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Conclusion

The pathway that is sought out through deliberate efforts of nations
to reach to a certain decision and resolution is not very smooth and easy.
The varying situations, turmoils, political trenches, uncertain behaviour
and abrupt attitudes of the global politics determine the salience and nature
of the relations among the countries. They too directly influence decision
making process and settlement of the problems existing among the states.
Superpower involvement in the Third World region - especially in West
Asia, reflects the nature of relations between small powers and big ones.
This rivalry in West Asia is the manifestation of their different behaviours,
inclination, trust, mistrust, suspicions, faith, allegiance, approach,
pressures, constraints, success, failures, attraction, repulsion, conflict and
cooperation. Though in the context of U.S. Saudi-relations, Soviet Union
had a very negligible role but it greatly affected US foreign policy towards
this region.

The US-Saudi relations, within the parametre of US foreign policy
towards West Asia are viewed with two angles - Cold war period and
post-cold war period. These two phases are quite important by virtue of
their different characters.

After the world War II, US and USSR both emerged ideologically
confronting superpowers. Consequently, many military blocs came into
existence led by two hostile hemispheres - Capitalist and Communists.
Their aims and objectives were to counter the rival activities and to fortify
their position accordingly. The world view to analyse US foreign policy
was entirely different at that time and since 1985, the cold war started to
cool off and gradually diminished with the dramatic end of a superpower.
West Asia region had been playing a significant role since its early days of Ottoman empire and after 1945 it became an arena for superpowers game. Due to its immense strategic, economic and the political values, the entire region soon became the attraction of super-power rivalry. Each nation began to identify itself with one superpower or another, depending upon its political and economic interest.

Historically, U.S. maintained its link with Saudi rulers ever since the creation of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1923. Initially, U.S. companies ARAMCO and SOCAL have played very important role in cementing and strengthening US Saudi relationship. The discovery of oil in 1933 brought the two nations closer to each other. After the creation of Israel Saudi Arabia could not oppose US policies towards Palestine but supported palestine as far as it could. It had to adjust with US in the world setting. On the other hand US policy makers were always guided by the Monroe doctrine of 1823 and Washington’s farewell speech. U.S. remained neutral before the World War I and for a short period they broke down their neutrality and after the World War I, they were back to the policy isolationism. Since the end of World War II, US got fully involved in world affairs. After the world war II, West Asia became more important for both the superpowers including the former USSR. The Soviet objectives at that time in West Asia were as follows.

1. Not to let the European states and US use the West Asian Oil.
2. To have its influence among the socialist Arab regimes.
3. To counter any US move in that area.

On the other hand US had its objectives in West Asia to fulfil its economic interest and to keep Soviet Union away from there. More precisely these objectives were as follows:
1. To counter the communist influence at any cost in West Asian region

2. To use oil and natural gas and to encourage to do same to its ally countries (Western Europe)

3. To support Israel at any cost and to keep an eye on Arab activity through Israel

4. To Project itself as defender of Arab Gulf states from external threats

From 1947, Truman doctrine, Four Point Plan 1949, Eisenhower doctrine 1957 and other all these have been US foreign policy manifestation for West Asia to minimize the Soviet influence. The creation of Israel was a great setback for the entire Arab world but Saudi Arabia could not do anything to prevent the creation. Major security, military, economic, political, diplomatic and traditional relations were maintained so far as their mutual interest were concerned.

The year 1970 was very significant because after the death of President Nasser it became very easy for US to get strong position in West Asia. President Sadat was much more realistic, practical and pro-US and his policies to West Asia that directly suited to Israel. And his approach toward US proved to be catalyst for US in achieving its objectives. Britain’s departure from this area had created vacuum and this was filled by the US.

