Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?

"Change we can believe in" (Obama, 2008). Enunciating this theme as his campaign slogan, Barack Obama won the 2008 presidential election. After a controversial period in US foreign policy under President George W. Bush, the Obama administration appeared to promise crucial changes in US foreign policy (Singh, 2012a; McCormick, 2014). At that time, however, Lynch and Singh (2008) suggested that Bush's foreign and security policy was likely to be continued by his successors. Indeed, far from wholesale reversal, Obama has been accused of implementing a foreign policy which is essentially the same as that initiated by Bush, replicating and even reinforcing Bush's strategies (Indyk et al., 2012a; Scott-Smith, 2012; Shea, 2012; Singh, 2012b; Bentley and Holland, 2013a; Ledwidge, 2014). This essay will discuss whether Obama has delivered change or continuity in US counterterrorism and security policy, and will argue that Obama has essentially continued with Bush's foreign policy, working within the framework inherited from him, but that he has also proved to promote change in some areas and approaches. Firstly, it will be suggested that Obama's foreign policy is essentially characterized by its continuity with that of Bush, providing certain examples and examining the reasons that may have led to that continuity. Secondly, it will be argued that, nevertheless, there is a change in the way of approaching to the framework of the War on Terror inherited from Bush. It has to be emphasized that this essay will discuss the counterterrorism and security sphere of US foreign policy, hence the term foreign policy will always refer to these particular areas.

As stated above, this section will argue that Obama's foreign and counterterrorism policy is primarily characterized by an inherent continuity with that implemented by his predecessor George W. Bush. Firstly, this statement will be discussed, emphasizing the continuity with the War on Terror, which is visible in the Afghanistan War. Then, the reasons that might have made difficult enact change in US foreign policy will be examined. A great body of literature suggests an evident continuity between Bush and Obama with regard to counterterrorism and national security policies (Crocker, 2010; Keridis, 2012; Rockman, 2012; Skinner, 2012; Shea, 2014). Hemmer (2011) and Lindsay (2011) note that, even though certain strategies and approaches may differ from one administration to the other, both Bush and Obama share core values that shape their foreign policies: the defence of American national interests, the US global leadership, and the emphasis on a war against the terrorist axis of Al-Qaeda and its supporters. Indeed, as Klaidman (2012) observes, that the language of the "Global War on Terror" established by Bush has been replaced by one of "transnational global conflict" does not mean that the War on Terror has actually been brought to an end. On the contrary, the underlying policy drivers of such war remain the same, and America's national and security interests continue shaping US foreign policy and providing the justification for an exceptionalist interpretation of international law (Burkemann, 2009; Indyk et al., 2012b; Aaronson, 2013).

A notable example of Obama's continuity with Bush's foreign policy and, thus, with the War on Terror —or "transnational global conflict"— is the war in Afghanistan (Singh, 2014). Far from its abandonment, the Obama administration has implemented a more precise prosecution of a renamed War on Terror in Afghanistan (Klaidman, 2012). Reinforcing Bush's determination to dismantle and defeat Al-Qaeda, Obama (2009a) justified this war arguing that intervention was still needed to prevent Al-Qaeda from operating freely in Afghanistan. As Mann (2012) states, his commitment to continue with the Afghanistan War initiated by Bush is evident in the "surge" of 30,000 additional US troops to this war. This policy choice (a "surge strategy"), in turn, seems closely aligned to Bush's "surge" in Iraq in early 2007; indeed, General David Petraeus, who conducted the surge strategy in Iraq for the Bush administration,

Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?

Written by Javier Martín Merchán

was also appointed to lead this strategy, which reflects a higher degree of continuity between both administrations (Jones, 2011; Singh, 2012b; McCormick, 2014; Miller, 2016). More importantly, according to Aaronson (2013), the reasons that led Obama to justify this surge coincide with certain principles at the core of Bush's foreign policy: the protection of the US security and the defence of American national interest. Thus, with the objective of preventing any future acts of terrorism against the US, Obama has resumed the war initiated by Bush in Afghanistan against those involved in the 9/11 attacks, reserving, as his predecessor, the right to act unilaterally (Obama, 2009b; Aaronson, 2013). As Sanger (2012) notes, Obama seems not to have rejected the strategic necessity of Bush's response to 9/11 in Afghanistan; in fact, he might have made this response more aggressive. Another significant example of the continuity delivered by President Obama in US foreign policy is the use of drones in the war against Al-Qaeda. Obama has even been accused of giving an excessive emphasis to this practice established by his predecessor (Guerlain, 2014). As Aslam (2013) notes, whereas there were only nine drone strikes in Pakistan from 2004 to 2007, there were 111 in 2010 alone.

