

Obama and the Arab Spring

By

**Dr. Anthony N. Celso
Associate Professor
Department of Security Studies
Angelo State University
ASU Station # 10922
San Angelo, TX 76909-0922
anthony.celso@angelo.edu
(325) 486-6753**

Paper prepared for and delivered at The 2012 Western Political Science Association Meeting at the Hyatt Regency Portland, OR, March 22-24, 2012

“ I know there has been controversy about the promotion of democracy in recent years. And much of this controversy is connected to the war in Iraq. So let me be clear: No system of government can or should be imposed by one nation by any other.” President Barak Obama address at Cairo University June, 4, 2009.¹

Introduction

The expectations raised by the Obama Presidency of a new U.S. relationship with the Arab world have not been realized. Obama has proven to be an extremely cautious and hesitant democratic reformer. The Administration’s failure to fully embrace the Arab Spring belies much of the optimism generated by his famous 2009 Cairo Speech. Obama’s ambivalence toward democratic reform is driven by a multiplicity of factors that include: his aversion to the Iraq war, his “realist-idealist” vision of a post American world, and U.S. strategic interests. Having pursued an early Mideast engagement strategy that has failed to achieve a breakthrough in the peace process and faltered to derail the Iranian nuclear project, Obama’s current Mideast policy reflects many of the priorities of George W. Bush’s second term in office.

The persistence of policy continuity is surprising given the paramount nature of Obama’s critique of George W. Bush’s foreign policy and his early efforts to embark on a new U.S. relationship with the Muslim world. The argument that Obama policy shares much in common with his maligned predecessor is organized in four parts. These are: (1) a distillation of Obama’s critique of Bush’s Mid East policy; (2) a discussion of Obama’s foreign policy views that merge idealism with “Post American World” realism; (3) an evaluation of his ambiguous response to the Arab Spring; and (4) an overview of the factors that have driven U.S. Mideast policy to resemble the Bush Era.

I. Burying Bush and Raising False Expectations

Obama’s pre-presidential foreign policy vision was spelled out in his 2007 Foreign Affairs article *Renewing American Leadership* which he further elaborates upon in his *Audacity of Hope* book chapter *The World Beyond our Borders*². These writings heavily criticize the Bush Administration and center its critique on its “strategic blunders” in the “war on terror”. Obama fulminates over the Iraq war writing that the Administration chose “precipitous unilateral military action over the hard slog of diplomacy, coercive inspections, and smart sanctions, America was missing an opportunity to build a broad base of support for its policies.”³

Iraq he argues has played into the hands of Osama bin Laden by allowing him to “provoke a reaction we’ve seen in Iraq—a botched and ill advised U.S. military incursion into a Muslim country, which in turn spurs on insurgencies based on religious sentiment...that fans Anti-American sentiments among Muslims, increases the pool of potential terrorists..”⁴

Obama critiques the Administration's entire strategy claiming it is a throwback to Reagan's evil empire and Theodore Roosevelt imperialism allowing it to move unilaterally with a preventive war against "governments not of our liking".⁵ The Bush Doctrine, he writes, sought to "extend Manifest Destiny beyond the Western Hemisphere to span the globe" and resuscitated Cold war politics that demonized Iraq war critics as "soft on terrorism or anti-American".⁶

Audacity of Hope treats the Bush Administration and its neo-conservative advisors as a great aberration in America's post war consensus critiquing its use of unilateral force as a means for democracy promotion. Iraq is a "dumb war" with catastrophic impact on U.S. relations with the Muslim world, raising an image of an imperial nation engaged in permanent warfare. The Iraq war and its bungled occupation accordingly has been a catalyst for anti-Americanism across the world that needs to be repaired and healed.

Obama's writings depict a stereotypical vision of a Bush foreign policy high jacked by neoconservative ideologues at war with the Muslim world. Much of this is politically motivated and does not depict the reality of policy change during Bush's second term that sought both a gradual disengagement from Iraq and multilateral action on North Korea and Iran. The Bush Administration, moreover, sought to accelerate Mid East peace in its final years.

Obama argues that we need to refocus American promise and image with a redefined war against Al Qaeda and a return to Afghanistan and Pakistan as the central front in war against religious extremism that should be complemented by a final resolution to the Arab-Israel conflict. Accordingly, America needs to refocus on the Arab Israel conflict as means to improve security and relax regional tensions.