During both the crises in West Asia - June 1967 and October 1973 Arab - Israel Wars. US - Saudi relations got very tense but military, economic and diplomatic relation were not curtailed. US wholeheartedly supported Israel and on the other hand Arabs did not get worthwhile support from Soviet Union. The then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger’s ‘shuttle’ diplomacy and step by step diplomacy played a very crucial role at that critical moment to bring peace and through this, they regained Arabs’ favour and pacified their anger. Materially, US - Saudi relations remained
unaffected but there were some warnings which were given to Saudi Arabia and other OPEC countries that oil should not be used as weapon in future again.

Iran was already one of the major ally of US and one of the confident country in West Asia at that time. Iran, since Shah's arrival in early 40's had been a centre of oil exploitation and Americanization. Being situated in the Gulf it served the purpose of security arrangement also. Secondly, it was known as one of the important pillar of US foreign policy. Equally important pillar was Saudi Arabia. In mid seventies US was busy in modernization of the defence structure of Saudi Arabia. US paid attention on these countries specially and this diplomacy was called twin pillar diplomacy.

President Carter strengthened relations with Saudi Arabia King Khalid and President Carter made a deal of F-15 that triggered off a bitter controversy specially in Jewish lobby in the Congress. In the meantime Camp David Accord was signed between Sadat, Begin and Carter in 1978. In that Palestinian's rights, self determination and their recognition were totally ignored. Consequently, there was mixed reaction among Arabs. It was bitterly criticized and Saudi Arabia also expressed its resentment against it. Next year Egypt-Israeli treaty in March 1979 enhanced the Arab wrath and Egypt was expelled from the Arab League and Organisation of Islamic Conference.

Another reason why Saudi Arabia opposed Camp David Treaty and Egypt-Israel peace Treaty, despite being backed by US, was that they cut a sorry figure of Saudi Arabia and undermined its position in the region which Saudi did not like. In reaction Congressmen were too adament negatively to release F-15 sale to Saudi Arabia. Apart from it, some other Arab countries i.e. Iraq, Jordan, and Syria had broken off diplomatic
relations with Egypt after signing Camp David agreement and treaty with Israel during 1978-1979.

Saudi Arabian resentment came out in some other form - for instance Saudi Arabia for the first time thought of Soviet friendship, the staunch communist empire. These two poles apart countries suddenly realized their mutual significance Soviet Union was not happy with Sadat's pro-US policies and it had also criticized Camp David Agreement etc. This was the best time for Soviet Union to establish diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia. Unfortunately, Soviet Union intervened in Afghanistan and this act was internationally criticized. Saudi Arabia was amongst the critics. Another important event in 1979 was Iranian revolution led by Khomeini. The entire panorama changed in Iran and now Islamic Revolution was a great disappointment for US. Consequently the strategy of twin pillar diplomacy weakened. On the other side Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and then its greedy glances towards West Asia was a great threat for US. The entire focus now moved entirely on Saudi Arabia - the only remaining single pillar in the Gulf. These new developments and especially Mecca incident of November 1979, made Saudi Arabia much scared of Islamic fundamentalism. On the other hand US had to strengthen its only pillar Saudi Arabia lest the revolution might take place in Saudi Arabia also. As a result, Saudi concern to its security reverted back its attention to US plank.

Significantly, Saudi Arabia realized that only US was the true protector and defender of Saudi security and interest. In this connection Gulf Cooperation Council was formed in 1981 and US took full advantage of the time and deployed R.D.F. in Qatar, Bahrain and other G.C.C. members to repel Soviet influence. The R.D.F. presence was taken into consideration under the Carter doctrine and US-Saudi collaboration again
President Reagan's arrival was a severe blow to the Soviet Union and for him that Communist empire was an evil to be kept off at any cost. As president Reagan's first four years were tough in their approach his foreign policy towards West Asia was quite solid and realistic. These policy postulates reflected through AWAS' deal with Saudi Arabia, 'Operation Bright Star,' 'Strategic Consensus' and some positive instructions to Israel to achieve peace in the region.

Fahad plan of 1981 was initiated for the settlement of Palestine problem but it was not totally against Israel and naturally President Reagan and secretary of State supported it. This was to be discussed once again in Fez meeting but radical Arab states including Syria and Iraq were not in favour of Fahad plan. Lastly, it could not get success and the situation remained uncertain.