Once observed an apparent continuity of Obama's foreign policy with that implemented by George W. Bush, now the issue arises of why a president elected on a platform of change has delivered such degree of continuity in US foreign policy; thus, this paper now moves on to address the reasons why change has been hard to implement for the Obama administration. Firstly, the possibility that Obama was ideologically opposed to implementing greater change from the outset, in other words, that Obama did not want to implement any substantial change should be considered. According to McCrisken (2011), Obama never intended wholesale reversal of Bush's foreign policy; on the contrary, his objective was to deepen Bush's commitment to counterterrorism while bringing the distraction of the Iraq war to an end. Indeed, McCrisken (2013) notes that Obama has been consistent with his rhetoric and the programme foreshadowed in his pre-election speeches. If these are analysed, it seems evident that Obama did not seek to achieve great change, but end "the excesses of the Bush administration" (Obama, 2007a); in other words, Obama did not promise the end of the War on Terror, but a new manner of fighting and confronting threats within this war (Carafano, 2014): "I am running for President to lead this country in a new direction. Instead of being distracted from the pressing threats we face, I want to overcome them" (Obama, 2008b). It could be observed, therefore, that Obama fostered a perception of change amongst voters that was greater than his actual intentions. Likewise, on taking office, his rhetoric continued on the same course, even deepening the commitment to work within a renamed War on Terror, and making appeals to war as justification for the continuation of the campaign in Afghanistan (McCrisken, 2013). After a year in office, for instance, Obama (2009b) stated: "I face the world as it is. Negotiations cannot convince al Qaeda's leaders to lay down their arms. So yes, the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace. […] War is sometimes necessary". Thus, Holland (2013a) argues that, on becoming president, Obama was increasingly converted to the cause and rationale of Bush-era counterterrorism policy.

Secondly, having proposed that Obama might have wanted to deliver continuity with Bush's foreign policy, it may now be considered that he could not deliver change, as he seems to have been limited in several ways. As Holland (2013a) argues, one of this limitations emerges because Obama failed to appreciate the demands of holding the office whilst campaigning, and adjusted accordingly once elected. On becoming president, Obama may have been aware of how difficult change is to achieve, and has failed to realise the change he sought (Scott-Smith, 2014). The inability to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay could exemplify this issue. Obama was elected having campaigned to close the facility within his first year in office, however, it still functions today; even though the number of detainees at Guantanamo has considerably decreased, Obama's promises of change have obviously been limited in their realisation (Korte and Vanden Brook, 2016). As Crook (2009) and Yin (2010) claim, closing Guantanamo was easier to promise than to accomplish; in any case, Obama's inability to shut the facility seems to represent the continuity between the Bush and Obama administrations.

Another limitation that might have made difficult enact change is the institutionalisation of the War on Terror in US foreign policy. In other words, Bush could have created such a pervasive foreign policy that Obama is entrapped, constrained by culture, identity, and discourse, and unable to break out of the policies, expectations and ideas associated with the War on Terror (Boyle, 2011; Holland, 2012, 2013b; Bentley and Holland, 2013b; Elridge, 2013; Holland and Jarvis, 2014). The policy programme following the War on Terror has affected political, economic and social aspects of life in the US, favouring a visible institutionalisation of the war (Jackson, 2005; Croft, 2006; Holland, 2012). This institutionalisation has had, for example, an obvious impact on the level of defence expenditure. As

Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?

Written by Javier Martín Merchán

Holland (2013a) illustrates, Bush conducted a great increase in defence spending and reoriented it in order to fight the threats of the War on Terror. This refocusing of American finances around the effort to defeat "terror" seems difficult for Obama to pull back from (Bentley and Holland, 2013b). Furthermore, the institutionalisation of the War on Terror in counterterrorism practices has been achieved thanks to the great significance of the discourses that underpin it. Zalman and Clarke (2009) state that the US has developed a narrative, in which it conducts a worldwide campaign against Islamic extremism. This discourse, in turn, remains in relevant branches of the US government, and Obama has seen himself forced to remain within the mainstream of this American discourse on foreign policy (Quinn, 2011, 2013). Simultaneously, according to Jackson (2011, 2013) and Parmar (2011), this narrative has been embedded in American popular culture. Obama cannot ignore the culture of fear promoted by Bush when implementing any aspect of counterterrorism policy; thus, the frames of fear that he has inherited limit him (Bentley, 2011, 2013). Obama has, therefore, seemed to be trapped within the parameters of Bush's construction of 9/11 and the War on Terror, choosing to modify, rather than overhaul, the fundamentals of this war (Solomon, 2012, 2013). After this analysis, it could be fathomed that US foreign policy is likely to be resistant to transformation, as the imperatives on which it rests are broadly acknowledged (Lynch, 2011). Since 9/11, it has widely accepted that the US is at war with a terrorist network, which necessitates the occupation of those territories perceived as bases for the enemy (Gerges, 2013). Therefore, as Lynch (2012) argues, possible disputes over recent US foreign policy are likely to be over tactical calibrations, but not over essential disagreements.

