

Volume No. 02

January 2020

MIDDLE EAST REVIEW

Research Journal Area Study Center for
Middle East & Arab Countries

ISSN 2663-0680



UNIVERSITY OF BALOCHISTAN
QUETTA

Note for Contributors

- The Middle East Review is an annual research journal and the Editorial Staff cordially invites the academics, scholars and policy experts in the relevant areas to contribute their well-thought and valuable research articles for publication.
- The research articles submitted for publication should be the original and unpublished work of the authors and co-authors. The submitted articles must not have been previously published or submitted for publication to any other research journal. Articles are published after the plagiarism test.
- The Middle East Review follows APA style of referencing. References should be authentic and relevant and be placed at the end of the article. Manuscripts should be typed in double spacing with wide margins.
- Research articles should have a brief abstract comprising around 150-200 words and the article length should be between 4000 and 7000 words. Articles must have key words, introduction, central theme, conclusion and references.
- All selected and accepted articles would be initially reviewed by the Editorial Staff and then will be recommended for double blind peer-review. The articles are published after the recommendations of the peer-reviewers in the relevant field.
- The Editorial Staff will reserve the right to edit/change/modify the research article, if required and the authors will be informed for approval before the publication.
- The views expressed in the published articles of the Middle East Review do not reflect the views of the Area Study Centre and its Editor/Editorial Staff and the responsibility for the accuracy of the facts and opinions expressed therein rests solely with the authors.
- Researchers/contributors are invited to submit their manuscripts electronically via email to the Editorial Staff of the journal on mideastreview.asc@gmail.com.

The Area Studies has emerged as an interdisciplinary field of research pertaining to a particular, but internationally recognized geographical region. Academically, the Area Studies was initially launched in the Western universities following the end of the World War-II and with the herald of portentous events of the Cold War to concise the multidisciplinary approach into an interdisciplinary academic discourse to study and conduct research about a particular geographic region involving International Relations, History, Culture, Political Science, Political Economy and Strategic Studies. Based on the foregoing concept, the Area Study Center for Middle East and Arab Countries has been established by the Government of Pakistan as an autonomous higher education research institute at the University of Balochistan, Quetta, by an Act of Parliament to conduct inter-disciplinary research and recommend policy proposals regarding the resource-rich region of Middle East. With the inter-disciplinary approach, the Centre seeks to conduct research on the geopolitically important region of the Middle East to strengthen academic and diplomatic ties with the regional countries. The principal objective is to produce highly qualified academic as well as policy-making experts on Middle East and Arab countries. The Area Study Center is a HEC-recognized degree awarding institute and offers M.Phil. /PhD admissions in International Relations, Political Science and History with specialization on Middle East & Arab Countries.

The Middle East Review is a multi-disciplinary and annual research journal in which research articles related to the Middle Eastern and regional affairs (International Relations, Political Science, History, Political Economy, Strategic Studies, Peace and Conflict Studies, Foreign Policy, Religion and Cultural Studies) are accepted for publication. The key objective of the Middle East Review is to provide a research forum to the academics, scholars and policy experts for sharing their valuable research work related to the Middle East and regional studies.

Editor

Editorial Board

Patron-in-Chief

Dr. Shafiq-ur-Rehman
Vice Chancellor/ Chairman Board of Governors,
Area Study Centre for Middle East & Arab Countries,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Editor

Mansoor Ahmed (*PhD*)

Associate Editors

Dr. Para Din
Jahanzeb Khan (*PhD*)

Assistant Editors

Abdul Qadir (*PhD*)
Shaukat Tareen

All Rights Reserved

**Area Study Centre for Middle East & Arab
Countries, University of Balochistan, Sariab Road
Quetta, Pakistan.**

ISSN: 2663-0680

Subscription Rates

Pakistan: Rs. 150/ Copy
Overseas: US\$. 3/ Copy

Disclaimer: Opinions and views expressed in the published articles are those of the authors/contributors and should not be attributed to the Editor and Staff of the Middle East Review, Area Study Centre for Middle East & Arab Countries, University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Advisory Editorial Board

Foreign

- **Prof. Dr. Marvin G. Weinbaum**
Professor Emeritus, Director of Pakistan Studies,
Middle East Institute, Washington, USA.
- **Prof. Dr. Akbar Ahmed**
Professor at School of International Service & Ibn
Khaldun Chair of Islamic Studies.
American University, Washington, D.C. USA.
- **Prof. Dr. Faegheh Shirazi**
Department of Middle Eastern Studies,
University of Texas at Austin, USA.
- **Prof. Dr. Miriam Cooke**
Professor Emerita of Arab Cultures,
Duke University, North Carolina, USA.
- **Prof. Dr. Joel Gordon**
King Fahd Centre for Middle East Studies,
University of Arkansas, USA.
- **Dr. Maria Holt**
Associate Professor, Dept. of Politics & International
Relations, University of Westminster London, UK.

National

- **Prof. Dr. Abdul Razzaq Sabir**
Vice Chancellor, University of Turbat, Balochistan.
- **Prof. Dr. Nazir Hussain**
Director School of Politics & International Relations,
Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.
- **Prof. Dr. Mansoor Akbar Kundi**
Vice Chancellor,
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan.
- **Prof. Dr. Malik Muhammad Tariq**
Dean Research, Faculty of Arts,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.
- **Prof. Dr. Hussain Shaheed Soharwardi**
Department of International Relations,
University of Peshawar.
- **Dr. Salma Malik**
Assistant Professor, Department of Strategic Studies,
Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad.

Contents

1. **Revisionist Powers in Middle East: Implications for Pakistan**1
Muhammad Ikramullah and Mansoor Ahmed
2. **U.S. Foreign Policy towards Middle East: A Case Study of Iraq**.....25
Muhammad Junaid Khan
3. **Pak-Japan Relations: Connecting Far East with Middle East**.....45
Mansoor Ahmed
4. **Iranian Nuclear Program: Impacts on Regional Security**.....74
Hakeem Khan
5. **Syrian Crisis and Mass Migration: Politics of Refugees**.....90
Shah Muhammad and Muhammad Zahir Mengal
6. **International Refugee Law: The Case Study of Palestine**.....106
Muhammad Hanif
7. **Humanitarian Intervention under International Law: A Critical Analysis**.....122
Noor Khan
8. **Democratic Culture in Afghanistan: A Case Study of Post-Taliban Era**.....140
Walat Khan
9. **Gamal Abdul Naseer: The Protagonist of Arab Nationalism**.....160
Kafayatullah and Jahanzeb Khan

Revisionist Powers in Middle East: Implications for Pakistan

Muhammad Ikramullah

M. Phil Scholar at Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Mikramullah37@gmail.com

Mansoor Ahmed

Assistant Professor, Area Study Centre
University of Balochistan, Quetta

Qaumansoor@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The Middle East is swirling with break neck events. The U.S shifts its military bases from Saudi Arabia to Qatar and from Turkey to Romania. Russia has intervened in Syrian crisis by sending its troops in the Middle East for the first time in the post-Cold War era to salvage its longstanding allied regime. President Assad has thwarted interventionists' designs by defeating the U.S. and Saudi backed fighters in Syria, whereas China has sought to increase its sway in the Middle East to offset the U.S.' "Pivot to Asia Policy". The U.S. seems to have stepped in to Thucydides Trap after its economic/ traded war with China. The whirlwind events prognosticate the formation of a revisionist alliance between Russia and China in region where Pakistan's multi-faceted relations with the regional states and the revisionist powers place it in a strategic dilemma to transform region's politico-strategic climate. In contemporary environment Pakistan has to acquire a balanced position because of its geographical proximity with Iran, and economic and cultural affinity with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA). Pakistan needs to pursue a well-articulated strategy in the volatile region where its regional powers like Turkey

and Qatar have stood up to the KSA and UAE led alliance in addition to the involvement of Russia and Iran.

Key words: Middle East Politics, Revisionist Powers, Thucydides Trap, Oil Politics, Security, Military Bases, Geographical Proximity, Power Politics and Equilibrium.

Introduction

For greater part of the history, the world has experienced imperialism as typical mode of government. States perceiving hegemonic designs, proselytizing agenda, temptation of economic gains or having security concerns do not have interest in operating a centrally designed international order, rather they themselves aspire to be an international system. Meanwhile there seems to rise a country in every century with a resolve and intellectual impetus to mold the entire world according to its perceived vision and values as if due to some natural principal. In the Twentieth Century no country influenced international system, so, decisively as United States did. No other society so firmly insisted on the intervention in the homeland affairs of other countries or profoundly asserted on the universal applicability of its own values. These values were imposed as an obligation to crusade for hegemony across the globe (Kissinger, 1994).

Torn between yearning to dominate the world and a pristine past U.S. kept oscillating between isolation and commitment. World political scenario after the departure of Soviet Union was marked with vindication of the U.S. ideals and brought it face to face with a world the U.S. wanted to avoid throughout the Cold war. In the emerging order states tend to view the world with the binary of nationalism. The nations seem to peruse their personal interests basing upon shifting balance of power hence competing each other more than cooperating. In the given scenario; for the first time the U.S. can neither dominate it nor can withdraw from it. It has found an inexorable challenge of achieving its goals in stages most of which

are amalgamation of geo-political necessities. The unavoidable feat in contemporary period is that a world is transcending through a system comprising various states of comparable strength forming an order on the basis of equilibrium; the idea which the United States has always detested.

Torn between obsessive insecurity and economic needs and the requirements of its allies and temptations of becoming Asia continental power, the U.S. has always had a role in power equilibrium at Middle East. The requirements of security in tandem with defeating adversaries became merged in the minds of U.S. establishment. Since the end of cold war United States has deployed its military forces on foreign soil more than other power. Most of it got engaged at turmoil in the Middle East, an area so vital to other emerging powers like Russia and China particularly in the wake of Arab spring. Both the dissidents in the present environment have converged at multiple policy issues leading the global system to a power transition with world present with multiple poles of power. The emerging partnership is the outcome of the realization that U.S. is trying to marginalize their interest through its unilateral approach in various issues especially in the Middle East.

Revisionist Powers in Middle East

The U.S. attempts compelled these powers to adopt multilateral approach to secure their interest and contain U.S hegemony. In this context there are being three major transformations that tend to transform global landscape.

- a) The global power transition.
- b) The Sino-Russia convergence/ divergence across several areas.
- c) U.S. policy of containing China and Russia at Middle East and elsewhere.

The Sino-Russian strategic partnership is aimed at interlocking in to relationship with neighbors and world

powers within the ambit of practicing and establishing relations powers and rally them for their support to contain and deplete the power and resolve of the U.S. The establishment of Shanghai cooperation organization is the manifestation of the commitment to eradicate terrorism, economically integrate and provide defense cooperation to member states (Selim, 2016).

“Russia joined the China-controlled Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank in March 2015. But the most decisive step came a few months later in May, when Xi and Russian President Vladimir Putin met in Moscow to pledge to work toward a “link-up” between Russia’s Eurasian Economic Union and China’s Silk Road Economic Belt”(Lukin, 2018).

The quantum of defense cooperation and arms trade volume increased in the wake of 1989 Tiananmen Square. Russia’s depleting industry got huge dividends from this rising cooperation in addition to that 35 billion cubic meters liquid natural gas agreement worth 400 billion was also irresistible for Russia. Moreover Russia convinced Turkmenistan, (the energy wise richest state in central Asia) to sell out its energy resources through Russia oil giant GazProm leaving European markets for Russia. At present Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan are linked to China through a network of pipelines. The geographical proximity of states to oil rich countries in Gulf and Caspian Sea region increases competition for Russia in Asian continent as compare to European Markets. The Russia endeavors to divert these energy resources to local markets shall enhance its international influence. Whereas it will limit no of clients for oil and gas producing countries thus leaving more resources at cheaper rates for China.

The two countries want to utilize their growing relations as a lever to undermine the U.S. efforts to marginalize their interests by rallying regional and global powers and to increase their leverage and political clout. To this end

multilateralism and pluralism through reciprocity and integration will bring farfetched results meaning by shifting balance of power toward China and Russian side.

China and Russia, like many other powers, were caught aback by Arab Spring however through subsequent evaluation of crises a both conceived implications of Arab spring on their interests through two perspectives: domestic and foreign. The semblance of authoritarian power structure in the Middle East, Russia and Communist Party of China was a matter of grave concern despite a diametrically opposite political environment and economical condition of the masses. The new surge in the Middle East generated waves of anxiety for the two as turmoil in the Middle East was deemed as a source of radicalization of Muslim minorities in China and Russia. In Russia thousands of native Chechens and North Caucasian were attracted by the *jihadist* rhetoric in Iraq, Syria and Libya. These elements may easily be linked up with Russia's resurgent groups and transnational fundamentalist elements (Pieraccini, 2017).

The Middle East holds immense geo-economic importance for China as it imports bulk of its oil and natural gas from the Middle East as well as wants to connect the entire European land mass with its "one belt, one road" initiative through road and sea. Second, it fears radicalization in Central Asia, Middle East and North Africa could act as a catalyst in its Muslim population in the West. For Russia the situation was a dangerous blow to its strategic interests in the region that was magnified by over throw of Gaddafi at Libya and the turmoil at Syria, the two of the historical and traditional allies in Middle East (Stepnova, 2016). In Libya, Washington was wary of Russo-China economic interests since the Qaddafi Government extended oil concession to oil companies of both countries after lifting of sanctions from the regime.

China suffered a loss of approximately \$18 billion as 27 Chinese construction projects suffered direct military

attacks from NATO forces. This was in addition to 30,000 Chinese workers who were evacuated by Chinese ships amid tempestuous environment in Libya. Russia suffered the loss of \$10 billion in exploration, extraction and infrastructure projects apart from loss of \$4 billion arms deal following an arm embargo by UNSC in early 2011.

Dynamics of Renewed Approach

The Libyan episode was cognitive factor to formulating a decisive policy by China and Russia and both chose to adopt a proactive approach. At the formative stage of crisis at Syria the two decided to avoid repetition of shortsightedness and repel Western efforts to intervene to dominate and redirect the course of the crises. Russia sought to protect its only military base at Tartus, Syria beyond the Russia frontiers hence, the value of a loyal Syrian regime could not be undermined (Peck, 2017).

Both realized the need to preserve Assad Regime fall of which could embolden Israel and anti-Iran powers to attack and destabilize Iran. This could turn in to a scenario which would have endangered the territorial integrity and national solidarity of both the countries. Any attack on Iran would result into likely blockade of Strait of Hormuz and flow of oil to China and for Russia meant by reaching the NATO to the fringes of Russia. China and Russia viewed that they were put through a deliberate hoax as NATO tricked to oust Qaddafi by exploiting UNSCR 1973 in the garb of responsibility to protect (R2P).

In given scenario the global hegemon that is losing the global power preponderance tends to contain the attempts before reaching to a threshold of power equilibrium (Organski, 1958). To meet this end, the U.S. is out to rebalance Asia through its “Pivot to Asia” policy. In addition to that attempt to engage Russian rivals in the Europe and influence Black Sea, Caspian Sea and Central Asian region through NATO’s Eastward expansion and a string of U.S. military basis across the region. Russian viewed it tantamount to an encroachment on Russia’s

traditional sphere of influence and retaliated by developing the system that could breach American Thermal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD), nuclear parity with US and to redeploy Russian ballistic missile system at Europe. The “Pivot to Asia” has led China to counter balance U.S influence in its historical domain, the Middle East which has left profound effects over great power alliance seeking to challenge U.S. global hegemony.

The strategy was substantiated by forging closer ties with important countries like Iran, Syria and Egypt in the region. It was in this back drop that China and Russia chose to intervene directly in Syrian crises to secure their interests. Up till 2014 China and Russia vetoed and blocked as many as four UN draft resolutions against Syria which according to analysts demonstrated their cooperation to maintain a balance of power in the region (Prasad, 2016). The Lebanon-based Hezbollah and Al-Quds force of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard militarily intervened in Syria to strengthen the Assad regime which is being backed by Russian since September, 2015.

The Chinese naval deployment in Mediterranean and its military base at Djibouti have glittering significance to the changing pattern of power politics in the world. It defies U.S. global hegemony and shifts the unipolar world order to a new bipolar world order. Cole, a former analyst at the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) stated that while claims that we are seeing the emergence of an “authoritarian axis” may be premature, we are nevertheless, witnessing the rise of a new power one with global seafaring reach whose strategic considerations, or the value of their political leaders, are often times diametrically opposed to those of the West” (Selim, 2016).

Peeping through the lens of latest developments in Chinese foreign policy and its growing economic and military capabilities it is clearly understood that the balance of power in the Middle East has collapsed and

China is out to reestablish one of his own with the help of Russia and its close partners like Iran (Pieraccini, 2017). Throughout the crises, Russia has provided abundant military support to Assad Regime. This may be an exaggeration that every defiant group was budding from Al-Qaeda or the Islamic state. Numerous group, secular or Islamist, Arab or Kurds fought not only against Assad but against Al-Qaeda and the ISIL too. However, there were plenty of those immersed with pure *jihadi* or violent Salafist ideology bragged to fight alongside Al-Qaeda and the ISIL. Sever war crimes were committed by all side including Free Syrian Army or FSA - aka 'secular and moderate fighters' supported by West (Mazzetti, et al., 2017). From October 2015 onwards began air strikes with Government's consent. This was done with a primary objective to reassert Russia as a global power projecting its influence and fight the terrorism across the world.

Over the course of last two decades the bilateral relations among the three important powers of Asian Heartland have radically morphed. China, Russia and Iran come to conclusion that their mutual cooperation and union are the only means to thwart the hegemonic and expansionist designs of their common rival U.S.

“U.S Policy makers since the days of President Reagan have failed to understand that there can be no rapprochement between the two govts. because as Iran's leaders understand, that would undo the very existence of the Iranian regime. They have overlooked the fact that Iran is an exceptionally dangerous state- to its neighbors. In the long term, the Islamic Republic will join the Soviet Union and other ideological relics of the Twentieth century in eventual collapse. Until then, however, there can be no real peace between Washington and Tehran” (Cohen, et al., 2016).

The U.S. multi vector strategy is to simultaneously engage China, Russia and Iran and to undermine the growing influence of the three powers across the Arab region. The ouster of Saddam Hessian, over throw of Libya regime, Pivot to Asia policy, destabilization of democratic order at Ukraine and especially war in Syria (The covert CIA backed program to train and arm rebel fighters began with the name of 'Timber Sycamore') are the events that have led the nations to integrate which were rarely seen during early 1990s.

The developments are signaling a transition from a unipolar world driven by United States and Europe to a multipolar global order based on China, Russia and Iran. At present these are substantive proof of an enduring Russo-Iranian bilateral cooperation (Issave, 2017). Iran has out rightly supported Syria in its war against resurgent groups backed by chief Iranian rivals in the region like Saudi Arabia and Turkey which battled against the ISIL it's well known Hamza Division and Sultan Murad Division that kept on boasting about their well-stocked armory with US delivered anti-tank TOW Missiles. Yet Iran would not have succeeded without Russian military intervention. In addition Russia is only country willing to modernize Iranian army through selling advance military equipment as years of sanctions resulted by latter's pursuit of nuclear weapon program brought a toll on Iranian military up gradations. Looking at the successful partnership at Syrian crises and their potential achievements in other hotspots in the region there are all the likely chances that Russia will support Iran under demanding circumstances.

Preservation of Assad regime has been instrumental in securing the main supply route (MSR) to Iran's protégé Hezbollah the biggest supporter and guarantor of maintaining Iran strategic depth with regards to Israel and U.S.A. For Russia, Syria is of a core value as it is Russia's only out post across the region. Russia is also scared of Syria's collapse which would embolden the numerous

fighting bridges and catalyze the already brewing chaos at an exponential rate and to pour in across the neighboring states. The policy is concomitant with proclamation that any internal disorder and overthrow of any regimes will not work anymore. On military front Russia's 2015 intervention was critically important for Assad to consolidate his position and shore up Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) operations in Syria. Iran's effort to secure an upper hand in Syria is of a core value vis-à-vis its foreign policy that has enhanced its outreach across the region and has helped to fight successfully against religiously orthodox and fundamentalist organizations like the ISIS. The shared vision and the costly Iranian engagement in Syria has brought great domestic legitimacy for Iran.

The Chinese commentator Often Invoke the Phrase "20 countries of cooperation" describing the deep rooted Sino-Iran bilateral relations. Indeed contacts and mutual cooperation via the Silk Road have been robust throughout centuries (Graver, 2016). China emerged as a credible and trustworthy partner of Tehran. Indeed China values Iran as an important card to utilize against deteriorating relations with Washington in future.

In the economic sector, China is the one of biggest importers of Iranian oil and liquefied natural gas. Given the qualitative technology China may face stiff competition from European manufactures however in the security field China enjoys upper edge. The European weapons may be better in term of quality and robustness but it is likely that Iran may receive a replenishment of parts and service in the wake of a renewed arm embargo. In the broader spectrum of all the regional and international powers China is most likely to accommodate and welcome the rise of Iran as a dominant power in the Gulf with parallel rise of China as a dominant power in Asia.

China was acknowledged as a reliable arbiter while helping Iran regain benefits from global economy through facilitating the JCPOA. Averting the military collision between Iran and Washington or Israel was the prime agenda of Beijing which to its calculations would have proved disastrous not only for Iran but for Chinese interests in the Middle East as well. China's multi-pronged strategy encompassed a multi dimension partnership based upon mutual trust and deep rooted cooperation and placing Iran as a potential power in a region where growing influence of China would be perceived as a threat by many.

Amid the changing dynamics of geo-strategic environment of the Middle East Saudi Arabia is a variable for which the Iranian nuclear deal did not go very well. For Kingdom thinks that a nuclear deal with Iran would have for fetched dividends epitomizing the rhetoric of historic Iranian politics across the region. China though has been trying to prevent any negative implication being put on its relations with the KSA a definite tilt towards Iran is unavoidable his contemporary atmosphere of the Middle East (Luce, 2016). In the deteriorating environment of the Middle East China at many occasions has reiterated its neutrality. China seems willing to improve security relationship with Saudi Arabia, but the fact remains that the Kingdom is a historic U.S. ally and a nuclear deal followed by U.S look out for entente with Iran raised eye brows in the Kingdom and created doubts America fidelity. Despite all there is negative Saudi willingness to ally with China and contain U.S influence in the region (Fulmen, 2017).

For Russia, the OPEC policies governed by the KSA is a constant irritant. The kingdom is a largest oil producing county and is quite capable of shattering the contenders' economy as a swing producer. If the OPEC pushes much of the difference between two countries the Gas Exporting Countries Forum (GECF) is an industry oriented initiative taken by Russia to improve functioning

global gas production by meaningful negotiations and contain influence. The Kingdom's support of *jihadi* groups pushes much of difference in former Soviet States in Central Asia and the Middle East. Russia, in the past, has deployed its forces in active military operations in Chechnya and at Syria during recent years. The escalating situation is creating a resonance that will soon transcend Russo-Saudi relations despite the two's constant effort to avoid crossing the red line.

Implications for Pakistan

For most of the years Pakistan's Middle East policy has been manifested by two competing ideologies: religious and post-colonial in addition to economic compulsions. But the effects of the Cold War in Arab World with new power poles between Saudi Arabia and Iran together with international approach to dealing with rampant disorder, leadership vacuum in certain areas in the wake of Arab spring, rise of the ISIS after U. S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 and its fierce ideology with a deadly outreach in different regions of the world has heightened the need for a major policy shift in Islamabad. Various defected groups' growing strength drawn from West's colossal miscalculations in the Levant has made it obvious that absence of a sincere international consensus to diffuse the tension in the Middle East will only exacerbate the unraveling in the region and exponential rise of terrorism as far as South Asia.

“Recent uprising in the Middle East was long overdue. An artificial political order imposed on the Middle East region after World War has ever since been simmering and looking for an opportunity for its logical return to roots. Unnatural balkanization never went down well amongst the masses of Middle East” (Haq, 2011).

New drivers of tension like the U. S. decision to acknowledge Jerusalem as capital of Israel, establishment of Islamic Military Alliance (IMA), Iran's nuclear deal and subsequent U.S unilateral withdrawal require proactive measures in Islamabad to mitigate negative implications for Pakistan's domestic fabric, redefine its security module and cultivate strong partners in Middle East region beyond a Saudi- Iran lens. Being the only Islamic nuclear states with ambitions to develop Gwadar deep sea port with Chinese "One Belt, One Road" vision to connect to Eurasia through Arab peninsula puts it in a consequential position.

Since 2008-09 global economic recession there is a persistent shift of global wealth from West to the East which is acutely transmitting equilibrium in power equation in Asian heart land. Above quoted factors demand a major policy shift, restructuring and reforms in foreign office and foreign policy of Pakistan. It needs to carry out a new and in-depth evaluation of its foreign policy which has to be based upon pragmatic view of its long term national interests. A detailed analysis of Pakistan's foreign policy reveals that its foundations were built upon four basic columns that continue to buttress its relations to outer world to this date. These policy hall marks are: U.S.A-India-Pakistan, U.S.A-China- Pakistan, U.S.A-Afghanistan-Pakistan and U.S.A.-Middle East-Pakistan, whereas United States being a constant factor in this equation delineates that Pakistan needs to maintain a cautious balance between the West and the East and cannot afford to maneuver diplomatically on the bases of imbalances as its previous policies have been beaten up and back fired.

Pakistan being on the periphery of Middle East killing grounds and accommodation of militant groups and their splinter cells in Afghanistan from Middle East is the matter of great strategic anxiety for Pakistan (Humayu, 2015). The changing dynamics around Pakistani frontiers demand formulation of a coherent and cohesive approach

with revolutionary reforms which off course are not feasible with present bureaucratic structure. Most important is to bring a synergy between its military and political leadership. China's economy is flourishing with a striking growth rate of 9% and it is turning its Sothern provinces as an economic zone which are about 4500 Km away from its sea ports. Whereas Pakistan's deep water port Gwadar is just 2500 km away which captivates merchant Ships from South-East Asia, China and Central Asian states because as compared to Iran's 4500 km and Turkey's 5000 km distant ports it provides the shortest access to maritime trade corridors. More over being the only Islamic nuclear states with ambitions to develop Gwadar deep sea port with Chinese Belt and Road Initiative to connect to Eurasia through Arab peninsula puts it in a consequential position to steer multilateral security issues in the region (Mumtaz, 2014).The coastal belt of Baluchistan provides an outlet and access of Western zone of China to Gulf and the Middle East.

For most of the period, Pakistan's Middle East policy was steered by religious and post-colonial ideologies. But frequent change in ground realities around its vicinity and arrival of the Neo-Cold War to the fringes of Middle East and rise of new power poles in region spear headed by Saudi Arabia and Iran and consequential disorder demand Pakistan to bring a major policy shift in its regional binary at a time when the Geo-political and geo-economic stakes of China and Russia in the region are higher than ever before which attempt to replace U.S. monopoly across Eurasia. Pakistan's relations with China, Russia and the Middle East countries have taken sharp turns whereas Pakistan always tried to maintain good relations with the U.S., but those have eroded and turned sour after the Soviet departure (Hussain, 2018). The revamp in China-Pakistan relation is a minor Segment of a much larger scenario of China challenging U.S. global hegemony and particularly incumbent U.S. administration's much insular view of rise of China as a dissident state, 'belt and road initiative' and shrinking U.S. global leader ship role.

Pakistan's efforts to ally with China may have institutionalizing and long term consequences in joint efforts to mitigate U.S influence and leverage in region with growing military strength of China in South Asia with a repost to U.S Pivot to Asia Policy. The Sino-Pakistan Bilateral approach to strengthen their alliance is weakening U.S. economic and political influence in region and undermining current U.S. administration's efforts to penalize Pakistan through various means to large extent. As quoted by former U.S. Vice President Joe Biden "if you don't get Pakistan right, you can't win in Afghanistan" (KUU, 2018). Pakistan so far has played its cards wisely as the present strain in Pak-U.S. relations in not new to both countries as exploitation of bilateral relations for perceived objectives and national interests has remained a common phenomenon throughout. Pakistan needs to recall the several occasions whereupon the U.S. has vacillated from a stick and correct policy to an outright suspension of military aid and sanctions. Pakistan has rightly opted for an alternate source of backing by a major power like China and then mending its relations with Russia. U.S. fair weather friend attitude has rightly engendered the idea of fostering the alliances with major powers like Russia and take those with China to the pinnacle which can orchestrate the development of Pakistan's economy as a credible and trustworthy friend. Pakistan has aptly agreed to house an important segment of "One Belt One Road" initiative "CPEC" that will connect Gwadar Port 3000 km away to western Chinese city of Kashgar. The Chinese investment is likely to reach to \$60 billion within the ambit of China-Pakistan economic corridor (CPEC).

Beijing aspires for hegemony over Indian Ocean through Arabian Sea which would enable it to keep a check over U.S. and Indian naval movements across the entire region and monitor to and fro shipment of energy resources from the Gulf of Aden and the Persian Gulf. Pakistan's Government must embark on to strengthen relations by corroborating the Chinese future designs China's policies

presume to have immense significance as Pakistan's one of biggest challenges in contemporary period is global war on terrorism and rise of India as a regional hegemon that is nudging its Muslim neighboring countries against Pakistan. China's dispatch of its battle ship beyond its frontiers for the first time to Libya, its submarine operations in Indian Ocean and Pak-China naval operation are likely to rebalance the naval equilibrium in region leaving sufficient space for Pakistan to enhance its clout and leverage.

Throughout Cold War era, Pakistan remained a proactive ally of U.S. against the Soviet Union. It joined CENTO designed primarily to create a 'Northern Tier' that was supposed to prevent communist expansion towards the Middle East and rendered its Air force basis to facilitate espionage activities across Soviet influenced countries. But following U.S. global War on terrorism Pakistan has been viewed from a diametrically opposite perspective and no more an ally to trust upon. Amid rapidly growing Russian influence in the region and rise of economically prospering China and their aim to contain U.S. hegemony significant questions arise like "how Pakistan was going to react to this rupture in world order and what stance was Pakistan going to adopt?" The situation has totally altered diametrically turned where Pakistan at present is cozying up to Russia and the U.S. is embroiled in Afghan Quagmire for past seventeen years (America's longest war wasting approximately \$122 billion) (Nadeem, 2018).

Each with a different agenda of its own but this is for the first time that Pakistan, Russian and Iran are supporting Afghan Taliban simultaneously. Pakistan provides a viewing plate farm for all three. For Pakistan is acting as a screen and a nuclear shield to protect Chinese interests as well prevent U.S. access to its own nuclear installations. Russia wants to prevent the chaos and radicalization transcending its frontiers through Central Asian states and avoid NATO/ U.S. presence so close to

its frontiers. Iran with a similar agenda does not want to be encircled.

Pakistan being a neighboring state of Afghanistan needs to formulate the policy compatible to its interests with precautionary measure for the resistance movement being hijacked either by Russia or Iran. If it does not succeed it will not only result in loss of initiative as well as loss of opportunity to keep U.S. stuck in Afghanistan to break its will. Pakistan will definitely face brunt of feverish behavior of numerous forces, but a sturdy position supported by a consummate and scrupulous policy would result in to manifestation of perceived objectives. Pakistan has off and on been penalized through ungrateful attitude of U.S. in the form of economic sanctions which have compelled Pakistan to search for alternate sources over whelmed by economic and geo-political considerations.

It must keep in view that there are no permanent friends or enemies in the business of the states and only end justifies the mean for the states like Pakistan. Pakistan's priority has to be a strategically and economically strong nation which would be possible by allying with right partner at the right time. For the same purpose Pakistan has to support Russia's role in the Middle East which will herald the bipartisan collaboration in several other global issues too. The offer made by Pakistan for a multidimensional strategic partnership is a step in the right direction which if accepted by Russia would serve great benefits. Lately Pakistan has been declared as a geo-strategically important country by Russia with willingness to expand the existing cooperation.

“In 1947, Pakistan's army inherited the default position and strategy of British India in opposing Russian influence and inroads into Afghanistan and Central Asia. Now, for the first time in 200 years, they have reversed the old British policy of confronting the Russians for

control over Central Asia. Pakistan's army now sees the Russians as their strategic partners. Have announced an end to the British-era policy of the Frontier Crimes Regulation. This would mean the fabled 'buffer zone' of Curzon and British India would be no more. In effect, the Russian threat is over. Pakistan's army and Russia are sealing an ever-closer defense relationship which will have a strategic impact on the world stage for years to come." (Alam, 2018).