The situation got more tense and complicated when Israel attacked on Palestinians residing in Lebanon in June 1982. At this stage President Reagan was not in favour of any attack on PLO in Lebanon. At that state of affairs 'operation Bright Star' and 'Strategic Consensus' group unitedly criticized Israel. Lastly, PLO withdrew from there but entire syndrome was unsettled and precarious.

Secretary Haig's diplomacy was a total failure and distorted the US image among Arabs. Consequently, Reagan maintained a slight difference and distance with Israel. President Reagan introduced Reagan peace plan in Sept 1982 but it was not favoured by Israel because it did not consider any room for Israeli government in Ghaza strip and West Bank. After nine days of his Reagan plan, Fez plan II was introduced that reaffirmed Palestinian self government with its capital in Jerusalem. King Khalid was already reluctant and after his death in June 1982, King Fahad did
not appreciate this type of US attitude. He announced to purchase missile from France and China. This Saudi move expressed its displeasure with US.

The AWACS deal was already proposed since Carter's administration. The programme was up to 1985. After a long controversy AWACS was transferred to Saudi Arabia but the condition were all in favour of US. i.e. no AWACS was to be used outside of Saudi Arabia and no AWACS was to be used against Israel. It was very hard nut to crack because there was a tug of war between the Congress and the Administration which was persisting since last two years due to Reagan's support to Fahad plan, Saudi reluctance and sullenness over Camp David Accord and subsequent Saudi indifference during 1979 on Egyptian-Israeli pact.

However, economic and trade relations were on cordial grounds. In his second term President Reagan after one year (1984) changed its point of view and even decision making. The arrival of Soviet President Gorbachev changed his outlook and Reagan started to tackle Soviet Union with a different angle, technique and different diplomacies. For the first time in history both the superpowers emerged on the same lines. The US kept a watch on Arab activities and Saudi Arabia was declared not to be a second Iran, in the same year 200 stinger defense missiles were sent to Saudi Arabia to appease it.

Some of the Saudis were suspicious of US activities and its efforts and declaratory diplomacy for Saudi security that only US is its protector and defender and is the only option. But truly speaking only Saudi protections was not enough, they all wanted US support to Arab cause. After sometime, US behaviour seemed to be fake and farce and all its activities gave an impression of exploitation and hegemonism. This was the time when Saudi Arabia had imported Chinese C-SS.2 missiles and
Though it was a matter of deep concern for US but US did not interfere in Saudi internal decision making matters. This was very critical time for Saudi security and it was concerned and conscious specially on two grounds.

1. Due to political implications of Iranian revolution Khomeini declared that Islam opposes monarchy how come Saudi Arabia remain a monarchy with in a Islamic parameter. Hence, it threatened Saudi monarchic legitimacy. It was Sheits sectarian revolution which was a great threat for Saudi Arabia.

2. Secondly, uncertainty and Saudi lack of faith in US (for the time being).

Both the countries shared broad objectives but they differed on many issues according to their requirements, priorities and other interests. In 1987, US Secretary of state George Shultz paid a visit to Saudi Arabia and immediately after two weeks Crown prince Abdullah went to Washington. U.S.-Saudi friendship was reaffirmed and in August 1988 Iran-Iraq crisis resolved Consequently, situation somehow was on lighter grounds.

The year 1990 and weak position of Soviet Union and its subsequent disintegration ploughed a fertile ground to blossom US interests in the entire world. This led to US supremacy in the world. A litmus test between Iraq and US vanished away. Iraq started to criticize US for its unnecessary interference in West Asian affairs.