Resolving the Palestinian issue, Obama believes, would abate anti-Americanism and terrorism healing America's relationship with the Muslim world. Obama's ideas are quite traditional returning U.S. foreign policy to a Post-Cold War bi-partisan consensus engineered by the first Bush Administration and built upon by the Clinton Administration. Both Administrations believed America's legitimacy was consolidated by multilateral action and international support. Despite this traditionalism it would be a mistake to say that Obama's views are as a simple rehash of George H.W. Bush and William Jefferson Clinton.

Reflecting a globalized economy, the rise of new powers, declining U.S. economic fortunes, and the appearance of unique, complex security challenges, Obama adds some new components to U.S. foreign policy. *Audacity of Hope* sees a post American world where soft power and multilateralism become hallmarks of a new strategic paradigm. It is to this issue that we now turn.

II. Obama: The “Realist-Idealist” in a Post American World

“ Globalization makes our economy, our health, and our security all captive to events on the other side of the world...no other nation [United States] has the capacity to build consensus around a new set of international rules that expands the zones of freedom, personal safety and economic wellbeing.” Barak Obama, *Audacity of Hope*⁷

Obama’s *“The World Beyond Our Borders”* is a complex, contradictory and sweeping vision of America in a global world characterized by a multilateral power structure where international trade, law and norms are the key to stability and prosperity. The chapter appears to borrow heavily from Fareed Zakaria and Joseph Nye in its emphasis on the relative decline of U.S. hard power around the world and the transcendence of soft power, trade and ideas as a common global human bridge between nations.

Obama writes “ our military power becomes just one tool among many...and that “we should be engaging in some hardheaded analysis of the costs and benefits of the use of force compared to other tools and influence at our disposal.”⁸ The second Bush administration, accordingly, is a nice test case of the limits of American power and the corresponding diminution of U.S. legitimacy.

America needs to repairs this damage by practicing a more restraint and cooperation. Obama argues that the United States should obtain “global buy-in to carry a lighter footprint when military action is required” and that his Administration would “give them [our allies] joint ownership over the difficult, methodical, vital, and necessarily collaborative work of limiting terrorists capacity to inflict harm”.⁹

Obama’s commentary suggests a humble, remorseful America can be a catalyst for international healing. Rebuilding diplomatic capability, therefore, becomes a critical component in restoring American status helping us to broker conflict between nations and working with others to resolve global and regional problems.

While recognizing the transcendental value of multilateral action to reinforce international norms, Obama also states America has a special place in the world despite its past Cold War transgressions and the post 9/11 errors. He quotes Kennedy’s inaugural address pledging America’s support to end misery and oppression and he writes “ Of course, there are those who would argue with my startling premise--- that any global system built upon America’s image can alleviate misery in poorer countries....but ultimately I think these critics are wrong to think that the world’s poor will benefit by rejecting free markets and liberal democracy.”¹⁰ He continues “ our challenge, then, is to make sure that U.S, polices that move the international system in the direction of greater equity, justice and prosperity—that the rules we promote serve both our interests and the interests of our struggling world.”¹¹

Obama's vision of America appears in the *Audacity of Hope* as remorseful "for decades we would tolerate and even aid thieves like Mobuto, thugs like Noriega, so long as the opposed communism", yet boastful when he catalogues the achievement of post WWII containment policies.¹² Obama thinking contains similar tensions when describing America's special role in the world system that seeks to harmonize American strategic interests with international norms while combating unique security challenges. This may not be so easy to accomplish.

Obama writing recognizes the urgency of American unilateral action in select cases noting that U.S. foreign policy "has always been a jumble of warring impulses".¹³ It is quite apparent that Obama world view balances competing interests and refuses to adopt fast and hard rules and his ideas are contextually adjusted on a case by case basis. Obama's realism is further underscored when he argues that "we have the right to take unilateral military action to eliminate a imminent threat to our security—so long as the threat is understood to be a nation, group, or individual that is actively preparing to strike U.S. targets ... and has or will have the means to do so in the immediate future."¹⁴ The breadth of this view does not really seem to be too far from the Bush doctrine of preventive war he so heavily criticizes.