Pakistan needs to realize Russia that joining the OBOR would assert China across the entire region especially in the Middle East which is beyond present Russian military and economic strength alone; cooperating with China would bring substantial economic and strategic gains for all. The U.S. unilateral decisions to withdraw from various international accords like Trans-Pacific Partnership, Paris climate Accord and Iran's nuclear deal have greatly undermined U.S. influence and legitimacy across the world and together China, Russia, Iran and Pakistan are likely to undercut U.S. influence in Central Asia and the Middle East. But despite all the benefits, Pakistan must not deny value of keeping multilateral foreign relations at a time when U.S. has remained a non-variable factor of Pakistan foreign policy formulation. The U.S. misgivings that U.S. financial and military support to Pakistan is wastage of resources seem to have failed to conceive the prospects of potential and value of Pakistan for a long term strategic gains/ hold in the region.

Despite longing for close relations with Russia and historic ties with China bad relations awash with trust deficit with U.S. are better than no relations at all. Abandoning U.S. due to Afghan Policy and completely relying on China for its defense production and Russia for energy needs is not a success story rather a major foreign policy failures for Pakistan. The present state of

affairs in the realm of economy, defense and security are much valuable than that of with Russia. Financial Action Task Force (FATF) motion moved by America against Pakistan was a clear indication that even China's deep rooted relations with Pakistan did not suffice to counter U.S. Pressure. Pakistan must not embellish the compensations made by Russia and China against U.S cuts in aid. "China is not a charity and does not provide assistance on demand; it only provides support to key allies including Pakistan when it serves its interests. Concomitant, the extent of Russia's support for Pakistan to this point is unclear" (Dawn, 2018).

The tumultuous environment in the Middle East is acutely polarizing Pakistan's domestic opinion and public narrative. There are great sympathies for both Saudi Arabia and Iran in Pakistani society which mostly originates from sectarian schism. Pakistan unfortunately have faced these challenges at a moment once its economy is expected to take a turn around according to latest economic indicators at the growth rate of 5% during the recent years, the highest in past several years.

If the Middle East crises does not abate it will lead to political and economic instability in Gulf countries that will have ramifications for Pakistani economy by rendering millions of Pakistani expatriates jobless. The spillover effect of radical and sectarian crises in the Middle East is also hampering Pakistan's economic prosperity and political stability. The engendered gravity demands profound response and effective reaction.

The focus of Government resources and consumption of energies must be concentrated on indigenous source of economic strength. Pakistan must reevaluate the basic tenants and core of its relations with the Middle East countries which primarily stem from religious or

sectarian affinities so as to pursue a bold and reciprocal course of diplomatic relations. As its past strategy did yield considerable gains for Pakistan same also back fired in the form of radicalization of its society and sectarian violence.

Conclusion

The foreign policy options and security arrangement of any country keeps on changing in tandem with varying dynamics of the region and major events taking place in a geopolitical environment. However the strings which Pakistan is weaved in with its allies shall continue to play its cords. Generations after generations and decades after decades, the Middle East and Pakistan have sought to reaffirm their fraternal ties and deep rooted relations. However, as the world squeezes to human vision it becomes more complicated and antithetical it demands concerted efforts to restrain exploding events, protection and restoration of human rights, management of natural resources and streamlining their flow. How Pakistan adopts stringent foreign policies and readjusts its posture amid a fundamental development around the world which is anathema to present military and economic powers demands a vision and a widening horizon needed to avoid biasness and maintain equilibrium. Pakistan bore brunt of negative implications of short lived policies adopted while dealing with issues across the region in particular and around the world in general. Injustice was also done while formulating the domestic economic structure that resulted in to a crippling economy and resultant stamped among the masses. It is about time Pakistan turns to a bold and swift policy to pull up its economy and gain a sustainable position around the comity of nations otherwise it is just a matter of time when it may find itself among the ranks of failing states. Individuals sitting at the helm of affairs need to shun the wrong notions and maintain a cohesive, consummate and scrupulous approach.

Pakistan, instead of vacillating between Saudi Arabia and Iran, should create a conducive environment for a rapprochement between two adversaries so that their strength must be consumed for the good of Muslim brethren. Special focus must be paid to the capacity building of Pakistan security operates so that it can skill fully deal with mounting array of threats to its national solidarity. Similarly, Pakistan should purse a neutral policy vis-à-vis Turkey's involvement in various crises in the Middle East, and particularly the Syrian crisis.

References

- Alam, Kamal. (2018, September 8). “Pak Army has Reversed Great Game”. *The News* (Karachi).
- Cohan, Eliot, et al. (2016, January/ February) “Time to Get Tough on Tehran”, *Foreign Affairs*, 95.
- Fulten, Jonathan. (2017, September 15). ”Why is Saudi Arabia’s King Spending a Month in Asia?” *Washington Post*. <http://www.washingtonpost.com>, (accessed on January 12, 2018).
- Garver, John. (2016, February 8). “China and Iran: An Emerging Partnership Post Sanctions”. *Middle East Institute*, <https://www.mei.edu>, (accessed on January 20, 2018).
- Haq, Noor-ul-. (2011). “Arabs Rise for Change”. *Islamabad Policy Research Institute*. <https://www.ipripak.org>, (accessed on February 1, 2018).
- Hussain, Aftab. (2018, April 4). “Pakistan makes new Foreign Policy Choices amid Deteriorating Ties with US”. *Times of Islamabad*.
- Humayun, Fahad. (2015, November 19). “Pakistan Middle East Problem”. *Foreign Policy*, <https://foreignpolicy.com>, (accessed on January 25, 2018).
- Issaev, Leonid, (2017, August 24). “The Russia-Saudi Rapprochement and Iran”. *Aljazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com> (accessed on February 5, 2018).
- Kissinger, Henry. (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York, America: Simon & Shuster.
- Kugler, Jack and Organski A.F.K. (1989). “The Power Transition: A Retrospective and prospective Evaluation”. *Handbook of War Studies*. 1st Edition, Ed. Midlarsky Manus. UK: Rutledge Revivals.
- Kuo, Mery A. (2018, May 30). “China-Pakistan Relations: Challenging U.S Global Leadership”. *The Diplomat*. <https://thediplomat.com>, (accessed on May 31, 2018).

- Kechichian, Joseph A. (2016, January 27). “U.S Friendship with Saudi Arabia is Stronger than Ever”. *Gulf News*. <https://gulfnews.com>, (accessed on June 1, 2018).
- Luce, Dan DE. (2016, January 18) “After Nuclear Pact, New U.S- Iran talks Bring New Deals”. *Foreign Policy*, <https://www.foriegnpolicy.com> (accessed on June 5, 2018).
- Lukin, Artyom. (2018, February 8). “Putin’s Silk Road Gamble”. *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com>, (accessed on June 10, 2018).
- Mumtaz, Kashif. (2014, December 08). “The Middle East in flux: How should Pakistan Respond?”. *Institute of Strategic Studies*. <https://www.issi.org.pk>, (accessed on June 12, 2018).
- Mazzetti Mark, et al. (2017, August 2). “Behind the Sudden Death of a \$ Billion Secret CIA War in Syria”. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com>, (accessed on June 15, 2018)
- Nadeem, Amir. (2018, April 15), “Pakistan Needs a Coherent Foreign Policy”. *Daily Times* (Karachi).
- Pakhomov, Nikolay. (2016, May 26). “Russia and Saudi Arabia are Headed for a Showdown”. *The National Interest*. <https://nationalinterest.org>, (accessed on June 20, 2018).
- Prasad, Vijay. (2016, February 1). “China’s Road to the Middle East”. *Counterpunch*, <https://www.Counterpunch.Org>. (accessed on June 25, 2018).
- Peck, Michael. (2017, March 18). “How Russia is turning Syria into a major Naval Base for Nuclear Warships and Israel is Worried?”. *The National Interest*. <https://nationalinterest.org>, (accessed on June 28, 2018).
- Pieraccini, Federico. (2017, March 11). “The Strategic Triangle that is changing the World”.

Strategic Culture Foundation.
<https://www.strategic-culture.org>, (accessed on July 5, 2018).

- Selim, Gammal M. (2016, June). “The Syria Crises and the Dynamics of a New Cold War”. *Annual Conference of the Canadian Political Science Association*. <https://www.researchgate.net>, (accessed on July 10, 2018).
- Stepanova, Ekaterina. (2016, February). “Russia in the Middle East: Back to a ‘Grand Strategy’ or enforcing Multilateralism?”. *Politique Stranger*. <https://www.ifri.org>, (accessed on July 20, 2018).
- Sussex, Matthew. (2013). “Russia’s Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity”. 2nd Edition. Book Review published in *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Volume 25, and Issue. 1.
- “Why is Russia warming up to Pakistan?” (2018, February 27). *Dawn* (Karachi).

U.S. Foreign Policy towards Middle East: A Case Study of Iraq

Muhammad Junaid Khan

M. Phil Scholar at Area Study Centre,

University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Khiljian009@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The U.S. interests in Middle East are based on geopolitics and hydrocarbon resources. Since 1990s, the U.S. has been more concerned towards Iraq owing to the presence of a strong anti-U.S. Saddam regime, its immense oil resources and its strategic location in the heart of Middle East. The major interest of the U.S. in the Middle East includes the free flow of oil without any obstructions. This vital interest has only been ensured by ousting the Saddam regime and installing a pro-US government and their permanent military-bases in Iraq. The Pentagon has allegedly used the 9/11 attacks, global war on terror, the UN inspections of weapons, Human rights of Iraqi people, sectarian violence, allegations of WMDs and the Saddam regime as pretexts to as a tool to pursue the U.S. economic, political and strategic interests in Iraq. Beside some challenges, the U.S. gets more opportunities in Iraq. The emergence of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) provides another justification for the U.S. military bases in Iraq. The U.S. takes advantage of the security threats created by such terrorist group in order to expand the war in the Middle Eastern region to maintain its sphere of influence in the region. Thus, the war gamble in Iraq was very successfully projected by the U.S. in order to keep its supremacy in the region besides ensuring free flow of oil from Middle East to the West.

Keywords: Foreign Policy, Middle East, Saddam Regime, Iran-Iraq War, Gulf War, 9/11, Iraq War and Oil Politics.

Introduction

“The current Iraqi regime has shown the power of tyranny to spread discord and violence in the Middle East. A liberated Iraq can show the power of freedom to transform that vital region, by bringing hope and progress into the lives of millions. America’s interests in security, and America’s belief in liberty, both lead in the same direction: to a free and peaceful Iraq.”

George W. Bush, February 26, 2003. (Tucker, 2010)

Since the U.S. acknowledged and assumed its position as the world’s superpower, it has given priority to the Middle East in its national interests. President Franklin Roosevelt in 1944 described Middle Eastern region as of “vital interest” to the U.S. Moreover, he resolved for the keeping peace in this region as fundamental to U.S. After the end of British rule and then in late 60s, the withdrawal of Britain from the Persian Gulf, the U.S. assumed the charge of new security sponsor of this vital region. Before getting superpower status, the U.S. achieved its objectives indirectly through proxies, but now the U.S. directly taking actions against any power or state that makes hindrance in the way of progress. However, U.S. has been maintaining peace in its own terms (Shareef M. , 2014).

Throughout the Cold War period, the U.S. only policy was to control and deter regional actors from the influence of Soviet Union. At that time, it was the U.S. foremost strategy to make friendly affairs with regional players on the one hand, and discourage states in making relation with Soviet bloc on the other hand. Throughout this turmoil, Iraq was in fluctuating relation with U.S. owing to the distinctive geopolitical situation and nature of government in Iraq. Like other States, Iraq was also the part of this regional setup and was affected by superpower contention for this region. Later than

Cold War ends, the U.S. continued this policy to avoid the rise of new regional powers with the strategy of containment, deterrence, and confrontation with those states (Shareef M. J., 2010).

A century of U.S. foreign policy towards Iraq shows some of the key interests of the U.S. that mainly includes political interests, military interests, and also most important is economic interests. Iraq is really a vital state for the U.S. in the Persian Gulf region for the free flow of oil to the international market. Moreover, Iraq also serves as a key player to stop Iranian influence in the region. The future stability of Iraq is very significant for U.S. national security interest (Telhami, 2002). Thus, U.S. can not only use Iraq as a base against Iran but also wants Iraq as a strong and unified state in the gulf region. The country that is able to have an internal security forces and effective capability of self defence. The U.S. help Iraq in improving its governance by resolving its political divisions and also move forward to build its better economic progress rather than only relying only on its oil earnings. But, as a whole, the strategic location of Iraq i.e. in the heart of the Middle East, its vast natural reservoirs of oil, gas and other minerals proved as a curse beside blessings for its people and political leaders due to foreign influence mainly United States involvement in Iraq (Ahmed, 2014).

U.S. Middle East Policy

The U.S. has long been interested in the Middle East and its appearance has been most effectively developed since the Cold War came to an end. Following the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. engagement in the region grew even more preeminent. The U.S. interest in the present time has been divided into five main areas: first the U.S. concern in the Middle Eastern region is to safeguard the free flow of oil. Secondly, the U.S. wants to prevent nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. Third, US

involvement is about combating terrorism there. Fourthly, US assure the security of Israel and fifth, promoting democratization in the entire Middle Eastern region. Iran, the ISIS, and al-Qaida pose serious threat to the vital interests of the U.S. in the region, however the U.S. portray that threat is more overstated but in fact many interests of the U.S. in the region is at a very little risk. US leaders have affirmed a numerous important American interests in this vital Middle Eastern region. These includes historical as well as present key interests in the region, however the U.S. administration have more concern about guaranteeing the free flow of oil and the security of Israel. The U.S. has further expressed intense desire to prevent more nuclear proliferation inside the Middle East region, and since the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. top priority is on counterterrorism. Moreover, spread of democracy in the region is also includes in the main agendas of the U.S. in the Middle Eastern region (Byman, 2016).

U.S.-Iraq Relations

The International Order after the World War-II (WW-II) and with the beginning of the Cold War drew the attention of the U.S. into a political relationship with Iraq in order to stop the spread of communalism in this region. The U.S. also takes active measures to resolve the First Arab-Israel Conflict of 1948. It helped Iraqi government by providing economic and military aid to stabilize the region. The relationship between United State and that of Iraq severed in 1967 when the Iraqi government found that U.S. helped Israeli military in the so-called Six Day War of 1967. Thus, Iraq in 1970 with a collaboration of Soviet Union by developed its oil capacity and started nationalization of Iraqi oil. The step taken by Iraqi government had directly threatened the U.S. political and economic interests in Iraq as well as in the region.

The U.S. again built its relation with Iraq in 1979 when a secular leader Saddam Hussein came to power in Baghdad. On the other side, In Iran, where Ayatollah Khomeini overthrows the U.S. backed Shah Regime. He also has the intensions to extent his revolutionary ideas throughout the region and was opposed to the U.S. presence in this region. He has the intentions to spread his revolutionary ideas across the region. Saddam Hussein in order to save his regime and by seizing vital geographic areas in the Persian Gulf attacked Iran in September 1980. Saddam expected a short war due to weak Iranian military after revolution but the war entangled into a rough deadlock. They attacked each other economic facilities and major cities that caused more than one million casualties and other billions of economic loss counted together at the end of war in 1988. Throughout this 8-year war, Iraq was politically and militarily supported by U.S. in order to contain Iranian expansionism and its anti-American ideology.

Saddam Hussein once again to seek economic gains ordered a military action against small neighboring state, Kuwait in August 1990. He blamed Kuwait for slant drilling of oil into Iraq's territory and also claimed of Kuwait as a part of Iraq decades before. He took decision in a hope to capture Kuwait's oil reservoirs that might relieve the financial burdens occurred in Iran-Iraq war. However, Saddam Hussein again expected the U.S. support in this war. The American ambassador clarified their intentions that "we have no opinion on Arab-Arab conflicts" and also deals Iraq with a friendly term (Hahn, 2012).

In August 1990, Iraq started its full-scale war against Kuwait the United Nation Security Council (UNSC) passed resolutions against this action. The UNSC also imposed economic sanctions on Iraq. The United Nations (UN) gave a deadline to Iraq for the withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait but Saddam refused and carried out military strikes on Kuwait's financial assets.

The UN authorized to make “use of all necessary means” to compel Iraq military from Kuwait. In 1991, U.S.-led coalition forces started a huge scale of missile strikes and aerial bombing. Saddam Hussein used Kuwaiti civilians, in military and industrial areas, as human shields.

On March 1991, the UNSC passed a resolution containing the ceasefire terms including, Iraq to disclose all its information relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) and nuclear facilities to UN-led inspection team. Iraq accepted all the ceasefire terms and accepts the responsibility of damage and casualties occurs in this war (Saddam’s Iraq: Key events). After 9/11 episode, relations between the U.S. and Iraq further deteriorated and the U.S. declared global war against terrorism. Under Bush administration, Saddam Hussein and his regime was portrayed as a serious threat for U.S. as well as for the entire region because of his intentions to restore WMDs program and military expansionism.

Thus, the propaganda was launched through media against Saddam and his rouge regime in 2003. Thus, in a favorable scenario the U.S.-led coalition force attacked Iraq. After several weeks of fighting, the U.S. was successful by demolishing Saddam from Power. The U.S. faced a challenge of insurgency across the country. The U.S. lifted all its economic sanctions against Iraq. The U.S. also started economic dealing with Iraq including purchasing of arms from any state. Numbers of democratic elections were held under the supervision of the U.S. that agitated the Sectarian violence between Shiite and Sunnis by attacking each other’s religious places in early 2007. Thus, the U.S. by taking advantage of this insurgency brought about 30,000 more military forces and justified their presence in Iraq. The U.S. President George W. Bush said, “Iraq has gone from a brutal dictatorship and a sworn enemy of America to an Arab democracy at the heart of the

Middle East and a friend of the United States.” (Donnelly, 2013).

President Barrack Obama after taking office in early 2009 announced the extraction of U.S. military from Iraq by giving military training to Iraqi Security Force (ISF). With threat of Iranian influence and other sectarian conflicts, the ISF support for some presence of the U.S. military in Iraq. Thus, in 2011, the U.S. official stated that it would keep its military presence nearly about 35,000 in the Persian Gulf region to keep the situation control in Iraq (Hahn, 2012). In 2014, the Sunni extremist group named, the ISIS emerged and declared caliphate in Iraq and Syria that created a risk to Iraq and the entire Middle East region. Thus, it gives a moral justification of US military presence in Iraq to contain the threat posed by this militant organization.

U.S. Interests in Iraq

“Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.” President Jimmy Carter, State of the Union address, January 23, 1980. (Jones, 2012).

Iraq plays a very important role in the contemporary International Politics, mainly because of its strategic position in Middle East region. It comprises of about 168, 868 square miles territory along with 36 miles long coastline in the strategic Persian Gulf. This coastline gives a significant economic gateway for trade and transportation across the region. Moreover, Iraq also contains as a 2nd largest oil resources in the world. If Iraq develops its oil infrastructure, it has the capacity to challenge Saudi Arabia for the sponsor of stability of oil prices in the world (The US Occupation of Iraq: An Overview, May, 2004).

Beside oil, Iraq also contains gas reservoirs and other minerals like iron, phosphate and sulfur. The Tigris and Euphrates are the two main rivers flowing across central Iraq towards the south-east. The Tigris flows from Syria and Turkey while Euphrates River enters Iraq from Syria. These two rivers unite in the south-eastern Iraq into Shatt Al-Arab River, which makes 120 miles long border between Iraq and Iran. Another territory of Iraq mainly consists of plains, mountains and deserts. There is also ethno-religious diversity in Iraq. The ethnic groups consist of majority Arabs, in which there are 60% Shiite Arab and 20% Sunni Arab, 18% Kurdish, Turkmen, Assyrian or other 2% (Harris).

Summing up, in the twentieth century the U.S. main political and economic interest was the flow of Middle Eastern oil and protecting the safety not only of Iraq but of the whole Persian Gulf region. However, the chief interests of the U.S. in Iraq is broadly divided into three main parts; economic interest to trans-nationalize the Iraq's economy, political interest of installing a democratic pro-U.S. ally in the state and to attain a permanent bases for military presence in Iraq (Stokes, 2009).

U.S. Strategic Interests in Iraq

One of the central objectives of the U.S. military incursion in Iraq was to reorganize Iraq politically from the Saddam Hussein as a "rouge leader". Saddam Hussein posed grave threat and challenge U.S. political interests in Iraq. As long as Saddam Hussein served best interest to United States in the region he was supported by U.S. administration politically and militarily. As like in the case of Iraq-Iran war the Saddam forces were provided assistance relating to war in order to contain the Iran expansionist policy towards Iraq that threatens U.S. interests there (Murray, 2009).

When Saddam policies were seemingly changed that not served the interest of the U.S., the U.S. took military action against him and toppled his regime in 2003. U.S. administration lost all its faith with Saddam Hussein because of his anti-U.S. policies. He used oil as a weapon by turning its taps on and off in order to damage oil prices. Moreover, he also had the intentions to remove oil from international market for a short period of time, which directly posed a grave threat to the United States interests (Duffield, 2005).

A democratic and pro-American government in Iraq would become serve the best American interests in the free flow of oil from the Middle Eastern region. The U.S. would be the main player as a sponsor of oil stability by making alliance with Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Iraq, as both are oil-rich States of the globe (McMillan, 2006). Thus, by installing a pro-American government in Iraq, there would be no hurdles in free flow of oil to the world. It would maintain the oil prices stable and served an opportunity for American supremacy in the 21st Century.

Another major political interest of U.S. is limiting the influence of Iran in Iraq. Iran, in post Saddam era, has placed itself as a grave menace to American national interests in Iraq. The main goal of Iran is to limit the American influence in Iraq. Moreover, Iran had also intentions to weaken Iraq that is subordinate to it. Iran wants to position itself as the only authority in the region by supplanting the U.S. as the regional power. Thus, Iran uses its power of Diplomatic, Information, Military, and Economic (DIME) as strategy to influence in Iraq. Thus, the United States gives training and arms to the ISF that are including as a counter strategy to minimize the influence of Iran in Iraq (Eisenstadt, 2011). Due to Iraq strategic location and one of the oil-rich states in the centre of Middle East, the U.S. did not want to pull out its entire military from Iraq. By doing so, it might threaten American economic and political

interest in this vital region. After Saudi Arabia, Iraq is the only country that gives a safe and justified military bases to the United States. A permanent military presence in Iraq serves American to extract more oil without any obstructions (Telhami, 2002).

The Bush administration, with regards to troop withdrawal from Iraq, had talked broadly but in fact the Pentagon builds more permanent military bases throughout Iraq. The U.S. instigate a “surge” of additional about 30,000 armed forces, brought the figure of 138,000 in 2004-2006 to a high of about 170,000 in early 2007, in order to suppress the insurgent movements (Katzman, 2014). In recent, the U.S. taking advantage of the fear arising from Islamic extremist groups that further justified the surge of additional U.S. forces in Iraq. The Obama administration announced withdrawal of troops by giving training to ISF. But with the approaching of final withdrawal deadline, the fear of rising Iranian influence in Iraq and other Islamic extremist groups give space to some American forces remained in Iraq (Cordesman, 2013).

U.S. Economic Interests in Iraq

The Iraq contains world’s second largest oil reserves and has vital geo-strategic location in the world map. It creates links between Asia, Europe, Arabia and North Africa that attracted the U.S. involvement in Iraq. However, the most vital interest of United State in Iraq is globalizing the political economy of Iraq under the supreme hegemony of the United States. Its invasion in Iraq was also for the free flow of Iraqi oil into the global markets that might benefit the U.S. and the British oil companies and to regulate the oil prices under American control. Saddam Hussein privatized Iraqi oil and used his own export plan in order to manipulate international oil markets. He used the oil as weapon that directly threatens the U.S. economic interest. The U.S.

administration conducted an immediate policy review towards Saddam and his regime using military, economic and diplomatic measures (Hinnebusch, 2007).

In recent, this key interest of the U.S. is being fulfilled in the form of Production Sharing Agreement (PSA). The contract, which is between Western oil companies and the State of Iraq, permits for private exploration and oil extraction in Iraq by giving some share of revenue to host State. PSAs basically served as a legal authorization that the State of Iraq can maintain the national sovereignty on its oil reservoirs but in actual the Western oil corporations has effective control over these oil productions and gain profits (Tyagi, 2019).

Beside economic interest of oil, the U.S. has provided large sum of weapons to Iraqi military against insurgency and other Islamic extremist groups. It is a boon for American military-industrial complex. Iraq was provided with massive arms supply. The U.S. also shared its intelligence with Saddam in Iran-Iraq war. In recent, the U.S. provided 140 M1 A1 Abrams tanks and two supportive ships by United States Navy to help out Iraq in securing its coastal areas and its offshore oil platforms. The U.S. also sold its 36 F-16s combat aircraft to Iraq, which cost is up to \$6.5 billion. Other war related equipment included 681 stringers, Stryker nuclear, biological and chemical equipment investigation vehicles (Katzman, 2015).

Challenges for U.S. in Iraq

The ISIS, led by “Abu Bakr Al Baghdadi” as the “commander of the faithful”, announced a caliphate in Iraq and Syria since 2013. It is an international Sunni Islamist Insurgent and radical group that claims Islamic rule of caliphate across the Islamic world. The Islamic State had also captured some part of Iraq and Syria, by

threatening the entire Middle East area (Humud, 2018). A major question is that, whether the Islamic State organization has aspiration to directly threaten American homeland security, the United States personnel or facilities in and outside the region, or it is a danger to several American allies in the Middle Eastern region.

Since 2014, the Islamic State (IS) advanced its control along the Tigris and Euphrates rivers and captured Mosul. The I.S. massacred Iraqi adversaries, citizens often from racial and religious minorities and killed a number of U.S. hostages that include citizens. The Organization further goals and tactics raised U.S. attentions to save its vital interests. Washington in September 2014 declared a number of measures indented to “degrade and ultimately destroy” the organization of ISIS. The U.S. has provided 3,100 armed forces to advice and trains ISF, the Kurdish *Peshmerga* and others forces including some Sunni tribal troops. The U.S. also carried out airstrikes on Islamic State positions and facilities in Iraq. About 820 U.S. military personnel in Baghdad and Irbil are protecting the American Embassy and other facilities (Blanchard, 2018).

Dealing with Iran is one the most crucial challenge for United States. The National Security Council in 2006 states that, “We may face no greater challenge from a single country than from Iran.” (Amuzegar, 2014). After the Saddam’s regime demise, Iran has placed itself as a key actor to lessen American control in Iraq and in the area. Iran threatens American interest with its nuclear program and also it sponsor state terrorism by providing assistance to anti-American faction. There is a clear indication of Iran support to the insurgent militia groups attacking U.S. troops in Iraq. Both U.S. and Iran wants control over Iraq and Middle East natural resources.

Iran through its revolutionary Islamic ideology wants to dominate over the region. Iraq's Shiite sect that is in majority also gives opportunity to Iran for dominant position. Iran supports to the insurgent and militias groups functioning in Iraq. These groups opposed military presence of United States in Iraq by attacking U.S. military personnel and facilities. Iran by using its "Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force (IRGC-QF)" to train, equip and providing arms to these insurgent militias. These militias include the Salam Brigades, Badr group, Asaeb Ahl-e-Al Haq and Khata'ib Hezbollah and the Promised Day Brigades (Eisenstadt, 2011).

Opportunities for U.S. In Iraq

The United States involvement in Iraq offers the opportunity of its vital geo-strategic position in the region. Military bases in Iraq also enabled the U.S. hegemony to further its supremacy in the Middle Eastern region, Africa and Central Asia. Moreover, United States presence in Iraq also insures the security and defence of Israel, which is the major ally of the U.S. in the region. The United States military presence in the State of Iraq also keeps an eye on Syria that is considered as hostile regime by U.S. and Israel (Lieberfeld, 2005).

One of the opportunities for the United States in Iraq is Arms sales to Iraq to make stronger Iraqi military against the Islamic extremist groups and insurgency there. The U.S. has provided massive arms supply to Iraq that includes 140 M1 A1 Abrams tanks of which Iraq had paid \$800 million with their national funds. The U.S. Navy provided two assistance ships in order to help military of Iraq to attack rapidly that includes patrol boats to defend its offshore oil platforms. Iraq had paid \$600 million for RAPISCAN system vehicles that help Iraq's security forces to limit the capability of terrorist

groups and insurgent to cross Iraq's territory and checkpoints.

The U.S. sold 36 F-16 fighting aircrafts to Iraq worth of \$6.5 billion. Moreover, Iraq had also purchased the "Integrated Air Defence System and Apache attack helicopters" as well as 681 Stringer, three Hawk anti-aircraft batteries and other combating equipment with a value of \$2.4 billion. Additional arms sale worth of \$2.3 billion to Iraqi government that consist of "Stryker nuclear, biological and chemical equipment inspection vehicles, 12 Bell helicopters and the Mobile Troposcatter Radio system" that is a boon for American military-industrial complex (Katzman, 2015).

The IS, beside challenge to the U.S., also provides opportunity for the U.S. in promoting "divide and rule" policy in Iraq and also in the entire Middle Eastern region. The IS, as a new global threat, create a cause and validation for American intervention in Iraq and in the region on humanitarian grounds. Their goal is to use religion, increase sectarian conflict, undermine the region of the Middle East and provides a ground for the U.S. presence in Iraq as well as in the region. Pentagon has started hundreds of airstrikes against this militant group, the ISIL in Iraq and Syria, which is regarded as strategy of the U.S. to broaden its power in this area and also to protect American personnel inside the country (Hidayat, 2015).

The successive administration in the U.S. allegedly used the IS terrorists pretext as re-assert its influence over the resources of Iraq. Thus, U.S. exploiting the threat posed by the IS terrorist group to expand its power in the Middle Eastern region and to "create more fear" in the world (US uses ISIL to 'create fear, wage wars', 2014).

Conclusion

Saddam's reign in Iraq had granted an apparent challenge to U.S. domination in the region. Saddam Hussein Wanted to control over oil resources by his aggression of Kuwait. Those intentions of Saddam were against the interests of U.S. Secondly, U.S. would like to use Iraq as an everlasting military base for its military in the Middle Eastern region. Moreover, the region of Middle East is strategically so crucial that its presence in the heart of the oil rich region i.e. Iraq, is very compulsory for U.S. interests. So far, the U.S. has been succeeded in war gamble by achieving its vital objectives. The main goal that the U.S. "war gamble" tried to attain is the constant flow of the Middle Eastern oil without any obstruction and safeguarding the U.S. political predominance in the Middle Eastern region.

The U.S. invasion in Iraq and its military presence till now is not considered as an illogical blunder but in fact it is completely logical in which high-stakes "war gamble" was planned in order to safeguard its vital interests not only from Iraq but in the entire Middle East region. However, the main interest of US in Iraq is the free flow of oil without any obstructions by installing a pro-US government and their military bases ensures that vital interest. The Pentagon used 9/11, global war on terror, the UN weapons inspection, WMDs, human rights of Iraqi people , Saddam Hussein as a 'rogue leader' and in recent the ISIS phenomenon, as a tool to pursue their economic, political and strategic interests in Iraq. Beside some challenges the U.S. get more opportunities in Iraq. The emergence of the IS provides justification for their military bases. The U.S. exploiting the danger created by the IS terrorist group to expand the war in the Middle East region and to create more fear among world that serve their interests best. Thus, the war gamble in Iraq was very successfully projected by U.S. in order to keep its supremacy in this vital region along with the constant internationalization of the oil-rich Middle Eastern political economies.

Reintegration of Iraq into the Middle Eastern politics and also its capability and strength in the international politics as a middle power will be more strengthened by the partnership with the U.S.

References:

- Ahmed, Nafeez. (2014, March 14). "Iraq Invasion was about Oil". *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/>, (accessed on August 20, 2019).
- Amuzegar, Jahangir. (2014). *The Islamic Republic of Iran: Reflections on an Emerging Economy*. New York: Routledge.
- Blanchard, Christopher M. and Humud, Carla E. (2018, September 25). "The Islamic State and U.S. Policy". *Congressional Research Service*. <https://fas.org/>, (accessed on September 15, 2019).
- Byman, Daniel L. and Moller, Sara B. (2016, December). "The United States and the Middle East: Interests, Risks, and Costs". *The Tobin Project*. <https://www.tobinproject.org/>, (accessed on August 12, 2019).
- Cordesman, Anthony H. and Khazai, Sam. (2013, June 12). "Shaping Iraq's Security Forces". *Center for Strategic and International Studies*. <https://www.csis.org/>, (accessed on September 20, 2019).
- Cordesman, Anthony H. (2019, February 12). "The Strategy the U.S. Should Pursue in Iraq". *Center for Strategic and International Studies*. <https://www.csis.org/>, (accessed on September 21, 2019).
- Donnelly, Faye. (2013, January). *Securitization and the Iraq War: The Rules of Engagement in World Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Duffield, John S. (2005, June). "Oil and the Iraq War: How the United States Could Have Expected to Benefit, and Might Still". *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, Volume 9, Issue 2.