Unfortunately, the situation fuelled the fire when Iraq claimed on Kuwait and declared it its 19th state. This was the appropriate time to project itself as defender of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, for US because next target was Saudi Arabia (but this could not happen). At this state of
affairs during the time of Gulf crisis, US foreign policy for Saudi Arabia and West Asia - generally came out as follows:

1. To defend Kuwait directly through coalition force against Iraqi aggression.
2. To emerge as Saudi Arabia's friend in need.
3. To keep up its security arrangements through G.C.C. and Saudi Arabia.
4. To play a role of balancer and mediator for West Asian peace process.
5. To implement US policies of direct military activism or prompt intervention.
6. To declare a New World Order.
7. To project Iraq as enemy of All Arab states.
8. To control oil flow for ever.
9. To finish the remaining influence of weak Soviet Union for ever.

All above the new objectives and frontiers developed in US foreign policy towards West Asia specially after the Gulf war, 1991. Overall an ambivalent relationship developed since 1933 between US and Saudi Arabia. US interest in West Asia has always been strengthened on three major grounds:

1. Exploitation of Petroleum.
2. Israel factor - an open support to Israel.
3. Anti-communist and anti-Soviet propagation Saudi Arabia never had any friendly ties with Soviet Union and this situation proved very fruitful for US.

Saudi Arabia most of the time, was threatened by Iran. In this case it became imperative on the part of Saudi Arabia to seek military and economic assistance for internal and external security. Saudi Arabia was not an Egypt that half of the time remained Soviet Union's friend and
after the death of Nasser and in subsequent years shifted under the US camp. The central factors that determined US-Saudi relations and threats that strengthened their friendship- are their compatible and broad shared objectives like-

1. Being never on Soviet lines and not to go under the socialist camp.
2. Being oil rich (Saudi Arabia) and its export to US.
3. Saudi Arabia being in need to be technologically and militarily advance.
4. Saudi Arabia being a monarchy, US took full advantage of it and exploited as much as it could.
5. US economic interests that always fulfilled in Saudi Arabian market.
6. The US security arrangement in the Gulf with twin pillar diplomacy or single pillar or multipillar diplomacy.
7. Being threatened by fundamentalism US is itself allergic with this type of developments. And it never supports, Libya, Iran, Iraq, Chad and even other central Asian republics. Apart from it, this fundamentalism never suits to Saudi Royal family. Therefore, US-Saudi collaboration was considered necessary to curb this sort of tendencies and radical trends.
8. The US-Saudi relations have left a positive affect on G.C.C relationship when US diplomacy of having faith in Iran started to collapse. The other remaining state to be used for its economic interest was Saudi Arabia and even some other G.C.C nations Qatar, Bahrain, UAE also played an important role.

The G.C.C. as collective framework proved a very effective instrument for legitimizing its hegemony in the region and manipulation of other resources is being done without any limit and control. Moreover, the entire G.C.C mechanism which distribute the oil has to look and listen
to the US instruction. They know very well their weakness and for them there is no other option except US to defend their security from internal and external threats.

As Saudi Arabia has got a big market for oil export in US, similarly US has got a prosperous market in West Asian in general and Saudi Arabia in particular for arms, other commodities and technological material sale. Lastly, the entire thrust of Saudi foreign policy is guided by the view point of security and that security is assured by US.

Significantly, Saudi Arabia has long been a base client country for US. They support mutually each other. During the Gulf war when Saudi Arabian security was being threatened; US had already stationed its troops; though the purpose was not very transparent just for Saudi security but to get a permanent root in Saudi land and soil (Despite Saudi reluctance and unwillingness for their prolonged stay)

US projected Iraq as threat for the entire Arab world. On the other hand Iraq wanted to give this crisis a tinge of Arab-Israel war. US neither wanted to loose Arab strategy nor Israel’s faith. US even does not want to let Israeli infrastructure weaken by devastating wars, therefore, it tried its best to avoid Arab-Israeli war and prohibited Israel to retaliate on Iraqi move and attacks during the Gulf war 91.

