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Chapter V


A. Post Cold War Period And International Scenario.

Though this period seems very short, nobody could have ever guessed that so many major events would take place on international landscape, so dramatically. The end of ideology, end of Superpowers' rivalry, German unification, settlement of regional conflicts and changes in socialist world with the unrest in West Asia leading to the Gulf War, 1991, and then the most important - the collapse of massive Soviet empire and lastly US supremacy in the globe all proved to be responsible factors to give the directions to the world politics. Gorbachev's immediate reforms including Glasnost and Perestroika brought startling changes in various aspects of the Soviet system- polity, bureaucracy, army, foreign policy, domestic matters, decision making and especially in economy. Glasnost, the freedom of expression and Perestroika, restructuring of the Soviet system, became the catchwords because these included human factor which was never discussed before in Soviet watertight system. The thawing of iron curtain of Soviet Union brought some positive developments with it so far as international scenario was concerned.

Four general approaches were incorporated by the Soviet Union for prevention of crisis and conflict.

1. An agreement on general principles.
3. Periodic general negotiations with US president.
4. The reduction of US-USSR nuclear risk arms control was politically
important in the context of managing peaceful coexistence.¹

The arrival of Gorbachev was harbinger of open and free society. Gorbachev had spun a network of change and although he could not control every event that landed in it, no one doubted that he was the pivotal figure.²

Cold war seemed to be concluding to a historic end and US took full advantage of it. This transitional period 1989-1991 December changed many things which had taken place since 1945-to 1988. D.S. Kamatekar rightly said “The international scene is totally transformed like a landscape shaken by a major earthquake.”³

**US position in West Asia:**

Traditionally, US has always been keeping an upper hand in this region. During the intense cold war the competition was quite tough and it never let the Soviet Union to spread its tentacles in their area of influence and US remained always greatly successful so far as its interests were covered.

The moment US realized the ‘weak’ position of erstwhile Soviet Union, it started designing and implementing various policies and strategies vigorously so as to its own interests and also to ensure its complete domination over the entire world, in short, assuming the role of Super-Co. Following few events confirm the trend.

**B. Iraqi aggression on Kuwait and threat to Saudi Arabia:**

Hardly two years had passed after the Iran-Iraq-War ceasefire with

---

slight calm and peaceful position, the year 1990 altered the entire situation in West Asia again. The whole world underwent a massive change and many chaotic events took place. The policies initiated by the President Reagan and continued by President Bush had Political motivation to maintain Iraq as counterweight to the anti-American government and to wean away Iraq from the influence of the then USSR. Having suffered from reverses during Iran-Iraq war and having been cut off arms supply from the USSR, Iraq had moved towards US (not ideologically but Politically). The US subsequent responses were positive and Iraq-US relations grew closer. Further commerce and trade relations were established since 1982. But Iraqi criticism of US in February 1990 embittered the relationship perhaps for ever. President Saddam Hussain accused US of its exploitation of oil and futuristic plan to enjoy unusual freedom in West Asia due to declining position of USSR. He pointed out Kuwait and Saudi Arabia as an agent of imperialist country that is US.

Moreover, he sharply criticized US imperialist designs. Naturally, these differences made both the countries poled apart and triggered US wrath.

Despite the recognition of Kuwait in 1963 Iraq did not give up its territorial claims of two islands Warba and Bubiyan and these were to be annexed. The problem of boundary demarcation and delimitation was created by Kuwait in 1951 and Iraq was ready to do it on the condition if both the islands were included in Iraqi territory but Kuwait did not agree. After sometime in 1954 Iraq put forth claim to modify her frontiers with Kuwait not only to have a free access to the Gulf but also to be able to defend her narrow coastline and to play her role as Gulf state.

---

In 1969 situation took a new turn, Iraq sought for stationing its troops in Kuwait territory to protect Umme Qaser. Ultimately this resulted into border tension.\(^5\)

After a long tussel Iraq became ready to withdraw from Bubyan and Warba and tension was somehow cooled down. During the Iran-Iraq War 1980-88, Kuwait provided a large amount of financial assistance to Iraq. Meanwhile Iraq was busy in war with Iran, Kuwait directly involved to sell crude oil from Rumaila oil field, (the controversial oilfield between Kuwait and Iraq) on behalf of Iraq.\(^6\) As Iraq realized and awakened, it started to put pressure on Kuwait on three counts

1. Annexation of Warba and Bubyan islands to its boundary (the old tension).
2. Kuwait should pay the compensation for oil it drawn from Rumaila oil field without keeping it into the knowledge of Iraq. It should pay also for a loss due to the lowering of world oil price because of production of oil by Kuwait and U.A.E.
3. Thirdly Kuwait itself must be of its 19th state as Kuwait was part of Iraq during the Ottoman empire.\(^7\)

Kuwait’s official suggested that they were ready to compensate debts and finance but they were too adament to make any compromise on boundary. After two weeks threatening to Kuwait, one fine morning on August 2, 1990 Iraq invaded Kuwait.\(^8\)