- <https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/>, (accessed on August 25, 2019).
- Eisenstadt, Michael. et al. (2011, April). "Iran's Influence in Iraq: Countering Tehran's Whole-of-Government Approach.". *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*. <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/>, (accessed on August 28, 2019).
 - Hahn, Peter. (2012, April). "A Century of U.S. Relations with Iraq". *Origins: Current Events in Historical Perspective*, Volume 5 and Issue no. 7. <https://origins.osu.edu/>, (accessed on September 22, 2019).
 - Harris, Amy. (2018, March 15). "What are the Important Landforms or Bodies of Water in Iraq?". *USA TODAY*. <https://traveltips.usatoday.com/>, (accessed on August 28, 2019).
 - Hidayat, Syarif. (2014, December 15). "The US uses ISIS to "Divide and rule" Middle East and Muslim World". *World Press*. <https://hshidayat.wordpress.com/>, (accessed on September 28, 2019).
 - Hinnebusch, Raymond. (2007, October 01). "The US Invasion of Iraq: Explanations and Implications". *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies*, Volume 16, Issue 3, 209-288. <https://www.tandfonline.com/>, (accessed on September 14, 2019).
 - Humud, Carla E. and Blanchard, Christopher M. (2018, September 25). "The Islamic State and U.S. Policy". *Congressional Research Service*. <https://fas.org/>, (accessed on September 15, 2019).
 - Jones, Toby C. (2012, June 01). "America, Oil, and War in the Middle East". *Journal of American History*, Volume 99, Issue 1, 208-218. <https://academic.oup.com/>, (accessed on September 29, 2019).
-

- Kagan, Dr. Kimberly. (2015, September 16). "The U.S. Role and Strategy in the Middle East: Syria, Iraq, and the Fight Against ISIS". *Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*. <http://www.understandingwar.org/>, (accessed on September 18, 2019).
- Katzman, Kenneth. (2014, July 2). "Iraq: Politics, Governance, and Human Rights". *Congressional Research Service*. <https://www.refworld.org/>, (accessed on September 16, 2019).
- Katzman, Kenneth. (2015, June 22). "Iraq: Politics, Security, and U.S. Policy". *Congressional Research Service*. <https://www.refworld.org/>, (accessed on September 17, 2019).
- Lieberfeld, Daniel. (2005,). "Theories of conflict and the Iraq war". *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Volume10 Issue 2, 1-21. <https://www.jstor.org/>, (accessed on September 12, 2019).
- McMillan, Joseph. (2006, January 1). "Saudi Arabia and Iraq: Oil, Religion, and an Enduring Rivalry". *United States Institute of Peace*. <https://www.usip.org/>, (accessed on September 03, 2019).
- Murray, Williamson, et al. (2009). "Saddam's War: An Iraqi Military Perspective of the Iran-Iraq War". *Institute for National Strategic Studies, NDU*. <https://ndupress.ndu.edu/>, (accessed on September 3, 2019).
- "Saddam's Iraq: Key events". *BBC News*. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/>, (accessed on August 5, 2019).
- Shareef, Mohammed. (2014, February 20). *The United States, Iraq and the Kurds: Shock, Awe and Aftermath*. New York: Routledge.

- Shareef, Mohammed and Jalal, Majeed. (2010, December 6). "President George W. Bush's Policy Towards Iraq: Change or Continuity?". *Doctoral dissertation, University of Durham*. <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/> (accessed on August 15, 2019).
- Stokes, Doug. (2009, March 25). "The War Gamble: Understanding US interests in Iraq". *Globalizations*, Volume 6, Issue 1, 107-112. <https://www.tandfonline.com/>, (accessed on August 27, 2019).
- Telhami, Shibley. (2002, March 1). "The Persian Gulf: Understanding the American Oil Strategy". *The Brookings Review*, Volume 20 Issue 2, 32. <https://www.brookings.edu/>, (accessed on August 19, 2019).
- "The U.S. Occupation of Iraq: An Overview" (2004, June). *Harvard Initiative for Peace and Justice*. <http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/>, (accessed on August 24, 2019).
- Tucker, Spencer. C. (2010, October). *The Encyclopedia of Middle East Wars: The United States in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq Conflicts*. California: ABC CLIO.
- Tyagi, Tal. (2019, May 6). "The Iraq War Was Not About Oil". *Quillette*. <https://quillette.com/>, (accessed on August 29, 2019).

Pak-Japan Relations: Connecting Far East with Middle East

Mansoor Ahmed

Assistant Professor, Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.
qaumansoor@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Historically, Pak-Japan relations can be traced back to the early years of 6th Century A.D. when the hallowed Gandhara Civilisation served as a source of Buddhist religious influence in Japan where Buddhism reached during the 5th to 6th Century via China and Korea. Right after the Second World War (WW-II) when Japan was shattered with the horrific experiences of war, the newly independent state of Pakistan became one of its key trade partners. In 1948, Japan concluded its first post-war trade accord with Pakistan and established its first outside trading liaison agency in Karachi. The independence of Pakistan and the revival of Japan's post-war economy were two major developments in Asia. The establishment of diplomatic ties and extension of trade between them were the likely consequences of the interplay of financial forces and the complementary nature of the two nations. Pakistan is well-off in human and energy resources but it lacks efficient planning and management to fully utilize them. The socio-economic troubles and the profound structural problems have also contributed minimizing the mobilization of raw materials and resources. Japan has historically been interested to share its experiences of development with Pakistan to move forward towards a socio-economic development model. Geographically, Pakistan is a bridge between the

Far East and the Middle East. This article critically analyses on the politico-economic, strategic and cultural relations of Pakistan with Japan to envisage the future dynamics of their relations in the complex strategic environment of the Asia-Pacific region as well as the emerging regional environment in the Middle East vis-à-vis CPEC and the subsequent rise of China in the oil-rich region from where Japan imports almost 70-80 percent of its oil.

Key Words: Bilateral Relations, Far East, Middle East, Trade, Cultural Ties, Strategic and Military Relations.

Introduction

Pakistan established very cordial bilateral relations with Japan soon after its inception on the world map as a sovereign country in 1947. Pakistan stood up for Japan to restore its post-war political sovereignty when Japan was emerging from a difficult period after the end of the ruinous WW-II in 1945. Virtually, Japan remained under the Allied Powers occupation since the end of the cataclysmic WWII in 1945 until early 1952. Under the post-war occupation Japan revived again on the world map as an advance democratic and economically powerful state by shunning its long-running strategic aspirations and adopting the Western economic model of free market. The Communist takeover of mainland China after the heartrending Civil War and the Cold War's Domino Theory factor were the instrumental dynamics that caused the 'reverse course' in the Allied policies towards the defeated Japan. The U.S. occupying forces led by General Douglas MacArthur compellingly amended the constitution of the imperialist Japan by introducing massive politico-economic, military and social reforms owing to which Japan emerged as the fastest growing economy at the international level. Pakistan profoundly values its bilateral relations with

Japan as it is world's third largest economy after the U.S. and China and a member of vital and prestigious international organizations like the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), G-20 and G8/7. Pakistan strongly supported Japan to be an observer state in the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Today, Japan is an important trade partner of Pakistan in East Asia and a significant source of foreign investment. Different factors and issues like economic development, global warming, poverty alleviation, education, health, development of the social sector, continuation of democracy, de-nuclearization of South Asia, and terrorism have mostly remained as converging forces rather than diverging forces in the normalized relations between Pakistan and Japan.

Historical Analysis

In September 1951, Pakistan was one of the signatory states among the fifty-two nations that met in the U.S. city of San Francisco to deliberate the final terms and conditions of the peace treaty (Treaty of San Francisco) with Japan. The aforementioned peace treaty along with the Security Treaty officially ended the WW-II and enforced the San Francisco System in Japan that ushered in a new era of bilateral relations between the USA and Japan. The US-Japan Security Treaty signed in 1960 allowed the indefinite presence of round 260,000 U.S. troops at around 3000 military bases across Japan to disarm the Japanese imperial army and protect it from external aggression (Packard, 2010). Presently, Japan still hosts more than 50,000 U.S military personnel under the aforesaid treaty. The absolute monarchy was abolished in Japan and Japanese Emperor renounced its all executive in favor of a democratic regime. The military industries

and military manpower were converted into industrial labour force (Minami, 1986). Pakistan was the only major country from South Asia invited in the San Francisco Peace Conference where Pakistan's first Foreign Minister Sir Zafarullah Khan made an historical speech in the favor of Japan by stating that "the peace treaty with Japan should be premised on justice and reconciliation, not on oppression and vengeance." In 1948, trade offices were opened in Karachi and Tokyo prior to formal ambassadorial relations. In the initial days Pakistan exported cotton and jute while in return imported textile machinery from Japan. Although the Cold War overwhelmingly affected the regional politics in Asia, but both Pakistan and Japan allied themselves with the Western bloc led by the USA and did not develop any major divergence in their bilateral relations except the China factor which lingered on and haunted their relations throughout the Cold War period. Pakistan dragged itself closer to the People's Republic of China due to the strained relations of latter with India, the sworn enemy of Pakistan.

Political and Diplomatic Relations

Pakistan vigorously supported the case of Japan for the United Nations (UN) membership which further nourished the embryonic trade relations into diplomatic relations. Pakistan and Japan established their formal diplomatic relations on 28th April, 1952 and since then both countries have strengthened their economic and cultural relations to the highest levels. During the early 1950s, Pakistan donated tens of thousands tons of rice to Japan as the latter was short of foodstuffs (Shaikh and Kanasro, 2002). Historically, China and the East Pakistan Crisis remained the only irritants that occasionally caused disturbance in Pak-Japan bilateral relations. During the 1960s Japan didn't grant landing rights to the Pakistani

flights traveling through Chinese mainland. The Japanese political parties adopted a pro-Bangladeshi stance during the East Pakistan Crisis in 1971 when Pakistan was facing a secessionist movement in its eastern wing (now Bangladesh) while the Japanese regime suspended all kinds of aid to Pakistan and formally recognized Bangladesh within two months of its independence. Interestingly, the successive Japanese governments have maintained a neutral policy over the Kashmir issue, the bone of contention between Pakistan and India, the nuclear-armed rivals in South Asia. But regular high-level visits between the two countries manifest the strong dynamics of their bilateral relations. Japanese Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi undertook the first high-level visit to Pakistan in May 1957 while President Ayub Khan was the first Pakistani head of state who visited Japan in 1960, followed by the Japanese Premier Ikeda's visit to Pakistan in 1961. During Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's regime, the Pak-Japan bilateral relations hit their lowest ebb owing to the socialist policies of Z. A Bhutto regime, however, steady rapprochement occurred during the military rule of General Zia-ul-Haq when the Japanese trade interests were at risk due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and its strategic ambitions to reach the warm waters of the Indian Ocean, threatening Japan's energy lanes passing from the Gulf countries. During the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Japan doubled its economic assistance to Pakistan. To deal with the Soviet imminent threat in the region, President Zia visited Japan in July 1983, followed by Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone visit in May 1984. In 1989, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto attended the funeral of Japanese Emperor Hirohito whereas Premier Toshiki Kaifu visited Pakistan in May 1990. Former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and his successor Benazir Bhutto visited Japan in 1991 and 1996 respectively. During the 1990s, Pakistan's nuclear ambitions perturbed Pak-Japan's relations as

Japan is earnestly vying for a nuclear-free world since its two major cities were ruined by US nuclear bombs in the WW-II. In the aftermath of nuclear tests in 1998, like U.S. and Japan also imposed economic sanctions on Pakistan due to its anti-nuclear stance at the global level by canceling the loan and grant aid. Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori visited Pakistan in August 2000 which was instrumental in rekindling the frozen relations. Moreover, the tragic 9/11 attacks revitalized their cold relations. President Musharraf visited Japan in March 2002 while Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi paid an important visit to Pakistan in 2005 mainly focusing on the economic ties. Japan deleted the economic sanctions on Pakistan over its nuclear tests during Prime Minister Koizumi visit to Islamabad (Financial Times, 2005). Japan has been a staunch supporter of the restoration of full-fledged democracy in Pakistan. It enthusiastically welcomed the restitution of democracy in 2008. It not only hosted the Friends of Democratic Pakistan and Donors Conference in Tokyo in early 2009 but also pledged one billion dollar during the conference (Pakistan's Embassy in Tokyo, 2017). Nevertheless, the U.S.-supported Indian-specific concession at the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) set off alarm bells in Pakistan's diplomatic relations with Japan. Despite of the contemporary ups and downs in Pak-Japan relations, the former President Asif Ali Zardari visited Japan twice in 2009 and 2011 while the Japanese government is working to materialize an official visit of the incumbent Prime Minister Shinzo Abe to Pakistan (The Express Tribune, 2015). Pakistan and Japan share the common stance over the United Nations reform to make it more effective to respond the mushrooming global challenges but slightly differ over the expansion of the UN Security Council, the executive body of the UN. The last high-level interaction between Japan and Pakistan occurred in September 2013 on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly meeting in New York, where

both leaders expressed their commitment to develop a ‘New Partnership’ in their cordial bilateral relations including the developing of a common stance over the UN reform (The News, 2015). The several state-level visits have provided impetus to the strong diplomatic and political ties between the two countries. As a sincere friend of Pakistan, Japan generously came forward to help Pakistan after the catastrophic deluge of 2010. Before this, Japan also helped Pakistan after the earth-shattering earthquake of 2005. Emergency grant, relief goods as well as air lift activities by Japan Self-Defense Force and medical support were provided to the flood-affected areas of South Punjab (Japan Embassy in Pakistan, 2017). Japan deeply values its diplomatic relations with Pakistan and deems Pakistan to be part of Middle Eastern and South Asian diplomacy due to its significant geo-strategic position that connects the Middle East with the rest of Asia (Malik, 2015). Pakistan and Japan interact through high-level dialogues including political consultation among top echelon, Foreign Minister’s Meeting, government-business dialogue, high level economic dialogue and security dialogue.

Pak-Japan Bilateral Institutional Mechanisms

S. No	Institutional Mechanism
01	Security Dialogue
02	Annual Bilateral Political Consultation
03	Expert-level Working Group on Disarmament and Nonproliferation
04	Official-level on Export Controls
05	High Level Economic Policy Dialogue
06	Expert-level Working Group on Counterterrorism Cooperation

Table 01: Source: Pakistan Embassy Tokyo

Economic and Trade Relations

Japan, the third largest economy of the world, has achieved outstanding economic growth in the second half

of the Twentieth Century despite of the fact that 50 percent of its industries were in ruins during the WW-II. Pakistan's strategic coastline starting from the northern lip of the Strait of Hormuz is very important for Japan to secure its sea lanes touching the Gwadar deep-sea port and Karachi Port in the Arabian Sea of the Indian Ocean. Stability and development of Pakistan is necessary to secure the sea routes between Japan and Middle East. Japan and Pakistan share common interests through commerce and trade since the end of the WW-II. Pakistan and Japan have developed extraordinary economic relations since 1950s through different economic and trade fora like Pakistan-Japan Business Forum and Pakistan-Japan Ministerial Commission. Japan was the first country to forge bilateral trade agreement with Pakistan after the WW-II. The economic ties precede all other bilateral ties as the Japan signed its first postwar trade agreement with Pakistan in May 1948 when Japan needed jute and cotton from Pakistan for its textile industry. Pakistan extended its help to Japan by exporting raw cotton and importing spinning machinery which was helpful in developing Pakistan's primitive textile industry (Shaikh, Kanasro, 2002). Besides that, the third overseas branch of Tokyo Bank was established in Karachi in 1953. The second office of the Japan External Trade Organization was also set up in Karachi, then capital of Pakistan (Farooqui, 2012). Pakistan was the first country to recognize the Japanese Overseas Agency that helped Japan to reopen its overseas trade. Pakistan-Japan Treaty of Friendship and Commerce was signed in 1960 that mutually granted the most favored treatment on trade and entry of their nationals (Shaikh, Kanasro, 2002). Pakistan also received massive economic assistance from Japan during its early industrialization process in the 1960s. Initially Pakistan received US\$20 million loan from Japan in this regard while by the end of 1961, 46 training facilities and 16 experts were provided as part of the

technical assistance program which were utilized in the fields of agriculture and textile industry (Pakistan's Ministry of Finance, 1962). Pakistan was the major recipient of the Official Development Assistance (ODA) and by 1964 it received 80 Percent of the total ODA disbursements. Withal, Pakistan received massive economic aid from Japan during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1980s. Apprehended of the Soviet ideological and territorial expansionism, Japan multiplied its grants to Pakistan during the 1980s. Since early 1950s, Japan has extended grant assistance of around US\$2.6 billion and provided loan assistance of over US\$7.94 billion to Pakistan besides dispatching 1400 experts to Pakistan and receiving more than 5200 government workers from Pakistan (Japan International Cooperation Agency, 2013). Presently, Japan is the second largest donor to Pakistan after the USA (Japan's Embassy in Pakistan, 2017). Japan Pakistan Business Cooperation Committee (JPBCC) was established in 1984 by the Japanese companies and Pakistan Japan Business Forum (PJBF) was established in 2001 by the Pakistani companies for the purpose of accelerating the business relationship between the two countries.

**Japan's Economic Aid to Pakistan during 1980-88
(US\$ Million)**

1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
112.42	117.72	95.28	91.28	67.03	93.31	151.56	126.69	302.17

Table 02: Source: Official Development Assistance (Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

After the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, the USA and its Western allies abandoned Pakistan which became non-essential for them until the shocking terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. During the whole 1990s, Japan remained the biggest source of the economic assistance to Pakistan, providing loans, grants and technical assistance as Japan transformed itself from a

developing state into a developed state by learning lessons from the tragic experiences. Various mega projects in Pakistan including Indus Highway (connecting Karachi and Peshawar) and the Kohat Tunnel (Pak-Japan Friendship Tunnel) were completed with the help of Japan. Currently there are around 70 Japanese multi-national companies operating in Pakistan. Japan has also shown its keen interest in the Karachi Circular Railway, the mass transit project in the largest city of Pakistan. According to the sitting Japanese Ambassador, Japan has helped in the construction of Pakistan Institute of Medical Sciences (PIMS) in Islamabad and Child Health Institute in Karachi. Japan has also helped to build more than 500 schools in various areas of Pakistan and provided 808 million yen for the upgradation of different primary girls' schools (Abrar, 2015). Until 2000, Japanese automobile industries like Suzuki, Toyota, Hino and Honda Motors occupied around 36 percent of Pakistan's automobile market, however the latest reports show that Japan auto sector accounts for about 95 percent of the four-wheeled vehicle market in Pakistan. In addition, Japanese electronic goods have a huge market in Pakistan. Japan has not been reluctant like the USA to transfer its highly competitive technology to Pakistan. According to Former Finance Minister Ishaq Dar, Pakistan is highly in favor of signing of a Free Trade Agreement with Japan. An 800-hectare Special Economic Zone for Japan near Karachi is the hallmark of its strong economic ties of the two nations. Osaka based Japan External Trade Organization deems Pakistan as the most productive market for its companies after Taiwan. Pak-Japan trading ties have been facilitated through a series of trade agreement between the two countries which are:

S. No	Bilateral Agreement	Year
01	Pakistan-Japan Trade Agreement	1953
02	Pakistan-Japan Trade Agreement	1954
03	Pakistan-Japan Trade Agreement	1957
04	Pakistan-Japan Trade Agreement	1958
05	Pakistan-Japan Trade Agreement	1959
06	Double-Taxation Prevention Treaty	1959
07	Treaty of Friendship and Commerce	1960
08	Protocol to the Double Taxation Treaty	1960
09	Agreement for Agriculture Training Centre	1960
10	Postal Money Order Exchange Agreement	1961
11	Agreement for the Protection and Promotion of Investment	2002
12	Avoidance of Double Taxation Convention	2008

Table 03: Source: Pakistan Embassy Tokyo

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the bilateral relations between the two countries cooled down owing to Pakistan's nuclear test in May 1998. Japan condemned the nuclear test and in a letter to former Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, the Japanese Prime Minister expressed displeasure to nuclear testing and requested to restrain from further tests (Shaikh, 2018). Regrettably, bilateral trade between Japan and Pakistan is highly in the favor of former as Japan is world's third largest economy by nominal GDP and 4th by purchasing power parity whereas Pakistan's economy has largely been the victim of war against terrorism. Pakistan's share in two-way trade is near 10 percent. Japanese exports to Pakistan have increased to US\$1.5 billion in 2005 from US\$500 million in 2001, while Pakistan's exports to Japan have decreased to US\$143 million in 2005 from US\$600 million in 1995 (The World Trade Review, 2005). Volume of trade between Pakistan and Japan has been hovering over US\$1.6 billion for the last few years where Pakistan's exports stood at US\$0.2 billion and imports from Japan

worth US\$1.4 billion (Dawn, 2015). However, the bilateral trade was US\$2.1 billion in 2012-13 (Pakistan Today, 2013). Between 2013 and 2014, Japan imports (textiles and chemicals) to Pakistan were of US\$202 million, while its exports (machinery, vehicles and auto parts) were of US\$1,398 million. Currently, the trade volume between the two countries is around US\$2 billion. Around 60 percent of Pakistan's exports to Japan are textile related, still, its share in Japan's total textile imports is negligible. In 2014, Pakistan's share in the total Japanese textile imports was only US\$123 million out of US\$38 billion, less than 0.33 percent, according to 5th Pak-Japan Business Dialogue. According to Pakistan's Ready-made Garments Manufacturers and Export Association, the share of Pakistan's ready-made garments (RMG) was just 0.03 percent of Japan's total RMG imports from the world in 2010. Energy shortage and the alarming security situation are the major stumbling blocks in the way of foreign investment in Pakistan (The News, 2015). According to an estimate, energy shortage costs Pakistan between 2.5-3 percent of GDP growth per annum. The accumulative figure of net FDI of the last two-decades from Japan amounts to around US\$820 million, making it the fourth largest investment partner of Pakistan. The net inflow of FDI from Japan was US\$44.1 million in 2013-14. In the Fifth Pak-Japan Government Business Joint Dialogue it was critically noted that despite having decades-old trade relations, Pakistan's textile industry is facing unfavorable position in Japan compared to those of India, Bangladesh and ASEAN countries which are enjoying tax-free access in the Japanese market (Japan's Ministry of Economy, 2015). Against all odds, Japan continues to finance several projects in Pakistan. Japan has financed Bin Qasim and Jamshoro thermal power stations, and hydropower project in Ghazi-Barotha in addition to US\$407 million loan for energy sector reform in Pakistan. Japan has also

upgraded and expanded 12 grid stations along with a 1,487km long transmission-line and electrified 700 villages in Pakistan (Abrar, 2015). The Japan International Cooperation Agency's desire to provide further technical assistance to the Pakistan's lucrative textile industry – Pakistan's largest exporting industry – is a positive sign of further closeness between the two nations. Japan has also upgraded Unit-I and Unit-IV of the Mangla Dam, a multipurpose dam on Jhelum River, which is the 7th largest dam in the world. The need of the hour is to finalize the Early Harvesting Program of Free Trade Agreement between the two friendly nations sooner than later Japan has frequently supported Pakistan at various forums, be it economic or security at the international level. Pakistan has continuously received extraordinary backing from Japan to get economic assistance from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and Asian Development Bank (ADB).

Social and Cultural Relations

Besides politics and economics, culture is a significant area of contemporary diplomacy to deepen the bilateral or multilateral relations among the states. Interestingly, Pakistan and Japan have centuries-old cultural ties. Pakistan being the cradle of Gandhara Civilization and the birthplace of Buddhism has served as an important religious and cultural destination for the Japanese as Japan is predominantly a Buddhist country. Gandhara Civilization flourished in Pakistan during 500 BC to 10 A.D, from here Buddhism reached to Japan, China and Korea in mid-sixth century. The relationship between Japan and Pakistan has also strengthened from the pilgrim visits from Japan to the Buddhist holy sites popularly known as Gandhara civilization. The Gandhara civilization now comprises of Mardan, Swat, Peshawar and Taxila and the region is known as the cradle of

Buddhism (Pakistan Tourism Development Corporation, 2017). Yet, Pakistan is not a tourist destination for the Japanese despite of having most revered Buddhist sites. Only 1400 tourists visited Pakistan during 2007, the highest figure so far. The cultural ties between Japan and Pakistan started even before the establishment of Pakistan. In 1930, a chair of Urdu language, now the national language of Pakistan was instituted in the Tokyo University and Takushou University. Today in Japan, Urdu is being taught in three major institutions of higher education, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Osaka University and Daitobunka University (Dawn, 2009). The Kobe Mosque founded in 1935 in Kobe, one of the largest cities of Japan, was the cornerstone of broadening cultural-cum-religious ties between the two civilizations. The Cultural Agreement between Japan and Pakistan was signed in 1957 to broaden the cultural ties; youth exchange, sports and education. Cultural organizations like Pakistan-Japan Cultural Associations in Karachi and Japan-Pakistan Association in Tokyo are instrumental in promoting the cultural and social relations. Pakistan is also a recipient of Japanese Cultural Grant Assistance that works for the preservation of cultural heritage (Japan Embassy in Pakistan, 2017). Under this program different cultural events have been held in various cities of Pakistan like Art and Speech Competitions about Japan, Contemporary Japanese Architecture Exhibition, Haiku Education Workshop Islamabad, Japanese Calendars Exhibition, Japanese Photo Exhibition, the Spirit of Budo and Japanese Film Festival. Around 200 Pakistani students are currently studying in the different Japanese universities under different cultural exchange programs like Japanese Government Scholarships program, Young Leader' Program, Youth Invitation Program, Japanese Language Program and Program for Journalists ((Japan Embassy in Pakistan, 2017). To wholeheartedly appreciate the openhanded Japanese financial and

technical assistance since early 1950s, Pakistan issued special postage stamp in 2004.

Strategic and Military Relations

The Afghan debacle of 1979-88 caused great impacts on Pak-Japan strategic relations that heralded tremendous diplomatic maneuvering and development. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 raised the hackles in the corridors of powers all over the world including Japan. Japan was apprehended to the Soviet territorial expansionism towards the South Asia, therefore it opposed the Soviet military adventurism at every international forum. Japan supported the United Nations Security Council Resolution (462) in 1980 that demanded the immediate and unconditional Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and suspended its all official dealings with the Moscow (Yoshitu, 1981). On the other hand Japan doubled its economic grants to Pakistan to cope up with *Mujahideen* training and the refugees' crisis. After the USA, Japan was the second largest donor of aid and loan to Pakistan during the Afghan crisis in the 1980s. The following two factors were the major reasons for the Japanese support to Pakistan's strategic stance over Afghan crisis:

- The US-Japan Security Treaty and their deep strategic ties,
- Japan's territorial disputes with the USSR and its energy interests from the Mideast.

The USA, Japan and Western allies shouldered the proxy war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan through Pakistan and Japan was the first country to extend practical assistance to Pakistan because Japan was importing more than 80 percent of its energy needs from the Middle East and the Soviet military adventure could

endanger Japan's energy routes from the Hormuz Strait of the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, the Japanese support to Afghan Jihad could be a diplomatic magnet as Japan was importing 94 percent of its energy needs from the Islamic countries during 1970s. In March 1980, Japan increased its Foreign Affairs' Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Pakistan by 230 percent from the previous year (Malik, 2009).

The catastrophic terror attacks of 9/11 on the twin towers of the World Trade Center in the USA further securitized the economic and diplomatic relations between Pakistan and Japan. Afghanistan, situated in the immediate proximity of Pakistan emerged as a grave concern for the security of Japanese economic interests in the region. The post-9/11 era compelled different states of the world including Japan and Pakistan to narrow down their even minor differences by redefining their security policies for a comprehensive global strategy to combat the menace of international terrorism, emitting from Afghanistan, the hotbed of Al-Qaeda and its proxies. Combating terrorism emerged as a convergence in the bilateral relations of the two countries as Pakistan became the front-line state in War on Terror. Being the most important strategic ally of the USA in Asia, harboring around 50,000 US troops, Japan also felt insecure from the emergence of the invisible enemy in the shape of religious extremism. The official visit of President Pervez Musharraf to Japan in 2002 opened new avenues of security cooperation between the two states. In the post-9/11 era, Japan and Pakistan mutually agreed to hold a security dialogue to develop a better understanding of the complex dynamics of the emerging non-traditional security threats in the shape of terrorism. "When the USSR invaded Afghanistan, we supported front-line state Pakistan and after 9/11 attacks Pakistan has played a very important role and we share similar stances on most important

international issues. Pakistan is one of very few states with which we have been holding politico-military dialogues” (Abrar, 2015). The first formal round of Security Dialogue was held in 2003 and so far three rounds of such talks have taken place. In 2008, Japan extended a soft loan of US\$ 479 million to Pakistan to fight terrorism (The Nation, 2008). Japan and Pakistan always participate in the biennial multinational Aman naval exercise since 2007 which provides a common military forum to counter the maritime security threats in the Indian Ocean where one-third of mass cargo traffic, half of the world’s container ships and nearly two-thirds of oil shipment pass every day. Aman-13 was hosted by the Pakistan Navy in early 2013 (Dawn, 2013). The maritime cooperation to secure the energy sea lanes is pivotal in the strategic cooperation between Japan and Pakistan. Pakistan’s navy is the biggest beneficiary of the Japanese operation in the Combined Task Force (CTF) 150; Bahrain based 25-nation naval force to support War on Terror in the Indian Ocean, world’s third largest all-weather ocean. Pakistan also joined Japanese Operation Enduring Freedom-Maritime Interdiction Operation to combat terrorism in the Indian Ocean where Pakistan’s navy received logistic support (fuel and fresh water) from the Japanese Self-Defence Forces (The News, 2008). According to the Japanese Embassy in Pakistan, more than 10 Pakistani Generals and officers visit Japan every year, followed by 20 instructors and student of National Defence University Islamabad each year. To further enhance the strategic partnership, Pakistan’s Standing Committee on Defence of the National Assembly along with Pakistan-Japan Parliamentary Friendship Group in the National Assembly visited Japan early this year.

The political upheaval coupled with religious bigotry in the shape of the Islamic State in the contemporary Middle East is one of the gravest threats to the Japanese national

interests in the region for which Japan ultimately needs Pakistan's backing. Stability of the Middle East has always remained a major concern for Japan. It also financed the first Gulf War against Saddam Hussein. Japan joined global war against terrorism lately but it cannot afford to overlook the spread of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) in East Asia, Southeast Asia and Pacific region (Ramaniuk, 2015). The incumbent Prime Minister Shinzo Abe visited four non-oil Middle Eastern countries, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel and Palestine, early this year and announced huge economic aid to fight against ISIS illustrates Japan's security concerns in the region. Japan earnestly needs Pakistan's direct or indirect support to deal with the looming ISIS threat.

Pakistan's strategic closeness with China and Japan's strategic partnership with India are not good-omen for decades-old Pak-Japan economic partnership. Coming from different backgrounds, USA, Japan and India are converging into an Indo-Pacific alliance to contain the Chinese rise including its territorial claims in South China Sea and East China Sea. For this purpose they have already launched a trilateral strategic grouping in late 2011 (Twining, 2015). The catastrophic images of the WW-II still haunt the Sino-Japan relations. The long-simmering battle between China and Japan over Diaoyu/Senkaku islands in the East China Sea has opened a new chapter of uncertainty and insecurity in the region owing to which Japan is pursuing a 'democratic security diamond' along with Australia, Japan and USA. Japan is concentrating on ASEAN, Australia and India while keeping a cautious eye on Pakistan owing to its growing strategic partnership with India coupled with the Sino-Pakistan unusual friendly ties since China is largest defence supplier of Pakistan and fourth largest economic partner (Abbas, 2014). India is the biggest strategic competitor of China in Asia and US wants to contain the

Chinese mushrooming role in the Asia-Pacific region, center piece of regional politico-economic gravity, which has created strategic dilemma for Pakistan to maintain a balance in its relations with the USA and China, world's largest economies. To counter the US strategic influence in the region, China and Russia long with Pakistan are contemplating into a trilateral alliance while Pakistan has moved closer to its Cold War-era rival, Russia in past years, whereas Russo-Japan relations are quite frigid owing to the ownership claim of the 18 Kuril islands in Western Pacific which were taken by then Soviet Union in 1945. Intriguingly, Russian reinforced strategic partnership with China is receding its reticence towards Pakistan (Akram, 2014). Consequently Pakistan's strategic relations with Japan could drift away and ultimately engulfing the economic ties of the two nations. In the present-day strategic environment, the former Cold War allies are seem to be drifting away in the simmering geo-strategic paradigm shift. The platform of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and Chinese-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) could provide a further strategic edge to the new emerging Sino-Russian strategic triangular with Pakistan (Malik, 2015). Yet in this complex and competitive strategic atmosphere, both countries need to quarantine their fiscal ties from the multifarious strategic rivalries in the region.