The latest problem remained as it is. Saudi-US relations could not take any positive setp in this direction. Saudi Arabia supported Arab cause and rendered economic and sometimes military help to Arabs. Many of the times Saudi Arabia could not be assertive and articulative so far as US perception is that a permanent presence of a strong Israel does not harm the Arab interests and Arab strategy whereas Arab’s view is entirely different. according to them Israeli wars have brought a disastrous effect
on the Arabs as a whole
This bone of contention since 1998 has been threatening Arab security
Palestinians' suffering cannot be explained in words. They should be given
the recognition and self-determined government as their territories have
been usurped by Israel.

Directly or indirectly, US pressurizes Saudi Arabia to safeguard Israeli
interest. Israel too serves two purposes - to appease Jewish lobby in
Congress secondly it is an open window to keep an eye and control over
the Arab activities. Hence, there arises no question to ignore Israel in
comparison of any other Arab state. It has always been given priority by
US.

Keeping in view of so many circumstances, US has compelled and prepared
the syndrome for itself to keep an upper hand in the region. And the
psychosis of self-imposed supremacy enhanced and increased around the
world. Immediately after the Gulf war and Soviet collapse, no power was
there to challenge it, and option was for Arabs except US. US intransigeance
and hegemonistic accessibility everywhere has unnecessarily created an
unhealthy atmosphere in world politics. Its self-assumed role of Super-
Cop can be seen anywhere any time whenever it desires. Its sets global
agenda, tries to legitimize it, and makes other nations to follow it.

Another development in US foreign policy came out after it tried to
emerge as balancer between Arab and Israel more prominently than it
had been ever during the Arab-Israeli wars. Peace process meetings under
US supervision gained some momentum at that time. They had started

Day by day, the US under the pretext of New World Order exploited
many countries. But last years (1996) experience also proved a tough
time for US itself.

It was direct breach of international law and sheer imperialism. "US' self imposed and self declared no fly zone and safe heaven and direct involvement through the policy of UN sanctions and coercion against Iraq, are something very challengable and reflexive of dangerous precedent in international Law through the the law of jungle" ¹

What could international community say against US and what is the use of U'NO that totally represents US interests-US also learnt a lesson from this war. Neither it proved beneficial for US nor for Arabs. It also taught a lesson to Arabs and opened their eyes They became more concious and their views gradually changed On the other hand, due to persisting unrest and political turmoil, it became difficult to exploit oil very easily. (As seen in 1973 war though the nature of crisis was quite different). The entire panorama of US foreign policy is fraught with various diplomacies, priorities and intersts based moves in klidoscopic change of the world affairs

During the time of cold war the entire decision and policies were characterized and guided by the communist threat and strategies to keep it away. After the collapse of Soviet Union US established its New World Order to make everything according to its desire and to safeguard its vital interests President Bush and other subsequent Presidents are being guided by the classical Monroe doctrine and Washington's advice.

Immediately after the demise of Soviet Union, the World became unipolar but it did not last for long. There emerged other major powers creating multiple blocs as 'challenges' for US. Now US has became more aware with the operating and emerging challenges

¹ The Times of India (Editorial). September 5, 1996
With the disintegration of Soviet Union the U.S. became more conscious of designing its strategies and policies so as to establish complete control over the flow of oil. It would not allow the other powers to capture oil flow neither it would bring any basic change in its foreign policy towards West Asia. As far as West Asian peace is concerned US role is ambiguous and dual faceted. Many times US becomes reluctant to all these complexities and generally wants the Arabs to accept Israel as permanent reality in the region. It, thus, plays important roles to protect its vital interests of Israel and its own as well.

Being a mediator it has been busy in bringing peace in West Asia very assiduously because it does not want to see the destruction of Israel. Moreover, US will have to face difficulty in exploring West Asian resources.

The US policy towards west Asia is based on commitments for Israel and Arabs both. US has to project a clear image in the eyes of Israel and Arabs both. If any shade emerges in West Asia whether of peace or conflict it would be controlled by US. Since the very creation of Israel, US had made some commitments with it and at the same time with other Arab states. In case, Arab-Israeli tension takes place US would emerge as peace maker through United Nations directly or indirectly. During the 1967 and 1973 wars same situations happened and after this, in Gulf war, US was there to offer good offices for peaceful settlement. (This is another aspect of reality that in West Asia instead of peace, more unrest is prevailing). This dual appeasement is more successful for US and fatal to Arabs specially after Soviet disintegration. The field is clear, there is no sharply divided “Arab” and it becomes easier for US to handle both Israel and the Arabs at the same time.