Equally in tension and at times contradictory is Obama's vision of democracy promotion and human rights and their role in U.S. foreign policy. He argues that "when we seek to impose democracy with the barrel of a gun, funnel money to parties whose economic policies are deemed friendlier to Washington ...we set ourselves up for failure".¹⁵ Yet he concludes "we can inspire and invite other people to assert their freedoms" and ... "we can speak out on behalf of local leaders whose rights are violated; and we can apply economic and diplomatic pressure to those who repeatedly violate the rights of their own people."¹⁶

Obama is quite clear he rejects the use of force as a vehicle for democracy promotion, but does not rule it out case of genocide and ethnic cleansing provided that the ground swell of international support exists, American burdens are limited and conditions are ripe for success. The complexity of Obama's view on human rights and democracy, a jumble of realist and Wilsonian impulses, may explain his difficulty in grappling with the Arab Spring movement. Yet, ironically, it was Obama that felt impelled to broach the issue of democracy in his June 2009 Cairo speech and dramatically reset America's relationship with the Muslim world.

III. The Soaring Rhetorical Excess of the Cairo Speech and Obama's Ambivalent Response to the Arab Spring

“ I’ve come here to Cairo to speak of a new beginning between the United States and Muslims across the world, one based on mutual interest and respect, and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition. Instead they overlap, and share common principles- principles of justice and progress: tolerance and the dignity of all human beings.” Barak Obama address at Cairo University June 4, 2009.¹⁷

The 2009 speech was described at the time as “historic” and was aimed at resetting America’s relationship with the Muslim world. The speech’s setting of the University of Cairo was seen as a strategic choice given Egypt’s role in world civilization and its place as the cultural center of the Arab world. The decision was furthered by America’s thirty year plus relationship cap stoned by Sadat’s signing of the 1978 Camp David Accords underwritten by immense U.S. financial support.

The address’ opening strikes a humble and at times apologetic tone with repeated references to Islamic greatness, Islam’s role in furthering Western civilization, and the abuse of American power during the Cold War and Bush eras. He notes American complicity in the 1953 coup that restored the Shah’s rule in Iran, renounces U.S. territorial claims on Iraqi sovereignty, renounces torture of terror suspects and pledges Guantanamo’s closure.

The speech identifies 6 tensions between the West and Islam that need to be overcome in an environment of “mutual respect” that casts away stereotypes. The ordering of these tensions provide substantial clues with overcoming religious extremism, achieving a comprehensive Arab-Israel peace, and containing nuclear weapons proliferation paced before promoting democracy, protecting women’s rights and ensuring the rights of religious minorities.

Obama pledges to restart the Arab-Israel peace process of a two state solution based on 1967 borders, and rejects Iraq War as a means to promote democracy stating the Iraq war does not “lessen my commitment, however, to governments that reflect the will of the people” and that he “has an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things” that include democratic government, transparency, rule of law and civil liberties.¹⁸

Obama commits his Administration support for democracy and human rights urging its spread across the Arab Middle East. Beyond moral exhortation, Obama’s address offers little guide on how a consent of the governed characterized by women and minority rights will emerge, other than in it should be a natural organic process facilitated by global economic and cultural forces.

The speech’s concluding sections read like the writings of pro-globalizers like Thomas Friedman, Vali Nasr and Fareed Zakaria with a proclamation that “trade can bring new wealth and opportunity... “and we must recognize that education and innovations will be the currency of the 21st century”.¹⁹ Though unstated in the speech’s text, Obama seems to believe that globalization and free markets will create a propertied middle class in Muslim societies that will serve as a catalyst for democratization.

Obama's pushes this point by stating that there is no inherent tension between globalization and cultural preservation noting "the astonishing success of Muslim-majority countries like Kuala Lumpur and Dubai".²⁰ His speech outlines a series of policies providing funds and support for micro finance for women entrepreneurs, free trade, student-cultural exchanges, and scientific- technological innovation funds.

Obama's address was enthusiastically received by the crowd including cries of "we love you" and repeated applause. His Cairo address was misinterpreted as a wholesale rejection of U.S. support for Arab autocracy and seemed to raise expectations that Obama would press regimes to democratize and he would support democratic movements. What many failed to read in the speech (soaring rhetoric aside) was the rank ordering of tensions in the speech, his past writings, and Obama's nebulous view of democracy promotion.

Democracy activists fairly soon saw that Obama words were not backed by deeds in which strategic interests (combating terrorism, achieving an Arab-Israel peace, engagement of Iran and Syria) trumped democracy, women's rights, and the repression of religious minorities.²¹ The 2009 disputed Iranian elections that inspired massive protests and a severe repression on the part of state security apparatus were only tepidly criticized by the Obama Administration out of fear that over criticism would scuttle international efforts to engage Iran and contain the development of its nuclear program.

