

# The Comparison of The United States Foreign Policy Against The Islamic World Under President Barack Obama and President Donald Trump's Administration

**Diana Mutiara Bahari**

*Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta*

*Email: dianaa.mutiara@gmail.com*

**Ahmad Sahide**

*Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta*

*Email: ahmadsahideumy@gmail.com*

## **Abstract**

The United States of America (USA) is an international concern, especially regarding the national election agenda. The presidential election of the world's leading superpower will impact the world's geopolitical order, such as the emergence of global political turmoil that has resulted in tensions in relations between the US and countries in the world, especially countries in the Islamic World. The 2016 US presidential election has captured international attention because it was won by a controversial figure, Donald Trump. The victory of Donald Trump to replace President Barack Obama marked a change in the style of US foreign policy toward the Islamic World. Therefore, the question arises of how the US foreign policy compares to the Islamic World in the era of President Obama and President Trump. This study uses a Foreign Policy Decision Making Theory. This study concludes that US foreign policy during the Obama administration was friendly to the Islamic World. Nevertheless, Obama has failed to bring about peace in the Middle East. On the other hand, US foreign policy during the Trump administration was not friendly to the Islamic World, which caused tension in relations between the US and the Islamic World.

**Keywords:** *US, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, Islamic World, Foreign Policy*

## Abstrak

Amerika Serikat (AS) merupakan negara yang menjadi perhatian dunia internasional terutama terkait agenda pemilu nasional. Pemilihan presiden negara adidaya terkemuka di dunia ini akan berdampak pada tatanan geopolitik dunia, seperti munculnya gejolak politik global yang mengakibatkan ketegangan hubungan antara AS dengan negara-negara di dunia, khususnya negara di Dunia Islam. Pemilihan Presiden AS pada tahun 2016 telah menyita perhatian dunia internasional karena dimenangkan oleh figur kontroversial, Donald Trump. Kemenangan Donald Trump menggantikan Presiden Barack Obama menandai adanya perubahan corak politik luar negeri AS terhadap Dunia Islam. Oleh karena itu, muncul pertanyaan bagaimana perbandingan politik luar negeri AS terhadap Dunia Islam era Presiden Obama dan Presiden Trump. Penelitian ini menggunakan Foreign Policy Decision Making Theory. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa kebijakan politik luar negeri AS pada masa pemerintahan Obama bersahabat dengan Dunia Islam. Di lain sisi, Obama telah gagal mewujudkan perdamaian di kawasan Timur Tengah. Sebaliknya, kebijakan politik luar negeri AS pada masa pemerintahan Trump tidak bersahabat dengan Dunia Islam yang menyebabkan ketegangan hubungan antara AS dengan Dunia Islam.

**Kata Kunci:** *AS, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, Dunia Islam, Kebijakan Politik Luar Negeri*

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

The United States is a country of international concern, especially regarding the national election schedule. The presidential election of the world's leading superpower will impact the world's geopolitical order, such as the emergence of global political turmoil that has resulted in tensions in relations between the US and countries in

the world, especially countries in the Islamic World. The US presidential election had always attracted attention, especially when the 2016 US presidential election was won by a controversial figure, Donald Trump. During his presidential campaign, Trump made various explicitly racist and sexist statements, from calling Mexican immigrants criminals and rapists, insulting women, to

questioning the proof of citizenship of former US President Barack Obama and accusing Obama of not being born in the US. During the presidential campaign and when he was president, Trump's various statements have always been related to race and religion (Lopez, 2020; Yan, 2015).

Trump's victory in the 2016 presidential election to replace Obama's position as the previous president marked a change in the complexion of US foreign policy. During Obama's leadership, US foreign policy focused on multilateralism issues and prioritized soft power, emphasizing cooperation and negotiation processes in conflict resolution. In contrast to Obama's foreign policy, US foreign policy during the Trump leadership tends to be anti-hegemonic and anti-multilateral. US foreign policy in the Trump era, famous for the slogan "Make America Great Again," refers to protectionism, known as the America First policy, which caused chaos in the international world.

The style of US foreign policy under Donald Trump continues to change, including Trump's view of the Islamic World. During the presidential campaign, Trump played on the issue of Islamophobia to gain support from the US public.

It is supported by various statements made by Trump that have cornered Muslims, such as Trump's idea for the supervision of mosques in the US as part of US law enforcement to prevent terrorism, as well as statements about prohibiting the entry of Muslims into the US (Stephenson & Becker, 2016). Thus, Trump's victory as US President in 2016 raises concerns for the Islamic World. Trump's negative view of the Islamic World will again cause tensions between the US and the Islamic World.

Based on the above description of US foreign policy in the Obama and Trump eras, this study will compare US foreign policy during the Obama and Trump administrations through the leadership styles of the two former US presidents. It is interesting to observe how the most basic unit of analysis, namely the individual, can influence a country's foreign policy.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This paper uses a qualitative approach in case study analysis regarding US foreign policy, especially toward the Islamic World under President Barack Obama and President Donald Trump's administration. The author focuses the article on a literature study by

collecting data and information from various literature related to the cases discussed. This article uses a secondary data analysis approach, including books, articles, newspapers, and other sources covering the main research problems.

### Theoretical Framework

Changes in a country's policy can be explained through several theories built with different methodologies. The author uses the theory of foreign policy decision-making to analyze the United States foreign policy towards the Islamic world during President Obama's and Trump's leadership. Through this approach, the author will find various comparisons of US foreign policy towards the Islamic world in the Obama and Trump administrations.

Foreign policy is the hinge between domestic and international politics. In general, it can be said that a country's foreign policy is influenced by two main factors, namely internal factors in the form of domestic conditions of a nation and external factors. However, external factors play a more critical role in some cases than internal factors (AS, 2018)

Since foreign policy is a goal-oriented action set by a country against entities outside the country's borders and determining foreign policy is influenced by internal and external factors, changes in foreign policy are things that have often happened. In other words, foreign policy is not static but tends to change to achieve its goals. In general, changes in foreign policy can be divided into two, namely changes that occur due to regime changes or state transformations and changes that happen when the government pushes toward a different foreign policy (Dugis, 2008).

