

## 6. Resumé (Shrnutí práce v anglickém jazyce)

The end of the eighties was not just a change in the time but it happened to be one of the biggest historical changes in the twentieth century. Two camps that stood against each other in ideological as well as realistic animosity were enemies no more. The Cold War ended.

American scholars became to question new world? Two main visions were represented by the theories of Fukuyama and Huntington. The first came with the thesis that the end of Cold war was not just the end of more than 40 years long struggle but that it was the confirmation of the superiority of the United States and the ideas that it was based on. Liberal democracy was said to be the final stage of human struggle to find the ideal way of statehood. The second theory came with totally opposite idea that considered the new world unleashed from the bounds of Cold war as full of geopolitical vacuum that will turn into more clashes between cultures and civilizations. The euphoria of those days appreciated the first theory but was afraid that the second one is closer to the truth.

The main question was: how will the new world look like? United States were considered to be the winners but the main task was to find their role in the new world. The new administration of George H. W. Bush even though shocked by the end of a Long Peace was successful in dealing with the changes but it lacked the ability to come up with the new strategy. What would be the world after bipolarity? Multi-polarity was the immediate answer, but was it real?

The region of Persian Gulf happened to be the answer in finding this role. New American administration used the idealistic rhetoric and reincarnated the myth on which the new nation was founded. The protestant faith in choosiness materialized in the belief that Americans were in some way better than the others. They believed that they were the new Jerusalem and that they were entrusted by God to lead the world to be free. To show the light of freedom and liberty.

But the nature of politics is not only the idealistic vision. It is mainly the “realpolitik” that is based on the human nature. The American ability to see things separately as black and white, helped to preserve the purity of the myth that was leading the American foreign policy.

Ideology and the idealistic rhetoric managed to describe the realistic policy as the only one possible to accomplish the mission. The defending of the national interests was seen as the only way. It was considered to be good for everyone since America was the chosen one.

The history of American-Persian gulf relations was not very long. It became intensified with the finding of oil. Before that the only interest in the Middle East was Palestine. The first President that took advice from American oil companies was FDR that marked the Persian Gulf vital to American interests. During the Cold War, Persian Gulf became the region of struggle many times and the United States were always trying to preserve the balance of power.

Safe supply of oil became the national interest essential to the main mission of American foreign policy. This became visible especially during the oil shocks in 1973-74 when Persian Gulf states put an embargo on oil to United States. The changes in strategy and presidential doctrines kept the national interests safe. Iran and Iraq were the main partners and enemies. The only partner that USA could rely on was Saudi Arabia. The ignorance of the history of these states was a big reason of such contradictory politics.

After the end of the Cold war the Persian Gulf region seemed to be forgotten because of the affairs that were happening in Europe. But the region was to become big challenge to new administration. Iraq, that was aiming to become the leader of Arab world, attacked Kuwait and threatened Saudi Arabia.

This scenario played into American hands. Bush had the reason to defend New World Order that originated as a forced strategy and was nothing but a slogan until then. Bush used its experience and political style to create a coalition of states and to “win” the resolutions in

OSN. The war itself was swift and the victory decisive but the real victor was not the New World Order but the United States. The new world had new rules but instead of OSN as the leading authority, America was crowned.

The oil from the Persian Gulf was confirmed as the interest that is needed in order to maintain the only superpower and to lead the free world. The partnership with totalitarian regimes was not seen as contradictory since it was helping with the mission of promoting democracy and liberty. The slogan "In Oil We Trust" seemed as the ideal description of the situation. New world was ahead. United States were considered by the administration to be the only authority that has the moral as well as the real strength to create that world.

But the "creator" of this new world, George H. W. Bush had to leave the work unfinished.

Victories in foreign policy were not enough to challenge the domestic issues. Here, Bush was a loser. The new world was still taking shape and the United States were to play the decisive role. If oil was the right choice to believe in, I leave up to you.