Bridging Far East and Middle East

Japan and Pakistan lie at the gateway of Far East and Middle East respectively. Japan as an East Asian country is of vital importance for Pakistan likewise the latter is significant for the former in terms of its strategic location along the Indian Ocean. East Asia is home of the world's second and third largest economies and accounts for 25 percent of the global exports, around 25 percent of the global imports and 21 percent of the foreign direct

investment (FDI). Moreover, 63 percent of the international reserves are held by the East Asian states (Abbas, 2014). Pakistan and Japan have gradually advanced their bilateral relations since 1952 when the two Asian countries developed their diplomatic ties. Japan gives great importance to its foreign relations with Pakistan seeing that Pakistan plays a very considerable role in fighting terrorism, the grave menace that the world faces today. Japan understands that the political stability in Pakistan is very much linked with the stability in the region, that's why it has been supporting Pakistan's budding democracy since the very beginning (Embassy of Japan in Pakistan, 2017). The U.S. factor in the Pak-Japan relations cannot be overlooked as the Japan's foreign policy towards the other Asian countries is very much parallel with the U.S. regional economic-strategic interests. Historically, the U.S. interests have echoed in the bilateral relations of the two countries and would continue to linger on. On the other hand Pakistan and China have been enjoying extraordinary cordial relations since the start of the second half of the 20th Century, but China and Japan are at loggerheads on the sovereignty issue of several islands in the East China Sea including their hostile past. During the WW-II, hundreds of thousands Chinese were massacred by the Imperial Japanese Army.

As the gateway to the Middle East, Pakistan is quite important for Japan vis-à-vis its energy security. Japan deeply values the Middle Eastern region in terms of securing a stable supply of energy and other resources as Japan imports more than 80 percent of its oil from the foregoing resource rich region (Diplomatic Bluebook, 2013). Japan has failed to diversify its energy security. In 1967, Japan was importing 91.2 percent of oil from the Middle East and in 2014 it imported 82.7 percent of its oil needs from the same region (Federation of Electric

Power Companies of Japan, 2015). Besides energy security, Pakistan is also a vital country due to its cultural and religious bonds with the Middle Eastern countries. Japan cannot afford any instability in the region where Pakistan holds a considerable influence as being the only Islamic nuclear power. Moreover, the U.S. withdrawal from the Obama-era Iranian nuclear deal of 2015 and the ensuing U.S. economic sanctions on Iran's oil industry have further enhanced Pakistan's importance for Japan since Pakistan's enjoy more cordial and warm relations with the Arab-speaking countries in the Middle East. Owing to the U.S. sanctions, Japan is compelled to stop importing Iranian crude oil accounting for 5 percent of Japan's oil imports (The Japan Times, 2018). Japan is importing 40 percent of its oil needs from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia In 2017; Japan received around 73 million kiloliters of crude oil from Saudi Arabia, followed by 46 million kiloliters of oil from United Arab Emirates. (Statista, 2017). The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are the most trusted ideological and strategic partners of Pakistan in the region. Similarly, through strong its strong relations with Japan, Pakistan can easily access the Association of South East Asian Nation (ASEAN), world's 7th largest trading area with a combined GDP of USD2.4 trillion, where Pakistan did USD6.6 billion in two-way trade in 2013. Pakistan also received USD 81 million in investment from ASEAN in 2014 (Malik, 2016).

The much talked-about China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) and the unexpectedly expanding Sino-Pakistan strategic-cum-economic partnership might inflict negative consequences on Pak-Japan relations. The reinterpretation of Japan's pacific constitution and increasing of the military budget depicts its military assertiveness in the region. Recently, Japan's Ministry of Defense has requested for US\$42 billion for the military

budget of the next year, the biggest ever budget in response to the Chinese growing military reach in the region (The Guardian, 2015). Comparatively, Japan's military budget is still dwarfed by that of China which was US\$131.5 billion in 2014, the second only to US which was recorded US\$581 billion same year. According to the London based International Institute of Strategic Studies Statistics of 2014, China accounts for 38 percent of defence spending in Asia while that of Japan is below 14 percent (Institute of Strategic Studies London, 2015). Pakistan should diversify its geo-strategic possibilities in order to improve its relations with the all three heavyweights of Asia-Pacific region, USA, China and Japan. In this regard, Pakistan needs to take Japan on board principally for expanding their economic cooperation beyond textile products. The incumbent government of Nawaz Sharif seems to be working on a broader agenda in the Asia-Pacific region to not only focus on the expanding strategic ties with its longtime ally China but also concentrating on the economic ties with other developed countries of the region. According to the Former Advisor on Foreign Affairs Sartaj Aziz, Pakistan is not only deepening its ties with China but working on a strategic triangle by simultaneously developing relations with Japan and South Korea along with China. Pakistan has already solidified its economic ties with China by signing US\$60 billion worth of economic corridor projects early this year (Dawn, 2015). The CPEC, an exclusive long-term economic plan to develop Pakistan's economy, is the most important part of the Chinese One Belt One Road initiative linking the Chinese built Gwadar port on the northern tip of the Strait of Hormuz to the western China. On the other hand Japan and India lie at the core of the U.S. 'Pivot-to-Asia' policy to rein in the burgeoning influence of China in the region. Obama's Asia Pivot has prompted a spate of anti-American sentiment in China and triggered Chinese

anxiety about the much talked-about U.S. China strategic partnership (Glaser, 2012). Tokyo is quite interested to play a leading role in American strategic rebalancing against China. However, China has a leverage to use its regional proxy North Korea in a chauvinistic manner on the Asia-Pacific chessboard to checkmate Japan as its contested nuclear program is another headache for Japan. Despite of the massive Chinese investments in Pakistan and strategic presence in Gwadar, situated at the entrance of the Middle East, Japan greatly its bilateral relations with Pakistan. Reciprocally, Pakistan values its bilateral relations with Japan despite of India's expanding ties particularly in the field of nuclear cooperation after the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal. Thus, both countries are equally important for each other in the context of bridging the Far East with the Middle East.

Conclusion

Historically, economic and security issues are the major areas of cooperation between Japan and Pakistan. Japan is a leading development partner of Pakistan. Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has been a chief donor in the development of key infrastructure projects in Pakistan since the geo-strategic location of the latter makes it ideal destination for Japanese foreign investment. Japan has gradually developed soft and smart power capability by creating a stable democratic system and inventing sophisticated technology which could be a role model for Pakistan. Pakistan and Japan have to steer their economic ties in a very amicable way in this economically significant, but strategically competitive region where the national interests of several regional and extra-regional powers are converging and diverging. China and India have already fought a war in 1962 over their disputed border while China and Japan have locked their horns on the tiny islands of the East China Sea. On

the other hand Japan and South Korea, US regional allies, are competing over the sovereignty of Liancourt Rocks (Dokdo/Takeshima Islands) in the Sea of Japan. Meanwhile USA is reassuring its presence in the region through its so-called Pivot-to-Asia strategy.

Pakistan needs to focus on economic development and its fiscal ties in the important region of Asia-Pacific and its strategic relations with China simultaneously. Pakistan should strengthen its trade relations with the ASEAN countries which is the most successful regional organization of Asia as the current US\$6.5 billion trade between them is heavily tilted in the favor of the latter. Nevertheless, Japan must remain in the core of Pakistan's economic policies. Currently the Japanese aid agency, ODA is funding around 25 crucial projects on economic development, infrastructure, agriculture, environment, water and power, governance, health, education, sanitation, transportation and irrigation in all four provinces including the autonomous state of Azad Jammu and Kashmir. The Pakistani government should sincerely concentrate on these on-going projects to bridge the slowly widening trust-deficit between the two countries.

Pakistan and Japan have sustained their bilateral relations through thick and thin and yet they should close off their economic relations from the geo-strategic axis of USA, India and Japan since this strategic alliance could contain China strategically but not economically. In the long run, Japan could use the much-publicized CPEC to have access to the oil-rich Gulf States from where Japan imports most of its energy requirements. The CPEC provides shortest land route to Japan to connect with Middle East. Finally, the sentiments reiterated during a meeting between the Foreign Ministers of the two countries on the Sidelines of the 12th Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) in Luxembourg in early November this year need to be translated into action. Moreover, the

recent visit of Japanese State Minister for Foreign Affairs, Kazuyuki Nakane to Islamabad and his meetings with Shah Mahmood Qureshi, newly appointed Foreign Minister of Pakistan, and Imran Khan, newly elected Prime Minister of Pakistan, could further strengthen the Pak-Japan bilateral economic cooperation.

References

- Abbas, Khurram. (September 10, 2014). “Asia Pacific: Relevance of Pakistan”. *IPRI*. <http://www.ipripak.org>, (accessed on January 10, 2019).
- Akram, Munir. (Sept. 28, 2014.) “India’s Great Power game”. *Dawn* (Karachi),
- Abrar, Mian. (August 1, 2015). “Interview: Japanese are very interested to invest in Pakistan: Japanese Ambassador Hiroshi Inomata”. *Pakistan Today*, <http://www.pakistantoday.com>, (accessed on January 12, 2019).
- “A Review of Foreign Economic Aid to Pakistan”. (1962). *Ministry of Finance*. Government of Pakistan.
- “Brief History of Pakistan-Japan Bilateral Relations”. *Embassy of Islamic Republic of Pakistan Tokyo*. <http://www.pakistanembassyjapan.com>, (accessed on January 15, 2019).
- Chaudhary, M. Aslam, et al. (Winter 2000), “Pakistan, Japan and ASEAN Trade Relations and Economic Development: A comparative Analysis”. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*. Vol. XXXXVIII, No. 2.
- “Exploring a New Frontier of Pakistan-Japan Economic Relationship”. (Nov. 10, 2015). *Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry*, <http://www.meti.go>, (accessed on January 17, 2019).
- Farooqui, Kalim. (April 30, 2012). “Pak-Japan’s 60-year diplomatic relations: an overview”. *Pakistan Today*.
- “Gandhara Civilization”. *Pakistan Tourism Development Corporation*. <http://www.tourism.gov.pk>, (accessed on January 20, 2019).

- Glaser, Bonnie S. “Pivot to Asia: Prepare for Unintended Consequences”. *Global Forecast 2012, Center of Strategic & International Studies (CSIS)*. <http://csis.org>, (accessed on January 23, 2019).
- “Helping Pakistan tackle its top two challenges: energy and terrorism”. (May/June 2013). *Japan International Cooperation Agency Newsletter*. <http://www.jica.go>, (accessed on January 25, 2019).
- “Japan lifts sanctions against Pakistan”. (May 2 2005). *Financial Times*. <http://www.ft.com>, (accessed on January 30, 2019).
- “Japan: Urdu’s other Home”. (January 06, 2009). *Dawn* (Karachi).
- “Japan looks to strengthen economic, political ties”. (August 13, 2015). *The Express Tribune* (Karachi).
- “Japan’s Foreign Policy by Region”. *Diplomatic Bluebook 2013*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Japan.
- “Japan plans largest ever defence budget to counter China’s reach”. (August 31, 2015). *The Guardian*, <http://www.theguardian.com>, (accessed on February 09, 2019).
- “Japan’s Dependence on Middle East Crude Oil of Total Imports”. The Federation of Electric Power Companies of Japan. <https://www.fepc.or>, (accessed on February 10, 2019).
- “Japan’s oil distributors plan to stop importing Iranian crude in October: sources”. (September 2, 2018). *The Japan Times*. <https://www.japantimes.co>, (accessed on February 13, 2019).
- “Japanese vendors coming to Pakistan”. (November, 2005). *The World Trade Review*. <http://www.worldtradereview.com>, (accessed on February 15, 2019).
- “Japan set to resume yen load for Pakistan.” (January 15, 2015). *The News* (Karachi).
- “Military Balance 2015 Press Statement”. (11 Feb. 2015). *Institute of Strategic Studies London*.

- <http://www.iiss.org>, (accessed on February 19, 2019).
- Malik, Ahmed Rashid. (04 February, 2015). “Japan’s Middle East diplomacy”. *The Nation* (Karachi),
 - Malik, Ahmed Rashid. (2009). *Pak-Japan Relations: continuity and change in economic relations and security interests*. New York: Routledge.
 - Malik, Ahmad Rashid. (23 April, 2016). “Pakistan Falls Behind in East Asia”. *The Diplomat*. <https://thediplomat.com>, (accessed on February 20, 2019).
 - Malik, Ahmad Rashid. (October 20, 2015). “A new bi-polarity: changing ground realities in the Asian theatre”. *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad*.
 - Minami, Ryoshin. (1986). *The economic development of Japan, A Quantitative study*. England: Macmillan Press.
 - “Multinational naval exercise begins today”. (March 03, 2013). *Dawn* (Karachi).
 - “Overview of Japan-Pakistan Political Relations”. *Embassy of Japan Pakistan*. <http://www.pk.emb-japan.go>, (accessed on March 5, 2019).
 - Packard, George R. (2010). “The United States-Japan Security Treaty at 50: Still a Grand Bargain?”. *Foreign Affairs*. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com>, (accessed on March 10, 2019).
 - “PM desires enhanced Pakistan-Japan trade”. (June 21, 2013). *Pakistan Today*.
 - “Pakistan, Japan to boost war on terror cooperation”. (May 04, 2008). *The Nation* (Lahore).
 - “Pakistan, Japan decided to enhance bilateral trade”. (Nov. 11, 2015). *The News* (Karachi).
 - “Pakistan Japan Cultural Relations”. *Embassy of Japan in Pakistan*. <http://www.pk.emb-japan.go>, (accessed on March 25, 2019).
 - Ramaniuk, Scott N. (Sept. 27, 2015). “Japan Need to Wake UP on Terrorism”. *Geopolitical Monitor*,

<http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com>, (accessed on April 1, 2019).

- Shaikh, M. Ayoob, et al. (2002). “Pak-Japan trade relations”. *Pakistan and Gulf Economist*, <http://www.pakistaneconomist.com>.
- Shaikh, Khalil-ur-Rahman. (May 11, 2018). “Analyzing Pakistan-Japan relations, *Daily Times* (Karachi).
- “Strategy evolved to remove trade barriers”. (September 25, 2015). *Dawn* (Islamabad).
- “Share of Japan’s oil import from Saudi Arabia from April 2011 to April 2017”. *The Statistics Portal*. <https://www.statista.com>, (accessed on April 5, 2019).
- “Ties being developed with China, Japan and South Korea: Aziz”. (April 29, 2015). *Dawn* (Karachi).
- Twining, Daneil. (February 24, 2015). “Asia’s New Triple Alliance”, *Foreign Policy*. <http://foreignpolicy.com>, (accessed on April 10, 2019).
- Yoshitu, Miachael M. (May 1981). “Iran and Afghanistan in Japanese Perspective”. *Asian Survey*. Vol. XXI, No. 5. University of California Press.
- “War on terror: Japan to continue fuel, water supply to Pak ships”. (September 28, 2008). *The News* (Karachi).

Iranian Nuclear Program: Impacts on Regional Security

Hakeem Khan

M. Phil. Scholar at Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Hakeemkhanqta@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The Iranian Nuclear Program is the contested issues of contemporary International Politics and is considered to be the chief source of regional conflict. It cannot be anticipated that whether Iran would attain the status of nuclear state or not but it is raising tensions and conflict in the Middle East. This study exposes the repercussions of Iranian Nuclear Program both regionally and internationally. Moreover, the study applies the tool of discourse analysis that analyzes the viewpoints of key international writers and scholars who know all sides of the conflict and discuss impact of Iranian nuclear deal on region as well as recent the US withdrawal from Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). They proclaim that if Iran becomes a nuclear state, it would give power to Iran having an upper hand over other Middle Eastern States, which would enhance the sectarian chaos between Iran and its neighbors. It is observed, that the Iranian nuclear deal between Iran and P5+1 also known as Joint Comprehensive plan of Action (JCPOA) neither brings a solution strategy, nor does it lead to the right direction. The analysts regard the Iranian nuclear weapons program as the biggest threat to Israel, US and Saudi Arabia.

Keywords: Nuclear Program, Nuclear Weapons, P-5 Plus-1, IAEA, Nuclear Politics, JCPOA, NPT, Regional Security and Diplomacy.

Introduction

The Five Permanent (P-5) members of United Nations, the USA, UK, France, Russia, China and Germany, known as P5+1 reached an agreement with Iran associated with the contraction of its nuclear program on 14th July, 2015. Under the terms of deal, all the P5+1 state made it sure that Iran should seize its nuclear enrichment to prohibit it from developing a nuclear weapon. Moreover, Iran made it assured to keep away from further advancing its activities at the Natanz commercial scale, Fordow facility and Arak reactor. According to the deal, Iran will be fully abiding by International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and would be providing complete information and access to International Nuclear Watchdog. In the written findings, authors have thoroughly described the origin and development of Iranian nuclear deal and the implications of neighboring states and others.

According to this agreement, effective provisions were made to alleviate reservations and concerns of world community regarding Iran's Uranium Enrichment and heavy water reactors program. Iran was under stern coercive diplomatic pressure from year 2006 to 2010, which brought it back to the negotiating table. Notably, the continuous negotiations paved the way for an interim deal signed on 24 November, 2013 recognized as the Joint Plan of Action. This temporary deal proved to be a milestone ,which later on 14 July, 2015 resulted into an accord known as Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) between Iran and P5+1 after a long diplomatic discussions and negotiations.

Furthermore, the deal allowed Iran to keep a level of total 5000 centrifuges that are capable to separate the ²³⁵ Uranium isotopes from the Uranium ore. The agreement also reserved Iran that it cannot refine Uranium from more than 3.7 percent of enrichment for the next fifteen years to fuel its nuclear power plants. It also set a limit on the total stockpile of the Enriched

Uranium to be not more than 300kgs. The IAEA has found that Iran has more than 20 percent of the enriched uranium which is enough for power generation and medical research, but this can also be used in the development of nuclear weapons on a short notice. The Iranian government under the President Hassan Rouhani, shut down a nuclear reactor that could enrich plutonium, which was an endorsement of the deal on the Iranian side. The IAEA also found that Iran was fully complying with its obligations.

Brief History of Iran's Nuclear Program

The Iranian nuclear program started in 1957 with coming into accord of a nuclear corporation agreement with United States as part of the Atom for Peace Program. In 1957, the United States signed an agreement with Iran whereby it supplied Uranium, Plutonium and Fissile isotopes. Tehran also signed the International Watchdog organization, known as Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968 and also rectified it in 1970. Moreover, the Iranian government with the help and support of US and Western States such as Germany and France, established the Iranian Atomic Energy Organization (IAEO) and expected to develop and build power reactors. But after the 1979 Islamic Revolution which resulted in the ousting of Shah Reza Pahlavi resulted in strain relations between Iran and the Western countries. Under the new government of Ayatollah Khomeini, the nuclear program almost came to an end, but it again resumed after almost a decade in 1987 following Iran-Iraq war (Adeniji, et al., 2015). When the US President, Bill Clinton came into Power in 1998, he felt uncomfortable and started to challenge the Iranian nuclear ambitions. He also offered Iran for sufficient oil and gas options to fulfill its power requirements. At the same time, he threatened Iran of economic sanctions, while not fulfilling with the expectations of global community. The Rafsanjani government at that time did not fulfill the U.S.

prospects, which resulted in a diplomatic crisis between U.S. and Iran. The Clinton administration imposed several strict sanctions on Iran by imposing an embargo on its oil exports and freezing of its international bank accounts which resulted in crippling the Iranian economy. Most importantly, the Bush administration further tightened the sanctions by ending the businesses of all European and American firms with Iran which worsened the subsequent gears ahead of 2000. The EU-3 took start of diplomatic negotiation and several struggles were made, which resulted an agreement between EU-3 and Iran known as Paris Agreement.

It is opined by writers and think-tanks that Iran's struggle for becoming nuclear state has myriad perilous implications to the west and to the rest of the world as it possesses strategic implications. The inception of Iran nuclear program from 2003 and its complete rejection from following the rule and regulations of International Nuclear Watchdog has brought Iran in the limelight. Interestingly, now here a question arises what compelled Iran to become a nuclear state, for that we need to study the geographical and security conditions of the Middle East and its neighboring states. Indeed, Iran's hostile ties with U.S. since 1979, invasion at Iraq and the enhanced hegemony of Israel compelled the Iranian regime to go for nuclear program. Moreover, it was also forced by having bitter relations with Gulf Corporation Council (GCC) particularly with Saudi Arabia, which has also cordial relations with U.S. In fact, this tense atmosphere and strategic scenario steered Iran to opt for nuclear program. Since 2003, Iran had been violating the safeguard agreement of IAEA. In 2005, President Ahmadinejad asserted during his comparing that Iran had been building and developing nuclear weapons self and if masses and states consider it crisis that is not crisis. Later on, the USA struggled and put influence to convince the Iranian regime to bar its nuclear program.

JCPOA and Its Regional Implications

After a marathon series of negotiations between Iran and P5+1, facilitated by the Sultanate of Oman, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) was agreed and signed on July 14, 2014, which was hailed as a major diplomatic breakthrough particularly between Iran and the U.S. However, Israel and the Saudi Arabia from the first day of deal did not welcome the Iranian nuclear deal and openly showed reservations and stern concerns and criticism over the JCPOA. In this regard, the Prince Bandar Bin Sultan (the former Saudi Ambassador to the U.S.) expressed his concern that this agreement would give birth to eruption of small wars, because this nuclear non-proliferation deal will not change the behavior of Iran in Middle East (Al-Arabiya, 2015). The Saudi journalist and analyst Jamal Khashoggi mentioned three clear examples of Iranian interference in collapsing governments in the Middle East region (Khashoggi, 2015). Firstly, Lebanon has been having no President since May, 2014 when the term of Michel Suleiman was ended and Lebanese militant group Hezbollah supported by Iran is held responsible for it. Secondly, the Syria is continuously indulged in civil war as because of Iran being the main external supporter of Assad regime. Thirdly, the Houthi rebels in Yemen supported and backed by Iran were also rejecting all peace proposals of the U.S., Saudi Arabia and Oman as well.

On the other hand, the Saudi Kingdom was not ready to accept Houthi's hold of the country. Khashoggi further asserted that opposed to claims of Iran, Saudi does not want to take attempt for elimination of Houthis from political future of Yemen. Owing to these differences and clashes, he also claimed that "We should not expect peace in the region, but rather promoting more clashes and conflicts". Moreover, he also observed that the behavior of Iran is seen as violation of International Law and not in a mode of bilateral dialogue, but want Kingdom to accept her as a regional power with

legitimate interests, comprising Shia majority area in south of Iraq. On the other side, Iran wanted Riyadh to go away from Assad alone in Syria, Hezbollah unbroken in Lebanon and the Houthis to have control in Yemen. On the basis of such “Peaceful relations”, it hopes to fight the Islamic State named as ISIS or ISIL (Zareef, 2015). Notably, Riyadh does not want to accept Tehran and consider her as the main contributing factor in the rise of Islamic State. Saudi Arabia wants Iran to leave Syria, Yemen and Lebanon on the basis that “Arab interests are linked” and both Iran and Saudi cannot be seen as equal in the Arab world. Riyadh considers growing Iranian interference in its traditional sphere of influence as a threat to her and asserts that no improvement can be obtained in relations without in a change in Iranian policies.

Later on, Adel al-Jubeir, the then Saudi Ambassador to Washington and later Foreign Minister declared that until kingdom get key details of nuclear deal, it would not justify the rules and terms of the agreement. More worryingly, he also stated that Saudi Arabia along with its friends like Pakistan would work hand in hand to challenge Iranian “terrorism, insurrection and intervention” in Arab states (Blanchard, 2016). Soon enough, Saudi fears over Iranian targets and skepticism toward United States were resounded in Saudi public opinion. On 9 April, Al-Hayat supported a column by Abdel Wahhadm Badar Khan with an ominous title: The nuclear agreement is no foundation of stability for any country that Iran is destabilizing (Khan, 2015). A day earlier, a chief column in Asharq al-Awsat by Abdel Rahman al-Rasheed observed: Obama: Apology to Iran, and Criticism for Arabs! (Al-Rashed, 2015). Similarly, articles by leading al-Saud members like Turki al-Faisal, and strategic analysts like Jamal Khashoggi (2015), and others criticized the American “abandonment” of its GCC allies in favor of the Iranian supremacy. Former intelligence chief and later Saudi Ambassador to the US Prince Turki al-Faisal asserted

that if Iran crosses the nuclear threshold, Saudi Arabia would follow suit, and nothing would stop them because Riyadh cannot live under an Iranian nuclear hegemony (Sanger, 2015). Indeed, amidst the nuclear controversy as far back as in June 2011, Turki had said: “It is in our interest that Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon, for its doing so will also compel Saudi Arabia, whose foreign relations are now so fully measured and well assessed, to pursue policies that could lead to untold and possibly dramatic consequences” (Solomon, 2011). He also said that “if Iran develops a nuclear weapon, that will be unacceptable to us and we will have to follow suit”. Riyadh feared that a nuclear Iran would “pursue its own, more hegemonic foreign policy” in the region, thereby limiting Saudi influence in its neighborhood.

Iran is the main contributor to the Syrian Civil War as it not only provides the critical support to the Syrian regime, but also to Shia fighters in winning war against the Sunnis. Moreover the Iranian help did not allow the Assad regime to fall against Sunni insurgent groups. The JCPOA got great importance for the Syria as its success or failure may change the dimension of the Syrian Civil War, as it is linked with the decision to be taken about the fate of the Assad’s regime.

Hokayem, a senior researcher, analyst and expert in Middle East studies at the US institute of peace asserts that geo-political relationship between Iran and the Assad regime brought both countries nearer to one another. Donald J. Trump who got elected in 2016 took a decision to withdraw from the JCPOA as he was not satisfied with its terms and conditions. The Trump’s administration shares the concerns of Israel and Saudi Arabia, whereby the JCPOA does not stop Iran for developing the nuclear weapons. The analysts view President Trump’s decision in the context of Syrian opposition. According to him, the President’s step was welcomed the Syrian opposition leader Hariri, whereby he termed the Iranian influence in Syria as equivalent to destruction of Syria. The Hariri also welcomed the

Israeli strike on the Iranian targets in Syria. He also emphasized on the ejection of nearly hundreds of thousand Shia militias being backed by Iran from Syria (Hokayem, 2018). The Syrian opposition considers the Syrian army and the Shia militias as the same and does not differentiate between them. To Hariri, Syria is more important to Iran as compared to Yemen, Iraq and Lebanon as Syria defines the core of Iranian interests in the region. He is also of the view that if Iran is defeated in Syria, it will definitely be defeated in Yemen, Lebanon and Bahrain as well.

Nasr- ul- Hariri is extremely worried about the future of his country as it is becoming a battlefield and a ground for bloodshed for the regional and global powers. In his reaction to the Trumps attack on Syria related to the Chemical attack on civilians in 2017, he said that the people of Syria have suffered a lot and the U.S. response should be based on strategic efforts that promotes peace and resolve the conflict avoiding bloodshed in the region. Hence, Syria should not be used at the hands of the U.S., Israel, Saudi Arabia and Iran as a theatre for their national benefits. It is also alleged that the chemicals (Sarin and Chlorine) that were used in Syria were manufactured in Tehran.

The U.S. Withdrawal from JCPOA

The deal was however endorsed by US under the Obama administration, which temporarily reduced tensions between USA and Iran but was currently rejected by the Trump administration. The Trump administration suspected that 20 percent of Uranium Enrichment is more than enough and it allows Iran to produce a nuclear weapon within just few months. The sunset clauses are a cause of concern to U.S. as it not only allows Iran to develop a nuclear weapon but it also allows Iran to carry out its anti-Israel agenda. Moreover, this agreement also does not put a hold on the Iranian proxies in the Middle East. The U.S. President

announced on 8th May, 2018 that the country is withdrawing from the Iranian nuclear deal and would impose severe economic sanctions on Iran which may set full restraint on its nuclear ambitions. Importantly, President Trump has termed the deal as the worst ever deal and threatened that he would not only impose sanctions on Iran, but also on those countries that make trade deals with Iran. (Schuster, 2011). He even threatened the EU, Russia, China, India, France and Germany to cancel all the deals with Iran. The U.S. also brought an end to the tax waivers for those countries eventually in 2018 for not complying with the U.S. sanctions.

International Reaction to the U.S. Withdrawal

In reaction to the U.S. withdrawal from the JCPOA, Russia condemned the U.S. sanctions on Iran and deemed it as useless aggression that may thwart the peace efforts of international community. The Russian Foreign ministry said that stopping the Iranian Oil exports may worsen the oil prices at the international oil markets and may also damage the Iranian economy. It also added that the U.S. sanctions do not add anything to the American Stand and it would hamper the peace efforts in establishing peace in the Middle East. The U.S. cannot patch the world to its knees by taking actions against the EU, Russia, China and India. On the other hand, it praised the Iranian government for not accelerating tensions with the U.S. in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine. China at the other hand also censured the U.S. move by opposing its unilateral actions since it violates the agreements of the JCPOA. Its foreign ministry spokesman told in a press conference that is cooperation with Iran is open, transparent and legitimate and hence it should be respected. The Chinese government announced that they will continue to import oil from Iran and would continue cooperation with Iran in different sectors. Turkey also rejected the sanctions and said that it would continue purchasing oil from Iran.

Furthermore, the Turkish foreign minister said in a statement that it is the need of time that a vast strategy must be chalked out to check and address the Iranian nuclear program through cooperative mechanisms. The western states must come forward to make ensure Iran that its integrity, sovereignty and country's security is safe and there is no threat to Iran. In addition, the U.S. and Israel must address the grievances of Iran through giving and providing security to Iran and Middle Eastern states also guarantee to Iran that Iran's security is protected.

However, President Trump's move was welcomed by Israel, Saudi Arabia, UAE and Bahrain. The Israeli Prime minister said that the JCPOA paves the path for Iran to develop Nuclear Weapons, which enables it to make nuclear weapons in just few years. He further said that the deal would bring Iran and Israel much closer to the war. The Saudi Foreign minister also welcomed the Trumps move by calling it a welcoming step in a forward direction. The Saudi foreign minister declared Iran as a terrorist state and asked all the countries to curtail their relations with Iran. The Saudi view is also endorsed by it Gulf Allies like the UAE and Bahrain.

Impacts of the U.S. Withdrawal

Iran would struggle to improve its nuclear weapon for pressuring its neighboring countries particularly the Middle East states. It wants to spread its Shia sects and its influence across the Middle East. For that purpose, Iran Wishes to gain the status of nuclear state. If Iran completes its nuclear program that would pose threat to the whole world and the U.S. and Israel would not be spared from the minas of that. A well-known scholar of Iran Mr. Anwar Ali said that if Iran completes its nuclear program, the very next day, the experiment would be done upon Israel. Secondly, all the outlawed organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah would accelerate their offenses against Israel and that would be

supported by Iran. Currently, Iran has been under watch list with its ailing economy of Iran from strengthening, but once Iran Gains its motive by becoming nuclear state, automatically all the sanctions would be lifted. Importantly, the way forward is that the U.S. has to resolve the issues of the Middle East and slash the differences with Iran and make it assure that no state is against Iran. The U.S. had to resolve the Issue of Palestinians and bring both Palestinians and Israel on the negotiating table. All these issues would be solved through only dialogue without bringing any conflict. Sanction would have to be lifted and allowing Iran and other states to improve bilateral tails with Iran. The long conflict and hostility between Saudi Arabia and Iran must be resolved through mutual dialogue and has to eliminate the differences between Shia and Sunni.