Apart from being influenced by internal factors, changes in foreign policy are also affected by external factors, namely the leadership style of a country's leader. Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen, in their book entitled *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*, state that one way to understand a country's foreign policy is to analyze the leadership style of its leader. Obama is a context-oriented leader with a strategic leadership style, unlike Trump, who is goal-oriented with a crusader expansionist leadership style. Context-oriented leaders are characterized as leaders who quickly adapt to the ongoing situation.

These leaders are open to mutual discussion to find flexible solutions to various problems. These leaders can adjust their behavior to suit specific conditions and work to build coalitions at the international level. In comparison, goal-oriented leaders focus on solving a problem.

The difference between context-oriented and goal-driven leaders is the degree of sensitivity to the political context. Context-oriented leaders are sensitive to political conditions, while goal-oriented leaders are not very sensitive. Sensitivity to political context then has great relevance in making foreign policy decisions. Context-oriented leaders tend not to bring their country into conflicts in the international world because they are sensitive to politics. In addition, this type of leader actively seeks new information. Thus, context-oriented leaders will work within constraints that require coalition building, empathy, constituency sensitivity, and compromise. In contrast, leaders who focus on deep goals are less likely to consult and compromise in setting and defending policies because they challenge political boundaries. In addition, this type of leader is less open to new information (Mintz & DeRouen, 2010).

Meanwhile, a strategic leadership style, like Obama, is characterized as a leader who knows what he wants and will seek information to achieve his goals. Meanwhile, Trump's crusader expansionist leadership style is described as a leader who opposes political boundaries and wants more territory and power through greater control. A type of leader like Trump has a low ability to make various alternative decisions and tends not to care about friendly relations between countries. Obama's strategic leadership style and Trump's crusader expansionist compared US foreign policy towards the Islamic World during the Obama and Trump administrations.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Barack Obama in the US

President Barack Obama was the first African-US descent in US history to successfully serve as the 44th US President in 2008. President Obama served as US President for two terms, namely in 2008 and 2012. However, Obama started his political career long before winning the presidency. His political career began when in 1996, Obama, a member of the Democratic Party, was elected as a Senator for Illinois. Then, Obama was re-elected for two terms, namely in 1998 and 2002.

Obama has been a leading legislator on various issues, passing nearly 300 bills aimed at helping children, the elderly, unions, and the poor (Obama Foundation, 2012).

Obama's history of occupying the highest office in the US began on February 10, 2007, at the Old State Capitol Building in Springfield; Obama officially announced his candidacy for the 2008 US Presidential nomination from the Democratic Party. On this occasion, Obama presented himself as an agent of change and told the entire US society that "this campaign can't only be about me. It must be about us – it must be about what we can do together." Obama's charismatic personality, stirring speeches, and campaign promises to change the US political system have led Obama to victory in the Democratic primaries in June 2008, defeating former first lady and US senator from New York, Hillary Clinton. Clinton supported Obama during his campaign after Obama won the primaries (Nagourney & Zeleny, 2007).

In his nomination, Obama chose Joseph R. Biden or Joe Biden as his running mate for President and Vice President of the US in 2008. Obama's decision to select Biden as his running mate took Biden's

biography into the awe-inspiring aspects. For Obama, Biden has extensive foreign policy and defense issues, an impressive record of cross-party collaboration, and a bipartisan approach to dealing with problems. In addition, Biden is also known as a figure familiar with foreign leaders and diplomats worldwide. Another thing Obama considered before choosing Biden was the elements of Biden's legislative career in the 1994 Crimes Bill and the Violence Against Women Act. Obama hopes Biden can help the campaign challenge claims of Obama's inexperience in foreign policy (Flintoff, 2008).

In an extraordinary moment in US history, the Democratic presidential nominee, Obama, won the 2008 US Presidential election and will become the 44th US President and the first African-US leader in the US. Obama got 52.9% of the vote, beating the Republican presidential candidate, Senator John McCain, who only got 45.7% of the vote. Obama won with 365 votes in the Electoral College, more than McCain, who only got 173 votes (The New York Times, 2008). Obama managed to get support from the entire Democratic Party in several states; even Obama won votes in the Republican Party states, which contributed to Obama's sizable

Electoral College victory, such as in Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Indiana, Ohio, and Colorado (CBS News, 2008).

Obama's victory as the first black US president was met with various emotions, from excitement to disappointment and even skepticism around the world. Several countries, such as Europe and Africa, expressed hope for better relations with the US under the Obama administration. While in some parts, other countries question whether Obama's victory will make a difference to their countries (NPR, 2008). However, the support obtained by Obama was far greater than the rejection of Obama. The magnitude of support for Obama is evidenced by the Obama-Biden victory for a second term in the 2012 US Presidential election over Republican candidates Mitt Romney of Massachusetts and Paul Ryan of Wisconsin. In the Electoral College, it took 270 votes to win the election, Obama managed to get 332 votes, and Romney only got 206 votes (The New York Times, 2012).

### **The US Foreign Policy Towards Islamic World Under President Barack Obama's Administration**

President Obama's victory in the 2008 US presidential election

has presented a new face, especially for US foreign policy towards the Islamic World. As Obama began his first year as US President, he had to deal with the tensions between the US and Islam globally created by President Bush. As a president from a minority in the US, President Obama is committed to bringing back the US full of peace, especially in responding to President Bush's war on terrorism policy. In contrast to President Bush's leadership style, the first black president in the US chose to use a soft power diplomacy approach in every foreign policy through international law and international cooperation. President Obama will not place military power as a priority in carrying out his foreign policy (Gerges, 2013).

After 9/11, under President Bush's administration, the US established an international war on terrorism marked by US military intervention in Afghanistan. However, the war against terrorism policy has clearly illustrated that the US strategy in the Middle East region has caused instability in various aspects. Many critics say that the Bush administration failed to protect the US from terrorism. So, it can be said that the US has failed in its policy of war against terrorism, a real plan but failed to be

executed properly. The failure in the fight against terrorism is based on two reasons; many critics consider that the policy cannot protect US citizens from terrorist attacks. The second reason is the application of intervention strategies that are too aggressive (Thrall & Goepner, 2017).