American allies like France and Britain were consistently tougher on the Iranian regime with more prompt and sharper criticism. The Administration couched its restraint in the fear that direct sharp criticism of support for the Green protest movement would inspire even more brutal treatment and discredit the opposition; a position that failed to impress many of the Administrations critics.²²

Arab democracy activists were similarly disappointed in the Administration's failure to press the Mubarak regime to democratize.²³ The Administration's lukewarm criticism of widespread election fraud during Egypt's parliamentary elections, its non reaction to Mubarak's decision to run again for a fourth presidential term and his Administrations unwillingness to use immense U.S. financial support to nudge democratic reform enraged many activists. Here too the Administration feared democratic reform could imperil the fight against Islamic extremism and derail its efforts to jump start the Arab-Israel peace process.

The Administration's hesitancy harkens back to previous Presidents (including Bush's second term) that saw reform efforts complicating Mideast peace efforts.²⁴ Advocates of pushing ahead with Mideast peace believe that reform efforts would be easier to push once a two state solution was achieved. Obama's reluctance to strongly support democratic movements received its greatest test in the Arab revolts of January 2011 that in little more than a month toppled the Tunisian and Egyptian regimes.

Egypt was especially difficult as the Administration waffled from early support for Mubarak to paving the way for a stable transition engineered by the Egyptian military.²⁵ The Administration was surprised by the mass protests (hundreds of thousands congregated against Mubarak in Tahrir Square) fearing they could jeopardize the fight against terrorism and disrupt Egypt's support for the Camp David Accords. Faced with Mubarak's fall, Obama sought to facilitate a military government while giving lip service to democracy and free elections. The Administration's efforts to balance strategic interests with humanitarian impulses outlined in the *Audacity of Hope* proved difficult to implement in the Egyptian case.

The February 2011 Libyan revolt similarly put the Administration in a bind: faced with fears of a mass slaughter and calls by France, Britain, the UN and the Arab League for international action, the Administration relented to support military action. True to his vision of a post American world, Obama sought to get France and Britain, despite their inferior military assets, to take the lead. This was underscored by an initial American participation that gave way to the French and British dominance in the final stages of the war.

As the war labored on for over 6 months the Administration equivocated over the purpose of the "Operation Odyssey Dawn's" mission and the limited nature of American involvement.²⁶ The Administration consistently narrowed its goals and limited its participation. Obama's timidity irritated his French and British cohorts who became puzzled about American resolve. Criticized for "leading from behind" and its apologetic tone, the Administration was on the defensive until rebels seized Tripoli and Qaddafi's death.

The Administration's caution toward supporting mass protests was repeated in Yemen, Bahrain and in Syria where the fight against Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, the loss of the 5th Fleet port on the island nation and fear of chaos in Damascus trumped human rights and democracy. Obama's Cairo speech favoring democratic reform increasing clashed with his Administration's inaction, leading many critics to question what Obama's views on the Arab Spring.²⁷

Faced with criticism and uncertainty about an "Obama Doctrine" as it applies to democratic movements, the President was forced to address the issue. His May 19, 2011 State Department address sought to clarify the Administration's position on the Arab Spring and lay out a set of policies in support of Mideast democratization. While lacking the grandeur of his Cairo speech, the address elevates democratic reform to a "core" interest noting that "yet we must acknowledge that a strategy based upon the narrow pursuit of these interests [fighting terrorism, achieving Mideast peace, and containing WMD proliferation] will not fill an empty stomach or allow people to speak their mind'.²⁸

Using Osama bin Laden death and American disengagement from Iraq as a spring board to discuss America's response to the Arab Spring, the President repudiates past policies of U.S. support for autocratic governments. Democratic reform can no longer be sacrificed in the name of Mideast peace, oil or the fight against terrorism and that "America's failure to speak to the broader interests of ordinary people in the region will only feed the suspicion that the United States festering for years pursues our interests at their expense."²⁹ The speech recognizes the historic nature of the Arab protest movements and pledges political, economic and moral support for democratization.