Conclusion

The Iranian nuclear program is a bone of contention between Iran and its adversaries since decades. This needs to be sorted out to bring peace and stability in the region. The sunset clauses are being rejected by the U.S., Saudi Arabia and Israel as it may enable Iran to produce nuclear weapons in the near future. The U.S. has imposed severe sanctions on Iran since long which is supported by its Middle Eastern allies. To find a probable solution to the crisis, the Obama administration along with the European Union, the Russia and China have formulated the JCPOA deal which was agreed initially by all the parties, but the U.S. later took a back foot from the deal. Most notably, the U.S. turnaround was appreciated by Israel and the U.S. Gulf allies. To deal with the situation, the French President, Emanuel Macron presented a probable way out consisting of four points from the existing crisis during his visit to the U.S. in April, 2018. The points included a comprehensive strategy in ensuring that the country may halt its nuclear and missile program and lead a way to regional and international peace. In his

meeting with the President Trump in Washington D.C., the French president agreed that Iran should never be allowed to develop nuclear weapons and the country should end its support to the proxies. Importantly, the French president argued that the JCPOA deal is good in a sense that it stops Iran from developing a nuclear weapon till 2025. Secondly, the French president proposed that there should be zero Iranian nuclear activity in the near future. The third proposal was that the Iranian Missile program should also be halted for a decade in order to develop the regional confidence on Iran. Fourthly and finally there should be a political process to curtail the Iranian influence in Palestine, Yemen, Syria and Lebanon. This would bring stability in the Middle East which would be ever-lasting. The French president put emphasis on the regional consensus based on political maturity on all these issues which is only possible through negotiations. Furthermore, he also claimed that the regional dialogue is a far much better strategy to curb the Iranian crisis than a confrontation and conflict in the region. In his address to the Congress, he laid emphasis on respecting the Iranian sovereignty as it would not allow the repetition of the past mistakes.

Iran can also be a beneficial partner to the World in ending conflicts in Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan and Palestine. This can be achieved by ending its support to the regional sectarian proxies. Iran is currently accused of supporting proxies in Syria, Palestine, Yemen and Afghanistan. The Iranian rivalry with Israel can be ended by stopping the Iranian support to Hamas and Al-Fatah organizations and stopping its interference in the internal affairs of Palestine. On the Israeli side, it should stop violating the Human Rights abuses in Palestine and adopt the two-state solution as proposed by the United Nations, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. The creation of an independent state of Palestine would end the longest war in the Middle East, which would help in reducing the religious

extremism in the region. On the conflict with Saudi Arabia, Iran should stop interfering in the internal affairs of Arab states whereby it should stop helping the Houthi rebels in Yemen, Bashar al Assad in Syria and the Hezbollah in Lebanon. By doing so, Iran will get a chance in getting closer to the Sunni majority Arab states. On the Saudi side, it should stop opposing Iran as a notion and respect its sovereignty, history and geography. The Saudis should also accept the Shia sect as a part of Islam and start accepting their point of view. It should take measures to mainstream the Shia community by giving them equal social and economic rights in the Kingdom by doing so; it would give rise to the concept of Muslim brotherhood among the Muslim countries.

It is the need of time that a vast strategy must be chalked out to check and address the Iranian nuclear program and to meet this program in a good way, the whole western states must come forward to make ensure Iran that its integrity, sovereignty and country's security is safe and there is no threat to Iran. In addition, the U.S. and Israel must address the grievances of Iran through giving and providing security to Iran and Middle Eastern states also guarantee to Iran that Iran's security is protected. Most importantly, Israel has to come forward to play a vital role to resolve the issue of Palestine and Middle East. Specially, Saudi Arabia, UAE and other regional states must seize animosity and eliminate the conflict between Sunni and Shia. Most people opine that sanctions and military action cannot be a strategy to thwart Iran from carrying out its nuclear program. It is viewed that a strong state may threaten a weak state by putting pressure in different ways but it cannot bar its mission.

It is the duty of western states to strictly comply with Iranian nuclear deal and persuade the U.S. to resume complying with this agreement. As per the IAEA, the Iran has been in compliance with this deal and to every

extent Iran has been striving hard to halt its Uranium program. All these matters must be resolve while coming on to table and through dialogue. Iran also must respect NPT and adhere with its rules and regulation. Furthermore, it is suggested that the U.S. and Israel must respect the sovereignty of Iran and must lift sanctions imposed by U.S. for the betterment of people of Iran and region.

References

- Al-Arabiya. (2015, July 16). "Saudi prince: Iran deal worse than one with N. Korea". Retrieved <http://english.alarabiya.net>
- Al-Rashed, A.R. (2015, April 8). "Obama: Apology to Iran, and criticism for Arabs" *Asharq Al-Awsat (Arabic)*, No. 13280.
- Blanchard, C. M. (2016, February 5). "Saudi Arabia: Background and U.S. relations". *CRS Report*. Retrieved <https://www.fas.org>
- Cordesman, A. H. (2009). "Iran, Israel, and the effects of a nuclear conflict in the Middle East". *Center for Strategic and International Studies*, Washington DC, 2009.
- Del Sarto, R. A. (2017). *Israel under Siege: The Politics of Insecurity and the Rise of the Israeli Neo-Revisionist Right*. Georgetown University Press.
- Goodarzi, J. M. (2013). *Syria and Iran: Diplomatic Alliance and Power Politics in the Middle East*, Ortadoğu Etutleri. 4(2), 31-54.
- Hokayem, E. (2014). "Iran, the Gulf States and the Syrian Civil War", *Survival, Global Politics and Energy*, 56(6), 59-86. Retrieved <https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338.2014.985438>
- Holloway, W. F. (2016). "Saudi Arabia's Nuclear Posture: Is Hedging the Future." *Naval Postgraduate School Monterey*, NSN 7540-01-280-5500.
- Khashoggi, J. (2015). "Saudi Arabia is Determined to Defend its Interests". *Confrontation or Conciliation: How the Nuclear Agreement is Reshaping GCC-Iran Relations*. Ed. The Arab Gulf States Institute in Washington.
- Lawson, F. H. (2007). "Syria's Relations with Iran: Managing the Dilemmas of Alliance". *The Middle East Journal*, 61(1), 29-47.

- Lin, C. Y. (2008). "The King from the East: DPRK-Syria-Iran Nuclear Nexus and Strategic Implications for Israel and the ROK". *KEI Academic Paper Series*, 3(7).
- Mabon, S. (2015). *Saudi Arabia and Iran: Power and Rivalry in the Middle East*. (Vol. 132). IB Tauris.
- Miglietta, J. P. (2002). *American Alliance Policy in the Middle East, 1945-1992: Iran, Israel, and Saudi Arabia*. Lexington Books, B01K2QY200.
- Oualaalou, D. S. (2018). *Volatile State: Iran in the Nuclear Age*. Indiana University Press.
- Pánek, Robin. (2017). *US-Saudi Counterterrorism Cooperation after 9/11*. University of Karlova Press, Frankfurt.
- Sanger, D.E. (2015, May 13). "Saudi Arabia Promises to Match Iran in Nuclear Capability". *New York Times*. Retrieved <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Sauer, T. (2007). "Coercive Diplomacy by the EU: The Iranian Nuclear Weapons Crisis". *Third World Quarterly*, 28(3), 613-633.
- Schake, K. N., and Yaphe, J. S. (2001). "The Strategic Implications of a Nuclear-Armed Iran". *Institute for National Strategic Studies*. Washington DC.
- Spector, L. S., and Cohen, A. (2008). "Israel's Airstrike on Syria's Reactor: Implications for the Nonproliferation Regime". *Arms Control Today*, 38(6), 15-24.
- Yaphe, J. S. (2009). *Reassessing the Implications of a Nuclear-Armed Iran*. DIANE Publishing, New York.
- Zarif, M. J. (2015, August 5). "Choose your neighbors before your house". *Al-Monitor: The Pulse of Middle East*. Retrieved <http://www.al-monitor.com>.

Syrian Crisis and Mass Migration: Politics of Refugees

Shah Muhammad

M. Phil. Scholar at Area Study Centre
University of Balochistan, Quetta.
Shahmuhammad413@gmail.com

Muhammad Zahir Mengal

Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Balochistan, Quetta.
Zahirmengal63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The wave of the Arab Spring in 2011, with internal and external challenges, resulted into a civil war in Syria. The mass agitation started after the repressive measures taken by Assad's government against the protesting teenagers who were allegedly involved in graffitiing against the autocratic regime in the southern city of Derra. As a result, various factors and actors culminated into flaming the festering resentment among majority Sunni population against the minority Alawite-backed al-Assad dynasty which has been ruling Syria since 1971. The al-Assad dynasty has many friends and foes in the tumultuous region, thus, different actors jumped into Syrian crisis, simultaneously, in against and favour of President Bashar al-Assad. After the conflict and civil war broke out among different opponents and rival, the general masses have become the most affected which resulted to amassing of internally displaced persons and mass migration in immediate neighborhood and across the Mediterranean shores. Many IDPs died of diseases and harsh winter climate while several migrants' boats drowned sea en

route to Europe. Hundreds of thousands of the Syrians fled to avoid political and religious persecutions. This research paper analyses the Syrian crises and mass migration vis-à-vis politics of the refugees in the international relations.

Key Words: Arab Spring, Syrian Conflict, Refugees, Mass Migration, Asylum Seekers, ISIS, Kurdish Militancy and Regional Actors.

Introduction

The Syrian crisis is the combination of multi-sided armed groups having different aims and motives. There is a struggle of power between Bashar Al-Assad's Baathist army sided by foreign and domestic allies and different internal militants and external forces opposing each other and Syrian government having various agendas. The Syrian crisis is considered to be the largest humanitarian conflict of the twenty first century. It took place in the result of mass agitation for change in the form of government. In the result of this colossal war more than five million refugees including 2.5 million children migrated beside this million other masses displaced inside the country and migrated to abroad countries. During this migration process masses were confronted with various kinds of hurdles. Furthermore, politics of refugees took new shape in the countries affected by the mass refugee influx.

Notably, the Syrian civil war started in 2011, which triggered its masses to migrate towards the neighboring countries. The number of refugees ranged from 3 to 5 million which brought a human catastrophe in the neighboring countries Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. The living conditions in those refugee camps countries were desperate and uncomfortable which made them to seek asylum in Europe between 2014 and 2016. The refugees faced a lot of trauma in the shape of social, religious, economic and cultural challenges in the European

countries whereby it was harder for them to assimilate in the western cultures. Their weak refugee status made them vulnerable in the shape of displaced labor, lesser job opportunities and the weaker international law for their protection. In a nut shell, the Syrian crisis is the cluster of mass migration and its impacts on regional and international politics.

Genesis of the Syrian Crisis

The origin of the Syrian crisis can be traced back after the loss of the Golan Heights territory of Syria against in Six Days War with Israel in 1967 that provided an opportunity to Hafez al-Assad to take over the government, who gathered army and civilians under the umbrella of the Baath Party having motto of unity, liberty and socialism. Hafez henceforth ruled over Syria for decades. Later on, after the demise of Hafez in 2000, his son Bashar-al-Assad had been elected as the President of Syria who also continued autocratic legacy of his father. Syria being the abode of multi religions and multi cultures has distinguished demography. The religious demography consists of Sunni Arabs, Shia Arabs, Muslim Kurds, Christian Arabs and Syrian Palestinians. Islam is the official religion of Syria. The Population of Muslim are 87 percent out of which 74 percent are Sunni and 13 percent are Shia. The Shia Muslim are comprised of Alawites and a smaller portion of Ismailis. The percentage of Christians is 10 percent, Druze 3 percent and small number of Jews living in Aleppo and Damascus (BBC, 2011 and CIA, 2016).

The majority Sunni Muslim in Syria are dominated by minority Alawites government and military officers since the Hafiz-Al-Assad regime. The Alawites are an offshoot of Shia Islam which has created a sense of deprivation and frustration among Sunni majority areas. Even the Alawite sect of Shia Muslim had no good reputation in the eyes of neighboring countries and the ties of neighbors had often remained tense with them.

Moreover, Muslim parties like Muslim Brotherhood established since 1928 that played significant role in the toppling of the Hasni Mubarak's regime in 2011 inspired by new view of Arab Spring had anti-Alawite sentiments and encouraged people to raise voice against the atrocities of President Assad. Most of the Sunni Muslims in Syria are influenced by Muslim Brotherhood doctrine who during 1980's also protested against oppressive measures (Hinnebudch, 2012).

On the issue of the Golan Heights and the Syrian government animosity intensified with western powers and diverted her attention towards the Soviet Union and Arab Gulf Countries. Other factors that contributed in antagonism against Hafiz-al-Assad were economic slump of 1980s along with rampant corruption and other irregularities. The collapse of Soviet Union in 1990s brought a new paradigm shift in the Syrian foreign policy and at last she in state of despair resorted to sign peace deal with Israel under the auspices of United State of America. Hence, Syrian government focused over enhancing military might in the region and for accomplishing her dreams she visibly tilted towards western powers (Hinnebudch, 2012).

Major Causes of Syrian Crisis

After the demise of Hafiz-Al-Assad, his son Bashar-Al-Assad inherited the throne as an authoritarian ruler. During the regime of Assad economy boosted and his family members availed this opportunity to a larger extent for accumulating wealth by fair and foul means (Salloukh, 2005). The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, on the pretext of presence of weapons of mass destruction, deteriorated the cold ties with Bashar al-Assad. Afterwards, Syria focused over developing better ties with Iran, Turkey and Russia (Haddad, 2011). President of Syria Bashar al-Assad miserably failed to tackle the economy that was severely affected by the drought from 2007 to 2010 which resulted into widespread poverty,

inflation and joblessness. Moreover, poverty ratio increased up to 10 per cent during 2005 to 2011. In the meantime government adopted Pan Arabism policy while supporting Iraq, Hamas, and Hezbollah that further aggravated tension in Syria. (Hinnebundch, 2012).

In addition, the Syrian civil war that is on the way forward since March, 2011 is the outcome of multiple factors like sectarian conflicts between Sunni-Shia Muslims, proxies of super powers, political instability, economic disparity, ethnic incidents, class system, and autocratic rule of Bashar-Al-Assad besides the immediate influence of Arab spring. All the above upper mentioned factors led this country into chaos and confusion. At the very first protest launched against Assad's regime on local level where they demanded for basic reforms. Government, despite of negotiating with them, took harsh measures and dealt them iron-handedly. The Alawite-led Assad regime military offence towards peaceful protestors was collectively condemned by the Arab League and Turkey. Henceforth, the tense relations with Western countries, Turkey and Arab Gulf countries created new blocks in Syria. It divided Syria into pro-Western Sunni axis (backed by United States of America, Canada, European Union and Turkey), while the Shia resistance axis (backed by Russia, Iran, Iraq and Hezbollah) (Hinnebudch, 2012).

Currently, Syria has economic ties with Iran and Russia and she is likely be backed by these two powers in terms of waging war against the adversaries of Syria on the battle ground so that to save Assad regime. Meanwhile, the U.S., U.K., France, Turkey and Arab Gulf states by December 2012 unanimously approved rebels Opposition National Coalition who is fighting against the government whereas Lebanon-based Hezbollah forces supported pro-Assad regime. The support of foreign powers and their direct involvement speed up

the war between the opponent groups. The use of chemical weapons by pro-Assad allies in Damascus in August, 2013 resulted on the arrival of the UN inspection team for knowing the truth. The UN brokered peace talks in Geneva from January to February, 2014 in which both Assad's representatives and western backed political opposition participated respectively. They unanimously asked Assad to step down in the interest of state and masses but he refused on doing so (BBC, Syria Profile, 2018).

Major Actors in Syrian Civil War

In 2014, a non-state actor named as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) or Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) or Daesh under the leadership of Abu Bakar Al Bagdadi entered into Syrian war. They declared the Syrian city of Raqqa as the capital of their Caliphate. They continued war against their adversaries. Its leaders declared a self-style caliphate system in Syria and adjacent areas of Iraq. They also participated in Syrian civil war and have given tough time to rivals. They also participated in the Syrian civil war and have given tough time to rivals. They were anti-Shia and continued the massacre of people by different ways. They occupied different areas. The Russians jumped in the Syrian crisis in September, 2015 while Iran and its proxies like Lebanon-based Hezbollah in the Middle East already started backing the embattled Assad regime. The United States military supported Kurds to combat war against the ISIS. The Russia also continued the air strikes to support the Assad regime. (Marsden, 2014). After ISIS attacks in Paris in 2016 France, Jordan, Qatar, Turkey and Israel also supported military interventions.

A Kurdish group named as the Partiya Yekitiya Demokrat (PYD) participated in the war against the ISIS. They remained a strong force against ISIS and shown strong resistance to the rival groups. Turkey

profoundly reacted to the U.S. support to the Kurds because of fear of provoking the Kurdish groups within its borders with Syria. In Turkey the Coup, d'état was failed that further deteriorated the situation (Stevens, 2016). Al-Nusra Front also described as Al-Qaeda in Syria a Salafist Jihadists organization is also fighting against Syrian government. The aim of this organization was to establish Islamic government in the Syria. The aim of this organization was to establish Islamic government in the Syria.

Syrian Refugees and Mass Migration

As per the report of the High Commissioner of United Nations, the Syrian civil war is the colossal humanitarian loss and on large scale mass migration of civilian of our time (UNHCR, 2016). According to Turkish government report, by March, 2016 the registered number of Syrian refugees were 48, 12,204 (UNHCR, 2016). According to the United Nation Commission for Human Rights (UNHCR), the numbers of registered refugees in Egypt are 2.1 million, 1.9 million migrants registered in Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon, while the numbers of registered Syrian migrants in North Africa are 28000 (UNHCR, 2016). The Syrian refugees were welcomed in Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Turkey and some European countries while temporary guest are Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq while other regional countries, particularly the Gulf states; Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar refused to allow refugees to settle in their respective jurisdiction (Amnesty International, 2016).

The recipient countries of Syrian refugees are badly affected in terms of infrastructure and development by the influx of migrants because they being in precarious condition are not in a position to handle them properly. The humanitarian organizations in coordination with the host countries are helping Syrian refugees to manage proper shelter and accommodation for them but

the massive flow of refugees has created electricity and water shortages (UNICEF, 2014). For examples out of 635,324 refugees in Jordan 86 percent residing in urban areas are living below the poverty lines (Amnesty International, 2016). In Lebanon more number of refugees is confronted with sanitation problems while their children are facing malnutrition problems and living substandard life (UNICEF, 2014).

The estimated age of refugee are 18-59 years who had migrated from Syria out of that 21.5% are male while 24 percent are female migrants. Children up to the age of 5-11 are the second largest category of migrants based on 11.2% male children while 10.6 percent are female kids (UNHCR, 2016). As per the report of year 2013 across the world 37,498 babies have born in Syrian refugee camps. As per the report 5.5 million children in dire need of humanitarian aid although the migrant's children living in Europe are living better life as compare to the children of refugees residing in neighboring countries and inside Syria (UNICEF, 2014).

During 2016 the ratio of migrants travelling to Europe had risen but it is comparatively low as their flow to the nearest states. The routes through which refugees are travelling to South Eastern Europe are of two separate ways. They travelled to Eastern Mediterranean via the Islands of Greek while on second route they travelled to Serbia-Hungary border via Western Balkans route. The rate of women and children migrating to Europe via Sea route increased from 30 percent in June 2015 to 60 percent till March 2016 (UNHCR, 2016).

The refugees usually confront with casualties on larger scale when they cross Mediterranean. In 2015 as a result of migration via sea route to Europe 3771 people had been drowned or went missing (UNHCR, 2016). After the start of war within three years 16211 refugees crossing borders to reach Europe were arrested by Greek port (Fargues, 2014). The UNHCR in 2016 had

shown hope that human smuggling and risk of adopting dangerous routes by Syrian refugees would be decreased with the passage of time by virtue of humanitarian aid and provision of Visas to refugees for resettlement of their family members (UNHCR, 2016).

The number of applications received in Europe between April, 2011 and December, 2015 for acquiring asylum were 897,645. Both Serbia and Germany receiving 59 percent applications of refugees is on the top list while 29 percent people had applied for asylum in Sweden, Denmark, Hungary, Netherlands and Austria and 12 percent refugees had given application for acquiring asylum of other countries in the Europe (Amnesty International, 2016).

After seven years of war from March 2011 to March 2018 in Syria, out of 22 million populations nearly 13 million Syrian are displaced (UNHCR, 2018). The details of the displaced persons inside and outside the country are as following:

1. More than Six million Syrians are internally displaced inside Syria as Internally Displaced Persons. (IDPs)
2. More than five million Syrians migrated to neighboring countries displaced Middle East and to North African countries (Egypt, Libya). In neighboring countries Turkey hosts 3.3 million registered refugees. In Lebanon more than one million Syrian refugees are seeking safety. More than 2 million refugees are seeking safety in Jordan. Iraq is hosting 246,000 registered refugees and Egypt is hosting 126,000 registered refugees.
3. Almost one million Syrians moved to Europe for seeking Asylum. Number of registered refugees are following: Germany 698,950; Sweden 122,087; Hungary 72,505; Croatia. 55,000; Greece 54,574; Austria 45,827; Netherlands 31,963; Armenia

22,000; Denmark 19,433; Bulgaria 17,527; Belgium 16,986; Norway 13,993; Switzerland 12,931; Serbia 11,831; France 11694; Spain 8365; Malta 1222 and Italy 2,525.

4. Almost 100,000 Syrian moved for asylum to North America. Majority of them moved to Canada and some applied for asylum in United States of America.

Asylum Seekers in Europe

During 1995 Europe allotted Schengen Area as borderless zone where migrants were allowed to settle for seeking asylum (Hampshire, 2015). Another regulation under the name of Dublin regulation 2013 ordered that only one application was enough for asylum seekers to gain International asylum by this way they would enter Europe (Hampshire, 2015). Northern European states adopted Dublin regulation while countries like Malta, Italy and Greece had adopted other ways for granting asylum to refugees in their particular countries. The European Union Commission had given proposal to Greece, Hungary and Italy for emergency 120000 refugee relocation scheme (Hampshire, 2015). In 2015 the commitment was made that 66,400 refugees would be relocated from Greece to other European countries only 1539 refugees had pledged to relocate and at the end of the days just 325 Syrian refugees relocation occurred (UNCHR, 2016).

At the time of Syrian Crisis in the Middle East, the Europe was once again passing similar economic crisis as they were faced with during World War II. At this hard time Germany and Sweden were among the for runner countries who wholeheartedly welcomed asylum seekers. They accepted refugees to avail their services as cheap labor and on humanitarian ground provide them possible facilities and put the precedents of helping needy Syrian. The refugee asylum issue divided

Europe into East-West blocks. Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia openly opposed relocation of refugees. Due to flow of refugees on Hungary border, she built razor wire fence to restrict the movement of refugees (Hampshire, 2015). Bulgaria had already installed 30 km fence on her adjacent Turkish border to stop Syrian refugee entry. In Europe to restrain the flow of migrants various tactics were adopted. Denmark passed a bill and ordered for confiscation of valuables of Asylum seekers worth more than \$ 1400. Besides this, government of Denmark also passed a bill and asked from refugees to wait three years in spite of one year so that to unify with their families. The spokesperson of United Nation refugees responded That Denmark strict stance would create fear and discrimination in refugees and is contrary to the basic concept of solidarity and fraternity with asylum seekers (Schlein, 2016).

Another hurdle created for refugee was their Muslim identity where some European countries felt that Islam would subdue Christianity and they even considered Islam as a threat to European religious structure (Hampshire, 2015). The Prime Minister of Slovakia had stated that he would not tolerate Muslim migrants who would construct Masjids in his country. They felt the fear of any future move of extremism behind the pretend of demanding asylum. Thus anti-Muslim sentiments can be judged from European policy because of different anti-Islam narratives that also creates problems for refugees (Hampshire, 2015). People of Britain voted in favour of Britain Exit (Brexit) from European Union with 52 percent vote on 23rd June, 2016 proved another stumbling block in the settlement of Syrian refugees in across Europe (EU referendum results, 2016).

According to CIC (2016) the Canadian government offered \$ 10000 interest free loan to each refugee family to be paid to government after three years. By June 20, 2016 total 28,449 refugees had reached Canada. As per

the CIC (2016) report, the Syrian refugees were sponsored by three main sponsors as following.

- a. Government sponsored refugees (15355)
- b. Privately sponsored refugees (9494)
- c. Blended visa office referred (2341)

Majority of the refugees sponsored by government and private sectors settled in urban cities of Toronto, Ottawa, Vancouver, and Montreal. However, some privately sponsored refugees had settled both in urban and rural areas near their sponsorship groups across the country. It is pertinent to mention that refugees belong to different ages having various kinds of physical and mental illness are treated by government in health care units so that they could remain prosperous and healthy (CIC, 2016).

Politics of Refugees

According to an estimate, during 2011 the Syrian population was 23 million. After more than consecutive war by October 2018 Syria's conflict that began in 2011 March has killed some 400,000 masses and some five million masses have fled to neighboring countries while millions others are internationally displaced. Beside this still 13.5 million people are in stern need of humanitarian aid. At the moment the state machinery and infrastructure is almost collapsed (Dawn newspaper, 2018). In the result of war 80 per cent of civilian are living below the poverty line. Most of the schools and hospitals are not operating. Polio disease is returned and once again Polio cases are found in Syria. Health services are minimized and people are confronted with basic health issues (UNICEF, 2018).

The Syrian conflict has changed the political paradigm of refugees. The Lebanon response for giving asylum to refugees was satisfactory while Turkey was also playing her specific role in giving passage to refugees. The flight of refugees was enhanced after weak role of

the rest of the Muslim and neighboring countries. The influx of refugees to European, American and African continents have re-modified the politics of the above regions. As there were different forums for supporting refugees and helping them on humanitarian grounds. Moreover, some factions were totally against the intentions of governments for giving asylum to them. The General Secretary of United Nations, while addressing to a gathering, shown grave concern over Syrian conflict and stated that after the Cold War, Syrian Crisis was the biggest threat to the world peace. Summing up, the Politics of refugee among countries is also the part and parcel of Syrian crisis and has big share in regional and international politics.

Conclusion

The Syrian conflict resulted into a mass humanitarian crisis in recent history. The intransigent attitude of President Bashar al-Assad and the opposition forces have devastated the whole country into the flames of unending fire. Millions of people have lost their loved ones and their homes. The strategic state of Syria has remained vital for the stability of the entire region. The Middle East will not be a stable region without any political in Syria which is one of the nerve centers of the tumultuous region. The people of Syria who took refuge in the neighboring countries have buried their hopes in their hometowns and now whole world is stranger to them. In addition, the world bodies like UN, OIC, Arab League and the great powers have miserably failed to end civil war in Syria. The Syrian crisis started in 2011 is still continued by dragging the regional and great powers like Turkey and Russia at loggerheads and in direct conflict with each other. In the result of this war, almost five million people have lost their lives, millions of masses migrated inside and outside the country. At the moment the fighting between different groups has caused economic, social, political crisis. The unending war has created multidimensional problems for Syrians

and the neighboring countries. World powers should intervene without any further delay to bring back peace and stability in the region before it spiral into the neighboring countries. At last, it can be understood that Syrian imbroglio is the result of proxies initiated by powerful actors. Beside this, different internal and external factors are responsible for this conflict. In a nut shell, it is the need of the hour that more attention from the global powers and the humanitarian organizations is required to resolve this crisis to end the large scale humanitarian crisis and stop the human rights violation.

References:

- Abboud, Samer. (2016). "Syria War: What you need to know about the ceasefire". *Aljazeera*. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com>
- Aljazeera. (18 Feb 2018). "Security Council Resolutions to be 'Geneva talk's basis." Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com>
- Amnesty International. (2016). "Syria's Refugee Crisis in Numbers." Retrieved <https://www.amnesty.org>
- BBC News. (2011). "Guide: Syria's Diverse Minorities." Retrieved from: <http://www.bbc.com>
- BBC News. (2014). "What is the Geneva Conference on Syria?" Retrieved from: <http://www.bbc.com>
- CIA. (2016). "The world fact book." Retrieved from: <https://www.cia.gov>
- CIC. (2016). "Joint Assistance Program – Sponsoring Refugees with Special Needs." Retrieved from: <http://www.cic.gc.ca>
- CIC. (2016). "Welcome Refugees: The Journey to Canada." Retrieved from: <http://www.cic.gc.ca>
- Doucet, L. (2017). "Syria Peace talks: Armed Groups come in from the Cold." *Migration Policy Centre*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com>.
- Fargues, P. (2014). "Europe must take on its share of the Syrian refugee burden, but how?" *Migration Policy Centre; Policy Briefs*, 2014(01), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu>
- Greenhill, K. M. (2016). "Open Arms behind Barred Doors: Fear, Hypocrisy and Policy Schizophrenia in the European Migration Crisis". *European Law Journal*. Vol. 22(3).
- Haddad, B. (2011). "The Political Economy of Syria: Realities and Challenges." *Middle East Policy*. Vol. 18(2).
- Hadfield, K. et al. (2017). What Can We Expect of the Mental Health and Well-Being Of Syrian

Refugee Children and Adolescents in Canada? *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 58(2). Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org>

- Hinnebudch, R. (2012). "Syria: From 'Authoritarian Upgrading' to Revolution?" *International Affairs*, 88(1). Retrieved From: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/refugees/sponsor>.
- Marsden, W. (27 July 2014). "Barack Obama Vows to 'Degrade and Destroy' ISIS Terrorists in Televised Speech." *National Post*. Retrieved from: <http://news.nationalpost.com/news/>
- Salloukh, B. (2005). "Syria and Lebanon: A Brotherhood Transformed". *Middle East Report*. Retrieved from: <http://www.merip.org>
- Stevens, J. (2016, August 1). "The number of migrants arriving on the Greek islands has doubled since the failed military coup in Turkey." *Mail Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk>
- UNHCR. (2016). "UNHCR Warns Imminent Humanitarian Crisis in Greece amid disarray in Europe over Asylum." Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/>
- UNHCR. (2017). "Syria Regional Refugee Response." Retrieved from: <http://data.unhcr.org>
- UNICEF Canada. (2016). "Meeting Syrian Refugees in Jordan: Five years into conflict, refugee children long for home, peace and school." Retrieved from: <http://www.unicef.ca>
- UNICEF. (2014). "Under Siege: the Devastating Impact on Children of Three Years of Conflict in Syria." Retrieved: <http://www.unicef.org>

International Refugee Law: The Case Study of Palestine

Muhammad Hanif

M. Phil Scholar, Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Hanifessazai1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The modern world has witnessed refugee crisis. In the Middle East the refugee crisis has been a pressing issue in Palestine and it goes on unabated. The Palestinians have been forced to abandon their permanent abode consequent upon the creation of 'Jewish State' in 1948. After the birth of Israel, the world witnessed mass exodus of Jew and Israel saw a mass influx of Jews from around the world, their settlement ended up with the Palestinian displacement and taking refuge in neighboring countries for the safety of their lives. Many of them carry no nationality rather living in refugee camps stateless. The international as well as regional bodies have passed conventions and protocols that include 1951 convention and 1967 protocol. Despite the existence of conventions and laws, the plight of Palestinian refugees continues to deteriorate and no enforcing authority has come forward to ensure and ameliorate the condition of the Palestinian refugees by removing political challenges and hurdles in the way of refugee laws implementation and guaranty of the right to return to the Palestinian refugees to their ancestral homeland and country of origin.

Key Words: International Law, Refugees, Palestine, Arab-Israel Conflict, United Nations, UNGA and UNSC Resolutions, Implementation and Challenges.

Introduction

The world witnessed two world wars, which resulted into mass migration of the people from one country to the other to avoid persecution of any kind. In the First World War, the Jews reported to have been persecuted by many world powers on the basis of their faith. The 1917 Balfour Declaration paved the way for, the Jews, the creation of a separate Jewish state. In 1948 Israel created on the world map with mass influx of Jews from around the world which resulted into the displacement of Palestinian from their ancestral homeland and establishment of refugee camps in the bordering state for Palestinians. Acknowledging the refugees crisis, the world body United Nations (UN) adopted 1951 Convention, first in its kind, to recognize, define and the guaranty the rights to the refugees. The subsequent protocols of 1967 further elaborated the refugee provisions and both the laws became the basis upon which regional and refugee laws were drafted and enforced in many member states for addressing the refugee issues.

Palestinian Refugees

The Palestinians refugees are the ones who left their home country amid war and chaos since 1948. Their children derive the status of refugee because of their being in refugee camps so far. The total numbers of the Palestinian refugees as per United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) data are 4,950,000 people. Out of them, only 1.5 million live in the United Nations Relief and Work Agency for Palestinian Refugees in Near East (UNRWA) camps while the rest of them have scattered throughout the world in search of better lives and opportunities.

