reflected in the Middle East. US aggressive and pre-emptive

foreign policy in Afghanistan and Iraq has marked a shift in US foreign policy in the early 21st century. Two ongoing issues in US foreign policy toward the Middle East, namely Israel and oil, competed with each other in terms of priority. In the first stage, during the early presidencies - Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy - these two issues seemed to be balancing each other. Later, despite many security challenges in the Middle East, Israel gained weight. The fundamental question, then, is: What has been the purpose of US foreign policy in the Middle East, and especially in Israel?

The hypothesis of the article is that all US actions and policies in the Middle East are directly related to the security of Israel, and in particular the activities of pro-Israel lobbies in that country, especially the AIPAC lobby. Which theoretical approach to international relations provides a good analysis and explanation of US foreign policy in the region? The present study is intended to demonstrate the realism of US foreign policy in the Third World using the theory

The theoretical underpinnings of US foreign policy can be better explained by the application of the theory of realism, as its performance in supporting Israel's security provides a significant change in security visibility in foreign policy. According to this theory, security is the first priority of governments and every government should always strive to increase its offensive power and by providing preemptive attack on potential and actual enemies, ensure national security and stand against any kind of power to find rivals and enemies.

### THEORETICAL STUDIES

Theories of international relations shape the perception of politicians and policy makers and theoretical and executive frameworks that explain the type of relations of expression of phenomena with creators and actors in international relations. Policymakers, especially in the field of foreign policy, will be aware of the existing and common theories in international relations, with a comprehensive and realistic vision to achieve, maintain and promote their national interests and national security. According to the author, realism is a comprehensive theoretical framework that has had the best definition and explanation of phenomena in international relations over the past half century. Apart from the main demand of realism, this theory provides a comprehensible

understanding of the science of international relations by taking a realistic view of the structure of power and governance and the relations between existing political governments and their weight in the international arena. To this end, in order to explain and explain more accurately the present research, the researcher tries to provide a correct understanding of US foreign policy and its impact on Israel's security, using the theory of realism and especially realism. So first we will briefly describe realism.

The school of realism with all its branches has been the most pervasive and important theory governing international relations for the past sixty years. For more than half a century, the three basic tenets of this theory, namely power, security and national interests, have played a key role in international relations. The realist approach emphasizes the primacy of military security in international relations. During the Cold War, this approach dominated scientific and academic circles and decision-making centers.

From the point of view of realism, the international system is the arena of struggle for power by the ruling states. The realists' definition of security is very government-oriented. Realism, like idealism in the theory of international relations, is rooted in the ancient political philosophy of the West and the writings of Ideas of western writers such as Tusidides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, who believed that man has an eternal and insatiable need for power that ends only with death is rooted in Hegel and to some extent, Max Weber. Realism, unlike idealism, assumes that the prospect of a fundamental change in the international system is not very promising. The international system is made up of countless forces, many of them they are not changed and cannot be changed. They believe that there is no fundamental harmony between the interests of countries, and on the contrary, they believe that nation-states often pursue conflicting national goals, some of which may lead to war. Realism emphasizes the politics of power and the pursuit of national interests and considers the government as the main player in the international arena, so that it can act as an independent entity (Ghavam, 2005: 81-79; Moshirzadeh, 2007: 79-83.) Realists attach great emphasis on the role of power in international affairs and tend to understand power in terms of military capacity or military force. The ambitious actions of the great powers have legitimized it. National security and the survival of the state are the central norms of the

realist approach and the values that shape realist doctrine and foreign policy. The national interest is the final arbiter in judging foreign policy. Human society and morality are limited to the state and do not enter the realm of international relations; Because the world of politics is a field in which disorder, discord and conflict between governments prevail. The fact that all governments must pursue their national interests means that countries and governments never fully trust each other.

Power is the key concept and center of gravity of the idea of realism in all its forms. In this theory, concepts such as security, national interests, and the balance of power around power, which are a vital element of government sovereignty as influential actors in the international arena, are significant and effective. In fact, in the school of realism, power is both a means and an end. who. J. Holsty argues that conceptual power is multidimensional and composed of these components: the actions by which one actor exerts influence over another, the abilities used for that purpose, and ultimately the desired response of the influencer.