Thus, it is the responsibility of President Obama to improve the condition of the US, which is increasingly uncertain under the leadership of President Bush. The failure to deal with terrorism attacks through military intervention indicates that the US has made a wrong strategy by intervening in Afghanistan through military operations. Therefore, President Obama is committed to reaching out more to Muslims, changing the negative perception of Muslims about the US, and emphasizing that the US will not go to war against Islam. President Obama, through his article, stated that:

*“The security and well-being of each and every American depend on the security and well-being of those who live beyond our borders. The mission of the United States is to provide global leadership grounded in the understanding that the world shares a common security and common humanity”* (Obama, 2007).

President Obama tried to avoid a more significant foreign policy conflict with the negotiation process during his tenure. Through his unequivocal commitment to improving US relations with the Islamic World, Obama is seen as a president who can bring hope. In addition, Obama’s foreign policy strategy is known as “leading from behind,” which means that the US must lead from behind or, in the Javanese phrase, “Tut Wuri Handayani.” The US experience influences the term leading from behind during the Bush era. In short, the US helps uphold prosperity in the world by providing support through diplomatic means (Cipto, 2018).

President Obama’s speech was the basis for a radical change in Western attitudes toward the Islamic World and a relationship based on mutual interest and respect. Obama’s visit to Cairo marked Obama’s diplomacy to normalize his relationship with Islamic World. President Obama’s visiting address expressed his support for the new beginning of relations between the US and Islam that had shattered since 9/11. President Obama mentioned that the Islamic World has a definite place in the US political system and a multi-religious, multicultural and



plural society. As US President, Obama promised to fight negative perceptions about Islam and vice versa. Obama also asked the Islamic World to combat negative perceptions about the US (Bidwai, 2009). President Obama could have given a sign of peace and supported the new beginning of US relations with the Islamic World through the speech.

During his tenure, President Obama chose to pursue international engagement rather than military force and made this an excuse in the interests of US national security and the safety of the US people. Through strong, intelligent, resilient, and relentless policies, he harnesses every aspect of US power to ensure his country remains safe and becomes a global leader in the 21st century (Obama Foundation, 2017). The first policy that shows an attitude toward peace between the US and the Islamic World is the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). President Obama set this policy to respond to US relations with the Islamic World caused by Iran's nuclear weapons. Since the Islamic Revolution, Iran has played a role in hostage-taking and violence against US troops and civilians. So since then, all US presidents have not had relations

with the Iranian president and have imposed economic sanctions on Iran. However, this did not apply during the Obama administration (Cipto, 2018).

Open diplomacy between the US and Iran began when the two Presidents held a telephone conversation to discuss Iran's nuclear program. The culmination of the diplomacy between the US President and the Iranian President was holding the Geneva Talks by the P5+1 countries, whose members consisted of the US, UK, France, Russia, China, and Germany. The Geneva talks agreed that Iran would give up its nuclear program. These diplomatic negotiations are officially known as the JCPOA agreement. The JCPOA agreement is an agreement that limits the amount of uranium and plutonium, which are materials used to make atomic weapons, that Iran can possess and produce (US Department of State, 2015). The United Nations Security Council ratified the JCPOA agreement through Resolution 2231 on July 20, 2015.

With the arrangement of the JCPOA, Iran declared its willingness to destroy its medium-enriched uranium reserves, cut its low-enriched uranium stockpile by 98%, and reduce by about two-thirds the

number of gas rotators it had over the past 13 years. The Geneva talks agreed that Iran would give up its nuclear program. The agreement also stipulates that for the next 15 years after the signing of this agreement, Iran can only enrich uranium up to 3.67% and is willing not to build new heavy water reactors for the same period. Uranium enrichment activities are limited to only one facility using the first-generation spinnerets for ten years. Meanwhile, other facilities will be converted to avoid the risk of proliferation. The US will ease economic sanctions on Iran and return Iranian assets of \$7 billion in exchange. Iran will also get sanctions relief from the European Union and the UN Security Council (Khalfi, 2020).

The JCPOA agreement that the P5+1 countries had successfully reached in July 2015 is a victory for world peace. The JCPOA is also the culmination of years of international efforts and high-priority foreign policy goals under President Obama. According to the US, this victory is because the JCPOA agreement has successfully implemented measures to curb the four main paths that Iran can take to produce nuclear weapons (Gibson, 2015). The JCPOA agreement that Iran and the P5+1 countries have

agreed on is a symbiotic mutualism. Economic sanctions imposed by various countries on Iran have caused economic instability. So with the agreement of the JCPOA, the P5+1 countries will lift economic sanctions and return most of Iran's assets worth billions of dollars. As for Western and European countries, the JCPOA agreement is a golden opportunity to re-cooperate with Iran, especially in the economic sector, to revive Iran's deteriorating economy (Cipto, 2018).

Obama's second policy to improve US relations with the Islamic World is withdrawing US troops from Iraq. This policy is related to President Bush's War Against Terrorism policy. In general, Obama considers that the Bush administration has spent too much political and military resources on its War Against Terrorism policy in Afghanistan and Iraq. These actions have had a significant impact on the US economy which led to the economic crisis. Therefore, Obama is committed to implementing policies that can reduce the burden on the US economy (Cipto, 2018).

Since the beginning of Bush's enactment of the war on terrorism policy, President Obama has opposed this policy. Therefore, Obama's foreign policy step to renew

the US leadership in the world is to end the war in Iraq and focus on Afghanistan. According to Obama, Afghanistan is the most crucial front in the US war on terrorism, and Iraq is a diversion from the war on terrorism that attacked the US on September 11 (The Wall Street Journal, 2021). So in October 2011, Obama announced the end of the Iraq war by announcing that all US troops would be withdrawn from Iraq by the end of the year. Obama's decision to withdraw US troops from Iraq is the realization of Obama's campaign promise. On the other hand, the decision was made by Obama because, in 2008, President Bush signed the Status of US Troops in Iraq agreement, which planned for all US troops to leave Iraq by the end of 2011 (Fordham, 2015).

Obama's statement regarding the withdrawal of US troops came after the death of Colonel Muhammad el-Qaddafi in Libya. It coincided with a decade of US military involvement that began after the 9/11 attacks. Obama communicated the decision to Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki via video conference call. In his video call, it was agreed between Prime Minister Maliki and Obama to withdraw tens of thousands of US troops from Iraq

by the end of December 2011. In addition, President Obama also said that starting January 1, 2012, the two countries would start normal relations between sovereign states, an equal partnership based on mutual interest and respect. Through this, Prime Minister Maliki and President Obama in claiming victory. President Obama managed to keep his campaign promise to end the war, and Prime Minister Maliki promised to end the US presence and restore Iraqi sovereignty (The Guardian, 2011).