However, whether it is Saudi Arabia or any other Arab country, US
is very particular and practical in its approach. After the Gulf war as Saudi Arabia became a leading partner of U.S. But situation is not the same with the passage of time US Saudi Arabia are good friends but simultaneously they are ambivalent allies. They can categorically criticize if their interests get jeopardized. Somewhere a declining trend is appearing on the scene.

In the light of hypotheses which were framed, the findings can be derived as follows:

1. US-Saudi relations from 1945 onwards have been running smoothly on political, military, economic and diplomatic grounds.

2. The US presence in West Asia became essential in order to protect its trade commerce and military interests. So far as the Gulf area is concerned the main client country of this area is Saudi Arabia. It seems that it became imperative on the part of Saudi Arabia to seek military and political assistance keeping in view its security.

3. Historically, if one looks back from 1970 onwards there are various events and occasions on which US and Saudi Arabia both differed. 1973 oil embargo and Arab-Israeli crisis proved very detrimental for US-Saudi relationship. It made a wide gap between them and Saudi Arabia criticized US openly to support Israel against Arabs. On the other hand OPEC country’s oil embargo brought a negative effect on Western countries. But after some years when all the affairs got settled, they gave new touch to their relations. For instance specially after the Iranian Revolution, Afghan intervention and some other external threats of 1979. Both of them realized each other’s need according to their own interests. And fortunately the situations and circumstances proved favourable for both (whenever they came...
closer).

4. Constraints and pressures from both the sides Saudi Arabia and US, sometimes negatively affected their relationship. There have been some differences between Congress and president as seen in F-15 and AWACS transfer deal. On the other hand sometime Saudi Government and general public opinion sharply differed -as seen during Camp David Accord 1978 and Lebanon war 1982 and so many times when US did not care for Saudi Arabia and its sentiments for Palestinians.

5. So far as military deal and oil flow is concerned both the sides US and Saudi Arabia tried their best to make it successful. During Reagan and Carter administrations there were some differences in Congress and Administration but both the presidents easily convinced the Senators and proposals were approved for Saudi Arabia. Ultimately it was in US interest. On the other side Saudi Arabia projected US its strong friend.

6. Both of them are anti communist and this factor brought them much closer Hence, Saudi Arabia became an staunch ally of US.

7. US always tried to keep any of oil rich country its permanent ally. Before 1979, Islamic revolution in Iran, Saudi Arabia and Iran both were used as twin pillars. After the fall of Shah, Saudi Arabia was given special attention and a single pillar in the Gulf. And after the Gulf war 1991, G.C.C. mechanism as multipillar strategy is serving US interests in the Gulf. The US Gulf security arrangement had two aspects.

1. Security of its oil flow

2. And security of oil exporting countries from external and internal
threats. (Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Oman, UAE etc.).

So far as twin pillar diplomacy and shuttle diplomacy of US is concerned it has been very successful Saudi Arabai

**Pattern or Paradigm that has Emerged after the Study:**

1. US-Saudi relations are based on their circumstantial requirements and basic interests. There seems hardly any room for selfless feelings and pure friendship. They pose like emotional friends but in actual sense they -do- what they want and what serves their interests in reality. They are very Practical in their relations.

2. Generally it looks like on smooth sailing but it is not so. Some of the regional and their internal matters strongly have proved very detrimental for their cordial relationship.

3. Though occasionally, but there have been sharp tensions between them.

4. Evidently Israel factor is there and US' open support to it- has been proving for a long itme very detrimental for US-Saudi relationship.