\(^7\) Link; Vol. 33, No.3, August 26. 1990. PP.5-6.
As crisis deepens and Iraq postion became more vulnerable in view of the possible attack of US, Iraq invoked the palestenin issue to mobilize Arab masses with the twin objectives of undermining the Saudi position and to challenge the US domination in the region. However needs to point out that Saudi Arabia, the Godfather of G.C.C. and a friend of Kuwait had signed a non aggression Pact with Iraq. Saudi Arabia did not oppose Iraqi aggression strongly. Looking powerlessly it was totally dependent on US assistance. It just limited itself upto the open doors for Sheikh Alsabah of Kuwait. Furthermore, a major pipeline that daily carries almost 1.5 million barrel of Iraq crude oil to the Red Sea port of Yambu, crosses Saudi territory constituting an Iraqi right of access that would have given to President Hussain a pretext for an attack on Saudi Arabia if Saudis interfered with this pipeline. Thirdly, Iraqi aggression also coincided with a severe criticism on Egypt by hardliners of the PLO who accused of Hosni Mubarak of being puppet in the hand of US. The entire region was dragged on the verge of disaster and specially monarchies were in danger; how could Saudi Arabia be spared if it would have happened, naturally US took a sharp turn to defend Saudi regime as well as Kuwait.⁹

The US-Iraqi rivalry intensified, the US propogated the idea that Saudi Arabia was the next target of Iraq and its troops were very close to Saudi border. Practically Iraq had no such intention. But now Washington had finally and openly designated Saudi Arabia as US protectorate and US as its benefector. Now Saudi territorial integrity was in jeopardy and this became US responsibility to protect it from foreign attacks. Despite Saudi unwillingness US imposed its will on Saudi government at this crucial juncture. In the eyes of Arabs it was humiliating position and a confirmation of Arab suspicion about the reasons for Saudi passivity and

⁹ The Times of India. Lucknow. August 5, 1990
subservience on the Arab-Israeli issues. On the other hand Iraqi military on the border of Kuwait had posed extremely threatening situation especially to Saudi Arabia. 10

Automatically, US economic interests started getting suffered and chances were more to be worsened but US took full advantage of its strategy making the circumstances fit and moulded according to its requirements.

President Bush immediately ordered for UN sanctions (trade, medicine, economy) against Iraq. “Immediately after Iraq invasion, I ordered an embargo of all trade with Iraq and many other nations announced sanction. Additionally UNO G.C.C. and Arab League courageously announced its opposition to Iraqi aggression. As I have witnessed throughout my life in both war and peace, Americans have never weavered when her purpose is driven by principles” 11

For the first time in history of cold war after 1945, both the superpowers US and USSR stood together against Iraq. Moscow declared a world wide halt against its closest ally Iraq and called this action as “brutal and illegal invasion on Kuwait.” 12 Moscow being no more an adversary of US, supported Security Council resolutions 660, 661, 662, 665 and 678 And US finally became successful in imposing embargo against Iraq. Had Gulf war erupted some few years earlier at the period of intensive cold war, Washington and Moscow would have stood as bitterest enemy supporting their respective allies as US to Saudi Arabia and Soviet Union to Iraq “The show down between Iraq as key client and Saudi

10 The Times of India. Lucknow. August 7, 1990
11 Congressional Quarterly. 1990. P 726
Arabia the old vital friend of the US could have embroiled the Superpowers in regional upheaval and conflict of superpowers.13 Definitely, it could have taken the turn as similar to Korean War of 1950-53.

Though Moscow was mild in its strategies and insisted peaceful settlement, on the contrary, US ultimately used force. Since Moscow was at the verge of disintegration, it could not oppose strongly Bush’s strategy. President Bush soon announced the deployment of forces on Saudi border under the ‘Operation Desert Shield,’ some of Congressmen objected but lastly it was approved by both the Houses of Congress. The President said —

“Iraq has massed an enormous war machine on Saudi border. Saudi government requested our help. The sovereign independent Saudi Arabia is of a vital interest for us. Any aggression against Saudi Arabia meant US military response. Any outside aggression on Saudi Arabia would represent direct threat to the national security of this country. This decision which I shared with Congressional leadership, grows out of longstanding friendship and security relationship between Saudi Arabia and USA. The forces of both the countries US and Saudi Arab would work together if any aggression happens from Iraqi side”.14

The US had started to feel a kind of threat in the region since the Iranian revolution occurred as Saudi Arabia’s security was also at stake. At that time ‘Carter doctrine’ and ‘Reagan doctrine’ did not let Saudi Arabia to be the second Iran. Eventually, at this time Saudi Arabia was considered as the next target after Kuwait and it was necessary for US to protect its interests in West Asia by managing Saudi Security and it was very easy

for US to mould the situation according to its requirements.

C. **US Foreign Policy and Defence of Saudi Arabia—Objectives and Strategies:**

Saddam Hussain's defiance and US monopoly had shattered the vision of a peaceful better world in aftermath of the cold war. Secretary James Baker before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council expressed that the invasion was indeed a historic challenge to the rest of the international community. It was a regional challenge very precarious for West Asia. President Bush outlined four major foreign policy goals towards West Asia.

