

Ph.D. Dissertation Theses

**The Rise of Neoconservative Foreign Policy
and its Impact on American-Iranian Relations (1973-1976)**

Rasha Fuad M. Awale

Thesis director: Dr. Tibor Glant



University of Debrecen

Doctoral School of Literature and Cultural Studies

2024

Topic and Thesis Statement

In the 1970s, the American-led liberal world order encountered challenges not just from the Soviet Union but also from various factors including the costly American war in Vietnam, the worldwide economic crisis, primarily triggered by the 1973 oil embargo and the subsequent rise in oil prices, the emergence of cartels controlling raw materials, and the calls from developing nations for a new international economic order. Simultaneously, the 1973 oil embargo was seen by oil-producing nations, notably under the leadership of Iran's Shah, as an opportunity to take control of oil prices and production levels, which had previously been dictated by international oil corporations. These developments had a distinct impact on the Middle East, where the surge in oil prices brought about increased wealth and political influence of oil producing countries in the region.

During this period, a group of intellectuals and politicians, often referred to as Neoconservatives, among them many Jewish individuals, shifted their attention from domestic matters to foreign policy issues due to the challenges posed on Israel particularly by the 1973 war and the economic and political repercussions of the oil embargo. These individuals were prominently involved in think tanks such as the Committee for Democratic Majority (CDM), the Committee for Present Danger (CPD), the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), as well as journals like *Commentary* magazine and *Public Interest*. They utilized these platforms to promote a confrontational foreign policy rather than one based on interdependence. As this thesis demonstrates, these Neoconservatives adopted narratives that perceived the rise of any regional power in the Middle East as a threat to both Israel and the critical Gulf oil fields, which they considered as paramount for the continued dominance of the Western liberal world order. They promoted invading and occupying the Arab oil fields of the Gulf following the 1973 oil crisis, called on the US to take a confrontational stand against Third World countries in the UN and other international organizations; and also defended human rights violations and the racial/ethnic policies of countries that were part of the Western alliance, notably, Israel and South Africa.

This thesis investigates and analyzes the narratives presented by Neoconservatives on the Middle East, with a particular focus on Iran, from 1973 to 1976. It examines the key issues that shaped regional politics at the time, including the rise of OPEC power, the Arab-Israeli conflict, human rights and democracy, regional arms race dynamics, the calls for a new international economic order, and the pursuit of nuclear power by non-industrial countries. The study also

highlights how Neoconservatives, through their platforms in think tanks, journals, and positions within the administration and Congress, influenced the political dynamics of the Middle East and advocated for policies that ultimately did not serve US interests in the long run. They played a pivotal role in crafting narratives that heightened geopolitical tensions and altered power dynamics in the Middle East, often in ways misaligned with US political and economic interests, particularly in the case of Iran. The Neoconservative emphasis on controlling oil fields and supporting Israel's expansionist policies proved self-defeating and fostered global hostility towards the US. Neoconservative policies and rhetoric also shaped the Shah's and Gulf leaders' perceptions of American reliability and support, impacting their decisions on domestic and regional matters. By focusing on the impact of Neoconservative rhetoric and policies on Iran during this period, this dissertation challenges the common perception that the deterioration of American-Iranian relations began with President Carter's introduction of a human rights-focused foreign policy. It argues that Neoconservative policies and rhetoric contributed to the downfall of the shah, the rise of the Mullah regime in Iran, and the growth of anti-American sentiments among Arab, Muslim, and Third World countries.

1. Research Methods Applied in the Dissertation

In this study, I employed qualitative content analysis, discourse analysis, and historical analysis, by drawing on a wide array of primary and secondary sources. Seminal books were used to explore the historical context and development of Neoconservatism, distinguishing it from other political ideologies, defining its principles and themes, and outlining its evolutionary phases.

The historical analysis within this research identifies key events, such as the 1973 war (the Yom Kippur War), the subsequent oil embargo, the evolution of the New International Economic Order, and their aftermath. It traces the development of American-Iranian relations and draws from a diverse range of texts, including declassified documents from the Nixon and Ford administrations, Congressional hearings as well as memoirs of Iranian, American, and Saudi officials. I also examined Imam Khomeini's correspondence, speeches, and interviews. Primary and secondary Arabic and Iranian resources were consulted regarding the relations between the Arab countries, Arab-Iranian relations, the Iranian stance on the Palestinian question, and the internal affairs of Iran. Documents in Arabic and news from Arabic newspapers were sourced from

the University of Jordan archive and library. All of the electronic documents cited in the research are extracted from reputable online sources that are academically reliable. These include George Washington University's National Security Archive website, and the US State Department Office of the Historian website. Both websites offer an advanced search engine that simplifies the process of finding documents. Additional documents were consulted in the *State Department's Foreign Relations of the United States* series, particularly in the Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford volumes. Congressional hearings and reports for Congress were extracted from the Hathi Trust Digital Library and the US Government Publishing Office website.