Holstein defines power as the general ability of one state to control the behavior of other states. Robert. G Lieber sees power as the common military and political aspect, just as money is the common economy. (4) At the heart of realism is structuralism, power, and security. This was somewhat challenged after the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union in the midst of power and military security, and material capabilities showed that following high policies (ie, security policies) could not protect them from threat. Rather, other goals can be considered as lofty policies and overshadow other goals. The assumption of national interests in realism is in fact a reference to greater conflict and less security between countries.

### Balance of Power

Balancing forces is one of the oldest and most key concepts in international politics. Although the balance of power is a new term in the political theories of international relations. The rule of maintaining the balance of power in the intellect of the film and the obvious historical argument from the past to the present. In fact, balance is one of the basic concepts of many sciences, such as chemistry, physics, economics, and even politics. Realism theory has opened a special account to explain the characteristics of the balance of power in international relations and the conceptual extension of this theory to

the fundamental principles of realism. Realism holds that order is created and maintained by the power of the state, and that change in this system ultimately results from a shift in the distribution of state power. Realism, based on this view and with the new perspectives of realism, presents two images of the world's political system. Balance of power and hegemony.

The theory of balance of power considers the order and pattern of relations between major countries as the result of a balance between the confrontation of forces and centralized threats. The order is the result of a continuous process of delivery and adjustment between countries under experimental conditions. The balance can be traced from the inside out. That is, through the mobilization of internal forces and the creation of temporary alliances between countries at risk of confrontation and resistance to a threat of a threatening power, alliances are formed as temporary solidarity of countries to confront the centralized powers, which, by shifting power, also moved form alliances. 2-1- Hegemony

Various theories have been proposed about the concept of hedgehogs and their theoretical arguments, including the ideas of Immanuel Wallerstein, Paul Kennedy, and Charles F. Doran and others pointed out. The word hegemony is derived from the Greek word meaning leadership, and "hegemony" in international relations refers to the leadership or leadership status of a group of states. In fact, leadership assumes a degree of social order and collective organization in which one unit plays a major role. Some have pointed to the imbalance of power. A situation in which competition between the great powers is unbalanced, in which a power takes precedence and, as a result, can impose its own rules and aspirations in the economic, political, military, diplomatic, and even cultural spheres. .Examining the extensive literature on hegemony, we can summarize the characteristics that are considered for the power of hegemony as follows:

one. Hegemony is associated with raw and hard power. Hegemon's capabilities are so great militarily that no other government can wage a full-scale war against it. Hegemony also has an economic advantage in the international system and is particularly prominent in the field of material resources.

Two. The concept of hegemony expresses the ambitions of the dominant power. Hegemons act

on the basis of interests in order to guarantee their economic, ideological and security interests. Although some believe that hegemony pursues public interests, it should be noted that public interests are defined in a way that does not conflict with the hegemonic interests and order. (2006, pp.7-41, Christopher Layne.)

Three. Some consider hegemony to be a form of polarization. According to their argument, due to the great advantage of hegemony in military and economic power, compared to others, the hegemon of great power in the international system is, in a way, a single pole (Ibid).

Four. Hegemony is related to the will and ability to apply it. Hegemon purposefully uses his enormous power to impose his desired order at the level of the international system. In fact, in addition to having power, the hegemon must have the will to do so (Robert W. Cox, with Timothy Sinclair Press, 1996, p.151) Five. Hegemony is essentially a debate about changing the structure of the international system; because if T-value reaches the level and position of hegemony, right at that moment, the international system will be out of the state of absolute anarchy and disorder and will become a hierarchical system (Ibid).

### US Hegemony in the Middle East

For the United States, vital benefits in terms of security, economic well-being, and its core values, as well as key players in Europe, are defined as parts of Asia and the Persian Gulf. Stephen Walt, a professor of international relations at Harvard University, believes that the United States should use a strategy of remote balancing, meaning that a large part of its military forces should stay out of the conflict, and that only intervention can be achieved in any other way. Protecting and intervening is the last resort. In a fundamental approach, it is not possible to understand the position of the United States as the leader of the Western bloc and the most important player in the international system, regardless of its strategic goals and strategy in the Middle East. Washington is pursuing a number of key objectives and strategies in the Middle East, including: 1. Guaranteeing the region's energy flow to the West; 4. Fighting political Islam as anti-terrorism and anti-fundamentalism.

### Israel-US Relations

The national interests of the United States are the most important axis of US foreign policy. However, over the past few decades, and

especially after the six-day Arab-Israeli war in 1967, relations with Israel have been at the heart of US Middle East policy. The core of US Middle East policy is entirely dependent on US domestic policy, and in particular on the activities of the Israeli lobby.