1. Immediate unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait as mandated in UN Security Council resolution 660.
2. Restoration of Kuwait’s legitimate government.
3. Release of all the hostages (US citizens).
4. Commitment to the Security of the Gulf and stability of Saudi Arabia.15

President Bush's primary concern during and after the Iraqi invasion was to provide security to Saudi Arabia. An Iraqi attack towards them would have forced US for a direct military intervention, because it would be a direct threat to US economic interest. President Bush pressed the Saudi government to accept US military presence on its territory. Though, Saudis maintained a close relationship with US and purchased most of the military equipments from them but they never liked foreign presence on their sacred soil. Some of the Saudis had always suspicious eyes and a corner of disliking and mistrust for them. Moreover, the Saudi government being the guardian and custodian of Holy Mecca and Medina could have

---

been harshly criticized by the Islamic world. But in the early days of August 1990, Saudi officials felt Iraqi threat much greater than the US military presence inside the country. By the end of third week of August around 50,000 US army reached to Saudi Arabia.\(^{16}\)

Gradually, most of the Western countries including Britain and France and many of Arab countries such as Egypt, Morocco, Pakistan and others joined. King Fahd in his speech to the people of Saudi Arabia justified this measure for the participation of fraternal Arab and other friendly forces. According to him it was purely defensive and necessary for security purposes. "They will leave the Saudi territory immediately at the request of kingdom."\(^{17}\)

This support at that time was momentous for Saudi Arabia and Saudi government took a sigh of relief. A favourable condition took place fortunately for US and King Fahad paid vote of thanks for it when he paid a visit to Washington.\(^{18}\)

President Bush devoted much of his energy in constructing an international coalition to oppose the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. He hoped that broad international participation would reduce the burden on the US, it would increase the effectiveness of sanctions and justify US presence in Saudi Arabia. He succeeded in his strategy despite some dissatisfaction of among Congressmen because this was extra expenditure at the time of crisis. Apart from Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Syria were the first Arab states to join it. This growing co-operation in Arab world left Iraq all alone. Even Saudi Arabia could not understand US strategy that it would leave


its troops permanently on its grounds. All assumption and the thinking of Fahad that US would withdraw all its soldiers on the request of Saudi Arabia — were based on illusions and imaginations professor Baker of King Fahad University said “Our relationship with US is not that of a client to a Superpower but more like an employment or employer to an employee”.

On the other hand President Bush justified his strategies successfully. The US support to Saudi Arabia and instant response of any request by Saudi government at this crucial juncture strengthened US-Saudi ties. President categorically said to the United Nations former General secretary Presed De Cuellar in a meeting that Saudi Arabians were free to make any request they want and they (US) would recommend He further clarified that he was not going to cancel any arms deal for Saudi Arabia.

In this connection when President was asked about the defence of Saudi Arabia he positively replied that the integrity of Saudi Arabia and its freedom were very important so far as US vital interests were concerned with it. Deputy Press Secretary assured US military assistance to Saudi Arabia. He expressed ——

“The United States has close and valued relationship with its long time friend Saudi Arabia. It was in the spirit of this relationship that the US responded favourably to King Fahd’s request and sent troops to the kingdom. For more than a decade the US has made available to the kingdom defense articles and services. Consistent with this policy and in response to the current threat, the administration recently provided Saudi Arab equipment on an emergency basis”.

Following consultations with the Saudi government and the Congress, the administration had determined that it was in the interest of the United States to equip Saudi Arabia with additional material. "We believe that it is essential that the US be able and willing to provide training equipments to solidify Saudi defence system. Such support constitutes a key dimension of our over all strategy toward the persian Gulf and could serve as well to protect American lives." 22 A broad consensus prevailed among US administration and Congressmen to project Iraq as an enemy of entire Arab world that was to be opposed at every cost and Saudi Arabia should be protected with the consideration of vital interests. However, it needs to be emphasized here that the issue of restoration of Kuwaiti government and the security of Saudi Arabia was mere pretext, the real intention of US was to ensure the continuous supply of oil and to prevent the emergence of any power which poses threat to its hegemony.

Though King Fahad had expressed in press conference that US troops are temporary only for defense purposes. internally, the Saudi leaders themselves were feeling threatened and requested for US help. It was not purely temporary, there were so many pressures, economic burden from US side that Saudi Arabia had to accept it and US became fully successful in creating a reverberation for Saddam Hussain as strong foe of Arabs and especially it might harm Saudi Arabia.

The US challenges and Iraqi obstinacy led to the war- the Gulf war 1991 and it was full fledged war in the region. Further, negotiations were stopped. Resolution 678 in pursuance of liberation of Kuwait, practically commenced on 16/17 January 1991 in the form of 'Operation Desert Storm' which was for all practical purpose of US-Iraq direct military
confrontation) In this war Iraq suffered heavily. On February 28, 1991, Bush announced that war to liberate Kuwait was won and declared ceasefire. Subsequently, withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait started. Ultimately, US regained its lost image in West Asia and won the heart of Arabs as being protector and patron of them against their own brother country. On the other hand, Prince Bandar Bin Sultan of Saudi Arabia, thanked the US president for his assistance and protection and President thanked Saudis for their steadfast cooperation. At this time, US as victorious power was feeling happy and at this finest hour President Bush declared New World Order. The miserable condition of the Soviet Union provided for US a suitable and favourable environment to implement that New World Order.

President Bush succinctly summed up national interest and old objectives after the end of cold war and at the time of Gulf war and after. He expressed “the survival of the US as a free and independent nation with its fundamental values are intact in New World Order its people and institutions are secure”.

