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END OF COLD WAR:

The Gulf war may be considered to be a watershed in the world politics because it acted as an important catalyst for the emergence of new world political order. Therefore, the end of cold war is perceived by global community as a triumph for American policy, strategy and ideology. President George Bush of USA while addressing American audience proudly boasted that "we have kicked the Vietnam syndrome once for all", and "the spectre of Vietnam has been buried forever in the desert sands of the Arabian peninsula". The US success to win the war in one week against Iraq, a third world country unprotected by jungle cover unlike Vietnam, against whom the US used a Trillion dollars worth of high tech arms and ammunition has left Washington thoroughly frustrated.

President Saddam Hussein of Iraq for long was on top agenda of the US foreign policy strategy. During Iraq-Iran War the US supported Saddam with intention to contain Iran. To fight war with Iran- Iraq became a major beneficiary of Western arms supply. During the Gulf crisis the US took the stand to deal with each Arabs states separately and refused to link Palestine issue. America openly ignored geographical, sociological and economical interests of the Arabs States. Washigton for strategic game
created parity between Israel on one hand and Arabs on the other hand. This equation harmoniously serve the interests of Israel and American. Both worked hard to conclude the first chapter of Iran-Iraq war without real Victory of any actor, ensured destruction of Iraq, maintained legitimately its presence felt in the Arab Peninsula\(^{(2)}\).

For the Soviet the Gulf crisis coincided with internal economic difficulties and ethnic turmoil. Due to volatile domestic environment, Moscow helpless subdued to the US pressure. In the Gulf crisis Kremlin showed allegiance to the US led coalition of the Western World. The Soviet leadership had to show their adherence to democratization and had to accommodate with US pressures. Therefore, Soviet policy was caught between a difficult past and uncertain future. Saddam was an old ally and payer of hard currency to the USSR but was also an aggressor. The West was imperial, but successfully constituted a necessary link for a falling Soviet Union.

Interestingly, the Soviet managed to maintain relations with the West despite wide differences on peace modality and initiative. Still, the Soviet leadership could demonstrate their position from the West, absolutely necessary for Soviet interest in both West Asia and Third World, this posture was adopted by Moscow to meet its interest in fast changing world. The Soviet regime did not show its potential as negotiator because of its links with Western World. Thus, given their own dire problems,
Soviet policy in the West Asia suited her overall geopolitical interests and strategies.

The absence of the Soviet due to decline in its influence paved the way for US to play the role of undisputed leaders in the Gulf crisis. It was Gorbachev and his policy on eastern Europe that enabled the US to think of much massive deployment of forces in the Gulf. Without USSR, UN could never have succeeded in either imposing the sanctions or issuing deadline of war against Iraq. Again, with implied support of the USSR Bush could think of going beyond his earlier objective of protecting Saudia Arabia.

**HEGEMONY OF US IN UNIPOLAR WORLD:**

President Bush while addressing the Congress on 12 September 1990, stated that it was "a unique and extraordinary moment", for the US as Gulf crisis, "offered a rare opportunity to move towards a historic period of cooperation" in the region. Thus, the end of cold war and strategic retreat of the Soviet Union from the centre of world affairs, tilted towards the West led by America, of course, USA lost no time in taking advantage of this opportunity in launching credible diplomatic efforts to lead a global alliance. The US Secretary of State James Baker spelled out this policy blatantly. He said, that USA remain the only nation that has the necessary political, military and economic instruments at its disposal to catalyze a successful response given by international community. Only American engagement he
added can shape the peaceful world that our people so deeply desire.

Thus the USA took the leading and commanding position in the form of coalition in the Gulf. The military operations desert storm (Assifat al-Sahra), which was led by the US and coalition forces against Iraq was essentially a demonstration of destructive military mighty of US which was applied against a third world countries. It was an unequal war which was been fought in history as the UN lacked standing forces and appropriate command, control, communications and intelligence structure to carry out the mission of maintanance of peace. The practice has been to delegate command responsibilities to the lead nation, normally the US as in Korean case[5].

During the cold war period ever since 1945, the US either provoked or initiated, or participated in most armed conflicts in the third world, be it civil war in Afghanistan, Iraq-Iran war, civil war in Lebanon, or air strikes against them. The US engagement in Libya and Iraq or recent direct intervention in, Grenada and Panama in October 1983, in which America defied all international law norms and flagrantly violated UN Charter. In the name of humanitarian mission and disaster relief operations, both at home and abroad, US, NATO, Western European Union military planner have identified cooperative security planning and crisis management as priority missions in the post-cold war[5].
The coalition which has been formed under the command of US comprised more than 40 nations. Strikingly some of these nations did not participate directly by sending troops, but their contribution was in the form of financial help. The following were the main contributor in Gulf war.