The Israeli lobby is a large coalition of individuals and organizations that are actively working to guide US foreign policy in support of Israel.

The Israeli lobby is not an integrated movement with a central leadership. Its members may disagree on certain issues. The core of the Israeli lobby is made up of American Jews. In their daily lives, they make significant efforts to steer American foreign policy in the direction of pursuing Israeli interests. Their activities are not limited to voting for pro-Israel candidates, but also include correspondence, financial aid, and support for pro-Israel organizations.

The Israeli lobby also includes Protestant Christians who believe that the revival of Israel is a sacred mission and support its expansionist program and think that putting pressure on Israel is against the divine will.

The first formal contact between the Jewish community and the US government dates back to 1970, when George Washington, the new president of the fledgling government, issued a message emphasizing the need to ensure the social and political freedoms of the Jewish minority, especially in equal rights with other citizens.

Among the influential figures in advancing the goals of the Jewish minority, and especially the supporters of political Zionism in the United States, in the second decade of the twentieth century, then-President Wilson has an important and influential position.

Wilson, who believed that Judaism was influential in the cultural and political structure of the United States, paved the way for Jews to hold high government positions, such as the formation of a strong Jewish pressure group in the White House and the membership of then-Zionist leader Lewis Brands. America (in the Supreme Court. Wilson's leadership period has been cited as the starting point for the organized formation of the Jewish lobby in Washington; Many organizations, such as the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation Union, were formed during this period. In 1932, in the shadow of the economic reforms, the result of the presence of Jews in the level of planning and

executive affairs of economic policy was provided. Truman's recognition of the Zionist regime and his pressure on the British government to pave the way for the immigration of 100,000 Jews to Palestine and the promise to American Jews to help accept Zionist membership in the United Nations indicate Truman's extensive ties to the Jewish minority. Many ups and downs increased the importance and role of the Zionist regime as a strategic asset in the Middle East approach of this government.

During Kennedy's time, social movements organized to combat legal discrimination against minorities and immigrants provided them with access to the leadership of many social movements advocating for civil rights and freedoms. During the Reagan administration, he agreed to sell the plane to Saudi Arabia, in exchange for opposing traditional Zionist defenders inside the United States and paving the way for tensions between Reagan and the Israeli lobby.

During the Bush administration, due to regional developments such as the end of the Iran-Iraq war, the end of the occupation of Afghanistan and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the strategic importance of the Zionist regime in the Middle East diminished. The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), which has been heavily involved in the transfer of weapons to these countries, has shown that the United States is not limited to the Zionist regime in order to protect its interests in the region.

Bush Sr. put pressure on Tel Aviv to enter the arena of negotiations with the Arabs, creating a context for their humiliation, including the blocking of the ten billion dollars needed by the Zionist regime for territorial development and Bush's stance on this. He pointed out that Quds, the eastern part of the occupied territories, is not part of the Zionist regime. The Clinton era marked the beginning of an unprecedented distribution of key country posts among influential Jewish figures, such as some officials from prominent Jewish organizations such as AIPAC. According to Mark Denkov, a political analyst from Texas under Obama, this influence continues. "I think it's important to realize that 'Obama is just as much a tool for the Israeli lobby as George W. Bush,'" he told Press TV.

### Israeli lobby in the United States

The Israeli lobby in the United States is a unique example of lobbying and lobbying in domestic and foreign policy. The support of this lobby

and its irreplaceable role in empowering individuals in various groups and parties in the United States greatly illuminates the many and varied interests of different governments in supporting Israel.

In fact, the main reason for the orientation of US policy towards Israel is the role that this country plays for the United States in the field of domestic and foreign policy. Israel has helped defeat radical nationalist movements in Lebanon, Jordan, Yemen and Palestine, and its air force dominates the region. Mossad has partnered with the CIA and other US intelligence agencies to gather intelligence and covert operations. Israel has missiles capable of reaching Russia, and the regime has partnered with the US military-industrial complex and research and development for new fighter jets, anti-missile defense systems and even strategic defense initiatives.