So far, this paper has argued that Obama's foreign policy reflects an apparent continuity with that of Bush: Obama appears to work within the framework of the War on Terror, reinforcing the war against the terrorist network of Al-Qaeda and stressing the defence of the American national interest. However, it would be an error to assert that the foreign policy implemented by Obama lacks any change and is a mere continuation of Bush's strategy. The following section will argue that Obama's foreign policy implies a change in the focus and approach to the War on Terror, differing from the strategy released by Bush by offering a distinct view of the international threat environment, and acknowledging the limits of American resources (Brzezinski, 2010; Hemmer, 2011). The first change in the manner of approaching to the War on Terror is linked to Obama's conception that American resources are limited. As Hemmer (2011) argues, Obama has never rejected the idea that the US is at war, but the idea that this war is against terrorism understood as a tactic. Instead, Obama has reasoned that the US is at war against a specific network, Al-Qaeda and its affiliates; thus, narrowing the scope of the war has allowed Obama to limit US expenditures and manage American resources in a more appropriate way to defeat a precise enemy. Obama has, therefore, accepted the framework of the War on terror, but his strategy has sought to fight against a more concrete rival (Aaronson, 2013). Likewise, according to Rahawestri (2010), change also seems evident in the focus given to the war in the Middle East. Whereas Bush appeared to seek the democratization of the Middle East and the reformation of Arab civilization, Obama has preferred to solve security problems than to transform the societies which created them (Sanger, 2012). Whereas Bush believes that the lack of democracy is likely to lead to instability, Obama reasons that externally promoted democratization may lead to the same outcome (Katz, 2010). Moreover, Stephens (2015) notes that Obama's rejection of the preventive use of force in Iraq, as the following paragraph shows, implies another considerable change in the way that the Obama administration has faced the War on Terror.

Indeed, Obama's strategy in the Iraq War supposes a new manner of approaching to the already established War on Terror (Aaronson, 2013; McCormick, 2014). From the outset, Obama opposed the Iraq War, as it was considered to divert America's attention away from the region in which US interests were most engaged: the Af-Pak border (Obama, 2007b). The Obama administration believed that Bush's intervention in Iraq was excessively costly and unnecessarily reduced the resources available for the war in Afghanistan (Hynek, 2009). Furthermore, as Katz (2010) observes, the US interventions in Iraq did not prevent the spread of radical Islamist activity either. Given these arguments and Obama's vision that the US possesses limited resources, Obama conducted a pragmatic shift in Iraq-oriented to withdraw the US troops from there and redeploy them to fight in the first front of the War on Terror, Afghanistan (Burke, 2011). As Ondrejcsák (2009) argues, for Obama, Iraq seemed a mere distraction from the real war that the US had to wage in Afghanistan, the centre of the War on Terror. In this way, the American soldiers in Iraq were gradually pulled from there, while the soldiers remaining as a "transition component" completed various tasks such as battling terrorist cells and training Iraqi security forces (Hemmer, 2011). As Katz (2010) notes, with the withdrawal from Iraq, Obama attempted to improve the undermined US relations with its allies and provide additional resources for the war against Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. Whether Obama's strategy was successful or not has

Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?
Written by Javier Martín Merchán

generated much debate. The Iraqi conflict was far from over when the US troops withdrew from the region, and stabilization was not achieved, which might have served as the basis for the rise of ISIS (Wechsler et al., 2016). What seems obvious is that Obama has delivered strategic change in this respect: the priority of Iraq has decreased, and most American attention, troops, and finances have been redirected towards Afghanistan (Jacobson, 2010).