Prime Minister Maliki welcomed the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq by expressing his gratitude for the sacrifices of US troops. In addition, the Iraqi people warmly welcomed Obama's decision by holding events spread across Iraq. In Sadr City, a Shiite district of Baghdad, a bastion of anti-US sentiment, about 1,000 people celebrated the policy by carrying pictures of young Shiite youths who US troops had killed. Muslim Mohammed, an Iraqi government employee, thinks the US is just like Saddam Hussein. Mohammed never thought Iraqis could beat Saddam Hussein, nor did his view of the US. Mohammed thought the Americans would never leave, and the US would continue to

make excuses to stay longer in Iraq and rule Iraq (Landler, 2011).

President Obama's efforts to create a new relationship between the US and the Islamic World received a positive response from the international community. The Norwegian Nobel Committee has determined that the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize will be awarded to President Obama to strengthen international diplomacy and cooperation between nations. The chairman of the Nobel Committee, Thorbjorn Jagland, gave exceptional support and value to Obama's mission to create a world without nuclear weapons, continue the Middle East peace process that had stopped under President Bush, and seek to create new relations between the US and the Islamic World. President Obama is considered to have created a new climate in international politics. Multilateral diplomacy has regained its central position, emphasizing the role of the United Nations and various international institutions by placing soft power diplomacy as an instrument of international conflict resolution. Obama managed to get the attention of the International World with his diplomacy, which is based on the concept that whoever will lead the world must be founded on the values and attitudes held

by the majority of the world's population (The Nobel Prize, 2009).

### **Obama's Policy Failure in the Islamic World**

After officially serving as US President, Obama implied that the issue of peace in the Middle East and negotiations on Iran's nuclear program were among his foreign policy priorities. But in reality, Obama has made little progress compared to his compatriots towards achieving Middle East peace. Obama has failed miserably in showing that he is serious about creating peace between Israel and Palestine (Cahyoputra, 2016).

Tensions in relations between Israel and Palestine are increasing every year. Direct negotiations between the Palestinian Authority and the Israeli Government have continued for decades and remain a complicated conflict to resolve. Obama's policy has distanced various peace efforts that previous US Presidents have carried out. During the administrations of Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, Israel felt that the US was on its side, so Israel offered a peace proposal to end settlements and occupations of almost all of the West Bank. However, under the rule of Yasser Arafat and Mahmoud Abbas,

Palestine rejected Israel's offer. During the Obama and Clinton administrations in 2001, Palestine also rejected the peace offer from Israel and the peace offer submitted by the Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, in 2008 (Dershowitz, 2017).

During the Obama era, several attempts to negotiate peace between Israel and Palestine were carried out but have not yet reached a satisfactory agreement. In August 2010, President Obama and Hillary Clinton, as US Secretary of State, stated that the two countries could achieve peace within one year. The US-led peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians began in September and occurred twice in Washington, DC. On 1-2 September 2010, Obama invited Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel and President Abbas of Palestine to agree on direct talks for the first time as a new effort to negotiate peace between the two countries (The White House, 2010).

When opening the peace talks, Obama stated that this meeting was an opportunity to make a significant and lasting change. The direct negotiation efforts initiated by Obama have won the support of Jordan, His Majesty King Abdullah, and President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt. In his remarks, King Abdullah said that Israel and Palestine must

try hard to deal with this conflict to the end to achieve a two-state solution. King Abdullah also stated that peace negotiations could be successful if both sides had good intentions, sincerity, and courage to resolve the conflict. In addition, President Mubarak expressed his hope for Israel and Palestine so that they could make the best use of the opportunity for a peace meeting. The four state leaders agreed that direct negotiations aim to form the framework for a final agreement on a two-state solution; Palestine is independent and sovereign and coexists safely and peacefully with Israel (The White House, 2010).

The second meeting of direct peace talks between Israel and Palestine was held in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, on September 14 to September 15, 2010. The main points of negotiations in this meeting covered four issues: Jerusalem's status, borders and settlements, Palestinian refugees, and security. Apart from these four things, Israel and Palestine must still resolve many problems that have not yet reached a peaceful solution. Both sides must find solutions to these four problems to get an amicable solution. Whatever the outcome of peace, efforts to seek peace must continue even though, at this time,

Israel and Palestine do not have trust in each other (Muhamad, 2013).

Obama's initiation, expected to be the final negotiation to achieve peace, was a failure like the previous negotiations. During the Joint Meeting of the US Congress held in May 2011, Prime Minister Netanyahu reaffirmed his commitment to the establishment of a Palestinian state alongside a Jewish state. Israel agreed with the US that direct negotiations were the only method to resolve the conflict with the Palestinians, but the Palestinians chose to take unilateral action. Amid high tensions and low hopes for peace, Palestine tried to impose its will on Israel through international pressure by submitting a request to join the United Nations in September 2011 (Jewish Virtual Library, 2018).

President Obama failed miserably in his first sustained attempt to show that he was serious about bringing peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Although Obama has a close relationship with the Islamic world, and even his victory as US President received a warm welcome from the Islamic world, Obama has failed to bring about peace in the Middle East region. Obama acknowledged that he could not create peace for Israel

and Palestine through a two-state solution until the end of his term (Muhaimin, 2016). In the end, at the end of his term as US President, Obama bequeathed to the next US President "Eternal War" in the Middle East region.

### **Donald Trump in the US**

The US Presidential Election in 2016 has captured the international community's attention, especially since the victory was won by a controversial figure, Donald Trump. The Federal Election Commission of the United States of America in 2016 showed that Hillary Clinton won the popular vote with a total of 65,853,514 million votes and defeated Donald Trump, who got a total popular vote of 62,984,828 votes. However, Donald Trump won the electoral vote by getting 306 votes and beating Hillary Clinton, who only got 232 votes (Federal Election Commission, 2017). Based on this, the US Congress announced the victory of Donald Trump, a figure known to be controversial, as the 45th US President to replace President Obama. Trump's victory received various responses from the international community. Russian President Vladimir Putin has said he is fully willing to restore relations with the US after Trump's victory. China's leader, President Xi Jinping,

also congratulated Trump on his victory and hoped that China and the US could improve bilateral relations. Trump also received similar support from several leaders of countries such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Canada, and other countries with close ties to the US (BBC News, 2016).