For the qualitative content analysis and discourse analysis, I conducted a close textual reading and analysis of the rhetoric and discourse employed by Neoconservatives in primary sources such as books, speeches, articles, policy papers, and interviews, as well as articles in newspapers, journals, and reports issued by think tanks. This analysis included the work of prominent Neoconservatives, including Walter Laqueur, Edward Friedland, Paul Seabury, Aaron Wildavsky, Joshua Muravchik, Jordan Paust, Albert P. Blaustein, Adele Higgins, Edward Luttwak, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Eugen Rostow, Robert C. Tucker, Norman Podhoretz, Irving Kristol, Douglas Feith, Albert Wohlstetter, Geoffrey Kemp, and Daniel Pipes among others. In addition, I also included the publications of well-known Neoconservative think tanks and journals like the American Enterprise Institute and *Commentary*. Along with the prominent Neoconservative figures, this research also highlights the views and policies of individuals within the Nixon and Ford administrations whom I consider to be allies and implementers of Neoconservative ideas.

2. Research Results

1. Neoconservative foreign policy following the 1973 war bore a striking resemblance to the policy of Neoconservatives following the 9/11 attacks.

The thesis demonstrated that the Neoconservatives of the first, second, and third generations were consistent in their foreign policy views at least when it comes to the US foreign policy toward the Middle East. Contrary to the common belief that early Neoconservatives were primarily concerned with domestic issues, the dissertation showed that the 1973 war provided the framework for the first generation of Neoconservatives to construct their foreign policy views and they chose to make the Middle East the focus of their attention for decades to come. By providing examples and

analyzing the rhetoric and policies advocated by prominent Neoconservative figures in the 1970s, the thesis demonstrated that they viewed the 1973 war and the consequent oil crisis as a struggle between good and evil, with the United States embodying the force of good and the Arab and Muslim world the force of evil. This belief led them to advocate for an active US role in maintaining a global order primarily through the use of force and call for invading and occupying the oil fields of the Arab countries in the Gulf. The thesis concluded that the Neoconservative obsession with initiating wars to topple political regimes in the Middle East was not and is not necessarily based on the policies of these regimes (e.g., lack of democracy, nuclear ambitions, human rights violations, supporting terrorism), but rather on the degree to which these countries presented a threat to US domination in the region. The foreign policy advocated by Neoconservatives toward the region was not based on practical realism or idealistic goals but rather leaned toward power-driven politics or *Machtpolitik*. That is to say, their political inclination tended more toward the use and pursuit of force in all circumstances, rather than employing power judiciously and only when necessary. Throughout the thesis, I provided a comparison between the rhetoric and policies advocated by Neoconservatives of the first and second generations and those of the third generation. This comparison showed that the spread of democracy, the clash of civilizations, advocacy for unilateral political action, and the immorality of the UN have all been integral building blocks of Neoconservative rhetoric since the 1970s.

2. Neoconservative foreign policy toward the Middle East was largely constructed upon ideological foundations rather than being primarily shaped by political or economic considerations.

Despite presenting themselves as experts on the Middle East, the thesis demonstrated that first-generation Neoconservatives lacked a real understanding of the region's history, culture, politics, internal dynamics, and economy. Their advocacy against the Arab and Muslim countries stemmed from what might be called a hostile Orientalist ideological stand that perceived the Arabs and Muslims as being inherently evil, irrational, and hegemonic. Consequently, the use of force was presented as the only logical way to deal with such entities, leading to the view that the US needed to exercise her power, even preemptively or unilaterally, when Arab and Muslim countries adopt policies that do not align with US interests. The Neoconservative rhetoric, introduced through extensive quotes from published writings, reused and replicated fixed ideas and theoretical

viewpoints from classical Orientalists about “Arabs and Muslims” to explain the economic and political developments in the region, without any genuine examination of the area’s geopolitical dynamics, culture, and history. Hence, the narratives presented by Neoconservatives, touted as supposed experts on the region, not only disregarded the contextual origins of the region’s political issues but also dismissed the local perspectives on their potential resolutions.