Throughout this essay, an analysis of the degree of change and continuity delivered by President Obama in US foreign policy has been conducted. On the one hand, it has been argued that, in terms of counterterrorism and security policy, the Obama administration has essentially continued with the policy implemented by George W. Bush. Far from abandoning the War on Terror, Obama has worked within it, and the defence of the American national interests has shaped his policies. The war in Afghanistan, the use of drones against Al-Qaeda, and his inability to close Guantanamo have proved to be elements of continuity with the previous administration. Furthermore, several reasons that may explain the difficulty which Obama has experienced to enact change have been examined. It has firstly been considered that Obama might not have wanted to deliver any change with regard to the counterterrorism policy initiated by Bush. Then, it has been suggested that Obama has not been able to promote change in US foreign policy due to two significant reasons: first, he may have had to adjust to the demands of holding office once elected, hence he has not been able to accomplish all his promises; second, he seems to have been constrained by the institutionalisation of the War on Terror in US foreign policy. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated that the Obama administration has also promoted change in, at least, the way of approaching to the War on Terror: a change in the focus of the war, as the case of Iraq confirms. In any case, in terms of counterterrorism policy, it may be erroneous to claim that Obama's foreign policy is only characterized by either change or continuity with that of his predecessor; indeed, Obama seems to have delivered both continuity, in the substance, and change, in the focus, in US foreign policy.

Bibliography

Aaronson, M. (2013) 'Interventionism in US Foreign Policy from Bush to Obama', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.124-139.

Aslam, W. (2013) 'Drones and the Issue of Continuity in America's Pakistan Policy under Obama', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.139-162.

Bentley, M. (2011) 'Overcoming Fear: Obama's Counterterrorism Policy', Paper presented at *ECPR General Conference*, University of Iceland, pp.25-27.

Bentley, M. (2013) 'Continuity We Can Believe In: Escaping the War on Terror', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.91-108.

Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (2013b) 'Conceptualising Change and Continuity in US Foreign Policy', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.192-202.

Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) (2013a) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge.

Boyle, M. (2011) 'Between Freedom and Fear: Explaining the Consensus on Terrorism and Democracy in US Foreign Policy', *International Politics*, 48(3), pp.412-433. DOI: 10.1057/ip.2011.1.

Brzezinski, Z. (2010) 'From Hope to Audacity', *Foreign Affairs*, 89(1), pp.16-30.

Burke, J. (2011) *The 9/11 Wars*. London: Allen Lane.

Burkemann, O. (2009) 'Obama Administration Says Goodbye to War on Terror', *The Guardian*, 25th March. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/mar/25/obama-war-terror-overseas-contingency-operations (Accessed 17 May 2016).

Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?

Written by Javier Martín Merchán

Carafano, J. J. (2014) 'The President's Scary Foreign-Policy Strategy: Obama's Tactics, Bush's Rhetoric' *The Heritage Foundation*, 25th September. Available at: http://www.heritage.org/res earch/commentary/2014/9/obama-tactics-and-bush-rhetoric (Accessed: 18 May 2016).

Crocker, R. (2010) 'Dreams of Babylon', *The National Interest*, 108(1), pp.18-23.

Croft, S. (2006) *Culture, Crisis and America's War on Terror.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crook, J. R. (2009) 'President Obama Orders Closure of Guantánamo Detention Facilities; Obstacles Remain', *American Journal of International Law*, 103(2), pp.325-331. DOI: 10.2307/20535156.

Elridge, A. (2013) 'No Exit: The Bush Doctrine and Continuity in U.S. Middle East Policy', *Avicenna: The Stanford Journal on Muslim Affairs*, 3(2), pp.26-32.

Gerges, F. A. (2013) 'The Obama Approach to the Middle East: The End of America's Moment?', *International Affairs*, 89(2), pp.299-323. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2346.12019.

Guerlain, P. (2014) 'Obama's Foreign Policy: Smart Power, Realism and Cynicism', Society, 51(5), pp.482-491. DOI: 10.1007/s12115-014-9814-x.

Hemmer, C. (2011) 'Continuity and Change in the Obama Administration's National Security Strategy', *Comparative Strategy*, 30(3), pp.268-277. DOI: 10.1080/01495933.2011.587685.

Holland, J. (2012) *Selling the War on Terror: Foreign Policy Discourses after 9/11.* London: Routledge.

Holland, J. (2013a) 'Why Is Change so Hard? Understanding Continuity in Barack Obama's Foreign Policy', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror.* London: Routledge, pp.1-17.