The Palestinian refugees have the largest displacement and the oldest refugees in modern times in the world and it is very well known that they face protection problems

all over the world. The applicability of the international refugee law and lack of UN entity with an explicit mandate for them is a challenge for their protection. (Baker, 2018)

Beside the people living in the refugee camps, there are many refugees living in the neighboring countries of Jordan, Egypt and Libya and Lebanon who escaped persecution and took refuge in these countries. However, most of them do not want to return to the exact places of Palestine from there they were expelled. However, in return for some money, they can accept some money and will readily accept the proposals to live in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank as compared to Jerusalem. (Alrifai, 2019) The UN refugee law in 1951 and UN protocol in 1967 define the term refugees and their plight where they are migrating from and finding a safe place for them. Whether they are the habitual migrants or they are migrating to escape death for numerous reasons of persecution. It also defines the condition of the migrants that they are the victim of the religious, racial, and ethnic or any other persecution. (Zimmermann and Dorschner, 2001)

Challenges to Implement Refugee's Laws for Palestinian

As long as the people of Palestine live in exile and live in the miserable refugee camps, the issue of Palestine can never be resolved and peace cannot be established in the Middle East. (Freedman, 2018). The overwhelming majority of the people are still ready to move to the West Bank and Gaza Strip which is always agreed by the major powers in the 194 resolution, but still Israel is defiant of implementing this law and it has not received any external pressure to do so. (Alrifai, 2019)

These may have several issues but political barriers play a very important role in bringing about challenges to implement the international refugee laws on the

refugees of Palestine. There are many aspects of international law other than refugee convention that are relevant to the protection of Palestinian refugees and are working on them but policies of host states for Palestinian refugees is a challenge. (Alrifai, 2019)

They have social, economic, security and religious concerns. The challenge is that the super power like USA and International sovereign body like UN is also bound with restrictions wither for their own sake or come under pressure. (Lilly, 2018). The Palestine Israel issue is not a new issue but remained unsolved since decades. The international community knows the seriousness of the issue and is also willing to solve the issue but due to political, economic and social aspects they are unable to play a vital role solving the issue. The main issue is that Israel at no cost is ready to accept the resettlement of the Palestine refugees back to their home town. (Lilly, 2018) Since this research article is aimed at exploring the political challenges in the context of the refugee laws while keeping the Palestinian refugees as a case study, the researcher has endeavored to cover all the key political aspects in the context of challenges. These challenges are given below.

Challenges and Obstacles from Israel

The issue of Palestinian refugees is the core issue not only for Israel-Palestine, but also for host countries, international agencies and other states. The compensation costs will be high and need major international contributions. Third parties are involved in implementing the refugee laws but political issues are a challenge in providing them with the right to resettle within their states.

Many agreements have been signed in which the refugees were promised to go back to their home towns but it was just on paper. At first we discuss the case of Israel, Israel sees Palestinian as a threat for the

sovereignty of Israeli state. Israel is not interested to link directly with the Palestinian refugees and do not want to accept them as they pose security threats. (Freedman, 2018) Israeli position on the return of refugees have not been changed since 1948, they do not recognize the Palestinian refugees and they are not allowed to return because they are supposed to pose a threat for the demographic Jewish majority in Israel. (Sarsar, 2004) Furthermore, they consider that if the Palestine's return to their homeland such huge flow of refugees may pose not only security threat but also economic crisis to the Jewish community. Though agreements have been signed, but not accepted by the Israel.

The permanent citizen status providing by the Israeli decision makers is a challenge to them as they do not want to give this status to the Palestinian, they consider this to be a political driven demand. Israel has signed number of agreements but it remained on paper and practically they do not accept it. No international body can force them as they have support of USA. (Alrifai, 2019) Israel clearly declared that in no way they are going to accept back the resettlement of Palestinian refugees as they poses serious security and economic threat to Israel. Though Israel clearly knows that they were the one who really own the state but US support to the Jewish community makes it a political as well religious issue. (Sarsar, 2004)

Lack of Support from Muslim Countries

Another challenge regarding status of Palestinian refugees is the lack of support from the Muslim world. Though Palestinian refugees are present in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Gaza Strip and the west bank, their right varies from state to state. Syria is now at a civil war itself and they cannot give protection to the Palestinian refugees anymore. (Baker, 2018) In Lebanon, they have not given the status of permanent

citizenship but they are free to move, work and study but still they are not allowed to buy land. The refugees living in Gaza Strip is always in a state of threat and violence. Why these states are unable to help recognition of the Palestinian refugees. Various factors are playing a role but most important is the political factor. If they back the cause of Palestine they may face economic sanctions and security threats from outside powers. Saudi Arabia has the capacity but is not helping in solving the issue because of its close relations with United States of America. (Sarsar, 2004)

Many Arab countries cooperate with Israel on economics, trade and other issues. Iran who attacked Israel from Syria is now facing major economic sanctions. Such actions from UN and USA make other Muslim world to rethink before they take any step in supporting the issue of Palestinian resettlement. Muslim states also have power to cope this issue, but they seek their internal profit, economic stability is much more important to them rather than standing behind the Palestinian. (Baker, 2018) Most of the Islamic states have taken action against cruelty of Israel and in return faces harsh sanctions of USA. Dependency of Islamic states on western countries and being an ally of USA restricted their policies to raise voices for the resettlement of the refugees. Most of the Islamic states such as Saudi Arab do not show any keen interest in solving this issue; they cannot do so as they share a cordial economic, security and political relation with the United States. (Sarsar, 2004)

Challenges and Obstacles from the U.S.

Whenever a law passed that is in favor of or good solutions to solve this dispute USA use its Veto power and fail the law. Majority of US is supporting Israel due to major political aspects such as U.S. Cold War imperatives and Israel's increasing popularity in US.

Israel and USA opposed UN involvement in the decision taken that Palestinians have the right to move to their own state. USA is financially supporting Israel to establish a strong Jewish state. (Freedman, 2018) Numerous resolutions have been passed in which UN condemn the attacks of Israelis on the Palestinian and demand to end Israeli occupation at the west bank, east Jerusalem and Golan heights, but Israel refusal to such demands was a challenge to UN as well. As the U.S. is the biggest donor of UN; UN is not free enough to deal with the issue. The U.S. is supporting, financing and building capacity of Israel while having political goals in mind. (Freedman, 2018)

Such as presence of the U.S. allies in the Middle Eastern region is a positive point for the U.S. As Islam is increasing and the U.S. have the fear to lose its power they are planning to strengthen a Non-Muslim state among the Muslim states to confirm its presence there. Though the U.S. have allies in Muslim world as well yet there may be some political issues that the U.S. is supporting the Israel point of view of not accepting returning of Palestinian refugees to their homeland. (Alrifai, 2019) The U.S. strategy of excluding UN from Palestine issue was very shocking to most of the world but U.S. is striving to play a role getting the refugees settled in other parts of the world. The U.S. concern over the Israel-Palestine conflict is not humanitarian but it is strategic. The U.S. wants some societal stability, but do not want political decision making stability to ensure its sovereignty in the region.(Alrifai, 2019)

The peace plan of President Trump, dubbed as the “Deal of the Century” is nightmare for the Palestinian refugees. According to the so-called deal of the century, the fate of the refugees would be settled in a future Palestinian state on the conditions and wishes of Israel as a Jewish state. Israel is adamant and intransigent accept the return of Palestinian refugees owing to the

fear of demographic shift in the state of Israel. The forgoing deal is one-sided peace proposal which has been outrightly rejected by the Palestinians as the slap of the century. The controversial peace plan of the Trump administration has further complicated the case of Palestinian refugees.

UN Role in Palestinian Refugees' Crisis

The UN is a central actor in ending the Israel occupation and ensures the rights of return to the Palestinians. UN holds legitimacy and authority to perform tasks for peace around the world. But despite its great efforts the agency has failed to solve the issue of Israel and Palestine due to external factors. The UN Security Council remained silent; Israel is not accepting the ways of peace that UN proposes to them. Like the council voted to send a team to Jenin to find a solution to end this violence but Israel did not allow the team to enter there, Israel did not accept the legitimacy of UN and UN could not pressure Israel to accept their decision. (Lilly, 2018)

It is a shame for an agency such prestigious like UN where the UN Security Council is just paralyzed and cannot take a strict action to implement the refugee law for Palestinian refugees. The end or lemmatization of the U.S. funds for the UNRWA is a greater challenge for them as U.S. claims that these funds will be used at bigger projects. Is there any bigger project than saving the lives of innocent people of Palestine? The UN Secretary General called for robust international protection for Palestinian s under military occupation but it was hugely ignored by Israel and was backed up by USA. Likewise, the Camp David II Summit also failed as Israelis were privileged and Pale Sanines remain disempowered.

Washington refuses to do so. UN is unable to bring about a change in the status of the refugees despite of

many struggles and agreements. The agreements were just on the paper but a practical step cannot be taken due to negligence and not acceptance of Israel. The U.S. veto power in this regard plays a significance role in building hurdle to solve the issue. Similarly, UN is unable to experiment the refugee laws for Palestine. (Hathway and Foster, 2014) The UNRWA is a UN body that especially works for the Palestinian refugees; was being funded by US, but recently they have cut a large portion of the funds which poses a great challenge to UN and UN is somehow failed due to the policy of USA to bring the basic support for the refugees of Palestine.

The Israel-Palestine issue has captured the emotions, imaginations and interest of almost the entire world. The states that provide help for the Palestinian refugees are using this issue as a bargaining chip. A large number of funds being provided to the host states and they spend almost half of it in the refugees themselves. (Hathway and Foster, 2014) The international community and its intervention are mostly for their own political and economic interest, they have the aim to utilize its power, strategic interests, influence and public opinion towards their regimes. Politics is considered to be a deep shallow well where you only seek your own existence, safety and security. The states use these refugees to get the support of their citizens' but in a real sense they are not playing any role in the rehabilitation of the refugees. The Palestinian refugees are being used as a bargaining chip in the host countries where as other states they just show their condolences and support on paper. Most of the states use their support and help they provide to achieve support of the citizens. (Baker, 2018)

The refugees are being treated differently at different states, all of them receive some sort of financial support from the UN to help the refugees. The world had treated Palestine refugee outside the international refugee law and as a bargaining chip for sorting out a negotiable

solution. Throughout the period, there have been several attempts made to increase the wellbeing of the refugees at the camps at different states while most plans were failed. The living condition of refugees in Lebanon is very critical and they are not being treated well. (Raffonelli, 2004) On one hand, Lebanon is seeking financial support while on the other hand they treated the refugees as prisoners. Such poor conditions of the refugees at the Lebanon camps are being used as a bargaining chip to let the issue be solved and let them go back to their state. (Raffonelli, 2004)

UNSC Resolution 242 and 338

The Palestine Liberation Army and the Israel signed a treaty in September 1993 in which both the parties have agreed to establish a Palestine autonomous authority in the Gaza Strip. It was a historic agreement between the parties to settle their long lasting issues since decades that have been kept in limbo. (Karayanni, 2014) Mainly the notable contents were discussed in this agreements were Palestine's Diaspora and the rights of the Palestinians. This agreement brought forth the issue of the refugees in both the states and indicated their permanent solution according to the UN Security Council's Resolution 242 and 338.

The Resolution 242 was adapted unanimously by the members of the UNSC in 1967. This resolution was adopted in the wake of the 1967 War. This resolution was passed keeping in view the chapter VI of the UN Charter. It was directed in the resolution that the all territories that Israel had annexed during the Six Day War were nullified by the UNSC; therefore, Israel was supposed to withdraw from these territories. (Zimmermann and Dorschner, 2001) Secondly, the states must refrain from the use of force and do not demonstrate any act of belligerence and must respect the sovereignty of each other. On the other hand, the resolution 338 was adapted by the UNSC in 1973 in the

wake of the 1973 war. Both these resolutions defied the Israeli aggression against Palestine also and defied the annexed territories as illegal from which the Palestinians were being pushed out to clear the path for the Israeli settlements. (Jastram and Achiron, 2001)

Power Politics on Palestinian Refugees

International system is run through the global superior powers. Unless the superior powers under design the strategy to carry out political maneuver, the international system tends to jam. The international system is directed through the political and diplomatic means of the super power countries. (Jastram and Achiron, 2001) International Laws signify the equal status of the countries in the eyes of laws, but the reality is much different. The international order is chaotic and in the absence of a supreme body to tame the states, there is always the climate of anarchy. The will of the stronger powers to subdue the weaker states has been the most prevalent notion throughout the history of the international relations.

The weaker countries always endeavor to stay out of the gambit of the influence of the stronger and the stronger countries always endeavor to subjugate the weaker. When the question comes to the refugee crisis in the Middle East, especially, of the Palestinians, the weaker states are seen supporting the cause of the Palestinians, but the lack of will of the major powers like the U.S., European Union and Russia and China has not been that supportive to their cause. (Academie de Droit International, 2002) This lack of will to act upon and implement the international refugee law has given Israel the unbridled authority to downplay the cause of the Palestinians and push them to the tight corner. They have been systematically subjected to displacement and exclusion from the society through the Jewish

settlements which have expanded to the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

The first wave of the refugee crisis in the heart of the Middle East took place in 1948 during the first Arab-Israel war. The war took place in the wake of the declaration of the Jewish homeland within Palestine by the latter Prime Minister David ben Gurion. The war was uneven as the Jews were military and diplomatically supported by the major powers like Britain and Russia. (Cattan, 1973) On the other hand, the Arabs were geographically and politically divided, in the absence of foreign support; they could not sustain the war and, thus, were defeated. The defeat came with the massive expulsion of the Palestinians by Israel who had taken control of Jerusalem. The expulsion triggered the first refugee crisis of the Palestinian people.

The blatant support of the major powers like Russia, USA, France and Great Britain bolstered the Israel settlements which gradually began to expel the Palestinians out of their homes. Soon they reached to millions and since then have been living in the camps administered by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees. Many Palestinians have taken refuge in the neighboring countries as well. (Kattan, 2008) The main challenge to their rehabilitation in the post settlement period is the lack of will of the stronger countries to even allow the settlement of the refugees to take place. They are not even allowed to go back to their homes.

Future Prospects

In every sense United Nations lacks imposing of any military, political social and economic sanctions against the rogue and defiant states. The history is replete with many glimpses. United States of America is itself a defiant state. (Fraser, 2015) The United Nations is not

an enforcing body. It is just an embodiment of the cooperation and zeal of the countries to sustain their relations. Since this organization is formed by the states and its entire management and administration is run by the states through their funds, it cannot become the dominating institutions and cannot become supreme.

If the states do not oblige with its code of conduct and defy its resolutions, it cannot take action against them. The only way of action against the harbingers of terror and mischief mongers against peace is through the Security Council, but there also the resolutions need the endorsement of the veto powers. (Bowker, 2003) Given the case of the Palestinian refugees, the international law has blatantly been violated by Israel not just once, but frequently by denying the Palestinians right to return to their homeland where the Jewish settlements have forcefully pushed them or they had been forced to leave during the Israeli aggression. Yet, the Security Council cannot take action against it because of the successive vetoes by USA. Therefore, under certain circumstances, where the states demonstrate their power, United Nations cannot do anything to ensure the implementation of its resolutions. Thus, it is helpless and the miseries of the Palestinian refugees grow day by day. (Al Majdal, 2002)

Conclusion

The maltreatment to the Palestinian Muslims reveals the fact that the major powers of the world including the world organization are not serious in fulfilling their international obligations of protecting the rights of the people. Israel still remains unbridled and violates the international law at will. The main Muslim organizations like the OIC are also silent on this issue. Israel is expanding the network of its settlements in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank which means the number of the Palestinian Muslims as refugees will increase in

an unabating manner. The lack of interest of the countries coupled with the ignorance of the refugees about their own rights is also contributing factors which keep the international refugee laws at bay. Millions of Palestinians are at the mercy of Israeli brutality and despotism while the major powers remain in sullen silence. The United Nations and the International Court of Justice cannot force any county to comply with the International Laws and same is the case with the Palestinian refugees.

References

- Academie de Droit International. (2002). *The Palestine Yearbook of International Law, 1999-2000*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Baker, Alan. (2018). Palestinian Manipulation of the International Community. *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*. <https://jcpa.org>, (accessed on May 15, 2019).
- Bowker, Robert. (2003). *Palestinian Refugees: Mythology, Identity, and the Search for Peace*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Cattan, Henry. (1973). *Palestine and International Law: The Legal Aspects of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Longman: University of California.
- Fraser, Thomas. (2015). *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*. New York: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Freedman, Robert. (2018). *Israel and the United States: Six Decades of US-Israeli Relations*. Washington : Taylor & Francis.
- Hathaway, James C. and Michelle Foster. (2014). *The Law of Refugee Status*. London : Cambridge University Press.
- Jastram, Kate, et al. (2001). *Refugee Protection: A Guide to International Refugee Law*. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
- Karayanni, Michael. (2014). *Conflicts in a Conflict: A Conflict of Laws Case Study on Israel and the Palestinian Territories* . London: Oxford University Press.
- Kattan, Victor. (2009). *From Coexistence to Conquest: International Law and the Origins of the*

Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1891-1949. New York: Pluto Press.

- Kattan, Victor. (2008). *The Palestine Question in International Law*. British Institute of International and Comparative Law.
- Lilly, Damian. (2018). UNRWA's Protection Mandate: Closing the 'Protection Gap'. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, Volume 30, Issue 3, 444-473.
- Raffonelli, Lisa. (2004). *With Palestine, against the Palestinians The Warehousing of Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon*. World Refugee Survey.
- Sarsar, Saliba. (2004). The Question of Palestine and United States Behavior at the United Nations. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 457-470.
- Tamara, Alrifai. (2019). *Gaza's "Great March of Return" One Year on: Impact on Palestine Refugees and UNRWA Services [EN/AR]*. Relief Web. <https://reliefweb.int/report>. (accessed on May 14, 2019).
- *War Crimes, International Law and Durable Solutions for Palestinian Refugees*. (2002), Al Majdal Magazine, Issue No. 14, Resource Center for Palestinian Residency & Refugee Rights.
- Zimmermann, Andreas, et al. (2001). *The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol: A Commentary*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Humanitarian Intervention under International Law: A Critical Analysis

Noor Khan

M. Phil Scholar at Area Study Center,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Noormiakhail@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

War among states is commonly regulated by International law, and precise bulks of law on use of force and state behavior in war is molded. The UN Charter is the basic bulge and creates medians that desperados the state action on one cross as well as the UNSC authorization to evaluate the situation and then converse a verdicts on communal movements to encompass armed action. Current legal statutes of armed assail and the practice of humanitarian intervention has masqueraded gargantuan confront to International Relation and International law, and humanitarian intervention has demonstrated precise dissonant. The gap in international legal system about Doctrine of R2P as base of HI arises serious question about political sovereignty. From the history, states could use the concept of sovereignty as a shield from foreign invasion, but Now, the international community, through authority of UNSC is obliged to prepared for intervene when they consider that sovereign regime is manifestly incapable to care for its population and then applied the norm of R2P. The UNSC, enactment with the approval of the principle of humanitarian intervention was not regular and especially after Arab spring, the discerning role of military intervention especially Libyan intervention creates stern distort in international community.

Key words: International Law, Humanitarian Intervention, United Nations, Libya, UNSC, Use of Force, ICISS and Responsibility to Protect.

Introduction

Humanitarian intervention supported by the military paved a drastic departure from the conventional methods of attacks on a country. It is the use of force or threat to use force and sanctions against another state to stop the human rights violation. The humanitarian intervention is a controversial subject under the International Law as it is linked with direct intervention in the internal affairs of another state which has not committed an act of aggression against the invading state. The concept of the forgoing intervention is solely based humanitarian objectives, but it includes national and strategic interests in terms of power politics. It dates back to the Hugo Grotius and European politics in the 17th Century and since the NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999, the humanitarian intervention has emerged one of the contested and debatable subject in the contemporary international politics. It is invoked when the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) becomes unable to pass any resolution under Chapter VII of the UN Charter to maintain international peace and security vis-à-vis the veto power of the P-5 states. This concept was first time invoked in 1990 when Russia and China did not support international efforts to establish no-fly-zones in northern Iraq to stop Saddam regime from attacking Kurds. The NATO's involvement to topple the Qaddafi regime or regime change in Libya following the Arab Spring in 2011 has compelled the scholars of the International Relations to critically analyze the humanitarian intervention under the International Law.

A similar concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) was codified by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in 2001 in

response to the UN Secretary General emphasized on international community to intervene on humanitarian grounds. The norm or concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) emerged at the conclusion of United Nations (UN) World Summit 2005 in the New York, which was endorsed by all UN member states as a global political commitment to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The aims and objectives of the R2P are based on International Law to stop armed conflicts, protect human rights and ultimately, maintain the international peace and security as the UN Charter refrains all members state from threatening or using violence against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has the primary responsibility to maintain the international peace and security. Under the International Law, the UNSC is the authority to authorize the use of force under the R2P as last resort when all measures like mediation, economic sanctions and other peaceful mechanism have failed to deter the armed conflicts and human rights violation. There are three important pillars of the R2P: (1) the protection responsibilities of the state; (2) international assistance and capacity building; and timely and decisive response. The concept of R2P varies from the concept of humanitarian intervention. The latter deals with the use of force as right to intervene whereas the R2P is based on responsibility to protect.

History of Humanitarian Intervention

The doctrine of humanitarian intervention has several definitions from various sources and experts. The Classical Encyclopedia of Public International Law (1995) defines the humanitarian intervention as the “use of armed force by a state for protection and freedom from any danger or threat to his populace or those of third countries” and conventionally called as self-defense. However Robertson formulated the modern definition of the concept: “A doctrine under which one

or more states may take military action inside the territory of another state in order to protect those who are experiencing serious human rights persecution, up to and including attempts at genocide.” The doctrine of humanitarian intervention originates by 17th-century (Hugo Grotius, *de jure belli* chap. XXV, Dutch jurist) but morally and socially the concept is considering as “A general authorization for vigilantes and opportunists to participate in hegemonies”, While many scholars consider humanitarian intervention as imperative provisions to legitimize what otherwise called ‘act of aggression’.

However, the term is also noticed as tool of developed world to suppress the small states. There are three famous interventions, Indian combat in East Pakistan, Tanzania conflict in Uganda and Vietnam warfare in Cambodia. In each case humanitarian concerns were a secondary or even tertiary consideration and Law derivate from these precedents are infinite approach for superior nations to subjugate their fragile neighbors. Although Franck adapted that the “use of force regime is not prepared for a humanitarian exception due to the prospect of self-serving interpretations by intervening states”. Michael Walzer share a different idea that a, mere’ intervention, or that intervention ought to be in snap to measures that have ‘stunned the scruples of mankind” So through this decisive factor, Walzer not approved intervention in Libya. (Walzer and Micheal, 2002).

Finally, Nicholas Wheeler, moved for a defensive humanitarian intervention, that the intervention should tackle foremost troubles such as massacre, carnage and large population ejection and ‘clear evidence of genocide’, and the intervention will have humanitarian ending. (Wheeler, *World Fact book – Libya: CIA*, 2012)

The planned norms on intervention flaunt the academic community. For legitimate intervention, Responsibility

to protect philosophy is brought in field (The conception of “R2P” is outcome of the 2005 United Nations summit in Newyark.) though this endorsement doesn't give a sturdy assurance but it will give, grade of international obligation to follow the standards of the theories of scholars like Tesón, Wheeler or Walzer. For holding such a chaste intentions of the intervening militia, interventions ought to rather be tripartite. (Tesón and Fernando, 2011).

Humanitarian Intervention under International Law

Socioeconomic rules limits cannot be crossed by the states. The United Nation was established at the rule that Use of force is banned until the rationale for it cascade into approved exception. Humanitarian intervention has not only defensive aspects but also offensive rudiments and thus has been highly challenging in international law. But in an extraordinary exodus from previous rule to description of “THREAT” to peace, the UNSC, in declaration 1992 expressed that, “the nonexistence of war and armed revelries in states does not guarantee international peace and security. The un-armed assets of flux in the economic, social, humanitarian and ecological fields have become threats to peace and security.”

General Annan inquires a query that “if humanitarian interference is undesirable attack on autonomy, how can counter Rwanda, Srebrenica genocide – the horrible and organized denial of rights for humans that distress each guideline of universal human race? (Kofi Anan Speech 2000). This destined that the fundamental ethics of sovereignty and noninterference would reserve in the chase of superior human rights defense. Thus international law staging universal progress in trace of human liberties at the cost of principle of “state sovereignty” justifies the UN military intervention. Scholars of international relations are worried about the

misuses of humanitarian intervention as a tool by the strong in the affairs of the weak. (Ayoob, 2002) Through a sequence of resolutions appearing in an intensifying description of Article 39 of the UN charter pertaining to terrorization to international serenity and protection the council has endorsed various military campaign in retort to humanitarian crises. (UN Charter 1945).

The report of ICISS December 2001 was purposeful episode in international dialogue of humanitarian intervention. It's in fact tried to codify a right of humanitarian intervention against genocide and to argue for an even stronger principle recognized the doctrine of R2P. Unexpected maturity of "Arab Spring 2010" stunned philosophers and regional rulers. Further, the notion of intervention for human reason emerged in 1990 with parallel idea of "responsibility to protect," as advanced since 2005, jointly tender a mixture of diverse views.

As General Assembly Resolution 2625 put it "No state or group of states has the right to intervene directly for any reason whatever in the internal or external affairs to any other state." Progress of human rights as common doctrine along with necessity to guard folks from wrecks, the international community along with states as a full or step by step clench the conception of peace through the United Nations Charter. The UNSC is claimed to possess established an on the spot link under Article 39 of the Charter to identify the humanitarian catastrophe and menace to the peace that starts UNSC action under this chapter:

Article 39: "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what actions shall be taken in accordance with *Articles 41 and 42*, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Charter interprets a consolidated mechanism for armed action. But the past actions shows that UNSC is not able to follow the guide lines in letter and spirit, and lamented from the schemed vision by the creators of the Charter and engaged an extensive interpretation of *Article 39* and has broadened its space of action. The UN Charter is the product of the two World Wars and the Charter is focused on collective security system, but the twentieth century has faced a situation where threats to international peace and security initiate not from wars among states but as of clashes within states. So, UNSC not only observed and provide mechanism to interstate clashes but also intrastate wars, such as civil wars, as “threats to the peace” under *Article 39 of the Charter*. In 1960, UNSC called the “large-scale killings of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination and segregation” in South Africa had steered to “international friction” and “might endanger international peace and security.”

Article 41: “The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and rail, sea, air, postal telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations”

Article 42: “Should the Security Council consider that the measures provided for in *Article 41* would be inadequate or has proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such actions may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the United Nations”

In humanitarian dilemma, IR scholars and thinkers, assemble various ideology to evaluate either an

intervention is enviable and justifiable. Experts initially elucidate the blurred legal position of humanitarian intervention and the non-binding nature of R2P but persuasive implementation of the doctrine into the duty for the international organizations and UN. As intervention should be permissible and effective, and in case of humanitarian intervention “human rights promotion “should be the test of effectiveness. (Pattison, 2011). Cunliffe collected different thoughts, the notion as "duty to care,” and cease that application of doctrine is harmful for states relation.(Philip Cunliffe,2010) Bellamy objects the common vagueness of concept (Alex J. Bellamy, Responsibility to Protect,) and Stahn summarize “responsibility to protect is still a political motto rather a legal rule".

Cases of Humanitarian Intervention

After the Cold War and the finale of bipolar world perceived large scale armed intervention as legitimate use solely for humanitarian cause as their rationale, Important of them are as under:

Libya: Muammar al-Gaddafi, has been dictatorial leader of Libya after 1969 Libyan overthrow of King Idris. The United States had good affairs with Libya till US embassy was hit by students in 1979 in Iranian revolution, and US President Reagan called, the Libyan Government an alloy of Iran. Reagan increase “diplomatic, economic, and military pressure on Libya” and in 1983 attempted to overthrow and assassinate Gaddafi and in 1986 attacked the Libyan cities of Benghazi and Tripoli as ‘terrorist activity and training ‘centers. Meanwhile the incident of ‘Lockerbie Bombing ‘of Pan-Am flight 103 and a French UTA airplane explosion over Niger was took place and Libyan role of action is doubted there. In consequence of these events, France, UK, and USA, demanded the surrender of these to blame for air craft bombings. The leader of Libya Gaddafi rejected the demands and

consequently UNSC adopted resolution 748 in March 1992, commanding trilateral bans on LIBYA. In April 1999, after negotiations Libya became ready to deliver the 2 suspects of the Lockerbie bombings to be trialed in The Hague and the sanctions were suspended imposed seven years past. Later on in 2003 and 2004, Libya agreed to pay the compensation amount to the victims' families of the Lockerbie bombings as \$2.7 billion and \$170 million respectively.

In another move Libya 'own free will' suspended the program of nuclear weapons, and connected carriage systems. This step leads Libya to come out from terrorism supported country's list and also ended the sanctions. A string of rising, called as the "Arab Spring" in 2010 December began in northern Africa, and firstly hit the Libyan city of Benghazi on February 15, 2011, in retort to the detention of a human rights lawyer and later on took the shape of civil war due to which Libyan forces evacuate the city of Benghazi because of the devastating demonstration, and later on spread out to many more cities of the country through raising the slogans to culminate the Gaddafi government. The Libyan rebels transformed themselves in the 'National Transitional Council' (NTC) of Libya to give a 'political face' to the revolt. France accepted the NTC as the legal regime of Libya and UNSC through Resolution 1973, on March 17, 2011, called for an abrupt "cease-fire and a complete end to violence and all attacks against, and abuses of, civilians", and also enforced arms-embargo and no-fly zone over Libya and also permitted member-states to take "all necessary measures (...) to protect noncombatants. French army started to defend the no-fly zone over Libya and NATO seize over all military charge, by 29th March, below the canopy of '*Operation Unified Protector*'. Rebel forces stretched out more land from Gaddafi and on August 24, 2011, Gaddafi was died under suspicious conditions after topple of Tripoli Government and with this death

NATO ended Operation *Unified Protector* in 2011 October. (Al-Dustour 2012).

The crunch in Libya attracted the quicker international reaction and expressly associated with idea of R2P as compare to former crisis prior to it. On 26thFeb 2011, the UNSC through Resolution 1970 predestined the deployment of force against civilians, enforced sanctions and referred Libyan case to the ICC (*International criminal court*), “the first unanimous referral of a crisis state of affairs to the ICC”. Latter on Resolution 1973 clarify the divergent views and distressed on the correct method of action on its application. On 19thMarch 2011, French, British and USA forces action is considered as extra vigorous without giving any chance to the reps of the African Union to trip Libya to discuss and end of hostilities with the Muammar al-Qaddafi.

Political, military specialists and international commentators after topple of Gaddafi Government debated that regime change exceeded the command of *1973 Resolution*. (Aljazeera News, 2011). The Libya intervention relined the international attention pertaining to the responsibility to protect and put back the idea within the first place on the important normative queries that underpinned the establishment of idea. Referrals case of Libya to ICC and the Role of Force to shield Civilians and the permission of powerful measures against a state, like sanctions has conjointly proved dubious inside the UNSC. As former South African President Thabo Mbeki said that UNSC neglected and blocked the AU endeavors to brought peace in Liberia conflict. (Mbeki 2012) .However, employment of force has been foremost contentious contrivance within the discussions on R2P.

Kosovo: UNSC Resolutions 1160 and 1199 in 1998 of Charter Chapter –V11 described the situation in Kosovo as a threat to international peace and security and

rejected the idea of domestic conflict. The resolution highlighted the human rights violation by the Yugoslavian in Kosovo and also called the deployment of life-threatening force by Serbian as unacceptable and demanded the instantaneous efforts to recover the humanitarian situation to remove all Serbian forces from Kosovo. Devastation and Belgrade's denial to obey was reflected as the account for the armed action.

Iraq: Saddam-Hussain action against Kurds and Shiites in north and south respectively fascinated international consideration. UNSC through Resolution No-688 in April 1991 condemning that “the repression of Iraqi civilian population in many parts of Iraq, including most recently in Kurdish populated areas, the consequences of which threaten international peace and security.” Resolution No 688 was the credentials of humanitarian crisis and states exploitation of the country residents as threat to International peace. So neglecting the rule of non-intervention and crossing the limits of international law through formation of “No Fly Zone” and “Safe Heavens” for Kurdish refugee by international forces, and in the upcoming decade this humanitarian intervention converted into open war and finished at regime change.