5. On the other hand, from Saudi side, the staunch group (that never liked US friendship with Saudi Arab) has played a negative role in this connection. The pattern which is seen is ambivalent. Sometimes it does not give any clear picture. There are some constraints, pressures, internal problems, national interests, requirements, needs and realizations from both the sides that greatly influence and determine their relationship - whether cordial or strained according to variations in circumstances.

During and after the Gulf war 1991, US Saudi relations were very cordial as per their requirements. Saudi apprehension was there and it was threatened by Iraq, automatically it had to look to its friend. On the
other hand, US strategy was there to make the time useful and fruitful by exploiting Saudi Arabia in the pretext of its defense from external threats. The weak position of Soviet Union proved as catalyst at that time leaving US unchallenged. As per King Fahad’s statement US troops were to leave Saudi land immediately after the war but the scene topsyturviwed and they did not leave the Saudi land. Saudi Arabia gradually realized its mistake that it had given much liberties to them. Consequently, US troops took their own tune in leaving the Saudi land. This led to the tense relationship between the two. The US had maintained that it kept troops to protect its interests and its allies a projection which implies that both’s objectives were identical. On the other hand, the Saudis implied that “protection of allies” - as a part of policy formulation was fine but if (it was temporary) They did not like a prolonged stay of US troops

I Since this realization strarted, Saudi government began to think to be firm on their own moves. Some incidents from 1993 onwards strained their relationships. In October 1994 at the time of Iraqi threat to Kuwait, US again got ready to retaliate and tried its best to use Saudi lands again but Saudi Arabia refused.

II In June 1996 there was a bomb blast in Dehran tolling the lives of 23 Americans.

III Still unsettled Palestinian question whereas US poses itself a leader of peace process but of no avail and Arab Israel tensions are yet to be resolved. Saudi Arabia never likes this.

IV Improved Saudi-Iranian relations have made US nights restless.

V And the most glaring factor has been in (recent months) Saudi denial to use its land in recent US-Iraq crisis in Feb 1998. Even Saudi
Arabia refused to speak any word in favour of US.

Recent development in Gulf leading to US Iraq tension and provoking global warfare, has unfolded multi-hued panorama in West Asian politics. The subtle and vehement reaction of the Arab World and other Western countries i.e. Russia, China and France specially against US hegemonistic moves has posed a great challenge to US. The US and Britain have been of the same voice and in this case they accused Iraq of having chemical and biological weapons intending to blow Israel. United Nations special Commission forcibly searched out whatever the material was there. US and Britain are still not having any soft corner to lift up economic sanctions against Iraq. In this connection, Secretary of State Madeline Albright's 'Shuttle diplomacy' in seeking the support of US European and Arab allies could not gather momentum for US support. Saudi Arabia had asserted that it would not offer its air bases for any possible US military strike against Iraq.

In a blunt warning Russian President cautioned that Mr Bill Clinton might provoke a Third World War if he declared military strike against Iraq. Meanwhile UN General Secretary played a very positive role to settle down the matter but Arabs and some of European countries had been very critical of US during these days. General Secretary's diplomatic skill and instant style to resolve the tension succeeded to a great extent. Apparently, US takes up it as victory as Western media also projected it as US triumph but, in reality, US intransigence and unnecessary forceful interferences in a Third World country - all have proved peurile now and this does not make analogy between US monopoly and a nation's victory. US got a severe blow on account of unanimous criticism of Arab world and rift among the European countries specially amongst the Security Council's members. (France, China and Russia bitterly criticized US
move) The entire international community too had not shown any enthusiasm to US line rather stands firm in its opposition to US activities. Another severe set back that US is realizing in Gulf region is rapproachment between Saudi Arabia and Iran. The re-orientation of relations between Riyadh and Iran has significant implications for the geopolitics of the region in post cold war world.