Trump's victory in the 2016 presidential election to replace Barack Obama's position as the previous president marked a change in the style of US foreign policy. Foreign policy during the Trump era tends to be anti-hegemonic and anti-multilateralism. Trump's background, a businessman, makes every foreign policy oriented to getting as much profit as possible, known as the slogan "Make America Great Again." In line with this slogan, Trump continues to set various policies that cause counter-independence in the international community.

The style of US foreign policy under Donald Trump continues to change, including Trump's view of Islam. His attitude towards Islam became a significant point during the presidential campaign debate, especially as hatred against Muslims in the US has soared to its highest level since 9/11. Trump's presidential campaign victory strategy is to bring up the issue of Islamophobia,

scapegoating Islam, and cornering Muslims. This is supported by Trump's various statements that have cornered Muslims, such as Trump's idea for the supervision of mosques in the US as part of US law enforcement to prevent terrorism, as well as statements about prohibiting the entry of Muslims into the US (Stephenson & Becker, 2016). On the other hand, Trump's victory has raised concerns for the Islamic world.

Trump's victory in the 2016 US presidential election has sparked tensions in relations between the US and the Islamic world, as during the Bush administration. Various statements that scorn Muslims will create obstacles for US Muslims to practice their worship, and symbols of Muslim identity will spark suspicion for the US government. Thus, another concern arises, namely where the highest positions in the US government allow discriminatory and violent behavior against US Muslims. If the US President, Trump, is the archetype of the issue of Islamophobia, then attacking Muslims, burning mosques, and attacking anyone in sight with Muslims is fair game. So it can be said that Islamophobia is not just a campaign strategy but has become an official policy of the

Trump administration (Beydoun, 2016).

### **The US Foreign Policy Towards Islamic World Under President Donald Trump's Administration**

Trump's victory in the 2016 US presidential election has reignited tensions between the US and the Islamic World. The tension in US relations with the Islamic World is caused by various foreign policies that Trump has set against the Islamic World. As one of his first policies after being officially sworn in as president, on January 27, 2017, President Trump imposed a controversial policy through Executive Order 13769, Muslim Ban. Trump unilaterally set the Muslim Ban policy on his initiation as an executive agency. The establishment of the Muslim Ban policy is one of President Trump's efforts to fulfill his campaign promises related to the issue of Islamophobia in the US. In his speech, Trump revealed that Ban's Muslim policy aims to protect the US from acts of terrorism carried out by Islamic extremist groups and maintain US security stability (Eroukhmanoff, 2018) a political issue is prioritised, or 'securitised', when an audience accepts a speech act with a particular security grammar pointing to the dangerous nature of the threat and

calling for extraordinary security measures. This article probes the opposite: what if not saying 'security' and instead saying 'friend' also contributes to the securitisation? I explore this logic with the ways in which Islam has been securitised in the United States from the Bush administration to the beginning of the Trump administration and offer an analysis of what this article calls the 'indirect securitisation of Islam.' Drawing on the philosophy of language of John Searle, an indirect securitisation is one that is successful through indirect securitising speech acts, that is, utterances that comprise two illocutions, one direct and one indirect, with the latter being the 'real' request of the utterance. Using covert forms of speech such as indirect speech acts enables elite speakers to 'deny plausibility' and claim they are not securitising (or 'the least racist person' as Trump claims).

Through the Muslim Ban policy, the US government banned Syrian refugees from entering the US indefinitely. Furthermore, it prohibited refugees from other countries from entering the US for 120 days and banned citizens of seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the country for 90 days. Executive Order 13769,



entitled 'Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States, directs those seven countries that are prohibited entry into the US, including Syria, Iran, Iraq, Sudan, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen (Arafa, 2018).

Based on the 2015 Department of State's country reports on terrorism, the reason behind this ban is that these countries have a high potential to threaten security. The US had designated Syria as a state sponsor of terrorism in 1979 when the Syrian government was involved in a military conflict against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Furthermore, Iran has been designated as a state sponsor of terrorism since 1984 and continues to support various terrorist groups, such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups in Iraq. The US also links Iran to the extremist group Al-Qaeda. Sudan has been designated a state sponsor of terrorism since 1993 because it supports international terrorist groups. Historically, Sudan provided a haven for Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups to meet and practice.

Libya is another country included in the prohibition visits to the US due to being an active fighting zone with hostilities between internationally recognized

governments and its rivals. In many parts of the country, the armed forces provide security and law enforcement roles rather than state agencies. ISIS took advantage of these conditions to expand its presence in the country. Like Sudan, Somalia has also become a haven for terrorist groups. Al-Shabaab, a terrorist group affiliated with Al-Qaeda, has been operating in Somalia for years and continues to plan and enhance operations in Somalia and around its neighbors. The ongoing conflict between the ruling government and the Houthi-led opposition in Yemen is why America barred Yemen from entering the US. Terrorist groups ISIS and Al Qaeda are taking advantage of this situation to expand their presence in Yemen and carry out hundreds of attacks (The National Archives and Records Administration, 2017).

The second controversial policy to realize President Trump's campaign promise is in the form of an initiative announced by Trump on December 6, 2017, regarding recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. An order from President Trump followed the initiative addressed to the US State Department to prepare for the transfer of the US Embassy to Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The

policy of moving the US Embassy implies that the US recognizes Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and will overturn 70 years of international consensus regarding Jerusalem. On the other hand, recognizing Israel as the capital of Jerusalem will hinder peace efforts between Palestine and Israel (Yasinta, 2017).

Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel is in the best interests of the US and the pursuit of peace between Israel and the Palestinians. President Trump said this policy was a long-overdue step to advance the peace process. Trump emphasized the domestic political dimension of the decision related to his 2016 presidential campaign promise. President Trump demonstrated that he was delivering on his campaign promises, unlike previous US presidents who failed to deliver on their campaign promises (Landler, 2017).