Israel has a leading position in the world in the production and development of drones, which allows accurate monitoring without risk. Zionism relies on the same military and economic capabilities that can fully support the interests of the United States of this old partner and. Instead, the United States gained mutual support in public assemblies such as the United Nations. The influence of Jewish lobbies, such as the saying of Ariel Sharon (before falling into a coma), is more self-evident. Recall his remarks to critical Israeli officials, who said: "Every time we take action, many of you address me and say that the United States will do this and that. I want to make a clear point that "Do not be afraid of American pressure on Israel, because we are the Jews who are in control of the United States, and the Americans themselves are well aware of this." Why the US approach to the Middle East is based on:

Adoption of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty by Middle Eastern Countries; - Adoption of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Proliferation of Chemical Weapons by Middle Eastern Countries; - Preventing the purchase of new long-range missiles, as well as air defense equipment by Middle Eastern countries, while US policy toward the establishment of an Israeli security base based on equipping that country with nuclear weapons, such as John Beton. He does not want to blame Israel for the proliferation of nuclear weapons because that country has never been a threat to the United States. According to Simon Hersh, this policy is not a compassionate compromise, but a clever

one to ignore the facts. The United States is committed to the requirements of Israel's security and existence policy, and that commitment includes economic, military, and political dimensions. The grants and privileges granted in these dimensions are so generous that astonish observers and writers in the field of foreign policy.

### US Foreign Policy and Ensuring Israel's Security

The United States and Israel have formed a single partnership to address the growing dangers in the Middle East. The reason for US support for Israel is that both sides believe that the United States is a strategic friend of Israel. By siding with the United States after the Six-Day Wars in 1967, the regime helped limit Soviet expansion in the region and inflicted a humiliating defeat on Soviet allies in the region, such as Egypt and Syria. The regime has backed other US allies in the region, such as King Hussein in Jordan, and its military might has forced Moscow to spend more on its defeated allies.

Israel has also provided the United States with useful information on Soviet capabilities. However, since the early 1990s, and especially since the 9/11 attacks, support for Israel has been justified by the fact that both countries are targeted by terrorist groups that originate in the Arab world or Islam. Both countries are also threatened by governments that call them insurgent governments and support these groups and seek weapons of mass destruction. He considers them terrorists, leaves them open and does not impose any restrictions on Israel. Apart from this claim, the supporters of this regime give other false reasons for the unlimited US support for Israel, which are as follows:

First: that this country is weak and surrounded by enemies. Second, there is democracy in this country, which is a kind of government that excels in other ways. American supporters of Israel often justify their work by claiming that Israel is a democracy that is our friend, ruled by its enemies. They are dictators, besieged. Third, the Jewish people have endured many hardships from past crimes and are therefore worthy of special respect and treatment. Finally, the Israeli character is morally superior to the behavior of its enemies. The Israeli regime is often seen as a weak and besieged regime, a Jewish David who is surrounded by an Arab enemy named Jalut. This image has been carefully created by Zionist leaders and their authors and has taken on a

natural color, but the image is closer to reality. It is closer to reality.

The next justification for the US's extensive aid to Israel is Azar and the torture that the Jewish people have witnessed throughout their history in Western Christian countries. It turned out that Staviz was very good for the Zionists to make the most of it from the day after World War II. Weapons companies in the United States have always made huge profits because of the security and special regional conditions in the Middle East.

And one of the biggest reasons for the security of the region can be considered the presence of Israel and the successive provocations of this regime. Therefore, there is a direct relationship between the rich profits of these companies and the presence of Israel in the Middle East, and the more secure the atmosphere in the Middle East, the greater the profits of these large arms companies. Because Arab countries always feel threatened by Israel and buy modern weapons from the United States to alleviate this feeling, for example, with the approval of the Senate to sell F15 aircraft to Saudi Arabia in 1978, the Pentagon tried. Avax also sells air control and warning systems to Saudi Arabia, as it was very lucrative, and the White House blames Israel for the revenue generation and the regime's potential threats to countries in the region.

### Financial Support

Since the October war between the Arabs and Israel in 1973, US support for Israel has been at a level not comparable to any other country. This support includes the highest annual direct economic and military aid since 1976. Israel has also received the most total aid from the United States since World War II. The total US direct aid to Israel until 2003 was one hundred and forty billion US dollars. Israel receives over \$ 3 billion direct aid each year, equivalent to one-fifth of the total US foreign aid budget. The average per capita aid to Israel per year is \$ 500. In addition, the United States has provided Israel with about \$ 3 billion in aid to expand its weapons systems, such as LAW aircraft, while the Pentagon does not want or need such weapons. This is at a time when Israel has advanced US weapons, such as Black Hawk 6 helicopters or F-16 jets. "Israel has been the largest recipient of US aid since World War II," said Cheryl McArthur, a retired Foreign Service officer. Thomas Stafer, an American engineer and economist and professor at the University of Washington, D.C., has argued that while the