Obama idealism shines through with such concluding comments like “tyrants will fail and that every man and woman is endowed with certain inalienable rights”.³⁰ He cites the Libyan campaign as a new model of multi-lateral action for support for oppressed peoples, urges dialogue in Bahrain and Yemen, and suggests Syrian President Assad permit reform or be swept away by public anger and international economic and diplomatic isolation. The speech ends with Obama offering a package of economic assistance and debt relief to facilitate democratization in Egypt and Tunisia, and renews calls for a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute.

It would be easy to read the speech as a historic change in Obama’s priorities that now conflate democratic reform with American “core” interests. The address, however, is deliberately ambiguous on this issue and continues to talk of balancing of competing interests that may vary on a case by case basis. He states “ there will be times where our short term interests do not perfectly align with our vision of the region.”³¹ On Bahrain he states “ it is a longstanding partner and we are committed to its security” and warns of Iranian meddling.³² Its emphasis on the Mideast peace process and achieving a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian issue is likely to be complicated by the growth of political Islam. The May 19th address, like his Cairo speech, has not been matched with concrete efforts to support democratization.

The Administration has supported transitions in Egypt and Yemen that feature prominent roles for elites associated with the former autocratic regime.³³ Obama’s policy continues to be driven by “strategic core interests” allowing repression of the Shia majority in Bahrain with no real initiatives to press the Gulf Kingdoms to democratize. Clearly cognizant of Iran’s growing regional influence in a post American Iraq, the Administration needs Saudi support for its containment policies vis-à-vis Tehran. Despite the lack of democracy in most Gulf Kingdoms, the Administration has recently signed major arms deals with Saudi Arabia and Dubai.

The Administration’s reticence to fully support democratic transitions (save debt relief for Egypt and Tunisia and a regional Trade and Investment Partnership Initiative) is not without merit. Recent parliamentary elections in Tunisia and Egypt resulting in strong support for Islamist and Salafist parties, potentially jeopardize American interests in fighting religious extremism, protecting women and religious minorities and pushing for a final resolution of the Arab-Israeli support.³⁴ The Administrations cautious strategy toward Syria, furthermore, reflects fear of instability and chaos, and the potential for greater sectarian conflict in a post Assad era.

Recent developments in Libya featuring rebel bloodletting, revenge killings and the prominence of pro Al Qaeda Islamic militias create a potential for a terror safe havens and possible civil war. Al Qaeda’s decision to send 200 fighters to Libya may create a new front on the war on terror. Despite Obama’s reticence to act, his open support for the Arab Spring and his efforts to engineer the departure of Presidents Mubarak and Saleh have narrowed his range of action. Having supported democratic change the Administration is now apprehensive about an arc of instability engulfing the region and the rising tide of political Islam.

IV. Barak W. Obama: Policy Continuity with Bush's Administration's Second Term

With the advent of the 2012 Presidential election, U.S. Mideast policy is caught in the cross hairs of a region in crisis. Obama hoped for breakthrough in the Mideast peace process has failed to materialize, his efforts at engaging Iran and Syria have faltered, and the Arab Spring has jeopardized U.S. relations with long time Arab allies. A constellation of forces have congealed to bring U.S. influence in the region to a new low point.

Obama's efforts to reset relations with the Muslim world have stagnated in the wake of strong Iranian influence in the region, Israeli intransigence on settlements, Hamas' unwillingness to accept a Jewish state and the emergence of Islamist parties hostile to American interests. His efforts at ousting Mubarak have angered the Gulf Kingdoms with Obama powerless to prevent Saudi military intervention in Bahrain.³⁵ Anti-Americanism continues to be rampant in the region and is likely to grow with Islamist ascendance. There is, in short, a crisis of confidence in American purpose and power in the region that is even greater than that his predecessor encountered.

By strategic necessity Obama's policies and priorities have fallen back to the Bush Administrations second term. Like Obama, Bush was bedeviled by his inability to achieve a Mideast peace breakthrough (confirming his early reservations), and Bush's reluctance to engage Syria and Iran has been verified by the failure of Obama's early engagement strategy. Bush similarly downplayed the importance of democratic change in his second term with a "realist" policy driven by strategic interests of oil security, fighting terrorism and paving the way for Mideast peace.

Obama's anti-terror policies have remained consistent with the Bush Era with military tribunals, predator drone strikes, and a Guantanamo Bay facility that remains open. The Administration's use of predator drone strikes vastly exceed those conducted by the Bush Administration and his targeted killing of terrorist suspects have been more effective than his predecessor. By all accounts, Al Qaeda is a crippled organization.