The policy to recognize Jerusalem, followed by the relocation of the US embassy, was based on a public law that the US Congress passed, namely the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995. The law recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and called for Jerusalem to remain an undivided city. Through this law, the US Congress required the president to move the

US Embassy to Jerusalem in 1999. Although it has been passed, the law allows the President to apply for a six-month postponement of the implementation of the law and reissue the postponement every six months for national security reasons (US Congress, 1995).

The Three Former Presidents The US decided not to risk and avoid a more significant conflict by canceling its major campaign promise, namely the policy contained in the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995. Former US Presidents, such as Hillary Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama, chose to postpone recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and moving the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem as stipulated in the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995. The policy of delaying the embassy's relocation is also supported by Middle East experts who argue that the policy can be detrimental to negotiations for the peace of the conflict between Israel and Palestine (Baker, 2016).

President Trump is the only US President who dares to fulfill his signature campaign promise by setting a policy to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move the US Embassy to Israel, as stated in the Jerusalem Embassy

Act of 1995. The US Embassy was officially moved to Jerusalem on May 14, 2018, to coincide with the 70th anniversary of Israel's Declaration of Independence. President Trump said that the policy of moving the US Embassy is an embodiment of long-delayed steps to advance the peace process between Palestine and Israel and part of cooperation to reach a lasting agreement (Farrell, 2018).

The relocation of the US Embassy to Jerusalem has become a controversial policy because it has violated international law in the UN Security Council agreement related to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Jerusalem is a unique entity under the administration of the UN Security Council with the legal basis of General Assembly Resolution 181 of 1947. The unique entity means that Jerusalem is an international city whose position is not owned by either country. The special status of Jerusalem is based on the importance of Jerusalem's religion for Christianity, Islam, and Judaism (Alzoughbi, 2019) specifically addressing the prohibition on establishment or maintenance of diplomatic missions within the Holy City. This will be undertaken firstly by exploring Security Council resolution 478 of

August 1980, and secondly through a discussion of State practice and *opinio juris*. This paper was inspired by the recent developments regarding the conduct of the United States of America, the Republics of Guatemala and Paraguay in relocating their embassies from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem in May 2018. Unlike the Republic of Paraguay, which subsequently restituted its embassy to Tel Aviv in September 2018, the United States of America and the Republic of Guatemala have hitherto maintained their embassies in Jerusalem. This paper adopts a comparative approach by drawing on the particularities of Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). Historically, Jerusalem is a city contested by two countries as the capital of Palestine and Israel. Israel claims Jerusalem as its eternal and undivided capital, while Palestine claims East Jerusalem as the capital of a future Palestine (The Economist, 2021). The area is considered a trigger for the all-time conflict between Palestine and Israel.

The conflict over the Jerusalem area between Palestine and Israel was exacerbated by the controversial statement from the US President, Donald Trump, who would recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and would move

the US Embassy to Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. President Trump's controversial policies have sparked Palestinian anger and global condemnation from world leaders. So many governments around the world have condemned Trump's policies. In response to the policy, the UN passed a UN General Assembly Resolution calling for the US to withdraw its decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital, despite threats from the Trump administration to cut funding to US aid recipients who voted in favor of the UN resolution. The UN resolution won the support of 128 countries, nine countries voted against the resolution, and 35 countries chose not to vote. Nevertheless, Trump remains in his stance to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move the US Embassy to Jerusalem (Aswar, 2018).

In the end, the policy of relocating the US Embassy to Israel to Jerusalem is not related to US policy or considerations of national security stability. Whatever the excuse used, this policy is related to cultural and ideological considerations. This is supported by Trump's statement in his speech before the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), which

will move the US embassy to the eternal capital of the Jewish people, Jerusalem. The choice of words in the statement reflects a particular worldview, in which Jerusalem belongs only to the Jews or is reserved for Jewish and Christian civilizations. The statement also implied that Jerusalem is not a heritage of Palestinian, Arab, and Islamic cities (Elgindy, 2017).

### **Comparison of US Foreign Policy Against the Islamic World Under President Obama and President Trump**

President Obama is a context-oriented leader with a strategic leadership style. The JCPOA policy and the policy to withdraw all US troops in Iraq very much describe the figure of Obama with his strategic leadership style. From the beginning of Obama's entry into politics, Obama had a clear vision of the United States. Obama is deeply committed to civil and human rights and will create a system that works for everyone. In addition, Obama's strong interpersonal skills and a friendly and empathetic attitude indicate Obama's high level of emotional intelligence.

Obama learned from the political experience of previous presidents. When Obama became

president, Obama was committed to uniting the US and repairing the excellent image of the US in the world that had been damaged by the War Against Terrorism policy in the era of President Bush. Obama's policies and other steps taken by Obama to approach the Islamic World show Obama's high emotional intelligence, which prioritizes the peace negotiation process over establishing war. Both policies are in dire need of coalition, empathy, and compromise. President Obama, who aims at context, has succeeded in bringing the US not to be involved in various conflicts in the international world. So it is not surprising that Obama reached great deals.

On the other hand, President Trump is a goal-oriented leader with a crusader expansionist leadership style. As a goal-oriented figure, Trump does not need a coalition of various parties. Trump's leadership style is reflected in Trump's policies, namely the Muslim Ban policy and the transfer of the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Both of Trump's policies have received no support from most countries and have drawn criticism domestically and internationally. In addition, this policy also shows Trump's closed nature from new information. Trump has generalized too much

that Muslims are terrorists, so it is not surprising that Trump later adopted a policy of protectionism against the Islamic World under the pretext of US national security.

Trump's leadership style is crusader expansionist. Trump is a leader who opposes political boundaries, wants great control, has low ability to policy alternatives, and is not concerned with friendly relations. The three US foreign policies toward the Islamic World that Trump has set have drawn criticism from the international community, proving that Trump does not care about friendly relations between countries. Three of Trump's policies also show that Trump is a person who defies political boundaries, which is demonstrated by the actions of Trump, who constantly threaten other countries as enemies of the US if these countries do not agree with the US. Trump has promised to impose sanctions on countries that are not on the US side. It also shows Trump's personal desire to have more control and power.

## CONCLUSION

The United States is a country of international concern, especially regarding the national election agenda. The US presidential

election always attracts attention, especially when the 2016 US presidential election was won by the controversial figure, Donald Trump. Trump's victory marked a change in the style of foreign policy from the previous US President, Obama. The presidential election of the world's leading superpower will impact the world's geopolitical order, such as the emergence of global political turmoil that has resulted in tensions in relations between the US and countries in the world, especially countries in the Islamic world.