Darfur: Sudan the larger contrary in Africa has the population of Arab Muslim in north and African Christian in south. For ascendancy in power and control over Government the Sudanese Arabs having “Sudanese peoples Liberation Army” (SPLA) commenced a civil war for over twenty years, and in 2004 through peace agreement the south was given autonomy, but in Darfur region in 2003 Arab tribes attacked over black to extend their autonomy, black guerrilla from Darfur began military operation in response and the Sudanese Government retorted by supplying Arms to Arab tribes legitimizing them as militant. Their action draws international consideration and the important militating are the Janjaweed, as result humanitarian Catastrophe was developed. In

consequence the UNSC voted for numerous Resolutions in 2004 after spread of civil war in Darfur. Initially through resolution (July 2004) UNSCR-1564 created a mandate of addition of Darfur under the existing UN mission in Sudan (UNMIS). Through UNSC second resolution 1590 (2005) a committee is formed to examine the actions in Darfur. A new Darfur peace accord in place of 2004 peace agreement is passed by UNSC in 2006 and in July 2007, through UNSCR-1769, UNAMID, UN African Union Mission in Darfur is brought in field.

Rwanda: In Rwanda from 6 April to July, 1994 in a genocide dread initiated between HUTU and Tutsi were took life of an estimated 800,000 Rwandans , But UN linger silent, in the face of mounting disaster due to Somalian failure . Latter on UN propelled in 1993 a diminutive action by sending a force to supervise a ceasefire between Tutsi patriotic front PRF and Rwandan Government, but at once UN through dreadful verdict depart its forces, and damned the Rwandans to their doom. Later on Franc with verdict of UNSC under Chaptter-V11 as the situation is declared as a threat to international security and peace from the domestic dislocation of one and half million Rwandans at the boarder of contiguous counties, interferes by deployment of forces and shielded the refugees. This crumple act of the UN and failure to maintain its adopted action accentuated the application of the norm of HI as it contended with other state interests.

Somalia: In the UN history the 1992 intervention in Somalia through Resolution No 814 under Chapter V11 to implement its mandate by force in circumstances of anarchy and chaos was exceptional. Its rudimentary drive was to dispense food items and to obtained political goals, but continuous resistance compelled the UN to perched the operation in 1995. As the aversion arises with local warlords, and also the U.S. forces lose their declaration of impartiality, due to which state transformed into a humanitarian crisis and food and

medicine chain become targeted and botched to arrive at the planned recipients.

Bosnia: In seek of greater Serbia the Serbian president Slobodan Milosevic in 1987 through forging alliances with Serbian nationalist, move to annex Bosnian parts. In April 1993 UNSC through Resolution No. 819 delineate vital departures from the order of noninvolvement in a war of two sides, but in place of protection one facet within a war against another, the UN aligned with one facet within the conflict lead a continuing normative shift in humanitarian intervention.

Future of Humanitarian Intervention

Under the Article 2 (7), the United Nations has no authority to intervene in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, while this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. (Purposes and Principles of the UN) However, the UNSC have absolute autonomy in interpreting that a ruin can be professed as threat for International Security and peace, if the Council confirms” But intervention is considering acceptable if as, “Humanitarian intervention should be non-forcible, methods without military force to assuage mass human agony within sovereign borders” (David J.S, Modern Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention (1992). Hurd clearly articulate about this uncertainty that, “Existing international law can be read as favor or combat International humanitarian interventions, and the legal ambiguity around humanitarian interventions is fundamental.”

Humanitarian intervention is extremely discerning; History has several examples of mass havoc where no intervention has occurred. Various examples include the force starvation of almost 1 million Ethiopian people by their Government in the 1980s and slay of thousands of Kurds by the Iraqi Government in 1988-89, and in Darfur which is called genocide by money, has yet to trigger

intervention by an international military force. In Middle East the Syrian, Libyan and Yemeni crises erupted around same time but received very distinct response from the international world.

Use of force and military intervention in a sovereign state bordered concept of sovereignty and dragged international law in capricious directions. Non-intervention is the duty correlative to the rights of sovereignty. As a result of the distinctive implementation in Libya, through the doctrine of “responsibility to protect” (R2P) in absence of proper codified law and without any judicial review and just on the recommendation of UNSC, is only for the interests of dominant nations and drone the region and state in anarchy and ultimately the decay of humanism in the affected area. During Libyan operation and before Gaddafi death the UN recognized the NTC as the legitimate authority of Libyan people, But continue civil war arises serious question about the legitimacy and after Gaddafi death the NATO chief announced that NATO led forces stopped a massacre and save incalculable lives (Rasmussen,2011) . However the world scholars also counted the death toll of six months of civil wars. (Dawson, 2012)

Conclusion

Humanitarian intervention is a highly controversial tryout and frequently applied in cases as an authentication when required domestic support for direct political intervention. In the name of a greater purpose it assigns legitimacy to states to intervene. The resolution to intervene is deeply partisan by the morals and political position of the intervening states. Thus, intervention can never be entirely philanthropic. The abrupt refer of situation in Libya to ICC and then permission of armed action and in further move the extension of the mandate, politically as well as under International law created mistrust about the USA and

European humanitarian Intervention which arises a serious question about the future of application R2P elsewhere. Generally the armed action should be the last and final resort, where a proper and legalized method of negotiation from all corners are applied and failed as compare to Libyan case where African envoy tried for that but NATO denied the permission and started military action. The UNSC mandate and authorization should be clear and action will be explicit as compare to Libyan case where the UN mandate was used for regime change and ended with the death of Gaddafi and this overstepping of UN mandate in Libya may have the disastrous consequences and till today the country faces the political and economic decline and the state is on the bank of disintegration and humanitarian predicament.

References:

- Alter, M. (2012). “Libya after Gaddafi: Interactive Dynamics and Political Future”. Comment on a Panel, in Libya, Prospects and Challenges of Democratization. *The Arab Future*, 4(34).
- Aqel, Z. (2011). The Military of the Uprising: The External and Internal Failure in the Libyan Republic. *International Politics*, 148(47).
- Archibugi, D. (2003). *Cosmopolitan Guidelines for Humanitarian intervention*. Rome: Italian National Research Council and London School of Economics and Political science.
- Campbell, H (2013). “Global, NATO and the Catastrophic Failure in Libya”. *Monthly Review Press*.
- David, J.S (1992). “Modern Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention”. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 1(1).
- Dina, S., & Maryam, W. (2011). “The Dynamics of Change in the Arab World”. *Law and Policy*, 2(2).
- Fernando, T. R. (2011). “Humanitarian Intervention: Loose Ends”. *Journal of Military Ethics* 10 (30).
- Franck, M. T. et al. (1973). After Bangladesh: The Law of Humanitarian Intervention by Military Force. *AJIL*, 7 (2).
- Grotius, H. (2015). *De Jure Belli Acpacis Liberties*, Chap. XXV, pt. VIII (4) (Carnegie ed., Francis W. Kelsey trans. 1925) (1625)
- Holzgrefe, J. Et al. (2003). “Unilateral Humanitarian Intervention and the Future of international Law, in humanitarian intervention: Ethical Legal and Political Dimensions”. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 1(7).
- Holzgreve, J. L. (2003). “The humanitarian intervention debate, in *Humanitarian Intervention*. 3rd Ed. Cambridge University Press (2003).

- Kinsman, J. (2011). Libya: A Case for Humanitarian Intervention? *Policy Options*
- Kofi, Annan. (2005). "Report on UN Reform". In *Larger Freedom* (March 21, 2005) <http://www.un.org>
- Michael, W. (2011). On Humanitarianism: Is Helping Others Charity, or Duty, or Both? *Foreign Affairs*, 90.4 (2011).
- Micheal. W. (2002). The Argument about Humanitarian Intervention. *Dissent Magazine* (Winter 2002).
- Moon. (2016). "Secretary General Ban-Ki Moon's Report on Implementing the Responsibility to Protect". (January 12, 2016). <http://www.un.org>
- Nicholas J. (2000). "Saving Strangers". *World Factbook - Libya. CIA 2012*. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov>
- Reuters. (2011). "Analysis: France sees Libya as way to diplomatic redemption." www.reuters.com (accessed October 23, 2011).
- Scheffer, D. J. (1992). "Toward a Modern Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention". *University of TaledoLaw Review*.
- United Nations Charter, (2018). *Charter of the United Nations, 24 ICISS*, Report of the International Commission on Libya.
- United Nations Treaty Series (2001). Intervention and State Sovereignty, the Responsibility to Protect, December 2001, Foreword, VII October 1945, 1 UNTS XVI. Conducted under the auspices of the Canadian government, the report was also published in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No.6, November/December 2002, pp. 99-110
- UNSC, (2011). "UN Security Council, Security Council Resolution 1973 (2011) on the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, 17 March 2011". *UN Doc. S/RES/1973(2011)*.

- Vanghie, A. (2004). *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheeler, J. N. (2004). “The Humanitarian Responsibilities of Sovereignty: Explaining the Development of a New Norm of Military Intervention for Humanitarian Purposes in International Society”. *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*.

Democratic Culture in Afghanistan: A Case Study of Post-Taliban Era

Walat Khan

M. Phil Scholar at Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.

Walatkhan88@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Democracy is much talked-about government system of modern times. In this system, people have the same right to indirectly participate in legislation and policy making through their elected representatives. Since it is a Western political system, therefore, it has been in practice in the third world and developing countries with the decolonization in Asia, Africa and South America. Afghanistan, historically a kingdom, has introduced in early 2000s, when the Islamic-based Taliban regime was overthrown by the U.S. after the 9/11 attacks. An interim government with interim constitution was introduced in Kabul and later on efforts have been made to instill a democratic system in the war-torn Afghanistan. However, the internal civil instability, conflict, civil war, insurgency, corruption and external forces impeded the democratic mechanization. The literature related to Afghan democracy has traced many elements that explored geographical and strategic importance of Afghanistan. The Afghan Taliban have resurged as a strong political and military force in Afghanistan. After the departure of President Hamid Karzai, the successive disputed elections in 2014 and 2020 show the failure of democratic system in Afghanistan. Nevertheless, Afghan Taliban's ideology seems to be antagonistic to the process of democratization. The fate of democracy in Afghanistan seems to be bleak after any expected deal between the Taliban and U.S.

Key Words: Democratic Culture, Taliban, Post 9/11, War on Terror, Political Instability, Regional Insecurity, Peace and Stability.

Introduction

Democracy, in general, is a form of government: rule of the people, by the people and for the people. It were the Greeks who coined the term *democracy*, or *demokratia*, from the Greek word *demos*, the people, and *kratos*, to rule. Although Greece is known as the early home of democracy, the current democracies are far more different from the early ones. The International Institute for Democracy has explained democracy as a political system that is based on popular control and political equality. The people have shared their common interest of power without any objection over domination and subordination in this form of governance.

Democracy as a political system marked not only by free and fair elections but also by the rule of law, separation of power, and the protection of basic liberties of speech, assembly, religion, and the right to own property. Robert A. Dahl has described five standards for a democratic process: effective participation, equality in voting, gaining enlightened understanding, exercising final control over the agenda, and inclusion of adults. In fact, the outcomes of democracy lead to peaceful environment, preventing tyranny, promotion of essential rights, self-esteem, exploring human development, moral supremacy, socio-economic equality and indiscrimination on the basis of gender, religion and color.

Afghanistan has long history of democracy but its maturity has been fabricated by internal, regional and international chaotic forces. The ground for democratic order was established by King Amanullah Khan in July 1923 through a functionalized constitution. After that multiple abduction and conviction of constitution facilitated the ground for snatching Afghan political power. The series of political instability provided

opportunities to external forces to reflect their power from the land of Afghanistan. Therefore, political system of Afghanistan is still passing through the mechanism of democratization. The new, 2004 constitution of Afghanistan has included the essence of democracy that has transferred power to second elected government of President Ashraf Ghani in 2014. But the presence of American and NATO forces has shadowed the democracy of Afghanistan by taking the power of security, decision making and utilizing its budget.

Politically, democratic system promotes social diversity including ethnicity, gender, religion and color. The population of Afghanistan is constituted by different ethnic groups; Pashtun, Tajik, Uzbek and Hazara as socio-political harmony is only possible when all these groups have the same democratic power and rights over the resources of Afghanistan and its civil-army institutions. The Afghan government and other institutions, in present time, are struggling to fulfil the requirements of democracy in order to maintain socio-political order.

Democratic Culture of Afghanistan

The roots of democracy grabbed the land of Afghanistan when King Amanullah introduced first constitution in July 1923. This political framework had guaranteed freedom of socio-economic and political activities. King Amanullah examined the future of Afghan people in the prism of developed bloc of the world that was the only way to implement the spirit of democracy. It is a fact that many changes were seen in the infrastructure, women empowerment and education at that time. Unfortunately, this phase of development was evaluated as fatal to the prominent Afghan tribal structure and culture. Religious faction opposed women constitutional rights and formal educational reforms that forced Amanullah on exile. People of this state are still facing the consequences of that mistakes as they had

preferred their old patterns of life over the democracy (Kane, 2019).

The socio-political structure of King Amanullah was also abolished after the exile of King Amanullah. Later, General Muhammad Nadir Khan declared himself the king of Afghanistan after summoning *Loya Jirga* (Grand Assembly) in 1930. New constitution of 1931 was constituted that included principles of Sunni Islam (Dupree, 2005). This second phase of Afghan constitution again drowned the state into the centuries old structure of living and ruling where questions over basic rights were stigmas. The anticipations of modern education, political freedom, and rights of suffrage, elimination of tribal system, women rights and ethnic indiscrimination were drained (Weitz, 2016). People who had religious and ethnic support got the power to decide the fate of Afghan people and that consistency prevailed.

Third constitution was passed by Muhammad Zahir Shah approved by the parliament on October 1, 1964. It was influenced by the constitutional reforms of King Amanullah and once again lower and educated class had attached good omen. State had promoted education and independent way thinking and writing. It was also considering the era of development when that constitution lasted for 10 years. Political structure got little stability but still faced shocks from religious bloc that were influential because state could not take any action because of religious sacredness (Haqqani, 2005). Society was in agricultural phase and even modern education was not accessible to the majority therefore the hold of landlords and orthodox was infrangible. The success of democratic structure actually needed long term to parallel the associated institutions (Zakaria, 2003). Unfortunately, Afghan democracy had loopholes that were not filled out properly to avoid its sinking in the period of Zahir Shah and his predecessor.

The monarchy of Zahir Shah overthrown by Sardar Muhammad Daud and controlled the political institution legacy illegally. Later, he passed new constitution in 1976 in which he had to give more space to orthodox rather than modern vision of Zahir Shah and Amanullah. In this time the religious segment had stretched their palms to the important position but the followers of left-segment were not happy from the orthodoxy type of constitution and governance therefore dramatic escalation once again became the destiny of Afghan democracy (Allen, 2013). It was not properly established; later Soviet backed Peoples Democratic Party of Afghanistan gained power in 1978. They announced revolution as the only way to get rid from the religious influence and the least solution for the stability of Afghanistan including its democracy (Goodson, 2014). Democracy was once again predicted to be prevailed in 1980 general election under the leadership of Peoples Democratic Party. In 1980 general election, Socialist party could not get the majority in order to make democratic government and also lost party structure incoming few months.

The democratization of Afghanistan is a century old process that has been passed through many folds. The series of monarchy, tribalism, ethno-nationalism and political-religious movements brought constitutional changes for the need of hours but not for well-being of future. The real essence of democracy could not prevail as in other parts of the world. Afghanistan became the epicenter of world powers to stretch their potential (Rabia, 2015). It is clear that a war-torn state could not present the will of people to serve their rights and needs. The nature of afghan government is democratic in the pages of constitution but the practical aspect is far different. Many regional and international forces have created many factions for their own subject-matter that could not be productive for the essence of afghan democracy.

It is a fact that a state, when passing from undemocratic to democratic transition facing hurdles like political factions, ethnicity and the status-quo of past ruling class. Similarly, the political environment painted with many rivalries of tribal and religious leaders that had openly allowed foreign elements to establish its hold. Democracy brought people into one page where people just focusing on the fulfilment of their basic rights rather the background of their representative. But in Afghanistan background of the representative is the prominent factor to be either elected or selected as the culture of Afghan democracy is under the influence of ethnicity and man-power (Nayaan, 2006).

The human development is directly connected with the material progress in the realm of 21st century. In this industrial period, Afghanistan has been still portraying the political structure of agricultural days where only landlords could enjoy all the rights of living and ruling as people keep their old cultural values always near and sacred (Rutting, 2017). It shows that people of Afghanistan are not only the victims of war but also their ancient patterns of living could not let them adopting new political structure, democracy, where social and economic differences have no such vital influence.

The structure of democracy in Afghanistan has not overwhelmed the differences on the basis of ethnicity: a root of escalation and volatility. The majority ethnic group, Pashtun, has maintained their authority either by force or any other source for the last century and faded the rights of others that is completely against the actual spirit of democracy (Amina, 2017). It is a fact that ethnical issue is the alarming problem for Afghan stability and open interference of foreign elements. Even in present time U.S. has also implemented the traditional formula of ruling in Afghanistan, allowing one ethnic group to rule rest without the majority support of public (Aziz, 2016). People had incredible

expectation from U.S. presence in Afghanistan by strengthening institutions and prevailing the real structure of democracy that would benefit its masses after U.S. withdrawal but they have not seen any change in last presidential election of Ashraf Ghani.

Democracy is a government system where all citizens have equal status that is irrespective to religion, ethnicity, color, and gender. Therefore, developed world had discriminated itself from the rest. Everyone gets the basic necessities and same opportunities to get sources of socio-politics to avail high standard of life (Barry, 2009). Political institution has the main responsibility to maintain law and order for both human and economic development. Globalization has promoted the concept of universal human rights for that many institutions are functioning. The democracy of Afghanistan has not extended its institutions to empower whole society. The multiple conviction of afghan constitution by kings have not followed the structure of election to abolish the rule of tribal elders (Laub, 2014).

The influence of terrorism overlapped the socio-cultural order of Afghanistan as well as prevented democracy to stabilize itself. A small populated country has been segmenting into different groups on the basis of religious-sects, ethnicity and tribalism that have affected its public, but also the whole region (Misbahzada, 2005). Many efforts were made by super powers of the world as well as regional forces to bring the fate of afghan people onto the cause of equality and peace but in vain. It is a fact that the maintenance of any new structure needs time to be implemented. Democracy is also in its nascent phase in Afghanistan that can be easily triggered by militants and landlords. It is the main reason that educated and committed people have left their country and living somewhere other than Afghanistan. The political structure has been

controlled by the uncertain forces by the policy of might is right.

Many researches have been conducted that have explored the challenges of Afghanistan democracy and the influence of world dominant powers. Afghanistan had welcomed democracy to facilitate its diversity and provide opportunities to those who can serve their services for the best of people. According to prominent Afghan historian Mir Ghulam Muhammad Ghubar movement for political reforms started more than 100 years ago (1903-09) as they used term *mashrutiat* for movement or political party (Ghubar, 2012). Democracy has benefited the majority middle and lower class of any state in the world rather than the elite and landlords. This is the basic reason that Afghan people have attached their better future with democracy. Political structure of Afghanistan has been passing through main three waves Islamic current, the communist Left and a variety of ethno-nationalist (Larson, 2011). In each stage smooth development is never seen but force is the prominent element which is antagonistic to democracy.

Post-Taliban Era of Democracy

After the Soviet invasion in 1979, the government of Afghanistan scattered into many segments; interim government of Peoples Democratic Party of Afghanistan, seven Mujahidin group, Northern Alliance, Afghan National Liberation Front and Uzbek militia. Every faction hold over some specific areas where all activities of daily life including law and order were scrutinized by it, Afghanistan was circle of different government circles in a single territory (Omrani, 2009). Later these seven mujahidin groups became well-organized and brought Pashtun majority areas under their supreme control. They also expanded their control to other areas as well but could not get public support.

After nearly a deadly decade war between Afghan mujahedin and the Soviet Union ended without benefiting democracy and common-men interest. In consequences, Afghan mujahidin became a strong and unbeatable power to decide all matters either internal or external of the state (Ahmedzai, 2016). In the end Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev signed UN Geneva Accord on April 14, 1988 to withdraw Soviet Union forces from Afghanistan and withdrawal process completed by February 15, 1989. A weak government of Najibullah was left by Soviet Union to the imminent danger of mujahidin who had easily countered it (Zahab and Roy 2006). Rabbani became the president of Afghanistan and also mainstream person of all mujahidin factions in 1992 till 1994.

In 1993-1994, Taliban movement consisting of clerics and students, most of them were Pashtun origin, was formed. In this movement many leading persons were from mujahidin. Like Mullah Muhammad Umar who was a fighter in Khalis' Hezb-i-Islami Party during the period of anti-Soviet war. Umar was also Pashtun origin who later became the leading person of Taliban. Taliban has viewed Rabbani government as anti-Pashtun in result Pashtun ethnic have supported Taliban in all aspects. In November 1994 they controlled southern city of Qandahar and in 1995 fighters were near to Kabul and captured Herat province and crashed the government bodies. On September 27, 1996, they hanged Najibullah, his brother and aides. Later Taliban announced self-claimed government without international support and recognition. During Taliban regime Mullah Umar held the title of Head of the State and ruled Afghanistan till the invasion of U.S.

In fact, democracy was drained to the hands of orthodox from the time Soviet invasion to the fall of Taliban in 2001. They had proclaimed the implementation of centuries old political system that could neither benefit

the ruling nor the common-man. Modern political structure needs smooth external relations that does not matter either such state has common religious ties or not but the most important is the economic development for setting itself in the direction of economic race. The people of Afghanistan have not seen the fruits of democracy where one can easily fulfil his basic needs and rights beyond any ethnic, gender and religious discrimination. People associated their future in the prism of Islamic Sharia where simplicity and equality are the prominent principles but that was also inflamed by ethnicity (Kane, 2019).

Karzai Regime

After the fall of Taliban in 2001, U.S. introduced a democratic set-up without general elections in Afghanistan. The power of Afghanistan was hand over to Hamid Karzai who was a Pashtun by ethnic due to the Pashtun majority in Afghanistan. At that time the government of Afghanistan focused on peace and stability rather to political reforms. It was a challenging task for Karzai to protect his people from the insurgents, neighbors' interference and international exploitation (Allen, 2013). In the history of Afghanistan, the role of Karzai was completely important towards the tranquility and disharmony among tribal elders who had solely dumped into ethnic and civil war.

Karzai had created platform for religious scholars, elites and tribal elders to openly participate for the well-being of their homeland. The declination of monarchy and establishment of democracy before the invasion of Soviet had introduced a positive omen among people. The economy of Afghanistan was on the way to fulfil the measurements of well-developed nations. After the Bonn Agreement 2001, it is the first time that Afghan government has transferred power to elected government of Ashraf Ghani in 2014 (Goodson, 2014). Afghan democracy has organized structure but its

practical results have been distorted by internal as well as external forces. Internally, the prevalence of holly war changed the whole ecology of Afghan politics (Zakaria, 2003).

Many educated and middle-upper class have migrated to other countries due to fragile security in Afghanistan. The migration of politically rich class gave open ground to those who were easily exploited (Weitz, 2016). The holy warriors created the possibility for external interference to fulfil their interest legitimately. They have not worked to serve the interest of poor by improving the actual essence of democracy. The uneducated and rigid mindset tribal leaders had blindly added fuel to the flames of infinite Afghan war (Larson, 2011). It is a fact that civil war of Afghanistan has engulfed its talent by many ways which playing the role spinal cord in the skeleton of democracy.

The political institution has also been influenced by the ethnicity of Afghanistan besides religious cause. The territory of Afghanistan is the home of multiple ethnic groups such as Pashtun, Hazara, Uzbek and Tajik as well as some other minorities such as Baloch and Parsi. They have also defended their homeland from the horizon of Taliban who have controlled the regime of Afghanistan after the assassination Dr. Najibullah. Taliban has overthrown the eminent government of Najib and declared themselves as the only protector of Islam and Muslim unity. On other hand non-Pashtun ethnic groups have organized their own local army to protect their cities and villages from the dominancy of Taliban. The civil war among ethnic groups of Afghanistan formed many states within a state (Thomas, 2008). Democracy of Afghanistan could not bring expected results for the scattered population as they have lost the socio-political fabric.

The Bonn Agreement was drafted and implemented in 2001 to serve accomplish the goals of democracy,

security and organized society. People of Afghanistan have attached positive meanings and hoped Taliban would accept it. Later, Afghan Taliban have demanded the complete exclusion of the NATO and U.S. army from Afghanistan. The challenging demands of Taliban have affirmed America to stay for more time in Afghanistan. The presence of America is also an imminent threat in the destiny of Afghan democracy. It has also attained the nature of bone of contention for the nourishment of democracy. The presence of foreign hands existing either directly or indirectly have been exploiting the political structure of Afghanistan (Barry, 2009).

The invasions of world powers; the Soviet Union in 1980s and the U.S. in 2001 scattered the focal point of democracy. The most newly phase of Afghan democracy began in 2004 after the Bonn Agreement that concluded three weeks discussion in 160 Articles and 12 titles. Afghanistan is strengthening the role of democracy to include Taliban as the part of government provided, they have to admire the constitution of Afghanistan. The presence of foreign forces has divided the war-torn country into many fictions on the name of religion and ethnicity. The instability of political structure has been alienating democracy from its actual essence and prevalence.

Ashraf Ghani Regime

The transition of power, in 2014, from one democratic government of Karzai to Ashraf Ghani was the millstone of Afghan democracy. Ashraf Ghani has focused on national and international relations. He inclined more towards Pakistan, Iran, Russia and China to find solution through dialogue for the war-torn countries, Afghanistan (Ahmadzai, 2016). Obviously, a state cannot change its neighbors but its policies must have the nature of flexibility for the sake of harmony and development. Afghanistan has permanent neighbors

who have worked to maintain law and order in its land. Peace of one place has the same impacts over other but time and good management is required to attain the same order. In contrast, chaos and conflict hastily circulate the tranquility of associated place. It is also one of the main reasons of American presence in Afghanistan to secure the rest of the world from the flames of terrorism. Pakistan and Iran have stretched its arms toward Afghan policies to secure their own sovereignty and development (Aziz, 2016). Afghan people have divided themselves by different identities; their unity is lying in the cause of developed democracy.

Similarly, the Afghan democracy has wide impacts over the region including the South Asia. These countries are including Pakistan, Iran, China and India which have linked their prosperity and instability with security and political stability of Afghanistan. The new constitution of Afghanistan is mostly in the form of words instead of its actual implementation to overcome terrorism, regional insecurity and global harmony. The Afghan democracy and its actual implementation is not only the core essential of developed Afghanistan, but the root cause of South Asian political, economic and social uniformity (Khan, 2014). For instance, undemocratic forces in Afghanistan have shocked the structure of Pakistan that has also affected the stability of India, China and Iran.

China and India have also been paying high price to decades' old war on terror that is erupted from the geography of Afghanistan. The two rising stars of Asia have great concerns over terrorism that is alarming threat to their development and security (The Asia Foundation, 2011). It is fact that China has a platonic plan to get access to East Asia, Africa and Latin American markets. On other hand India has been competing china economically, politically and militarily. The regional countries have been facing a severe threat from extremism and terrorism. Democracy

in Afghanistan is not only facilitating afghan people but also ensuring the whole region (Constable, 2007). Actually, economic development is permanently associated with political harmony and sustainability.

The new era of economic and military supremacy has been following the policy of trade and post-colonialism. Afghan conflict has acquired more severity than the last two world wars (Amina, 2017). Countries after World War-II have crossed the phased of industrialization, urbanization and entered into services economy. But the picture of Afghan civil war is widely different from the history. The world power presence could not avail required peace.

Future Prospects and Challenges

The Afghan democracy has been passing through nascent stages, far from the maturity and depending on the neighbors and international contribution. The economy of Afghanistan is completely depending on U.S. aids, international NGOs are working for the well-being of people because the government could afford the basic necessities of people. Afghan government has no independent political structure with sovereignty and power to decide the matter of internal and foreign because of direct control of US. The interference of India and Iran in the economic, ethnic and political affairs of Afghanistan is creating loopholes in the democratic process and stability.

Democracy needs independent election commission, fair and free election and well-organized political parties for its implementation and promulgation. The government of Afghanistan has serious security problem that erodes its political as well as social structure by different aspects. Therefore, as such democracy of other developed states could not attain the targeted goals. The ethnicity and religious diversity as well as the collusion among liberal and modernists have

been causing acute threat to the democracy of Afghanistan. In the coming election it is compulsion for the political structure of Afghanistan to give space to Taliban in the general election in order to overcome the decades' prolonged challenges to security, democracy and economy. The contribution of neighboring countries especially Pakistan has the retaining the gigantic importance to be engaged in peace of Afghanistan.

The inclusion of Afghan Taliban in the democratic system is also the need of hour for the stability of Afghanistan and the whole region especially Pakistan. The new phase of table talks among America, Taliban and Afghan government including different fictions in Doha is a sign of prosperity. The Afghan Taliban has been maintaining their strong hold over different areas of Afghanistan while Afghan government and America have also tightened their muscle to overthrow them but in vain. Taliban inclusion, on one hand is a problem because of their terror and fear history but a sign of progress that they will do positive work for the peace and stability (Kane, 2019).

In fact, the prosperous Afghanistan has either direct or indirect impacts on socio-political as well as economic spheres of Pakistan, Iran, China and India (Rabia, 2015). The status of Afghanistan has maintained the title of buffer zone. Pakistan has its common border with Afghanistan and its democratic development is completely dependent on Pakistan (Laub, 2014). Pakistan has paid high price on the war of terror and faced challenges from neighbor countries. For instance, Pak-India relations is below the freezing point because of Indian harsh allegation of supporting terrorist (Khan, 2014). Democracy in Afghanistan ensures human rights, peace in region, elimination of proxy war, and promotes socio-economic stability of South Asia (Weitz, 2016).

According to the report of Asia Foundation (2011), the soviet invasion had paralyzed the ongoing process of democracy in Afghanistan. The people had changed their mindset slightly toward democracy from the stagnant tribal structure but Soviet attack had promoted old structure. People of Afghanistan once again attached their sense of security and peace with their leaders. A new concept was developed that war against Russian is Jihad that is compulsory over all Muslim and that is the basic reason Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Iranian involvement in Afghanistan.

After the fall of Taliban, Afghan government has got success in its political structure like elections for presidential, parliamentary and provincial councils through a democratic way. Similarly, Afghanistan has implemented democratic constitution where every people of different ethnic and ideological backgrounds have equal representation (Barry, Charles & Samuel. 2009). Many changes have been made in social sector and civil society that had provided opportunities to people for working their own people. However, long active insurgency and insecurity are the prevailing challenges for the country and its institutions. Similarly, bad governance has grown the seeds of corruption, and lawlessness that have further weakened the democracy of Afghanistan. Such fragility has provided opportunities for external forces to activate proxy war for their own interest (Omrani, 2009).

Conclusion

The Afghan democracy has different angles to be evaluated by its geographic strategic location, fragile government, tribal and ethnic division and brittle administrative structure. In fact, afghan democracy has been passed through different phases from monarchy to democracy, socialism, militancy and U.S. supported republic. Theses stages changed many folds including social, political and economic structurally and

theoretically except the geography of Afghanistan. Indeed, the well representative government in Afghanistan could not get the prolonged achievement of democracy. Instead of getting internal stability, the political war changed into the regional and later became the heaven of international chaos and extremism.

Democracy in Afghanistan has got great achievement after the fall of Taliban regime in 2001. Hamid Karzai had completed his double tenures and later it was democratically transited to Ashraf Ghani in 2014 that was considering a milestone in the history of Afghanistan. It has improved the political structure by entrenching the political awareness regarding general election on political, provincial and local levels among afghan people. Similarly, the people of Afghanistan have practically seen tranquility in democracy by getting rid from the conflicts of ethnicity. But differences over religious sects are still prevailing in the socio-political environment that is the alarming issue and justification for the presence of U.S. and allies' forces.

The stability and maturity of democracy in Afghanistan needs the inclusion of all Afghan stakeholders beyond their ethical, gender and religious differences. As the Afghan Taliban has welcomed to take part in the coming general elections of Afghanistan that would minimize polarity in their views regarding one another. Further, strong and firmness institutions cannot only erode the roots of tribalism, but also allowing the world-wide changes of development and progress that is the keen requirement for the consistent democracy of Afghanistan.