The thesis highlighted and analyzed three aspects that were entirely omitted from the Neoconservative analysis of the region. The first aspect was the significance of Palestine for the Arabs and Muslims of the region, demonstrating how support for the Palestinian cause was tied to the legitimacy and public support of any political system, including that of the Shah. The second aspect addressed the issue of the Arabstan/Khuzestan region in Iran, which Arab countries considered to be occupied by Iran, and its impact on the political reactions of the Gulf countries. The third aspect covered the ongoing political awakening in the region and the Cold War between moderate Arab countries led by Saudi Arabia and radical Arab countries led by Egypt and Iraq. Discussing these aspects demonstrated that contrary to the simplifying claims of the Neoconservatives (who sought to explain regional politics within a singular, rigid ideological framework), political decision making in the Arab countries operated exactly like in any other part of the world: it was, and still is, is an extension of their domestic policy and responds to global events. It is guided by values and principles of their own, but is also significantly influenced by national interest, geopolitical concerns, and public opinion.

3. Neoconservatives deliberately exaggerated the economic impact of the oil embargo, portrayed the 1973 war as being a war for Israel’s survival, and framed the situation in the Middle East not in its accurate regional and historical context but simply as part of the struggle with the Soviet Union (which was a factor, but not the only or dominant one).

The thesis concludes that the Neoconservatives constructed their narratives using sophisticated arguments against the expansion of communism abroad and détente policies at home. Their objective was to revive the Western alliance against communism internationally while appealing to opponents of détente and supporters of Israel among Cold War proponents, liberal hawks, and staunch conservatives at home. This effort consequently elevated the importance of controlling Middle Eastern oil as a cornerstone for safeguarding the survival of Western civilization. Upon analyzing the various Neoconservative narratives and the policies they advocated for and

supported, it became clear that the oil crisis was significant for them ideologically, as it presented an opportunity to revive the post-second World War alliance and mobilize the public against an external enemy. A war in the Middle East was seen by Neoconservatives as a possible excuse to making concessions of territories occupied by Israel in 1967 and as a means to reestablish a formidable image for both the US and Israel after the former's defeat in Vietnam and the latter's early setback during the 1973 war.

4. Neoconservatives participated in the construction of an ineffective human rights foreign policy framework, which impacted the Shah's conduct of Iran's human rights policy in a way that empowered his opponents.

The thesis determined that Neoconservatives played a significant role in shaping the US human rights framework, which later evolved into President Carter's human rights policy. A key element of their influence was advocating for the linkage of US foreign aid to the human rights practices of recipient nations. This was facilitated by the establishment of the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, all of which occurred before Carter took office on January 20, 1977. The Neoconservative focus on human rights aimed to weaken the détente policy and challenge groups perceived as advocates for appeasement with Moscow and supporters of Third World ideologies within the US and Europe. The thesis offered an analysis of the Neoconservative response to Third World countries' activism in the UN, presenting Resolution 3379, which equated Zionism with racism, as a case study. I concluded that the Neoconservative stance on the issue of human rights was ideologically motivated; it undermined the moral leadership of the US, and failed to serve American interests in the long run. The Neoconservatives used their platforms to enlarge the issue of human rights so as to become part of the confrontation between communist totalitarian regimes and liberal democracies, and to restore public faith in American exceptionalism, democracy, and values, thereby gaining domestic backing for a more confrontational foreign policy as opposed to détente. They even utilized the language of human rights to counter the criticism leveled against the US and her allies, mainly Israel and apartheid-era South Africa in the General Assembly of the UN, by claiming that countries that are actively criticizing the US and its allies on the account of their human rights performance had a far worse human rights record. Hence, they argued that the US should not just link its aid to Third World countries' human rights records but also withhold

aid from countries that criticize the US and her allies and provide aid to countries that are in line with the US regardless of their human rights performance.

The Neoconservative human rights framework drew a distinction between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. Authoritarian regimes, they argued, occasionally and randomly violated the human rights of their citizens, suggesting these regimes were less repressive and potentially more open to reform compared to totalitarian regimes, where human rights violations were systemic and deliberate. The Neoconservatives aimed to focus US human rights criticisms on the Soviet Union and other communist nations while overlooking the actions of Israel, South Africa, and other right-wing governments that were serving the American interests. The debates over human rights between the Neoconservatives and their opponents in the Democratic Party in the 1970s politicized the issue and made it partisan, which as a result helped develop the framework for the human rights foreign policy of the Carter administration. Iran under the Shah was at the center of this dispute. Neoconservatives defended South Africa and Israel but criticized Iran, revealing their hostility toward the Shah and undermining their later criticism of Carter's human rights policies after the Islamic Revolution.