Where Obama and Bush depart, however, is on the question of American resolve and commitment on larger Mideast regional issues. The Obama Administrations inability to work out a long term American presence in Iraq, its reluctance to significantly engage American military might in Libya, and its hasty abandonment of Mubarak has undermined American regional credibility. Obama's post American paradigm mixing realism and idealism has become increasingly dysfunctional.

Faced with intractable parties driven by religious and ideological imperatives, the best that can be hoped for is containment of the Iranian threat, and limiting the damage caused by the Arab Spring. Having used his Cairo speech to herald democratic reform in the Arab world, Obama now is confronted with specter of an Islamist Winter that threatens to profoundly alter America's relations with Muslim world in ways that he could not have imagined.

References

¹ “Obama in Cairo: A Commemorative Transcript” at www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-pres-cairo-university-6-04-09 p. 2

² Barak Obama, “Renewing American Leadership”, *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2007). Pgs. 2-16; Barak Obama, *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream* (Vintage Books: New York City, 2008)

³ Barak Obama, “The World Beyond Our Borders” in *Audacity of Hope: Thoughts on Reclaiming the American Dream* (Vintage Books: New York City, 2008) p. 347

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 364

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 346

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 347

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 359

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 367

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 366

¹⁰ *ibid.*, pgs. 371-372

¹¹ *ibid.*, p.372

¹² *ibid.*, p.338

¹³ *ibid.*, pgs. 364-365

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 365

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 374

¹⁶ *ibid.* p374

¹⁷ “Obama in Cairo, *ibid.*, p. 3

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p.10

¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 12

²⁰ *ibid.*, p.12

²¹ Walid Phares, *The Coming Revolution: The Struggle for Freedom in the Middle East* (Simon and Schuster: New York City, 2010)

-
- ²² Michael Doran, “The Heirs of Nasser: Who will Benefit from the Second Arab Revolution” *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2011) in *The New Arab Revolt: What Happened, What it Means, and What Comes Next* (Council of Foreign Relations./Foreign Affairs, 2011) pgs. 348-358; Shadi Hamid, “What Obama and American Liberals Don’t Understand about the Arab Spring” at http://www.brookings.edu/2022/1001_obama_hamid.aspx
- ²³ Hamid, *ibid*
- ²⁴ Martin Indyk, “Back to the Bazaar” *Foreign Affairs* (Jan/Feb 2002) in *The New Arab Revolt: What Happened, What it Means, and What Comes Next* (Council of Foreign Relations, 2011) pg. 22-37.
- ²⁵ Steven Cook, “The U.S.-Egypt Breakup: Washington’s Limited Options” *The New Arab Revolt: What Happened, What it Means, and What Comes Next* (Council of Foreign Relations./Foreign Affairs, 2011) pgs. 86-90; Barry Rubin, “Egypt: What the U.S. Should Do” at <http://www.fpri.org/enotes/202202.rubin.egypt.html>
- ²⁶ Max Boot, “Qaddafi Must Go”, *Weekly Standard* (March 28, 2011)
- ²⁷ Phares. *Ibid*; Hamid, *ibid*
- ²⁸ Barak Obama, *Remarks of the President on the Middle East and North Africa* at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/05/19/remarks-pres> p.2
- ²⁹ *ibid.* p2
- ³⁰ *ibid.* p. 6
- ³¹ *ibid.* p3
- ³² *ibid.* p.3
- ³³ Joshua Stracher, “Egypt’s Democratic Mirage: How Cairo Authoritarian Regime is Adapting to Preserve itself” in *The New Arab Revolt: What Happened, What it Means, and What Comes Next* (Council of Foreign Relations./Foreign Affairs, 2011); J.E. Peterson, “Turmoil in the Arabian Peninsula” at <http://www.fpri.org/enotes/201104.peterson.arabia>
- ³⁴ Michael Doran, “The Nexus and the Olive Tree” at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/22/the_nexus_and_the..; Raymond Stock, “The Islamist Spring: What Mubarak Got Right, What Obama Got Wrong” at <http://www.fpri.org/enotes/201112.stock.egypt.html>
- ³⁵ Doran, *ibid*; Rachel Bronson, “Saudi Arabia’s Intervention in Bahrain: A Necessary Evil or Strategic Blunder? At <http://www.fpri.org/enotes/201103.bronson.bahrain.html>