References

- Ahmadzai, A. A. (2016). “Challenges and Opportunities for Afghanistan in Future”. *The Diplomat*. <https://thediplomat.com> (accessed on June 12, 2018).
- Amina, K. (2017). “Afghan Refugees in Pakistan”. *Institute of Strategic Studies*. <http://issi.org.pk> (accessed on June 14, 2018).
- Barry, D. A. Et al. (2009). *What Democracy for Afghanistan? An Analysis Utilizing Established Norms and Five Non-Western Case Studies*. Center for Technology and National Security Policy National Defense University. <http://star-tides.net> (accessed on June 19, 2018).
- Constable, P. & Pamela, S. (2007). “A Wake-up Call in Afghanistan”. *Journal of Democracy*. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org> (accessed on June 24, 2018).
- Ghubar, M. G. (2012). “Afghanistan dar masir-e tarikh”. *Kabul Research Centre*. 23 700-717.
- Goodson, L. P. (2014). “The New Great Game: Pakistan’s Approach to Afghanistan After 2014”. *Asia Policy: The National Bureau of Asian Research Centre*. Roundtable in Asia Policy 17.
- Haqqani, Hussain. (2005). *Pakistan Between Mosque and Military*. Carnegie Endowment for Int'l Peace.
- Kane, S. (2015). “Talking with the Taliban: should the Afghan Constitution be a point of negotiation?” *United States Institute of Peace*. <https://www.usip.org> (accessed on June 28, 2018)
- Khan, M. I. (2014). “Why Pakistan fears foreign pullout from Afghanistan”. *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com> (accessed on July 1, 2018).
- Larson, P. & Anna, F. (2011). “Deconstructing Democracy in Afghanistan”. Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit. <https://www.refworld.org> (accessed on July 10, 2018).

- Nayaan, A. S. (2006). "Parties and Where They Came From 1902-2006". *Kabul: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung*. <https://www.kas.de> (accessed on July 15, 2018).
- Omrani, B., & Ledwidge, F.(2009). "Rethinking the Durand line: The legality of the Afghan-Pakistani frontier". *The RUSI Journal*. Vol. 154 (5).
- Rabia, S., & Jayita, S. (2015). "Pakistan, India, and China after the U.S. Drawdown from Afghanistan". *Asia Policy Paper, Stimson*. <https://www.stimson.org> (accessed on July 15, 2018).
- Zahab, M. A. and Roy, O. (2006). *Islamist Networks: The Afghan Pakistan Connection*. Columbia University Press.
- Rubin, B. R. (2002). *The Fragmentation of Afghanistan*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Ruttig, T. (2017). "Islamists, Leftists and a Void in the Centre: Afghanistan's Political Structure". *Afghanistan Analysts Network*. <https://www.afghanistan-analysts.org> (accessed on July 20, 2018).
- Thomas, T. H., & Mason., M. C. (2008). "No Sign until the Burst of Fire: Understanding the Pakistan-Afghanistan Frontier". *Quarterly Journal: International Security*. Harvard Kennedy School.
- Weitz, R. (2016). "Global insights: As U.S. Draws Down, India Raises Security Profile in Afghanistan". *Global Political Review*. <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com> (accessed on July 28, 2018).
- Zakaria, F. (2003). *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York, W. W. Norton & Company.

Gamal Abdul Nasser: The Protagonist of Arab Nationalism

Kafayat Ullah

M. Phil Scholar at Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.
U.kafayat777@gmail.com

Jahanzeb Khan

Assistant Professor at Area Study Centre,
University of Balochistan, Quetta.
Jahanzeb.rind@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The end of the Ottoman Empire and commencement of a new era, prescribed by the decline of the European influence post-1945, both proved to be a turning point in the modern history of Middle Eastern politics. During this period new leaders and nation-states began to emerge in the region. The Palestine issue, the Suez Crisis, the Iraqi Revolution, the creation of the United Arab Republic, and the Six-Day War have all had influences on the relations of Arab with Superpower and also the domestic affairs of the Arab world. These main events which molded Middle Eastern politics in the decades of the 1950s and 1960s have already been a source of a large amount of literature. This period also witnessed the use of ideologies by dominant leaders to encourage the help of masses and to broaden their command over the area. Therefore, this research article critically analyses Pan Arabism, or Arab Nationalism championed by Gamal Abdul Nasser of Egypt, as a dominant ideology that played a major role in the politics of the period. Further, the research article examines the various factors which lead to the decline of Pan Arabism, and eventually lead to the deteriorating role of Nasser in Middle Eastern politics. The study

concludes that Gamal Abdul Nasser's ideology of Pan Arabism changes the power in the Middle East and provides a new dimension to the power in Egypt.

Key Words: Cold War, Middle East Politics, Pan Arabism, Arab Nationalism, Unity of Arab people, Arab-Israel Conflict and Arab Spring.

Introduction

Gamal Abdul Nasser remained an absolute personality of the twentieth century. He stood the leader and the champion of Arab Unity in the Middle East. He did not even think about Western questions over his leadership in the Arab World. Nasser predicted Arab union in the Arab world. He provided the right directions to the people of Arab in the region of the Middle East regarding Arab public opinion. His ideology of Pan-Arabism created serious concerns for Israel, West, and other Arab states. Furthermore, Nasser as a charismatic leader in the Middle East made the struggle to become the real front runner of the Arab World. He discussed the role of Egypt in Africa, the Arab and Islamic world in his book *Philosophy of the revolution* and further added that Egypt had the capacity to influence Arab affairs.

Gamal Abdul Nasser emerged as the political leader of the Middle East after the nationalization of the Suez Canal and got a political victory from France, Britain, and Israel over the Suez Canal issue. He further increased his popularity in the world by supporting the non-aligned Movement. In addition to it, he adopted a deliberate policy to strengthen his position among the Arab people. These policies of Nasser helped Cairo to become a centre for the Arab world. Furthermore, the neighbouring Arab countries, Israel, Western powers and the Soviet Union were observing Nasser's pan-Arabism in order to counter Nasser's next move in the region. During the Cold War, Nasser skilfully played off

the two opponent superpowers to improve his nation's budgetary, political, and military stature while offering unimportant concessions.

This study elucidates circumstances in which Gamal Abdul Nasser continues his struggle for the unification of the Arab world till his downfall in the Arab Israel war nineteen sixty-seven. In the six-day war 1967, Israel became victorious that helps in a fresh epoch in Zionist history. Israel now controllers of an Arab zone that is four times of its original size. The success of Israel in the six-day war 1967 reveals Nasser's political death. However, Colonel Nasser presents many astonishments to Tel Aviv, Middle East influential countries and European countries especially to Britain, France, and the United States. It resolves in the following pages that Gamal Abdul Nasser becomes lucky for about a decade.

Rise of Gamal Abdul Nasser

Gamal Abdul Nasser was born on 15 January 1918 at Bakos, which was the district of Alexandria in Egypt. Gamal Abdul Nasser's father Abdul Nasser Hussein was a postal clerk in Alexandria (Lacoutre, 1973). Abdul Nasser Hussein sent his son Gamal Abdul Nasser to Cairo where he admitted to the school. He lived in the house of Khalil Hussein who was the uncle of Gamal Abdul Nasser. Khalil Hussein was the revolutionary man who was against the colonial rule of the British in Egypt. The philosophy of Khalil Hussein encouraged a young Nasser to make a plan that would oust Britain from the parameters of Egypt (Lacoutre, 1973).

Gamal Abdul Nasser served his country by joining the military academy in 1937. During his service in the army, he developed cordial interactions with military officers. Gradually, Gamal Abdul Nasser established the secret society of free officers which aimed to topple King Farouk's government in Egypt and removed

imperialism not only from Egypt but also from the Middle East region (Beeson, 1981).

The free officers started working on the direction of Nasser for a revolution in late 1951 (P.J.Vatikiotis, 1978). The revolution required an army officer to lead the revolution in Egypt at its early stage. Firstly, the executive committee of the free officers' movement nominated the name of Misiri who assisted General Rommel in a second great world battle. However, the old age of the Misiri refrained him to lead the revolution in Egypt. Secondly, the committee considered the name of General Foud Sadiq as a revolutionaries leader. However, he was appointed as chief of the Army staff by King Farouk. In these crucial moments, Aamer who was the close friend of the Nasser suggested General Mohammed Naguib, who was the boss of Aamer, for this job. Gamal Abdul Nasser accepted this suggestion and considered him as an excellent choice for this revolution (P.J.Vatikiotis, 1978).

On the other hand, King Farouk took the decision on 20 July 1952, to install a fresh government in order to give a position to those friends who were very loyal to his rule in Egypt. Therefore, Hussein Sirry resigned from the post of Prime minister. The King appointed Al-Hilali as prime minister of Egypt on twenty-one July and directed to him to bring Nasser and his followers into the custody of the Government. However, he could not run the affair of government for more than two days. Hence, The free officer managed to topple the thrown in a very organized manner on 23 July 1952 (Flower, 1972).

Aamer took charge of the operations outside of the GHQ building which was rapidly encircled by the revolutionaries who faced a minor resistance from the side of guards posted inside GHQ building. They entered into the GHQ head office where all the serving officers surrendered (Flower, 1972). In this revolution,

the two soldiers were killed. Therefore, the coup was bloodless (DcChancie, 1988).

In the same way, the free officers prepared to raid over all institutions of the government completely and captured Cairo and the main centres of the army without any resistance. This mission was started around 1:30 am of the twenty-three July and completed within time and it had taken an hour to end the King Farouk Era in Cairo. After the success in a coup, it was a time to consolidate the country, General Mohammad Naguib arrived at GHQ. There was smiling on his face and was repeating the words in Arabic language Mabrouk! Mabrouk! Which meant congratulations! He shook hands with all his friends who were presented at the GHQ.

Furthermore, in this crucial moment, Hilali Pasha, the current Prime Minister of Egypt called General Mohammad Naguib from Alexandria. Hilali Pasha argued with Naguib for almost half an hour and demanded to restore the government and he offered Naguib with his own choice. Hilali underestimated the coup and he believed that it was just a revolt which was made by an angry crowd whose demands could be tackled in an easy way. However, he hung up the phone and realized that was more to it (DcChancie, 1988). Early in the morning, the government radio station announced the news that the armed forces headed by General Mohammad Naguib caught the ability to re-establish the self-respect of the people of Egypt (DcChancie, 1988).

After the departure of the King, General Naguib and his associates announced that they wanted to see their country not only free from foreign expansionism but also to get rid of feudalism. They wanted to establish an honest and good government that would present a package of reforms in the field of economic, social justice and would introduce the law that represented equality before the law (Lenczowski, 1967).

However, a clash erupted between Naguib and Nasser on the issue of selection of Military chiefs. Nasser appointed Abdul Hakeem Amar as head of arm forces. The RCC completely sponsored Nasser and therefore denied to get any order from Naguib. Nasser, for the benefit of the RCC, declared that Naguib had enrolled from the administration and Prime ministership three days prior and was bound to his home. That Nasser had been selected as a head administrator in his place. In contrast, it was seen that some favored Naguib over Nasser. On 27 February 1954, noteworthy Khalid Mohiuddin, a great individual from the RCC and authority of the armed crops came to see Nasser requesting that Naguib should be restored quickly (P.J.Vatikiotis, 1978). Nasser requested that major be captured. However, he was astonished to identify that Khalid's supporters in tanks were prepared to dispatch an assault on the RCC home office if the major was captured. Nasser presently acknowledged that he had disparaged Naguib's prevalence and intensity of influence, and obviously being a chess player of the most noteworthy request, he didn't wish to begin a common war on this issue, sitting tight for a superior time to strike once more (P.J.Vatikiotis, 1978). Finally, through public meetings, Nasser succeeded to remove Naguib from the headship of Egypt.

After consolidating his power in Egypt Nasser looked ahead to deal with the imperialism of Britain in the Middle East and particularly in Egypt. He decided to build an Aswan Dam on the Nile River near Sudan's border to improve the lifestyle of Egyptian people. He prepared a strategy to get economic help from United State without any conditions. However, on rejection to provide economic help to Egypt by John Foster Dulles, Nasser established cordial relations with Russia in order to strengthen the Egyptian position in the Middle East. (P.J. Vatikiotis, 1978)

Arab Nationalism

A few researchers depict the word Nationalism as a mind-set in which an individual exhibits his commitment and affection to a nation, especially an idea of national keenness, and lifting up one's nation over all others and putting a basic element on the advancement of its lifestyle and interests instead of those of various nations or multinational groups. As concerned with the term Arab Nationalism, the people who speak Arabic Language and they devote themselves to Arab welfares, ethos, aims or morals are called Arab Nationalism (Elie, 1962).

The Arab world living in North Africa and the Middle East considered a major area of the Islamic world. The Arab world was mostly ruled by the Byzantines and Persian Empire. In the 7th century, mostly the people of the Arab world united under the Leadership of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and the Caliphs of Caliphate. This unity among the Arab world helped the Leadership of Arab people to snatch Arab Areas from Byzantines and Persians. The people, living in these Areas spoke Coptic, Syriac, and Berber languages which were influenced by the Arabic language and Islam. With the passage of time, the territory of the Islamic world was increased to a great extent and the Arabic Language was spread into these Areas. The Arabic language possessed highly developed grammar and mostly literature was available to people in the Arabic Language. So, it was available to the ruler who used it in their communications with people of conquered Area easily. Hence, the Arabic language got superior status over other Languages speaking in the region. Furthermore, it became a language of the Quran which was the only sign of unity among the Arab world. The Arabs considered the Arabic Language as a source of political and cultural stability of the Arab region (Chalala, 1987).

The idea of language was first used by Christians of Syria and they founded the Arabic language as a projected in Arab society. Islam and the Arabic language were the basic criteria of Arab nationalism. Islam was much concerned about Mohammedans Unity. The Sharia gave immense solidarity to the people of Arab, living across the rivers and oceans and deserts. When asked by Tunisia, that he would fashion upon Independence. Habib Baghuba replied it would be a Muslim Arab state (Elie, 1962).

In the 8th and 12th century the Arabic Language became an international language of learning. All the works in the major subject were written in the Arabic Language by Muslims. So, Arab nationalism was totally a struggle based on the principals of Islam. Arab Muslims and many other writers considered it a Socio-Political struggle of unification on overall political unity in the Middle East. This concept gained energy during World War II by the rising conflicts on the Suez Canal, Western concerns on Palestine question and Algerian and Omani conflicts had given power to the leading concept of Arab Nationalism. This concept of Arab Nationalism gave hopes for upcoming arrivals of Pan-Arabism that became the natural phenomena of contemporary Arab thoughts in the Middle East (Chalala, 1987).

Pan-Arabism represented the Muslim response to the Western Powers who took control of Arab territories in World War I and World War II. This concept of Pan-Arabism took rapid-fire on the whole in this era. So, this imperialism that was imposed by the allies on the Arab World encouraged the Arab Nationalists to work for Unity of Arabs against imperialism in the Middle East. They wanted to restore the Arab Society that linked to Islam. Strategically, they wanted to strengthen the power of Arabs under the shades of Islam in the Region of the Arab world (Elie, 1962).

Moreover, Arab nationalism began in the twentieth century when the Idea of Arab Solidarity prevailed in Arabian countries. They were intending to establish one single state for the People of the Middle East, where they were speaking the same language and having the same religion. The Arab rebellious activities against the Turks and its resistance against the Mandate system showed the rise of Arab Nationalism in the Middle East. Furthermore, the migration of the Jews from Europe to Palestine escalates the Nationalist feelings among the people of the Arab world. Arabian countries founded the Arab League in 1945 to show their concern over the formulation of the Zionism. The Arab countries were united at one point that all Arab countries had a common enemy who invaded Arabian land, were held responsible for the foundation of Israel on Arab soil (Dawisha, 2003).

The Suez Crisis enabled Gamal Abdul Nasser to unite all Arab countries on one page so that they would be able to remove the West influence from the Middle East. Gamal Abdul Nasser made contacts with the Arab Nationalists who were demanding the Union of the Arab in the Middle East. Gamal Abdul Nasser merged its country with Syria who aimed to improve its economic and military condition for the Arab world. In response to this union, Nur al-said who was the Prime Minister of Iraq considered that the Soviet Union compelled both countries into this union (Gordon, 2009). Gamal Abdul Nasser was a genius leader who had far-reaching ambitions for the unity of the Arab world. He believed this union enabled Arab counties to play as one nation. In contrast, the Syrian people gave their opinion against the merger of Syria with Egypt. They believed that Egypt would not give homage to this union and would get political, economic and social advantage from this union. In the same way the Prime Minister of the Iraq Nur al- said went ahead and shared that the USA and Britain would financially support those countries who

used a military option against this union. Furthermore, Britain declared the union between these two countries a threat to their interest in the Middle East (McNamara, 2003).

Moreover, the Gamal Abdul Nasser frequently delivered his speech through a radio station that was situated in Cairo. The speeches were heard in every village of Syria and all Arabian countries. The speeches mostly consisted of the statements that the Syrian union with Egypt was the only solution to their problems and invited all Arab countries to become a part of this union which could stop the western imperialism in the Middle East. At last, the Syrian army decided to send army officers to Cairo to inform the Nasser about the amalgamation of Syria with Egypt in February nineteen fifty-eight (Sadat, 1978). Syrian Union with Egypt resulted in the creation of the United Arab Republic. The people of both countries voted for this union on twenty-one February 1958. The official notification of union of both countries was released on twenty-two February and Gamal Abdul Nasser was declared the president of the United Arab Republic which consisted of most people and sectors of the territory of the Middle East. Gamal Abdul Nasser released a statement that the door of this United Arab Republic opened to all Arab countries (Lenczowski, 1967).

The member of the UAR further extended when Yemen decided to be part of this union and the head of the UAR changed the name of UAR to the United Arab States. In this new federal system, every state was free to form its own administration. The member of the United Arab States worked together on a common issue. The administration of the UAS was run through the supreme body which was known as Supreme Council. The Supreme Council consisted of the head of the states and supported by the union council which contained the members from states union (Gilbert, 2008).

The formulation of the United Arab States expanded further the power of the Nasser in the Middle East and incited those who were against Gamal Abdul Nasser in the Middle East, who developed a friendly relationship with President of Tunisia (Gilbert, 2008). However, a crisis erupted in 1958 between the United Arab States and Saudi Arabia which approached Syrian Interior Minister Sarraj to kill the Nasser and broke the Union with Egypt. Furthermore, the United Arab States supported the civil war in Lebanon and interfered in Jordan's internal affair. Consequently, Britain took advantage of the Nasser's interference in Jordan and sent the military force to Jordan to defend King Hussain's government. The arrival of the British troops in Jordan encouraged the Arab people to propagate the concept of Pan-Arabism in the Arab World (Khaldi, 1991).

Moreover, the philosophy of the Pan-Arab helped the people of Iraq to bring a revolution in Iraq. The revolution erupted in Iraq in 1958, which ended the Nuri-al Said who was killed by the revolutionaries in 1958. Nur al-Said was replaced by Karim Qasim in Iraq and took control of the government. He belonged to the communist party which was supported by the Soviet Union in Iraq. In addition to it, the whole Arab countries in the Middle East refrained to accept the merger of Syria with Egypt. Saudi Arabia wanted the rapture of union between Egypt and Syria because it shared a border with Syria and wanted that Syria to be a neutral state in the Middle East, but she failed to keep Syria away from Egyptian hands. Saudi Arabia, president of Lebanon, King of Iraq Faisal and king of Jordan considered this union a threat to balance of power in the Middle East (Sadat, 1978).

With the passage of time, Nasser became the supreme leader of the UAR which was supported by the Baath party in Syria in its earlier phase. However, there were

many people who were belonging to different professions put some reservations on this union. The conformists and modest in Syria were wanted to protect its socio-political and economic status in Syria. They also wanted to separate its currency from the union. Nasser responded to this action of Baath party, he dismissed the high-profile leaders from the Union and cabinet in 1960. He went ahead to nationalize the banks, kept control of the press and media in Syria (Gilbert, 2008). Therefore, UAR failed to run the affairs of its government not more than three years.

The Role of Nasser in Pan-Arabism

The conspicuous theoretician Sato al Husri who favored Pan Arabism or Arab Nationalism imparted that individuals who spoke a unitary language had one heart and a typical soul. Hence, they ought to have one unified state. This statement created a situation in which one felt that Arabs were associated through their culture which helped Arabs to act as one Nation in the Middle East region. In the same way, Khalidi and Dawisha stated that it was an idea that showed that Arabs were connected through the same language, history, and religion. Therefore their political association must reflect this reality (Khalidi, 1991), and further showed the political solidarity between the Arab people in the Middle East so that to protect Arabs interest in the world (Dawisha, 2003). However, it meant that Arab nations linked through socio-political connections. The ascent of Pan Arabism as a prevailing social and political power during the 1950s and '60s connected to decolonization which was occurring during this period and the Arabs needed something to unite them. Subsequently, to the general population of the Middle East, Pan Arabism spoke to a declaration of society which joined all parts of Arab culture, the language, religion, craftsmanship, and politics. The various courses through which Arab nations grasped this belief system can be seen by analyzing the manner in which

their pioneers professed it. One basic point to note about the manner in which it was drilled was, to restrain the impact of outside forces in regional politics (Dawisha, 2003).

As a result of the bloodless coup in 1952, Nasser came to power in Egypt. He was the pioneer in the Middle East who spread the idea of Pan Arabism in the region of the Arab world in the 1950s and '60s. As Elie Chalala who is the Adjunct Professor of Political Science at Santa Monica College expressed that he was the most significant pioneer for advancing the possibility of Arab Nationalism. In the 1950's Nasser's new reforms in lands, education, medical became very famous in the Arab world. His disobedience of the West and his call for Arab solidarity found responsive spectators in each Arab nation, including the preservationist governments (Gerges, 1994). Nasser set up Egypt as a territorial power with his appealing administration and the reception of "higher" values like the thoughts of Pan Arabism, political freedom, Third World solidarity and neutralism, and communism (Hourani, 1991).

However, Nasser wanted to protect National interest and removed regional imperialism from the Arab world through the introduction of Pan Arabism in the Middle East region. Through the objectives of neutralism, Egypt got benefits from the conflict that continued between the superpowers in the cold war era. The event of the 1950s was the Suez Crisis which helped Nasser to get a political and ethical triumph over allies in the Middle East and enabled him to establish himself as the founder of Pan Arabism. The Suez Crisis brought a new change in the region in the form of the international and regional balance of power in the Arab world. At long last, in 1955, with the relinquishing of Syria to the Egyptian camp, Nasser changed into the pioneer of the dynamic Arab camp which was seen inflexibly observed by the traditionalist monarchies of the region including Iraq, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, as Nasser was also

struggling to topple the monarchs from the region. The objectives of the Pan Arabism were to form the United Arab Republic where Nasser and the Ba'ath Party pioneers in Syria caught hands together for a new trial. However, the United Arab Republic failed to run its affair and it revealed the end of the Union after the three years.

Future Prospect of Arab Nationalism

The demise of Gamal Abdul Nasser devastated the dream of the unified Arab state. The successor of Nasser like Iraq's Saddam Hussein or Syria's Hafez-al- Assad continued to employ Arab Nationalist ideology in the Middle East. However, the Historians viewed that Arab Nationalism changed its version into State Nationalism. State Nationalism was seen as the driving force behind the foreign policies of the Arab leaders. Furthermore, the alliance of Egypt and Syria in Yoom-e- Kiffur war against Israel gave an opportunity to Arab nationalist leaders to revive Arab nationalism in the Middle East followed by Sadat's decision of signing the Camp David peace treaty in 1979 (Nasr, 2007).

The North Yemen war resulted in the formulation of the Arab Cold War. The support of Nasser to Saleh's government in the Cold war encouraged King Faisal of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to embrace a counter-belief system for the sake of Pan Islamism and take forceful action against Nasser's Egypt. Therefore, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia propagated Pan Islamism for the unity of all Muslims so that to crush the Pan Arabism movement. Iranian Revolution further escalated the importance of Pan Islamism rather than Pan Arabism in the Middle East. Fouad Ajami declared that the Iranian Revolution ended Pan Arabism in the Middle East (Khaldi, 1991).

In the late 1970s, two different ideologies over the unity of Arab converted regional politics from Pan Arabism

to Pan Islamism and Arab leaders followed the philosophy of Pan Islamism. Hence, ideological differences among the Arab leaders invited the super power to interfere with the foreign policies of Arab countries (Khaldi, 1991). The Arab leaders favoured the State Nationalism over the Arab nationalism by joining the US to take on Saddam Hussein's Iraq in the Gulf War. However, scholars, encouraged by satellite era, demanded to revive Arab Nationalism in the late 1990s and 2000s. This satellite-era reshaped the new form of Arab Nationalism that was known as New Arabism. Therefore, Arabian people protested against the pro-Western policies and demanded action on areas of common outrage such as Israel-Palestine, Iraq, and Lebanon. Resultantly, this protest paved the way for a new movement which was later known as New Arabism (Khaldi, 1991).

Mohammad Bouazizi, a Tunisian street vendor, set himself ablaze over the issue of license in December 2010. This incident escalated mass protests in the streets of Tunis. Resultantly, the mass protest ended Zine El Abidine Ben Ali's regime after twenty years. Furthermore, the revolt spread across the Middle East, particularly in Egypt. The protest across the Middle East revived Arab Nationalism of the 1950s and 1960s and suggested New Arab Unity in the Middle East. Hence, scholars in the Middle East called it an Arab Spring.

In this new mood of Arabism, the people believed that they would bring a change in regional politics in the form of democratic rule as Tunis and Egypt established democratic rule in their respective countries. Mohammed Morsi was elected as the first democratic president of Egypt in 2012. However, the people in Tunis and Egypt were interacting with people of other states by using Social Media. Before unrest spread in other parts of the Middle East, an

authoritarian government like Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Oman, and Jordan brought a democratic reform in their countries immediately. The unrest compelled the authoritarian regime to bring a change in the Middle East. They feared that if they failed to bring a democratic reform in their countries, the mass protest would topple their rule in the Middle East. The democratic reform proved to be a death blow to New Arabism. Abdel Fattah el-Sisi imposed martial law and restored the previous government of Hosni Mubarak in 2013 in Egypt that decreased the influence of New Arabism in the Middle East (Nasr, 2007).

Another version of the Arab Spring links to New Arabism which has played a vital role in unrest not only in Egypt and Tunis but also in the whole Middle East. In short, New Arabism fails to strengthen its position after the Arab Spring. Paradoxically, the rearrangement may happen, as new governments turn their thought inwards to satisfy the political and monetary solicitations of the protestors that conveyed them to pacify the protestors. Hence, Arab identity played a key role in spreading unrest across the region. Therefore, the idea of the federal structure helps to preserve Arab unity in the region. It remains a variable that might occur in the future. In contrast to this reasonable possibility, one who believes in Pan Arabism to establish the Arab Mega-States whose boundary lines are not known, cannot support this argument. The Arab intellectuals demonstrate that a confederation among the Arab states based on the Western-type of confederation is possible in future developments in the Middle East (Nasr, 2007).

Conclusion

It was the quality of Nasser's leadership that helped Egypt to play a dominant role in the Arab world. Furthermore, his ideology of Pan-Arabism and

Philosophy of Arab Nationalism encouraged the people of the Arab World to be united against the imperialism and colonialism in the Middle East region. The most colossal fragment of the Dogma was Pan-Arabism, which framed most of the bits of the Egyptian culture, the decision class, the strategy-making process, and people. The importance of Pan-Arabism could be seen in the formulation of the United Arab Republic (UAR) in the Middle East. Hence, the United Arab Republic was headed by Gamal Abdul Nasser who used this front against imperialism in the region of the Arab world.

Hence, under the leadership of Nasser, the integrity of the Nation, new reforms in education, agriculture, advanced technology establishment of new industries, standard living style, reliable constitution, and strong defence system have been the demand of the Egyptian people so that to improve the status of the country in the world. These demands of the Egyptians need more discussion in the coming time. In short, Gamal Abdul Nasser saved Egypt from the imperialism of Britain, the corrupt government of King Farouk and he worked hard for the Unity of the Arab world in the Middle East. He has ruled Egypt from 1952 to 1970 and succeeded by Anwar Sadat till 1981 and then Hosni Mubarak became president till 2011. After that, the country was underpowered by military rule after election Mohammed Morsi came as first elected president in the history of Egypt. The dictatorship turned into the civilian rule. In short, it was only Nasser who take out the country from dark and the colonialism of Britain and motivated all Arabians Countries to take notice of Britain's colonialism in the Middle East. Hence, the people not ever forget the time of Gamal Abdul Nasir that was a source of courage and power for the nation and for the survival of Arabs in the world.

References

- Abid, Q.-i.-A. a. (2012). *Gamal Abdul Nasser and Aftermath*. Lahore: Punjab University Press University of Punjab, Quaid-i-Azam Campus, Lahore.
- Auderheid, P. (1985). *Anwar Sadat*. New York: Chelsea House Publisher.
- Beeson, D. H. (1981). *Sadat*. London: London Press.
- Barrett, C. R. (2007). *The Greater Middle East and Cold War; US Foreign Policy under Eisenhower and Kennedy*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Carlton, D. (1981). *Anthony Eden: A biography*. London: Allen Lane.
- Carter, J. (2006). *Palestine Peace not Apartheid*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Chalala, E. (1987). *Arab Nationalism: A biography Essay in Pan-Arabism and Arab*, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Dawisha, A. (2003). *Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century: From Triumph to Despair*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- DcChancie, J. (1988). *Carnal Abdel Nasser*. New York: Chelsea House Publisher.
- DeChancie, J. (1988). *Carnel Abdel Nasser*. Chelsea: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Elie, S. (1962). Arab Nationalism: a Reappraisal. *International Journal, Vol.17, No. 3 (Summer, 1962)*, 289-299.
- Fisher, S. N. (1969). *The Middle East: A History*. London: Knopf
- Flower, R. (1972). *Napoleon to Nasser: The Story of Modern Egypt*. London: London Press.
- Gerges, F. A. (1994). *The Super Power and the Middle East: Regional and International Politics (1955-1967)*. Westview: Westview Press.

- Gilbert, M. (2008). *Israel: History; 60th Anniversary Edition Revised and Enlarged*. Black Swan.
- Goldschmidt, J. A. (1979). *A Concise History of the Middle East*. USA: Westview Press.
- Gordon, J. (2009). *Nasser: Hero of the Arab Nation*. London: Oneworld Publication.
- Hourani, A. (1991). *A History of Arab People*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Kerr, M. H. (1971). *The Arab cold war: Gamal' Abd Al-Nasir and his rivals 1958-1970*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Khaldi, R. (1991). *The Origins of Arab Nationalism: Introduction in Origins of Arab Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lacoutre, J. (1973). *Nasser: A Biography*. London: London Press.
- Lenczowski, G. (1967). *The Middle East in World Affair*. Cornell University Press.
- McNamara, R. (2003). *Britain, Nasser and the Balance of power in the Middle East, 1952-1967*. London: Frank Cass Publishers Crown Hous, 47 Chase Side London N14 5BP.
- Moore, J. N. (1977). *The Arab Isreali conflicts: readings and documents Abridges and revised Edition edited by Johan Norton Moore*. New Jersey: Princeton New Jersey Press.
- Nasr, V. (2007). *The Shia Revival: How Conflicts Within Islam Will Shap the Future*. New York: W.W Norton & Company.
- Nasser, G. A. (1959). *The Philosophy Revolution*. NewYork.
- P. J.Vatikiotis. (1978). *Nasser and His Generation*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Robert, McNamara. (2003). *Britain, Nasser and the Balance of Power in the Middle East 1952-77: From The Egyptian Revolution to Six Day War*. London: Frank Cass Publisher.

- Sadat, A. E. (1978). *In search of Identity*. London: Collins.
- Tawfig, Y. H. (1985). *The Struggle for the Arab World: Egypt Nasser and Arab league*, London: Taylor & Francis.
- Vatikiotis, P. (1980). *The History of Egypt, from Mohammad Ali to Sadat*. London: The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Wheelock, K. (1960). *Nasser's New Egypt*. London: Atlantic Books.
- Yergin, D. (2009). *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money & Power*. New York: New York press.

Sultan Qaboos bin Said Al Said
1940-2020



The Charismatic leader in Middle East who developed and transformed the impoverished Sultanate of Oman into a prosperous and modern welfare state. The reformer Sultan died on January 10, 2020.

May Allah rest his soul in eternal peace.

Area Study Center for Middle East & Arab Countries