President Obama is a context-oriented leader with a strategic leadership style. During the leadership of Barack Obama, US foreign policy focused on the issue of multilateralism and prioritized soft power, which emphasized the process of cooperation and negotiation in conflict resolution. In addition, Obama is more open to Islamic countries to restore the trust of the Islamic world in the US and is committed to increasing US involvement in military conflict tensions in the Middle East region. Obama's efforts to create peace with the Islamic world are demonstrated by the US foreign policy that is friendly to the Islamic world, namely the US policy in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action

(JCPOA) agreement and the policy of withdrawing all US troops in Iraq. However, until the end of his term, Obama had failed miserably in achieving peace between the two countries, Israel and Palestine. Obama has created a more profound war gap in the Middle East region.

Meanwhile, President Trump is a goal-oriented leader with a crusader expansionist leadership style. During Donald Trump's leadership, US foreign policy style was anti-hegemony and anti-multilateralism, including Donald Trump's cynical view of the Islamic world. During the Trump administration, the US experienced a change in the style of foreign policy, especially US foreign policy towards the Islamic world. US foreign policy towards the Islamic world strongly reflects Trump's leadership style. These policies include the Muslim Prohibition policy and the policy of moving the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Trump's goal-oriented figure, namely by taking protectionist steps that will prioritize the safety and welfare of US citizens and will not care about responses from various parties, has resulted in Trump taking a protectionist foreign policy. In addition, the nature of the leader with an expansionist crusader

type can be seen from the many international criticisms of the US foreign policy towards the Islamic world that President Trump has set. Even the policy also received a rejection from US domestic actors. The number of rejections of Trump's policies shows that President Trump does not need a coalition to formulate US foreign policy.

So it can be concluded that US foreign policy during President Obama's administration was more friendly to the Islamic world. But the fact that Obama has failed to create peace for Israel and Palestine cannot be denied. Although Obama received a warm welcome from the Islamic world, he has failed in his commitment to bring about peace in the Middle East region. Obama left many bad impressions on the US in the Middle East and bequeathed Eternal War to the President after him.

On the other hand, under President Trump, US foreign policy was not friendly to the Islamic world. The impartiality of US foreign policy towards the Islamic world has caused tension in diplomatic relations between the US and the Islamic world, which was initially eased under the Obama administration.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alzoughbi, B. (2019). The relocation of the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem (Palestine v. United States of America): A commentary on the merits of the case, jurisdiction of the international court of justice and admissibility of Palestine's application. *University of Bologna Law Review*, 4(1), 114–205. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2531-6133/9425>
- Arafa, M. (2018). A question to the president of the United States, Donald Trump: Is it a travel ban, or a Muslim ban, or a travel Muslim ban? *Revista de Investigacoes Constitucionais*, 5(2), 9–33. <https://doi.org/10.5380/rinc.v5i2.58990>
- AS, B. (2018). The Study of Foreign Policy in International Relations. *Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs*, 6(4), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2332-0761.1000337>
- Aswar, H. (2018). The U.S. Foreign Policy under Trump Administration to Recognize Jerusalem as the State Capital of Israel. *Nation State Journal of International Studies*, 1(2), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.24076/nsjis.2018v1i2.136>

- Baker, P. (2016). An Embassy in Jerusalem? Trump Promises, but So Did Predecessors. Retrieved July 7, 2021, from The New York Times website: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/19/world/middleeast/jerusalem-us-embassy-trump.html>
- BBC News. (2016). Trump wins US election: How world leaders have reacted. Retrieved June 22, 2021, from BBC News website: <https://www.bbc.com/news/election-us-2016-37919394>
- Beydoun, K. A. (2016). Donald Trump: The Islamophobia president. Retrieved June 16, 2021, from Aljazeera website: <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2016/11/9/donald-trump-the-islamophobia-president>
- Bidwai, P. (2009). Obama's overture to Islamic world. Retrieved June 15, 2021, from Transnational Institute website: <https://www.tni.org/es/node/13747>
- Cahyoputra, L. AL. (2016). Obama Berusaha Dorong Perdamaian di Timur Tengah. Retrieved September 1, 2022, from Berita Satu website: <https://www.beritasatu.com/dunia/387482/obama-berusaha-dorong-perdamaian-di-timur-tengah>
- CBS News. (2008). Barack Obama Wins Presidency. Retrieved September 21, 2021, from CBS News website: <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/barack-obama-wins-presidency/>
- Cipto, B. (2018). *Politik Global Amerika: Dari Obama ke Trump* (I). Yogyakarta: The Phinisi Press Yogyakarta.
- Dershowitz, A. (2017). Obama's Middle East legacy: Tragic failure. Retrieved September 1, 2022, from The Jerusalem Post website: <https://www.jpost.com/opinion/obamas-middle-east-legacy-tragic-failure-478525>
- Dugis, V. (2008). Explaining Foreign Policy Change. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 21(2), 101–104. Retrieved from [http://journal.unair.ac.id/download-fullpapers-Lepasan Naskah 2 \(101-104\).pdf](http://journal.unair.ac.id/download-fullpapers-Lepasan Naskah 2 (101-104).pdf)
- Elgindy, K. (2017). Why moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem would be dangerous and unwise. Retrieved July 8, 2021, from Brookings website: <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/2017/01/30/why-moving-the-u-s-embassy-to-jerusalem-would-be-dangerous-and-unwise/>