The Israel Factor:

However, this was the high time for US New World Order to be prevailed and the US with its triumphant approach played a multipronged role in West Asia and in the world as well. The US role toward Israel, Iraq and its friend states, in Arab world and toward former Soviet Union all reflected its hegemonistic designs and overactivity. By and large, at every step Soviet Union danced to the tune played by the US as no other alternative was there. The US, tactfully, kept away Israel inspite of several...
provocations US knew very well if Israel responded Saddam Hussain’s attack, it would convert into an Arab Israeli conflict as Saddam Hussain wanted and tried to turn the attention of the international community toward it. President Bush never preferred this crisis to take a colour of Arab Israeli war because in that situation the entire US-Arab strategy would have failed. To make this diplomacy successful and strong US projected Iraqi image very disdainfully in a form of hostile and enemy country for Arabs and other Western powers including France and Britain.

In early stages Israel could not anticipate any Iraqi attack on it. Israeli military leaders said that Iraqi president was aware of Israel’s strength and they were confident enough that Saddam Hussain would not start any war at the time when an international alliance was against him. In addition, Israel found its one time bitter enemy Syria on the opposite side against Iraq.

Cairo-Damascus axio that had sparked a disastrous attack in 1967, now was aligned with coalition force under US umbrella against Iraq. Nevertheless, Israelis were even confirmed in their second thought that this alliance would not last long. President Assad and Saddam Hussain for a moment might oppose each other but they belong to the same radicals rejectionist group that opposed Israel and they would always support PLO.

A section of Israel was deeply concerned and shaken by Palestinian support to Iraq and some Israeli leaders were contended to note that US might pressurize the Palestinian radicals to loosen their grip over occupied territories. Consequently, Palestine can also be dominated easily as since 1948. On the other side, even though Iraq was surrounded by the
coalition of Arab-Western hostile forces, and not Israel, Saddam Hussain chose to attack on Israel, exclusively for political purpose. But Saddam Hussain forgot that he was not equal to USA and Iraq's most confident friend Soviet Union was loosing its strength. no country was there to stand against coalition force with Iraq as a balancing and viable factor. Israel very diplomatically kept mum as per US instructions and did not make any pre-emptive attack on Iraq. They did not want to be played in the hands of Saddam Hussain. As a result against Iraq by US Israel's image shined more in the eyes of Congress, Administration, Public Opinion and Pentagon as well, whereas Israel felt some sort of discomfort departing from its traditional policy of quick shift and effective retribution and retaliation against any Arab state. Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria all had publicly indicated that they would understand the situation if Iraq attacks are responded by Israel. But Jordan was very critical of this stance and many times it had warned primier Shamir that if Israel crossed the Jordanian air space enroute to Iraq, Jordan would be compelled to respond to Israeli attack whereas Saudi Arab, Syria and Egypt were not in that mood. Had any Israeli reaction happened against Iraq all those three Arab states would have been mute spectator or situation would have been somehow different. Might be Arabs would have got divided into two groups Jordan, PLO and Iran group against Israel with Iraq and the other one with coalition force but Israel did not retaliate and situation remained as it was. Saudi government also concluded that they had a common interest in promoting more stable regional status quo.

Another lurking fear for US in this condition, i.e. in case of Israeli retaliation, Arab-Israel War and Arab rift was failure of US Arab strategies. US tried to maintain a balanced relationship with Israel and Arab states as well. Moreover, Arab states know very well that they cannot go against US that is the only alternative. Steven Spiegel, a US policy analyst, expressed his viewpoint in these words "In specific circumstances pressure on Israel does not guarantee improved relations with leading Arab states, and aid to Israel does not prevent expanded contacts with Pro-American Arab regimes".  

Israel was well conscious of the development of its infrastructure. They were not prepared to bear massive attacks and challenges unnecessarily.

Secondly, US Israeli relations got revitalized as US took care it during Iraqi aggression. In response, Israel was ready to cooperate with US in peace Process for West Asia and now it was obligatory for Israel to cooperate in peace process. Though this triggered off suspicion between the two countries but at last both of them realized the need of each other and relations were purely normal.

President Saddam Hussain could not achieve its objectives at terrible cost to his country and his people, whereas Israel had gained an appreciable position since not letting the war to be converted into an Arab-Israeli war.

President Bush addressed a joint session of Congress on March 6, 1991 in which he indicated four key challenges to be confronted. Firstly, to work jointly to create shared security arrangements in the region.

---

50 Ibid. P 83
America will be there with its allies to repel any aggression but that does not mean to station forces in Arabian peninsula but a joint exercise of air and ground forces, US vital interests depend upon a stable and secure Gulf Order.

Secondly, the US must act to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Thirdly, the US and West Asian countries must create new opportunities for peace and stability in the region.

Forthly, to establish and foster economic stability of the region for the pacific settlements - as West Asia is rich in its natural resources.\textsuperscript{12}

Significantly, it was hightime for US to use its brink manship with a rhetoric for peace and New World Order. And these recent experiences during Iraqi aggression on Kuwait, defence of Saudi Arabia and restoration of Kuwaiti government - all proved to be catalyst in this US measure. US was well aware of the time to appease Israel and Arab strategies both simultaneously. Arab world was well aware that it could not challange to US directly and at that time situation was more delicate as the Soviet Union was not in position to be a strong rival against any of US move. US itself paved the way in Gulf to serve its interests by taking a lot of favours of Saudi Arabia.

D. Soviet Role in Gulf War:-

The Soviet policy aimed at to make a political settlement of some issues if possible. But the circumstances were not so easy going. Soviet Union, due to multiple crises at home had to take economic aid from US and naturally to appease US, Soviet Union could not convince Iraq nor

challenge US strength and it was not in position to protect Iraq from heavy attacks from all capital side.