Holland, J. (2013b) 'Foreign Policy and Political Possibility', *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(1), pp.49-68. DOI: 10.1177/1354066111413310.

Holland, J. and Jarvis, L. (2014) 'Night Fell on a Different World": Experiencing, Constructing and Remembering 9/11', *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 7(2), pp.187-204. DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2014.886396.

Hynek, N. (2009) *Continuity and Change in the US Foreign and Security Policy with the Accession of President Obama.* Prague: Institute of International Relations.

Indyk, M. S., Lieberthal, K. G. and O'Hanlon, M. E. (2012a) 'Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy: A Progressive Pragmatist Tries to Bend History', *Foreign Affairs*, 91(3), pp.29-43.

Indyk, M. S., Lieberthal, K. G. and O'Hanlon, M. E. (2012b) *Bending History: Barack Obama's Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Jackson, R. (2005) *Writing the War on Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jackson, R. (2011) 'Culture, Identity and Hegemony: Continuity and (the Lack of) Change in US Counterterrorism Policy from Bush to Obama', *International Politics*, 48(3), pp.390-411. DOI: 10.1057/ip.2011.5.

Jackson, R. (2013) 'Bush, Obama, Bush, Obama, Bush, Obama…: The War on Terror as Social Structure', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror.* London: Routledge, pp.76-91.

Jacobson, G. C. (2010) 'George W. Bush, the Iraq War, and the Election of Barack Obama', *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 40(2), pp.207-224. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2010.03755.x.

Jones, S. (2011) 'Beating Back the Taliban', *Foreign Policy*, 15th March. Available at: http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/03/15/beating-back-the-taliban-2/ (Accessed 21 May 2016).

Katz, M. N. (2010) 'Assessing the Obama Strategy toward the War on Terror', *Middle East Policy*, 17(4), pp.275-286.

Keridis, D. (2012) 'US Foreign Policy: Continuity and Change in an Increasingly Complex World', in Tzifakis, N. (ed.) *International Politics in Times of Change*. London: Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht, pp.17-32.

Klaidman, D. (2012) *Kill or Capture: The War on Terror and the Soul of the Obama Presidency* . New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Korte, G. and Vanden Brook, T. (2016) 'Obama Takes Last Time to Close Guantanamo', *Federal Times*, 23rd February. Available at: http://www.federaltimes.com/story/news/politics/2 016/02/23/obama-release-plan-close-guantanamo-bay/80793530/ (Accesed 20 May 2016).

Ledwidge, M. (2014) 'Reviewing US Politics and Obama: Change or Continuity?', Journal of American Studies, 48(32), pp.1-10. DOI: 10.1017/S002187581302508.

Lindsay, J. M. (2011) 'George W. Bush, Barack Obama and the Future of US Global Leadership',*International Affairs*, 87(4), pp.765-779. DOI: 10.111/j.1468-2346.2011.0103.x.

Lynch, T. and Singh, R. (2008) *After Bush: The Case of Continuity in American Foreign Policy* . New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, T. J. (2011) 'The *McBama* National Security Consensus and Republican Foreign Policy in the 2010s', in Aberbach, J. and Peele, G. (eds.) *Crisis of Conservatism? The Republican Party, the Conservative Movement and American Politics after Bush*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.335-356.

Lynch, T. J. (2012) 'Obama and the Third Bush Term: Towards a Typology of Obama Studies', *International Affairs*, 88(5), pp.1101–1111. DOI: 1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01121.x.

Mann, J. (2012) *The Obamians: The Struggle inside the White House to Redefine American Power* . New York: Viking.

McCormick, J. M. (2014) *American Foreign Policy and Process*. 6th edn. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

McCrisken, T. (2011) 'Ten Year's On: Obama's War on Terrorism in Rhetoric and Practice', *International Affairs*, 87(4), pp.781-801. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2011.01004.x.

McCrisken, T. (2013) 'Obama's War on Terrorism in Rhetoric and Practice', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.17-45.

Miller, P. D. (2016) 'Obama's Failed Legacy in Afghanistan', The American Interest, 11(5), pp.1-10.

Obama, B. (2007a) *Speech at the Paul University*. Chicago, 2 October. Available at: http://www.cfr.org/elections/barack-obamas-foreign-policy-speech/p14356 (Accessed 18 May 2016).

Obama, B. (2007b) *Obama's Speech at Woodrow Wilson Centre*, 1 August. Available at: http://www.cfr.org/elections/obamas-speech-woodrow-wilson-center/p13974 (Accessed 20 May 2016).