The first sign of collective protest against the US and tentative acceptance of Iran was evidenced in Autumn 1997 when most of the Arab states boycotted a US sponsored economic summit and simultaneously endorsed the meeting of 54 nations Organization of Islamic Conference in Tehran in December 1997. The OIC summit was attended by crown prince and deputy primier Abdullah Bin Abdul Aziz and foreign minister Mr Saud Al Faisal. Iranian economic and polical compulsions and reallocation of oil production quotas under OPEC to give an expression to Arab solidarity and to resist US domination with in the region; all led to a broadened friendship between Saudi Arabia and Iran.

Another important thing is that though Iran, Syria and Saudi Arabia have different kind of attitude towards Iraq but there is a new look and mood within the region Economic requirements are dominant priority as nations grapple with the competing demands of globalization.

The US policy of dual containment to keep Iraq and Iran isolated and undercheck, has led to limited success Within the UN Security Council, Russia, China and France have taken positions to stand viably against US monopoly, and moreover, EU nations are keen to re-establish their contacts with Iran.

2 The Times of India, March 24, 1998
So far as Saudi-US future trends are concerned they are not very healthy presently, despite maintaining their essential relationship. Comparatively, Prince Bandar Bin Sultans government would be more practical and realistic in future. Saudi Arabia, would not loosen its friendship with US because (no other option left) nor US would leave Saudi oil flow so easily but a trend of Saudi submissiveness and softness would disappear very soon.

In comparison with past history or specifically with in the time frame of 1970-1991, the US-Saudi relations from 1992 onwards seem very strained. Though they still maintain their basic relationship but a flow of friendship has got eclipsed. After any gap and souring relationship between these two countries - they always realized each other’s importance for their purposes and interests and patch up every thing.

Always this pattern of mending the fences has been apparent so far as US Saudi relations are concerned but recently somehow a declining trend has emerged. This paradigm is not zig zag but indeed ups and down are there in their relationship. After a long healthy and friendly relationship there are sometimes slight or strong tensions between these two countries. In the light of recent development it does not sound very healthy and ameliorating.

As the entire mechanism has changed somehow and taken another shape, US is getting tough time but it is very consistent in its nature and basic roots of foreign policy.

Iran, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Egypt, & GCC, or whatsoever state gives an impression of being as challenge against US, US knows very well how to tackle without breaking its cudgel. At the spur of moment Arabs do not understand what is happening with them but after some months they feel
that they are made fools and left far behind. The echoing US monopoly is really pernicious to fair settlement of West Asian problems. After all it openly supports Israel by voting in UNO for it. Israel always gets a green signal and does what it wants. For instance it very courageously is busy in constructing new colonies containing 65000 houses for Jews in occupied areas.

Since some awakening has developed among the Arabs and they have opened their eyes, the US is not feeling very easy to exploit the natural resources from there. The global scene is multipolar now, there are some great challenges for US itself. It may exert its efforts in West Asian peace process that would be beneficial for both the Arabs and the Jews.

No state has any control on rapidly changing world circumstances. No situation can be trapped in its exact framework, hence, US-Saudi relations may take another turn after this bitter situation. Saudi Arabia after giving up its softness and submissiveness would be much more practical in its approaches and ties with US.

There is awakening and realizations from both the sides- US and Arabs. US would be conscious enough to tackle the situation and Saudi Arabia would be realistic and very vigilant in its moves so far as its relationship with US is concerned. US is giving enough time to tackle Saudi reluctance and recent Saudi indifference. Simultaneously Saudi Arabia is enhancing its relations with Iran. It is concerned how to reap the fruits from both Iran and Saudi Arabia. US is very much concerned to maintain good and cordial relations with Iran because it is erecting a formidable infrastructure. It has direct link with Turkmenistan, other central Asian countries and Caucasian states that may be of the great significance for US in future. The Secretary of State has made a land-
mark speech about US relations with Islamic republic of Iran. She gave a high shine to the Clintonian policy in words that President "Khatami deserves respect because he is the choice of the Iranian people." Iran and Saudi Arabia may emerge again as twin pillars for US in future but the steps and responses at least from Saudi side would certainly be very very cautious, careful and entirely pragmatic.

5 The Times of India (Sunday Times). June 21, 1998