In view of Robert, O. Freedman, the Soviet policy analyst, "At key juncture it cooperated with USA but it also tried to mediate the conflict and preserved its position in Iraq. While Iraq responded to the allied attacks by bombarding Israel, the Soviet ministry of foreign affairs was worried about the implications of an expanded war".  

Soviet Foreign ministers' effort to settle the problem through diplomatic measures could not be fruitful. Soviet leader Gorbachev in later stages did not like Iraq's defiant activities. Ultimately Moscow favoured US in working out the operations - 'Desert Storm' and 'Desert Shield' and ultimately it had to accept defeat of Iraq. Iraq was left into the lurch. Iraq fought all alone the massive costly war without any sort of assistance from any corner of the world. This incident also exposed the myth of Arab solidarity as no Arab nation came forward to support Iraq in view of the U.S. pressure.

Evaluating Soviet behaviour during the crisis caused by Iraqi invasion, it was a mixture of Gorbachevian new thinking and traditional actions. The crux of new thinking was Moscow's insistence on peaceful political settlements of the crisis. Moscow's 'Minimax' policy was an attempt to sustain traditional linkages with Iraq and to play a key role during the war to be as mediator only.

Unrest in Arab World and Road to Peace:-

In March 1991, the six Arab states together with Syria and Egypt

---

33 Ibid. PP 14-16
34 Foreign Affairs, Vol 71, No 1-3, 1992, PP 77-78
had issued the Damascus declaration calling for enhancement of economic cooperation and the establishment of Arab peace keeping force to maintain security in the Gulf. The war costed for Saudi Arabia around 50 billion dollars and Saudi Government had to borrow from US to meet its expenditures. By April, 1991, Saudi Arabia indicated to Egypt and Syria that it would not like to welcome more coalition troops. King Fahd was totally against now to offer further because this move of offering Saudi land to foreigners was bitterly criticized by oppositional religious groups. Egypt, Jordan, Yamen and Syria were facing economic problem. The breakdown of economic and security arrangement created some problems of disunity. Egypt tried to pick up the pieces of Arab unity. Since all the Arab states sought good relations with Washington: Cairo offered its services as a broker. The emerging US-Syria relations at this time proved very important for Egypt that led a New Arab Order. In this regard President Mubarak and King Fahad played a vital role to bring Hafez al-Assad the Syrian President—closer-to-US-sponsored peace process or West Asian peace talks with Israel.35

The US President Bush watched the situation very carefully and all these developments during the crisis had shaken the foundation of Arab world and the picture of Arab phenomenon was radically changed. Most of the Arab regimes were found on the side of vanquished victor.36

Madrid peace conference in October 1991, Moscow conference in November-December 1992 and Washington conference 1993-rounds respectively in further years proved US’ earnest effort for West Asian peace and settlement of Arab Israel constant tension and disturbance. Now the US was trying to balance the situation. It was not in favour of any

35 Ibid, p 79
36 Ibid p 93
other Arab-Israel war because all these confrontations proved to be too harmful and annihilating for Israeli infrastructure and development. Gulf war demonstrated the mere fact that Arab and Israeli have been talking to each other, and it would not resolve the problem of the region. The old Order was still smouldering. Secretary Baker was busy in fashioning a global policy that could accommodate the transformation of the Soviet Union into cumbersome CIS.

The weakening position of the Soviet Union and dramatic change in its foreign policy from competition to cooperation, played a very important role to make US diplomacy successful.

E. Soviet Position and Disintegration:

Soviet role during the Gulf war had been negligible so far as its strong stand and veto power against UN sanctions to Iraq were concerned. Had it been in a position to oppose US harsh decisions against Iraq, the situation would have been entirely different as seen many times during the cold war, for instance, Korean war of 1950, Vietnam war 1965 to 1975, and Arab-Israel war of 1967.

Soviet Union was busy in coping with its turbulent domestic problems and could hardly pay attention to the policies towards West Asia and other decision making processes during the Gulf war. There were so many economic and political problems prevailing in Soviet Union that led to a massive country into oblivion.

Later on, foreign minister's resignation brought a serious situation and there was no remedy except to be a mediator during the crisis for a

---

superpower which was loosing its grip & solidarity in terms of a strong power. Consequently, Moscow totally failed to convince Washington to avert the crisis peacefully, nor it could influence its ally not to go on wrong paths so defiantly.  

The Soviet Union tried to deal with the situation but his efforts miserably failed. New thinking and new trends in foreign policy and in internal affairs to a certain extent seemed beneficial but at the time of their failure and inapplicability, when Soviet crack-down started, the attempts to reform Soviet empire led to its collapse and Gorbachev had to pay an expensive price.  

Political, economic, social and organizational structures were so paralysed that no evolutionary change was possible - that Gorbachev was trying through two reforms 'Glasnost' and 'Perestroika'. The Soviet economic crisis was clearly visible in declining growth rates, increasing scarcity of exploitable resources and most important the worsening imbalance between military production and general production specially consumer goods.  

Enormous bureaucratic structure had got polluted by corruption earlier than Gorbachev's arrival. They increasingly neglected their goals of serving the civilians and political economic corruption encompassed it.  

The demand for independence from Baltic states— (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia) was most serious issue. Soviet-German pact of 1939 brought the

---

80 Foreign Affairs Vol 70, No 5, 1991 Winter P 168
81 Seminar, May 1992, P 19 See details in the same issue on P 20
Baltics into the Soviet territory and this was rejected in 1989 by the Congress of Peoples Deputies and they were declared independent in March 1990. But this did not solve the political problem and triggered off another ethnic problems and independent nationalities specially in Baltic regions.  