US adopted a hard line attitude during the Gulf crisis right from the beginning. The US was strictly guided in its policy Washington wanted that the vast energy resources of the region should be either remain under its own control or its allies or clients. The US trade in oil was largest and most profitable industry in the world. Gulf war offered extraordinary opportunities for financial gain to US war industries. The Middle East has provided spectacular profits not only to US oil companies, but to financiers, manufactures, ship builders. The possibility of making fortune attracted Americans of all ideological persuasion, conservatives and liberals alike, and has nothing to do with Communism, Soviet imperialism, or US Security.

The Arab oil exporter countries had invested their money in US specially Kuwait. This investment had provided the much needed financial support to the economy of USA. So, the lowering price of the oil was not an issue to wage a war against Iraq because increase oil rate was more desirable. The USA wanted to act as undisputed leader in the region which was not taken as surprise. Therefore, "the Gulf war saw the coalition forces carry out the
wishes of the US, but under the mandate of UN. It was US which took the lead and provided the teeth to the effort to stop Saddam from retaining what he grabbed, and it did thus with the cloak of legitimacy provided by the UN.

American business community have played decisive role in shaping American foreign policy. They have devoted lobbying to influence US policy makers in favour of the Arab exporting oil countries. The rise in business lobbies influence and power go back to 1980’s, when they put overwhelming pressure by the Senate to allow the sale of the airborne warning and control system (AWACS) to Saudi Arabia. The US administration was convinced that refusal to sell these aircraft might jeopardize their own business in the region. Thousand of American businessmen were engaged in business in Saudia Arabia. Hence, either directly or indirectly they participated in a campaign to influence Senators. The corporate giants such as Bechtel, Westing House, and United Technologies, worked hard to persuade the Senate to go along with President Regan’s wishes to sell these aircrafts to Saudi Arab.

Therefore, it was no surprise that Middle East region issue occupied eminent position in American foreign policy direction. USA main concern was to safeguard investment and oil supply. Middle East has become unparallel economic importance for the US and its allies. As no other region or area had oil deposits to replace and fulfill Western demand as the Middle East. Hence,
"consistent with its significance the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations Opinion Survey reflect the American leadership hinted the Middle East as the region with the second most urgent problems, just after relations with the USSR."¹⁰

US LED COALITION MILITARY OPERATION:

The Middle East region had emerged as an unique area of significance in USA foreign policy agenda. Since the black gold production from the region have contributed to about more than 50% of the international consumption ceiling. To protect this vast reserve for itself USA could mobilize and build up strong coalition of more than 28 nations during the Gulf crisis. To fight war Iraq the US despatched more than 40,000 US troops."¹¹

The US Army General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, the Chief of US Central Command, who commanded. African countries and the areas further east was the man who led the coalition forces, devised his own contingency plan. Before Saddam invaded Kuwait Schwarzkopf was conducting an exercise for forthcoming invasion on Iraq. After the invasion, the exercise became a model for "operation desert shield" and after the war, it became "desert strom". The Desert strom, said Defence Secretary. Dick Cheney; was basically Norman’s plan. Forces from more than 40 nations assembled in Saudia Arabia, Persian Gulf, Turkey, covering land, sea in the region. They were made up of land, naval, and airforce, constituting all alliances. For the first time throughout history, coalition armed forces faced the problems as
how to co-ordinate the military activities of contingents of different sovereign allies. But the US could convince the Saudian to permit the stationing of all allies forces in their soil and the American army took upon its shoulder the united command of alliance forces to fight a fierce battle against Iraq.

BRITAIN:

Britain played crucial role during the Gulf crisis. During post Second World War there were some differences between USA and UK borne out of contentious issues with regard to the imperial settlement. But the conflicts were resolved during 50s. Following the global order came to be dominated by USA. Britain has strong ties with America especially in Middle East. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, then the Prime Minister of UK, having strong ties with the US adopted a very tough stand against Iraq. Like America the British government called not only for destruction of Iraq, but also demanded Saddam’s head. UK has strong commercial relationship with Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Hence, the British business houses needed their financial support to the economy of U.K.

During Gulf crisis Great Britain sent about 35,000 troops or 23 percent of her ground forces and 210 tanks or 16 percent of her tank forces\(^{12}\) to fight war with Iraq.