5. Opposition to the Shah's pro-American and pro-Israeli stance was the common ground that unified his opponents from all factions and backgrounds—religious, socialist, leftist, and liberal—across Iranian society. This opposition has been, and continues to be, exploited by the Iranian regime to further its political agenda.

By analyzing the issue of human rights, the dissertation provided an analysis that counters the narratives brought about by several Neoconservatives regarding the fall of Iran's Shah, e.g., *Debate, the American failure in Iran* by Michael A. Ledeen and William H. Lewis, *Eternal Iran: Continuity and Chaos* by Patrick Clawson and Michael Rubin, *The Persian Puzzle: The Conflict Between Iran and America* by Kenneth M Pollack, *The Last Shah: America, Iran, and the Fall of the Pahlavi Dynasty* by Ray Takeyh, among others. These authors argued that the fall of the Shah resulted from a combination of economic and social challenges stemming from the Shah's urbanization plans and financial decisions as well as his leniency toward his opponents due to pressure from the Carter administration's human rights foreign policy. Their narratives about the Iranian Revolution ignore the widespread anti-colonial and neocolonial political and cultural discourse among developing nations at the time and how it impacted the Iranian people's aspiration

for sovereignty and independence, and provided a common ground that united the Shah's opposition against imperialism as manifested by the Shah's alliance with the US. Moreover, these accounts tend to understate the extent of US support for the Shah's authoritarian rule, her intervention in overthrowing Iran's first elected government (1953), and her continued unconditional support for Israel. These factors alienated the Shah from his people, bred anti-Americanism, and contributed to a sense of betrayal among Iranians. Simultaneously, the politicization of human rights (before Carter's inauguration) convinced the Shah that the issue was being used to attack and pressure Iran into changing her foreign and oil policies. Based on this understanding, the Shah did not introduce genuine changes to his oppressive methods, and his political reforms were primarily addressed to foreign observers, having little impact on the Iranian people. Additionally, the Shah viewed leftists, middle-class people and liberals as the most vocal opposition to his rule, which, in turn, allowed more time for his religious opposition to develop.

In contrast to the Orientalist Neoconservative narrative that portrayed the Middle East "native" as passive and irrational, the Iranian people proved to be an active force. Social tensions, already elevated in Iran, worsened with the economic turmoil following the 1976 OPEC meeting. Iranians lost faith in the Shah's White Revolution and its promises, as well as in America's moral leadership. Labor strikes and protests spread throughout Iran, and thousands of young Iranians turned to Islam, seeking social justice, liberation, and refuge from the oppression and corruption of the Shah's regime.

6. The Neoconservative call for invading the Gulf oil fields in 1975 did not serve US interests, but had significant political implications for the Gulf region that directly exacerbated Iran's political and economic situation, contributing to widespread protests against the Shah and ultimately leading to his downfall.

The lack of understanding of the region's history and politics, displayed by the Neoconservatives, was translated into advocating for policies that did not serve US interests in the long run and occasionally even backfired. For instance, the Neoconservative advocacy for a confrontational, militarized approach instead of a diplomatic one to address the oil embargo endangered key US interests in the region as Arab countries requested the termination of the work of the US Navy in the Gulf. The threat of war led to a further increase in oil demand and prices, hindered political reforms, development, and economic growth plans in the region, notably affecting countries like

Iraq and Iran. The threat to invade Saudi Arabia, the home of Islam's holiest sites, significantly influenced public opinion in the Arab world. It fueled anti-American sentiments, drew them closer to the Soviet Union, and, in retrospect, empowered radical regimes over moderates. That was also the case in Iran, where the seemingly unlimited support extended to Israel and the Shah's connections with the US and Israel were utilized by the radical powers to forge a common ground for the opposition to unite. The threat of a war also escalated demands for military equipment and instigated an arms race in the region. It increased the uncertainty, distrust, and suspicion of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries, not just toward the US but also to Iran and Iraq. Neoconservative calls for war painted an easy path to military victory. The lesser countries in the region, therefore, feared a military attack by Iraq and the Soviet Union, a joint military action by Iran and Iraq to divide the region's oil between them, and/or a proxy military action by Iran or Israel on behalf of the US. Consequently, while it served Iran and Iraq's interests to strengthen their relations with Arab countries to gain support for increasing oil prices, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf regimes were more inclined to reduce oil prices. They hoped to improve relations with the US and counter the aspirations for regional dominance of Iraq and Iran, limiting their capacity to purchase more arms. Additionally, the Saudis recognized that maintaining a moderate stance on oil prices was crucial to ensuring the influx of arms and easing pressure on human rights issues from the US.