Ultimately, mismanagement of modernization and traditional values proved fatal to the Soviet structure. After coming to an extent of reforms and changes Gorbachev moved backward. The conservatists were seeking to maintain some linkage with old system for which Boris Yeltsin was striving for.

The centre was loosing its control and credibility over the republics and gradually all became free breaking the structure of Soviet Union into CIS.

The unsuccessful coup of August 1991, led by conservatives brought the half of disintegration of the country. Coups led by Boris yeltsin speeded up and three Baltics and three other - Moldavia, Arminia and Georgia encouraged other three Ukrain, Bylorussia and Uzbekistan.

Gorbachev lost the balance in his team in Kremlin between the radicals and hardliners. His closest friend Alexander Yakolav and Shevardnadze (brains behind perestroika) had already gone.

The Slav states passed a resolution to establish the independent states' Commonwealth at Minsk and Gorbachev resigned as President on December 24, 1991. In its last sitting USSR Supreme Soviet dissolved.

42 Ibid. PP 19-20-21
45 Seminar. May 1992 P2
itself on December 16, 1991, along with remaining structure of USSR. The USSR was dead and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) emerged with a vague structure on Dec 25, 1991. The Soviet Union became a part of history US recognized and welcomed it. Soviet disintegration brought an unforeseen change in the world politics. The US' long desire and George F. Kenon's prophecy that USSR would be no more in near future, proved correct. The US was happy as its chronic adversary collapsed. During the Gulf war, as US was fully aware of Soviet position, it started to neglect former USSR in every matter though there was no mutual rivalry. Gorbachev had always tried to have a friendliness with USA. All the agreements, settlements, negotiations and talks initiated or participated by Gorbacheve, were not given importance and there was no weightage of USSR's initiative. Soviet Union miscalculated and underestimated US strategies. And its internal problems did not let it to do worthwhile what they could have done in normal circumstance and sound position. The Soviet Union's legacy transmitted to Russian Federation. Soviet disappearance left an unhealthy vacuum for its former rival US and US started playing one man show in every matter any time, any where it desires.

F. US Supremacy and the New World Order:

The demise of Soviet Union, which had been serving up till now as counter balance force against US, proved to be a boon for US and death-knell for other socialist Countries. US wanted to shoulder all the responsibility of self made and self assumed New World Order for the replacement of old world order.

In the words of Jaques Delors in his address to IISS in March 1991

47 Jindal Nirmal, US Foreign Policy Issues And Perspectives Lancers. New Delhi, 1991, P196
"all around us, naked ambitions, lust for power national uprising- all are contributing to create potentially dangerous situation containing the seeds of destabilization and conflict, aggravated by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Since these developments have been defined as the major security challenges to the global community, the US has assumed the responsibility of maintaining N.W.Order. 48

A couple of months after the collapse of the old world order, reconciliation process started in Cambodia and Afghanistan (half of the problem of Afghanistan was already solved by Gorbachev, the former Soviet leader in 1988). The new international climate made favourable impact on democratization in South America. The transformation of former Communist countries towards democracy which had taken place in a dramatic way, opened up a transitional period. Significantly, a non-ideological, basically pragmatic stream came into forefront which laid emphasis on discarding the concept of military confrontation and utilization of most well proved means to achieve economic efficiency as market liberalization etc. 49

As per US perspective, New World Order occupied a primary significance but still there is no clear outline that could have defined the contours of US led New World Order except its supremacy. President Bush aimed at -

1 The need for collective cooperation against any external aggression (He refered to Iraq).
2 The US had disproportionate responsibility to lead in defusing international crisis.

49 Jindal, Nirmal. op cit. P 197
3. The universal application of market economy both internally and externally.

4. Democracy, good governance, human right, economic liberalization, elimination of weapons and reduction of arms in future.

The US proposed a collective resistance and suggested the grouping of Western nations under US leadership like group of seven industrialist countries or big five to impose their 'will' on the world. The New World Order was specially designed to serve the interest of North. The end of the cold war and allied action in Gulf reflects western nations' solidarity and monopoly. It outlined the unity of north against south on the issues pertaining to military security access to resource market and political system to the interest of Western nations. In nutshell, the US-declared New World Order was totally in favour of western hemisphere and was to be implemented according to the US will. This led gradually to the NATO's eastward expansion including Russia in coming years.

In the context of US-Iraq confrontation, the New World Order is viewed by many Arabs as heralding a process of recolonization of Arab land through US military intervention. The US intransigence with so much force and zeal to "defend Saudi Arabia and liberate Kuwait", had conveyed a cynical message that it only cares those Arabs who are rich in resource and have oil. The US military presence in Saudi Arabia gave Washington a tremendous geographical advantages. Saudi Arabia and the Gulf Emirates took a grave risk when they appealed for US forces to defend them against Iraq because later on they had to face total US imperialism in the region. Americans made no visible effort to bring out

\[51\] Middle East International. March 8, 1991. P 27
a just settlement for the Palestinians and the situation became more
vulnerable and dangerous because of the US increasing opportunism in
West Asia.52

However, the Americans gave all this a colour of US victory over
cold war or triumph of 'Liberalism' over 'Communism'. According to
president Bush this Gulf war was the first test in 'New World Order' in
which they had been successful and passed out that test. He admired the
good performance of force as "this victory belongs to finest fighting force
this nation has ever known in its history. He expressed "We lifted the
yoke of aggression and tyranny from a small country."53 President Bush
in his address before joint session of Congress on March 6, 1991, apart
from this commitments to peace in West Asia stressed a security
arrangement in Gulf through maintaining US joint excercises involving
both air and ground forces and US naval presence in the region.