United States appears to be paying \$ 3 billion a year to Israel, it actually costs the United States \$ 3 trillion. The economist believes that the budget for public welfare is only 60 percent of the cost paid to Israel. According to statistics, the US economy pays Israel \$ 1 trillion and \$ 7,000 directly and \$ 1 trillion and \$ 3,000 indirectly through rising oil prices. Also, according to official statistics, the salaries of 275,000 American specialists are equal to the annual aid to Israel. "We lost \$ 600 billion in Israel's gross domestic product and \$ 450 billion in overpayments for oil imports, and the extra costs for taxpayers were between \$ 750 billion and \$ 1 trillion," Richard Nixon said during his time at the White House. "

### Military Support

The United States donates \$ 3 billion annually directly to Israel, most of which is military aid. That's Washington's highest funding for a country, with more than \$ 150 billion. According to Mirsheimer and Walt, Israel is the only US financial aid recipient to receive the full amount at the beginning of each fiscal year, and there is no need to be held accountable for how it is spent. U.S. government. US assistance in regulatory-strategic issues is expected. In 1986, Israel was allowed to participate in a strategic defense program called Star Wars, and the following year it was recognized as a non-NATO ally of the United States. The cooperation process between the two countries' strategic partners shows that this cooperation has been carried out more vigorously every day and includes more sensitive areas. At present, Israel is connected to the US Immigration or Warning System, and there is a red line between the Pentagon and the Israeli Ministry of Defense, which means that there is no middle ground between US security and US security.

### Political Support

"If Iran is equipped with nuclear or nuclear weapons, the Middle East and Israel will be in serious danger" Bush said at a news conference in April 2004. The United States has stepped in and will take this opportunity from Iran ... any force that opposes Israel's security. America will seriously react. The position of US government officials is in line with the recommendations of the US Presidential Research Group, which recommended to Bush: The Middle East has shown no hesitation in recognizing the power, importance, and continued strategic partnership between the United States and Israel, and recognizes that the

United States is committed to increasing Israel's deterrent power and providing political, military, and financial support.

### CONCLUSION

The superiority of hegemonic power in military and economic terms over other states in the international system makes him the only major power in the system, and therefore the system is defined as a unipolar system. An important foundation for hegemonic power is superiority. Its relative value lies in its economic value and then its system against other international powers.

In this context, the United States has sought to demonstrate its hegemonic influence in the Middle East on Israel's political, economic, and military support for other rivals and actors in the region. Multilateralism and the need for self-centeredness and realism in the Asia-Middle East axis strategy. During the Cold War, the United States maintained a balance in favor of the Zionist regime against the Arab states (Egypt, Syria, and Iraq), which were sometimes supported by the Soviet Union.

And in general, since World War II, it has sought to bring the geo-economic points of the Middle East, including the Persian Gulf, under its political-security control. In areas close to geopolitics, Israel has also sought to alter the decisions of elites in countries such as Egypt and Jordan, and to change the regime in countries such as Iraq and Syria.

Undoubtedly, the developments in the Middle East due to the presence of Israel and the security of this country along with the oil factor make this region very important for the United States. Because the United States considers defending Israel its mission. Washington's strong and influential presence in the region is also part of Washington's policy, so various governments in the United States are more committed to fulfilling this mission (supporting Israel), so their presence and influence in the Middle East is felt more. This was the occasion for the 9/11 attacks. Thus, it should be noted that, among other factors, the Zionist regime and its interests may not have been ineffective in invading Iraq. The United States' special support for Israel in the political, military, and economic dimensions is one of the main reasons why Israel is as important as a reliable base for the United States in the Middle East and in the Middle East. The goals and interests of the Middle East or the United States have acted.