Similarly, just as the geopolitical strategies of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf nations were impacted by the invasion rhetoric, they also impacted the Shah's political perspectives. The thesis concluded that the Shah, who was an avid observer of US media, was influenced by the call for invading the oil fields of Saudi Arabia and the openly hostile American approach to Third World countries' rights to development and sovereignty over natural resources. The Shah was convinced that maintaining control over the oil-shipping routes was the key to protecting Iranian independence and turning her into a regional power; high oil prices and obtaining large quantities of sophisticated weapons were but means to this end. The thesis demonstrated that in the period that followed the publication of the Neoconservative invasion articles the Shah made every attempt to assure his Arab neighbors that Iran was not complicit in US military plans and tried to reduce his country's dependence on the US. The Shah aligned OPEC's oil decisions with Third World countries' right to development and sovereignty; he took steps in support of the Palestinian cause and in favor of reducing the tension with the Arab countries, notably Iraq, and advocated for the

withdrawal of all foreign powers from the Gulf region. He also made a genuine attempt to diversify Iran's sources of energy and weapons, and increased cooperation with the Soviet Union.

7. Neoconservatives actively worked to undermine the Shah and sought to replace the US alliance with Iran with an alliance with Saudi Arabia; their aim was to force the Shah to change his oil and foreign policy and give up his hegemonic aspirations.

The thesis demonstrated how the changes in the Shah's policies and his attitude toward the US and Israel were not in line with the strategy advocated by the Neoconservatives and their allies in the Ford administration. These powers sought to break the power of OPEC and its alliance with Third World countries, halt arms sales to the Middle East, prevent the proliferation of nuclear technology, and establish Israel as the only ally for the US in the Middle East. Their ultimate goal was to revive the post-war Western alliance and fix what they perceived as a political, cultural, and economic crisis hurting the West. To achieve these goals, undermining the power of Iran was necessary. The Neoconservatives led an extensive campaign within the Ford administration, the American media, and Congress with the aim of reducing US dependence on the Shah, crippling Iran's regional hegemony and military might, and breaking the Shah's leadership of OPEC. The goals of the Neoconservatives aligned with those of Saudi Arabia, and both coordinated economic warfare against Iran, which eventually led to the economic crisis that struck Iran in 1976. The economic crisis united and empowered the Shah's opponents, and for the first time, the Shah's regime faced the emergence of organized opposition, with the streets of Tehran witnessing massive demonstrations demanding the Shah's ousting. The thesis showed that the Ford administration was fully aware of Iran's economic difficulties and their effect on the Shah's rule. However, when the Shah requested a bilateral oil deal with the U.S. to aid economic recovery, Neoconservative elements within the administration blocked the deal and further strained Iran's economy by increasing the cost of weapons, spare parts, and ammunition.

8. The thesis presented an economic argument that contradicted Neoconservative views on Iran's nuclear ambitions, demonstrating that the assumption that the Shah initiated Iran's civil nuclear program as a cover for a covert nuclear weapons program cannot be substantiated by any factual evidence.

Despite being one of the first countries to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968, Iran, under the Shah, was also vocal in advocating for the rights of Third World countries to share nuclear technologies. Given the widely publicized estimate that Iran's oil reserves would be depleted within two decades, and considering that oil was the country's main energy source and primary income, the shah considered developing a nuclear alternative as one of the few, yet notably effective, strategies to ensure Iran's long-term prosperity. Nuclear energy would have made it possible for Iran to diversify its economy away from oil through the reinvestment of export proceeds in brand new sectors, improved education, increased security, among other areas, and to use its oil for new industries like petrochemicals, fertilizers, etc. Iran was not alone in pursuing nuclear energy; many industrialized nations viewed atomic technology as more economical than oil and expanded its use to cut costs and accelerate development. Moreover, Iran did not need nuclear weapons for regional hegemony; its conventional military was the largest and most advanced in the region, with a budget surpassing those of her neighbors. If serious security threats arose, Iran could defend itself without risking relations with the U.S. and other developed nations. Additionally, Iran's nuclear program, reliant on U.S. support, was deemed insufficient for military purposes by the CIA. Nonetheless, Iran was targeted by the anti-nuclear proliferation rhetoric of the Neoconservatives. This rhetoric did not start after the Islamic Revolution but during the reign of the Shah by neoconservatives like Albert Wohlstetter, Paul D. Wolfowitz, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Robert C. Tucker, and Norman Podhoretz among others.