The recent episode of the opposition leader Dr. Al Massri, who has been asked by British government to leave the country since his activity caused harm to Britain’s financial position
due to the Saudia’s authority request, that if he was not expelled, Saudia Arabia might cancell a military transaccation to the tunes of billions sterling pound. But, he appealed to the Supreme Court, which rejected the government’s decree, which was against the right’s and spirit of British constitution.

It was widely believed that the depth of British knowledge about Middle East politics was the main reason for Israel to stay away from retaliation in response to the Iraqi missiles that have hit the Jewish state. In the occupied west bank because that “involved strategic difficulties”, said defence minister Mosheareans, Israel was under intense pressure from the United States not to get involved in the Gulf conflict. It was felt that it might undermine the anti Iraq coalition, which included Arab countries hostile to Israel. This was clear from the remarks made by Arons to 330 visiting jews from the United Kingdom to appeal Israel not to involve in war with Iraq\(^\text{13}\).

However, United Kingdom from the outset of the Gulf crisis had given concurrence to the United States position, and publicaly announced that it would send troops to Saudia Arabia, “The British troops were nicknamed as “Desert Rats” who had served in North Africa during the Second World War in the famous campaign against German Field Marshal Edwin Rommel. The United Kingdom and Iran had resumed diplomatic relations a welcome event which was deemed to keep Iran from supporting Iraq against the coalition in which United Kingdom had an active voice\(^\text{14}\). So, it
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was no great suprise that United Kingdom together with USA became the main benefeciary and guaranteers of Gulf War game.

FRANCE:

France for a long considered Iraq as good friend and maintained a good relations with her during 80s. Iraq had inherited a unique civilization and established a secular modern republic. In fact France had a number of bilateral military and industrial contracts with Iraq. In the process of diversification of armament sources Iraq purchased excocst missiles from France and even owed $5 million to France. The French President Mitter wanted to protect French interests in the Middle East. Hence, even France came up with peace initiatives to solve the Gulf crisis through diplomatic means. France has strong Arab immigrants community and could not afford to ignore their sentiments and weight. Though the majority of the community member supported France peace proposal of sending a peace - keeping force to replace Iraqi army in Kuwait and convincing of UN Middle East Conference to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict, but it was opposed by US and Britain. France swiftly followed the British commitment of troops. French troops sent to join coalition forces comprising 2.4% of allied forces

The national assembly on 16 January 1991, approved the use of force and placed French forces under US control.
JAPAN:

Japan was affected badly by the crisis in the Gulf. But Tokyo refused to participate in the coalition. Iraq and Kuwait together were supplying 13% of Japan's oil needs. Being one of the world most energy-efficient economics, Japan could always withstand any increase in the oil price. Though, Japan condemned Iraqi aggression it refused to join the blockade Tokyo showed reluctance to provide any kind of financial assistance for military operations in the Gulf. When America pressurised Japan to promised aid similar to front line states like Turkey, Jordan and Egypt. Japan has contributed to the coalition $10.78 billion ($9,429 billion paid, 1.37 billion pledged).

GERMANY:

The Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, realised that it was politically in the larger interest for Germany to support US led multinational forces financial support. The public opinion in Germany was in favour of diplomatic solution of the Gulf crisis. Germany provided multinational with transportation aid and non-lethal supplies like position, gas detecting. In addition Germany gave 8.9% billion in military aid, $1.4 billion in aid to Egypt; Jordan and Turkey, $836 million emergency aid to Israel, $77 million in loans to US, UK.

Italy also gave medical facilities, provided road, rail, air, and sea transport for allied forces via Germany to Gulf. Surprisingly, US and Western partners approved help to Jordan,
Egypt and Turkey as their economy was badly affected by war. Meanwhile, other Arab states, who condemned the presence of American force, and who used to get help from rich Arab states like Saudia Arabia, USA pressurised them to stop helping those countries such as Yemen, Sudan.

**EGYPT:**

The invasion of Kuwait divided the Arab world into two block pro and anti Iraq groups. President Hosni Mubarak not only condemned the aggression in strong words but also sent 38,500 troops to the allied coalition. Majority of Egypt's 56 million country men supported his stand, and were not taken in by Saddam's claims of a battle between the Arabs and the West. Ordinary Egyptians, except a few did not take to streets in support of Iraq as hundred of thousand of other Arabs mobbed the streets from Amman to Nouakchot.