Obama, B. (2008a) *Change We Can Believe In: Barack Obama's Plan to Renew America's Promise* . New York: Three Rivers Press.

Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?
Written by Javier Martín Merchán

Obama, B. (2008b) *Speech by Barack Obama: New Challenges for a New World*, 15th July. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/15_07_08_obama_speech.pdf (Accessed 22 May 2016).

Obama, B. (2009a) 'Remarks on a New Strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan', *The White House: Office of the Press Secretary*, 27 March. Available at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-a-new-strategy-afghanistan-and-pakistan (Accessed 17 May 2016).

Obama, B. (2009b) 'Remarks at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize', *The White House: Office of the Press Secretary*, 10 December. Available at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-acceptance-nobel-peace-prize (Accessed 19 May 2016).

Ondrejcsák, R. (2009) *American Foreign and Security Policy under Barack Obama: Change and Continuity*. Bratislava: Centre for European and North Atlantic Affairs.

Parmar, I. (2011) 'American Power and Identities in the Age of Obama', *International Politics*, 48(1), pp.153-63. DOI: 10.1057/ip.2011.10.

Quinn, A. (2011) 'The Art of Declining Politely: Obama's Prudent Presidency and the Waning of American Power', *International Affairs*, 87(4), pp.803-824. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2011.01005.x.

Quinn, A. (2013) 'US Decline and Systemic Constraint', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.) *Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.45-61.

Rahawestri, M. A. (2010) 'Obama's Foreign Policy in Asia: More Continuity than Change', *Security Challenges*, 6(1), pp.109-120.

Rockman, B. A. (2012) 'The Obama Presidency: Hope, Change, and Reality', *Social Science Quarterly*, 93(5), pp.1065-1080. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00921.x.

Sanger, D. E. (2012) *Confront and Conceal: Obama's Secret Wars and Surprising Use of American Power*. New York: Broadway Paperbacks.

Scott-Smith, G. (ed.) (2012) *Obama, US Politics, and Transatlantic Relations: Change or Continuity?* Brussels: P. I. E. Peter Lang.

Shea, J. (2012) 'The View from NATO', in Scott-Smith, G. (ed.) *Obama, US Politics, and Transatlantic Relations: Change or Continuity?* Brussels: P. I. E. Peter Lang, pp.69-77.

Singh, R. (2012a) 'Continuity and Change in Obama's Foreign Policy', in Rockman, B. A., Rudalevige, A. and Campbell, C. (eds.) *The Obama Presidency: Appraisals and Prospects*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, pp.268-295.

Singh, R. (2012b) *Barack Obama's Post-American Foreign Policy: The Limits of Engagement*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Singh, R. (2014) 'Neoconservatives in the Age of Obama', in Parmar, I., Miller, L. B. and Ledwidge, M. (eds.) *Obama and the World: New Directions in US Foreign Policy*. New York: Routledge, pp.29-41.

Skinner, R. (2012) 'Reviewing the Obama Presidency', *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 42(2), pp.421-424. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2012.03982.x.

Solomon, T. (2012) 'I Wasn't Angry, because I Couldn't Believe It Was Happening: Affect and Discourse in Responses to 9/11', *Review of International Studies*, 38(4), pp.907-928. DOI: 10.1017/ S0260210511000519.

Has Obama Delivered Change Or Continuity In US Foreign Policy?
Written by Javier Martín Merchán

Solomon, T. (2013) 'Affective Investment in the War on Terror', in Bentley, M. and Holland, J. (eds.)*Obama's Foreign Policy: Ending the War on Terror*. London: Routledge, pp.108-124.

Stephens, B. (2015) 'What Obama gets Wrong: No Retreat, No Surrender', Foreign Affairs, 94(5), pp.15-24.

Wechsler, W. F., Katz, M. N., Lister, C. and Cronin, A. K. (2016) 'The ISIS Threat to US National Security: Policy Choices', *Middle East Policy*, 23(1), pp.10-19.

Yin, T. (2010) 'Anything But Bush? The Obama Administration and Guantanamo Bay',*Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 34(2), pp.453-492.

Zalman, A. and Clarke, J. (2009) 'The Global War on Terror: A Narrative in Need of a Rewrite',*Ethics and International Affairs*, 23(2), pp.101-113. DOI: 10.1111/j.1747-7093.2009.00201.x.

Written by: Javier Martín Merchán
Written at: University of Surrey
Written for: Mr. Ciaran Gillespie
Date written: June 2016