G. **Gulf Security Arrangement and the US Strategy: (Oil Factor)**

President Bush in his speech of March 6, 1991, stated that the US
and its allies must work together to create a shared security arrangement
in the Gulf region which implies allied exercises for the perpetuation of
western domination of the region. "We must take together to create shared
arrangements in the region. Our vital national interests depend on a stable
and secure Gulf We must act to control the proliferation of weapons of
mass destruction and missiles issued to deliver them At the same time
peace brings real benefits to every one We must do all that we can to
close the gap between Israel and Arab states and Israel and Palestinians.54
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It can be construed that the US tried to maintain a balance approach and friendship for both the sides—whether Israel or Gulf States. On the one hand, US did not want to break Arab strategy so far as its interests were concerned— as Iran (upto Shah), Saudi Arabia and oil rich small G.C.C. etc., on the other hand, US strongly supported Israel as its spoiled child. It has always been successful in maintaining its arrangement for security and keeping its strong bases in the Gulf specially military bases. It has two phases—security to deter the Soviet influence and security for oil.

The US' main aim in the Gulf is to ensure for itself and its allies a continuous and secure supply of cheap oil and to keep control on oil rich regimes. On the other side, the main aim of Gulf states and Saudi Arabia is to produce oil without hinderance, to maximise their oil revenues and security against the outside aggression whether neighbour or any other power as seen in case of Iraqi aggression on Kuwait. It is clear that the interest of US and Gulf states including Saudi Arabia coincide and they complement each other.

One American objective as stated above was to ensure the security of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states Mr. Baker and President Bush proposed a new security arrangement through the Gulf Cooperation Council stationing local troops under the UN flag. This new arrangement left the options for army, navy and air presence according to the exigency of the time. Mr James Baker indicated to Iran as major nuclear power which was even a very good friend of US upto Shah’s period. Presently, Iran was creating a challenge for US- Saudis ties and US-GCC friendship. The US leaders do not have the kind of confidence in present day what they had in Raza Shah for entrusting it with regional policeman’s role.

---

The exception remains only Saudi Arabia and other small states for the fulfilment of its long term interests in the region. So far as its short term interests were concerned Egypt and Syria were included for the time being.

This turn in Saudi behaviour was reflexive of 'litmus test' as timely fixation of particular attitude and after some time Saudi Arabia turned back on its line and Saudi US defence commitments strengthened. Saudi Arabia was now more willing to do US' bidding though it strained its relations with Arab allies and it was taken as total failure of Pan Arabism and Arab nationalism.57

This is US strategy to have a strong stand in Gulf area sometimes it met to its failure and sometimes success. Since 1971 when British influence was withdrawan from there the US policy towards Gulf became more particular. At that time there were two objectives to protect oil and to counter Soviet influence. The region had gained extraordinary prominance in modern times mainly on account of enormous oil reserves located there and dependence of contemporary world on it.

The US is by far the world's biggest guzzler. The country uses 17 million barrels a day. 43% of US energy needs are met by petroleum products. Since the invasion of Kuwait, some price increase has been greater than those mandated by the laws of supply and demand. The department of state analyst said that if Saddam Hussain is forced from power peacefully, Iran and Saudi Arabia could dominate OPEC, leading to a relatively stable oil market.58

In 1980, Saudi Arabia bore a severe setback because of the decline in demand of OPEC oil. The economic boom in Saudi Arabia was followed by recession and large deficit. They realized that possession of oil reserves does not guarantee a market. They started its increase in capacity again before the crisis of 1991. The new goal was to expand the capacity from the current 85 million barrel today to 10 million barrel a day other OPEC countries had the same plan.\(^{59}\)

During the second half of the 1980, Saudi Arabia’s military outlay was average around 14 million dollars. Since Iraqi-Kuwait crisis emerged, Saudis have placed a very large order for military equipment with US manufactures - worth about 20 million dollars. This was a long term contract. Saudi Arabia and its allies, lastly, planned to sell more and more oil to meet and finance much larger military budgets and increased Arab aids. However, any crisis in the Gulf may lead to deficit again as in case of 1983-89.\(^{60}\)

The US interest (economic) has always been fulfilled by oil rich countries including six small states i.e. Kuwait, UAE Qatar, Bahrain, Oman and its old friend Saudi Arabia. The US had evolved a typical strategy after bearing a lesson from 1973 oil crisis that it started to sell high cost weapons and other goods in the pretext of security and stability of these regimes. The US twin pillar diplomacy was on of its innovative Gulf security arrangement strategy. This introduced direct military presence in the Gulf and after Iranian revolution Saudi Arabian protection was the foremost requirement of US.

\(^{59}\) Ibid. P 12

President Carter proclaimed in his doctrine on January 23, 1980 “The future of Saudi Arabia and the future of United States tied together very closely in an irrevocable way. An attempt by any outside force to gain control of Gulf will be regarded as an assault on the vital interest of US' and will be repelled by any mean necessary including military forces.”  