### REFERENCES

- [1] James Duerty and Robert Faltzgraf, *Contradictory Theories in International Relations*, translated by AlirezaTayeb and VahidBozorgi, published by Qoms, Volume 1, 1993, p. 129.
- [2] Mushirzadeh, Homeira, *Transformation in Theories of International Relations*, Tehran: Samat Publications, Third Edition, 2007, pp. 83-79
- [3] Ghavam, SeyedAbdolali, *International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Tehran: Samat Publications, 2005, p. 357
- [4] Hartman, Jürgen, and *International Relations*, translated by JavadGhodsi, Tehran: Published in 2011. P. 21
- [5] Jackson, Robert and Georg Sorenson, *An Introduction to International Relations*, translated by Mehdi Zakarian, and Ahmad Taghizadeh and Hassan Saeed Kalahi, Tehran: Mizan Publishing, Second Edition, 2006, p. 37
- [6] G. John Eckenbury, the only superpower: American hegemony in the 21st century, translated by Azim Fazlipour, Institute of International Studies and Research, Abrar Contemporary Tehran, 2003, p. 25.
- [7] Christopher Layne. "The Unipolar Illusion Revisited", *International Security*, Vol.31, No.2, Fall 2006, pp.7-41, at p.11.
- [8] Robert W. Cox, with Timothy Sinclair, *Approaches toward Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p.151.
- [9] Mearsheimer, JJ.Walt,SM.2016. The Case for Off shore Balancing. *Foreign Affairs*, 95(4):pp.70-83.
- [10] Ghasemian, Ruhollah et al., *The Syrian Crisis and the New Cold War*, *Quarterly Journal of Political Research in the Islamic World*, Issue 1, 1397, pp. 195-159.
- [11] Mohammad Reza Zadegan *The Influence of the Israeli Lobby on US Foreign Policy in the Face of the Syrian Crisis*, *Quarterly Journal of Politics*, Year 3, Issue 9, Spring 2016, p.84.
- [12] Goldberg,j.j, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish, Establishment Massachusetts*: Addison-Wesley,1996,p83
- [13] Lebert, Robert G., Wabt, *The United States and Israel after Fifty Years*, translated by BehzadShahandeh, *Quarterly Journal of Regional Studies*, No. 2, Spring 2000, p. 49
- [14] Findley, Paul,-14-Deliberate Deceptions, Facts About US-Israeli Relations, translated by Mohammad Hossein Ahavi, Tehran: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1999, p. 105.
- [15] Imam JomehzadehParviz, *The Structure of US-Israel Relations and the Impact of Israeli Foreign Policy Decisions on It*, *Specialized Quarterly Journal of Political Science*,No.3, Spring 2005, p.73
- [16] Saeedinejad, Hamidreza, *Why the United States Helps Israel Foreign Policy Quarterly*, No. 57, Spring, 2001, pp. 182-165
- [17] Abdullh Khani, Ali., *American Book 3 Features - US-Israel Relations* 317-, Tehran, AbrarMoaser Institute, Tehran, 2004, pp. 215-216
- [18] Torbati, Hossein, *The Danger of Zionist Massacre Weapons of the Zionist Regime from Myth to Reality* ", *Qods Newspaper*, 10/16/2003
- [19] Finland, Paul, 1999, *Deliberate Deceptions: Facts About US-Israeli Relations*, translated by Mohammad Hossein Ahvi, Tehran, Office of Political and International Studies, p. 147
- [20] 120- Levey, Zach , " The United States ' Sky hawk Sale to Israel, 1966: Strategic Exigencies of an Arms Deal," *Diplomatic His tory*, Vol. 28, No. 2 April 2004, pp.255
- [21] Terry Janice, Jay, *US Foreign Policy in the Middle East: The Role of Influential Lobbies and Groups*, Translated by Reza Ghorbani and Reza Simber, First Edition, Tehran, Samat Publications, 2009, p.159
- [22] McArthur, Shirl. (2008), *A Conservative Estimate of Total Direct U.S. Aid to Israel Almost 114Billion*, retrived from: [http:// www.ifamericansknew.org/download/cost-new.pdf](http://www.ifamericansknew.org/download/cost-new.pdf) on 25/12/2013.p.3
- [23] (Christopher Bollyn, 2009. see the link: <http://renew.com/general41/trill.htm>)23
- [24] *Israeli Palestinian Conflict: 3Trillion*, retived from <http://www.Ifamericansknew.org/stats/stauffer.html> on 25/12/2013.
- [25] Bard, Mitchell G. "Roots of the U.S.Israel Relationship." <http://www.Jewishvirtuallibrary.org/> 25Abdullah Khani, the former, p. 2226
- [26] Tavana, Kambiz, *bilateral conflict*, newspaper. East / 2/8/1383 "27

**Citation:** Edris Hassanpour, Hamid Sarmadi, "The Hegemonic Influence of the United States in the Middle East Case Study: Israel's Security", *Journal of Law and Judicial System*, 3(2), 2020, pp 7-14.

**Copyright:** © 2020 Hamid Sarmadi. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.