- Eroukhmanoff, C. (2018). 'It's not a Muslim ban!' Indirect speech acts and the securitisation of Islam in the United States post-9/11. *Global Discourse*, 8(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23269995.2018.1439873>
- Farrell, S. (2018). Why is the U.S. moving its embassy to Jerusalem? Retrieved July 7, 2021, from Aljazeera website: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-israel-diplomacy-jerusalem-explaidUSKBN1I811N>
- Federal Election Commission. (2017). Federal Elections 2016: Election Result for the U.S. President, The U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives. In *Federal Election Commission*. Washington DC. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvk8w129.20>
- Flintoff, C. (2008). Barack Obama Chooses Sen. Joseph Biden For VP. Retrieved September 21, 2021, from NPR website: <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=93902534>
- Fordham, A. (2015). Fact Check: Did Obama Withdraw From Iraq Too Soon, Allowing ISIS To Grow? Retrieved September 25, 2021, from NPR website: <https://www.npr.org/2015/12/19/459850716/fact-check-did-obama-withdraw-from-iraq-too-soon-allowing-isis-to-grow>
- Gerges, F. A. (2013). The Obama approach to the Middle East: the end of America's moment? *International Affairs*, 89(2), 299–323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12019>
- Gibson, B. R. (2015). For all parties involved, the Iran nuclear deal is a big win. Retrieved July 9, 2021, from LSE website: <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/for-all-parties-involved-the-iran-nuclear-deal-is-a-big-win/>
- Jewish Virtual Library. (2018). Israel-Palestinian Negotiations: History & Overview. Retrieved September 7, 2022, from Jewish Virtual Library website: <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/history-and-overview-of-israel-palestinian-negotiations>
- Khalifi, M. A. El. (2020). Agreement on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) Between Iran and the United States. *Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum*, 7(2), 183–189. <https://doi.org/10.26532/jph.v7i2.11296>

- Landler, M. (2011). U.S. Troops to Leave Iraq by Year's End, Obama Says. Retrieved September 25, 2021, from The New York Times website: <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/22/world/middleeast/president-obama-announces-end-of-war-in-iraq.html>
- Landler, M. (2017). Trump Recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's Capital and Orders U.S. Embassy to Move. Retrieved July 19, 2021, from The New York Times website: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/06/world/middleeast/trump-jerusalem-israel-capital.html>
- Lopez, G. (2020, August 13). Donald Trump's long history of racism, from the 1970s to 2020. VOX. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/7/25/12270880/donald-trump-racist-racism-history>
- Mintz, A., & DeRouen, K. (2010). *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Muhaimin. (2016). Jelang Lengser, Obama Tak Becus Damaikan Palestina & Israel. Retrieved September 7, 2022, from Sindonews website: <https://international.sindonews.com/berita/1095452/42/jelang-lengser-obama-tak-becus-damaikan-palestina-israel>
- Muhamad, S. V. (2013). Perundingan Perdamaian Palestina-Israel. *Info Singkat: Hubungan Internasional*, V(15), 5–8. Retrieved from <https://berkas.dpr.go.id/sipinter/files/sipinter-1525-342-20200730122049.pdf>
- Nagourney, A., & Zeleny, J. (2007). Obama Formally Enters Presidential Race. Retrieved September 21, 2021, from The New York Times website: <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/11/us/politics/11obama.html>
- NPR. (2008). Elation, Skepticism As World Reacts To Obama Win. Retrieved September 22, 2021, from NPR website: <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=96699117>
- Obama, B. (2007). Renewing American Leadership. *Foreign Affairs*, 2–16. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2007-07-01/renewing-american-leadership>
- Obama Foundation. (2012). Chicago: Where It Began. Retrieved September 15, 2021, from Obama Foundation website: <https://www.obama>

- org/chapter/chicago-where-it-began/#raised-south-side
- Obama Foundation. (2017). American Leadership in The World. Retrieved September 24, 2021, from Obama Foundation website: <https://www.obama.org/chapter/american-leadership/>
- Stephenson, E., & Becker, A. (2016, June 16). Trump backs surveillance of mosques despite criticism of rhetoric. *The Reuters*. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-election-idUSKCN0Z12AS>
- The Economist. (2021). Only negotiations can bring lasting peace to Israel and Palestine. Retrieved July 5, 2021, from The Economist website: <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2021/05/13/only-negotiations-can-bring-lasting-peace-to-israel-and-palestine>
- The Guardian. (2011). Barack Obama announces total withdrawal of US troops from Iraq. Retrieved September 25, 2021, from The Guardian website: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/oct/21/obama-us-troops-withdrawal-iraq>
- The National Archives and Records Administration. (2017). Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States. Retrieved June 30, 2021, from The Federal Register website: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/03/09/2017-04837/protecting-the-nation-from-foreign-terrorist-entry-into-the-united-states>
- The New York Times. (2008). Election Results 2008. Retrieved September 21, 2021, from The New York Times website: <https://www.nytimes.com/elections/2008/results/president/votes.html>
- The New York Times. (2012). Election Results 2012. Retrieved September 24, 2021, from The New York Times website: <https://www.nytimes.com/elections/2012/results/president.html?mtrref=www.google.com&gwh=35AF21E4C22433D6D5ECA70B12B70F3F&gwt=pay&assetType=PAYWALL>
- The Nobel Prize. (2009). The Nobel Peace Prize for 2009. Retrieved June 24, 2021, from The Nobel Peace Prize website: <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2009/press-release/>
- The Wall Street Journal. (2021). America's Longest War: A

- Visual History of 20 Years in Afghanistan. Retrieved September 25, 2021, from The Wall Street Journal website: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/us-longest-war-afghanistan-11583010024#>
- The White House. (2010). Barack Obama Administration: Remarks by President Obama & Middle East Leaders on the Resumption of Direct Negotiations. Retrieved September 6, 2022, from Jewish Virtual Library website: <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/remarks-by-president-obama-and-middle-east-leaders-on-the-resumption-of-direct-negotiations-september-2010>
- Thrall, A. T., & Goepner, E. (2017). Step Back: Lessons for U.S. Foreign Policy from the Failed War on Terror. Retrieved September 4, 2021, from CATO Institute website: <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/step-back-lessons-us-foreign-policy-failed-war-terror>
- US Congress. (1995). Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995. Washington DC. Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/104/plaws/publ45/PLAW-104publ45.pdf>
- Yan, H. (2015, August 8). Donald Trump's "blood" comment about Megyn Kelly draws outrage. CNN. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2015/08/08/politics/donald-trump-cnn-megyn-kelly-comment/index.html>
- Yasinta, V. (2017). Mengapa Pengakuan Yerusalem sebagai Ibu Kota Israel Sangat Kontroversial? Retrieved July 7, 2021, from Kompas website: <https://internasional.kompas.com/read/2017/12/06/11014491/mengapa-pengakuan-yerusalem-sebagai-ibu-kota-israel-sangat?page=all>