Conference Papers

“Neoconservative Rhetoric and the US Foreign Policy, Applying Qualitative Methods for Social Sciences.” The American Political Science Association, MENA Qualitative Methods Workshop. Tangier, Morocco, May 2024.

“Neoconservatives’ First War.” Scottish Association for the Study of America, The 24th Annual Conference. Glasgow, Scotland. March 2023.

“We Can’t Tackle Him Without Breaking Him: Iran and the Evolution of Neoconservative Foreign Policy in the 1970s.” Arab Center for Research & Policy Studies, Arab Graduate Students Conference. Duha, Qatar, March 2022.

“Enemy by Invitation: A Geopolitical Perspective on the Neoconservative Antagonization of Iran in the 1970s.” Károli Gáspár University of Reformed Church, the 15th Biennial conference of Hungarian Society for the Study of English. Debrecen, Hungary, January 2022.

“They Got It Wrong Again: Where the Neoconservatives Are to be Blamed for Trumpism.” University of Zadar, CAAS 2021 Workshop – Tracing Populism in the U.S. and Comparative Perspective. Zadar, Croatia, September 25, 2021.

“How the “Great Satan” Empowered the Mullahs: Weaponizing Anti-Americanism and Fortifying Iran’s Domestic Front.” University of Oradea, 7th Biennial Conference, Cultural Texts and Contexts in the English-speaking world. Oradea, Romania, March 2021.

“Populism as a Counter-neoconservatism.” University of Debrecen Postgraduate Symposium and Workshop in English and American Studies, Debrecen, Hungary, January 2020.

“Counterculture and Communism/ Socialism, Then and Now: The Neoconservative Take on the New Left Revisited.” Debrecen University, 14th Biennial Conference of the Hungarian Association for American Studies, Debrecen, Hungary. June 2019.

“Iraq and Syria, the Neocons’ Unfinished Business.” University of Pannonia 13th Biennial Conference of the Hungarian Society for Study of English, Veszprem, Hungary, February 2019.



**UNIVERSITY of
DEBRECEN**

**UNIVERSITY AND NATIONAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF DEBRECEN**

H-4002 Egyetem tér 1, Debrecen
Phone: +3652/410-443, email: publikaciok@lib.unideb.hu

Registry number: DEENK/449/2024.PL
Subject: PhD Publication List

Candidate: Rasha Fuad M. Awale

Doctoral School: Doctoral School of Literary and Cultural Studies

List of publications related to the dissertation

Foreign language scientific articles in Hungarian journals (4)

1. **Awale, R. F. M.:** Twisted Narratives: The Neoconservatives' Pursuit of War for Oil in the 1970s.
Hung. j. Eng. Am. stud. 30 (1), 146-179, 2024. ISSN: 1218-7364.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/hjeas/2024/30/1/8>
2. **Awale, R. F. M.:** 1990s and the Remaking of the Neoconservative Foreign Policy Paradigm.
Hung. j. Eng. Am. stud. 28 (1), 121-146, 2022. ISSN: 1218-7364.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30608/HJEAS/2022/28/1/5>
3. **Awale, R. F. M.:** Through the Eyes of the Delusional Ones.
Hung. j. Eng. Am. stud. 27 (1), 193-197, 2021. ISSN: 1218-7364.
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30608/HJEAS/2021/27/1/16>
4. **Awale, R. F. M.:** They Dare Disturb the Universe: a Review of Direct Action : Protest and the Reinvention of American Radicalism by L. A. Kauffman.
Hung. j. Eng. Am. stud. 25 (2), 450-454, 2019. ISSN: 1218-7364.

Foreign language scientific articles in international journals (1)

5. **Awale, R. F. M.:** How the "Great Satan" Empowered the Mullahs: weaponizing Anti-Americanism and Fortifying Iran's Domestic Front.
Cult. texts and contexts Eng. Speak. World. 7, 184-195, 2021. ISSN: 2067-5348.

The Candidate's publication data submitted to the iDEa Tudóstér have been validated by DEENK on the basis of the Journal Citation Report (Impact Factor) database.

29 August, 2024