In present Gulf war 1991, Iraqi military infrastructure was strong and all these were made by US during Iran-Iraq war. Now this jeopardized pro Western regimes specially Saudi Arabia and US had to seek out a new alternative for security of Saudi Arab and other oil rich countries. Saudi Arabia became a leading partner of US and came closer to US than ever before.

H. US -Saudi Ties After Gulf War:-

During the cold war, US objectives were determined according to the lines of USSR’s moves and perceptions of objectives. i.e.

2. Continued access to Persian Gulf oil resources at resonable prices.
4. To keep a watching eyes to control West Asia through Israel.

Generally US Saudi relations have been on cordial lines except some differences. For the security arrangement in the Gulf during 1969-72, the US focused a lot of importance on Iran under its twin pillar diplomacy. As the part of Nixon doctrine, Iranian hegemony in the Gulf was intended.

---

to promote regional stability and to deter against the Soviet threat to the western economic interests in West Asia. Saudi Arabia was at second position but after the fall of Shah of Iran, Saudi Arabia became the centre for the Gulf Security.

After the end of cold war, threat from Soviet Union was minimised US-CIS relations are cordial and in this situation US-Gulf objective are:-

1. Continued acess (flow) of Persian Gulf oil at reasonable price.
2. Preservation of Arab territory and security from outer threats.
3. To defend Israel at any cost  

Not only Gulf war appears to be responsible for the alternation in US policies but post cold war developments played a very important role in this direction. Gulf war was one of the maifestation of US supremacy in West Asia after the Soviet collapse.

However, Saudi Arabia and US both require each other very much to fulfil their respective interests. Very much concious of each other’s geopolitical significance, diplomatic, economic and political importance. Both the countries always made efforts to make their relations very much strong in this area. But lately, some differences emerged in Royal family. Crown prince Abdullah opposed any permanent presence of US force in a Muslim state (Saudi Arabia). King Fahad was mild in his approach and could have allowed stationing of other equipments  

Four alternatives were prepared:

1. Saudi defense Independence.

---

63 Agmon. Marcy. op cit. P 35-42
2. Defence of all Gulf states
4. US as disengaged balance.

The key features of these strategies are large defense expansion in Saudi Arabia, US-Saudi cooperative defense of Arabian peninsula, US reliance on security arrangement with participation of the GCC states and maintenance of a stable military balance in the region.

In post cold war environment, Saudi Arabia may be in a better position to have adequate defense capabilities against potential enemies. During the peace time US would provide Saudi defense expansion training, arms transfer and intelligence. Large Saudi weapons purchase would help to expand foreign market for US. For Saudi Arabia this alternative could bring the reduction of tension among Saudi decision makers in royal family and Saudi society.

Secondly, a substantial defense expansion would be required for US-Saudi intensive cooperation and coordination would be expected and US would provide assistance in Saudi condominium would be more compatible to Egypt Israel and some other states.\(^4\)

Participating non Gulf states would require power projection capabilities. This would enhance cooperation with other Arab states. Shireen Hunter refers to this strategy as an “all Arab pillar strategy”.\(^5\)

Fourthly, the US would attempt to regulate programmes of arms transfer. For this, regional intervention and multilateral participation were

---

\(^4\) SAIS Review, winter/spring 1992, P 16
\(^5\) Hunter Shireen. Lessons of the Past and Need for New Thinking. P.P 43 to 49. Quoted in The above review
greatly preferred. But no formal arrangement for security in the region would be made. The US would pursue a well designed and smooth policy of maintaining balance whether to join or oppose any group of states. This strategy may provide the US with a greater likelihood of maintaining the economic good will of regional oil producing states. 66

Though these alternatives were assumed by US to make its position strong there is no certainty whether they are going to be successful or not as circumstances and changes in world politics do not remain static.

As far as US-Saudi relations are concerned US Saudi defense condominium carries some weightage. US may prefer to maintain cooperative security arrangement with the Saudis for several reasons i.e. to preserve a familiar sort of diplomacy, to increase the likelihood of ‘special construction’ of US economic and political interest and to maintain military interest in the region.

So far as arms control in the region is concerned all arms should not be stopped. A plan to reduce arms transfer to the Gulf may be possible on two goals.

A. First the transfer could be structured roughly to enhance the defensive capabilities of the arms recipient.

B. Secondly such regimes must not hamper US balancing role if necessary (whether it is intervention) and Israeli security should not be threatened by the arms control arrangement for Persian Gulf. Moreover, arms competition in West Asia would be a burden also on Israeli security and economy. 67

66 Ibid, P P 63-65
67 Ibid, P P 63-65
peace in world politics in which US tried its best to maintain self-assumed World Order under its own leadership. Immediately after the decline of one superpower the world environment had become very unhealthy, due to the lack of balances. As US had projected a danger to Arabs from Arabs, they cynically shifted under US umbrella but later, gradually they started to realize that their wealth not is being used for their own advantage.

They also feel that their wealth is ploughed back into America which promptly pumps off some of it to Israel. With the military, diplomatic and political backing of the US, Israel has made its mission to humiliate and dominate the Arabs. This happened many times in 1948, 1996, 1967, 1973 and 1982, still nothing has been settled down.

Recently, in 1994, some realization has prevailed there specially among Saudis. they do not want to see Saudi Arabia as a ‘puppet’ of US Congress, Administration and decision making bodies.68