Egypt's bitterness and resentment against Iraq be in eight years long Iran-Iraq war in which 1.5 million Egyptians working in Iraq, were sent back to their country. Egypt lost approximately $1.2 billion a year. In 1988, when the war came to end economically weak Iraq froze the wages of foreign workers. It also put an end to the funds to be sent out of the country. Suddenly, Egyptians has to face stiff job compeition.

Reportedly, ill treatment was given to Egyptians at the hands of Iraqis authorities. However, there were reports in
Egyptian press about a mysterious deaths and killings of its labours. It was in Iraq felt that Iraq also executed a number of Egyptians, who tried to smuggle hard currency out of the country. As a result the relations between the two countries deterioriated. Even the Muslim follow brothers and Muslim parties in Egypt condemned the civilian bombing in Iraq, and described Saddam’s regimes as a cruel.

The Egyptian bitterness was the result of their strong beliefs that Egypt fought with Israel for the Arab cause and their country already paid unreasonable price on behalf of the Arab world in five brutal wars with Israel since 1948. In fact the change of leadership in Egypt has played an important role in moulding public opinion in Egypt. The President Nasser was for pro-Arab unity, Saddat pragmatism and subsequently the peace agreement at Camp David, in which Egypt enjoyed a huge amount of financial support and aid from the West, in turn a country with heavy foreign debt. The Camp David peace witnessed a new era of progress and development and people felt easy after a long years of difficulties. This also contributed the peoples attitudianl change. Once again Hosni Mubarak continuation of Saddat policy and emphasizing Egyptian culture and unique history with one of the greatest civilization goes back to more than 5000 years made them uncomfortable in acknowledging themselves along with their Arab brothers, since the Arab countries of Gulf area including Iraq enjoy billions of income and were leading luxurious life.
Their donation to Egypt like other poor countries is a little amount. Tourism was the main source of income to Egypt which was affected badly due to the Iraq invasion of Kuwait. Above all, Egyptian leadership pragmatism was a decisive factor in their stance during Gulf crisis. In addition, "Iraq's defeat would have meant the emergence of Egypt as a dominant Arab military power both in the Gulf and the Middle East"\(^{(19)}\), which compelled not to support Saddam.

SAUDIA ARABIA:

Saudia Arabia has played the most pivotal role in the Gulf crisis. In fact, Saudia Arabia endeavoured hard to defeat Iraq and liberate Kuwait. The American and allied troops were stationed in the desert of Saudia Arabia. Traditionally it is an ally of the USA, who control the production of oil through their giant company ARAMCO, Saudia Arabia is largest producer of oil in the Gulf area. Here, the American companies have huge amount of investment and their commercial relations touch billions of dollars. Therefore, in the Gulf crisis naturally, America was not prepared to see any threat to the Saudi kingdom. In fact prior to the Gulf war the American troops were present in Saudia Arabia. America has military bases in Saudian city of Khobar in the eastern province and in Riyadh base. After the Gulf crisis intensified it had become target of bomb blast in which "at least 23 American military personnel were killed and 345 other were wounded in a powerful truck bomb attack"\(^{(20)}\).
The Saudian authority at the beginning of the crisis were reluctant to permit additional American or multinational troops in their soil. However, when crisis intensified the US sent its troops when Saudi King finally invited them King earlier, refusal of foreign troops in Saudia Arabia motivated as the king wanted to avoid provoking Saddam. Had not by the time American forces reached for salvation of Saudi oil field possibly it might had gone to Saddam hand. Therefore, the America took a lot of time to convince the king of imminent danger from Iraq to his Kingdom.

Earlier Saudia Arabia had benefitted greatly from Iraq-Iran war. After the war Saudi king refused to subsidise Iraq to help reconstructing its war torn economy. The America, however, showed satellite pictures of Iraqi troops moving to Saudia Arabian frontier. To meet this grave situation Saudia permitted America troops to even conduct the war from their country. Iraqi forces during the war had even entered Saudia Arabian city of al-Khafiji and captured some American troops. Iraq fired many missiles in Saudia Arabian. The "Iraqi jets bombed a military base at the city of Tabouk"21.

Saudia Arabia, as a result of the American forces presence, had to bear a huge financial burden of the war. After the crisis was over there were soar rise in the prices of even essential commodities. The Defence Secretary William Perry, during his recent visit requested the Defence Minister Prince Sultan to pay substantial part of the cost of 500 million US dollars for the
despatch of the US troops to the Gulf to meet the recent Iraqi threat and to pay for stationing dozens of American tanks and planes permanently in Saudia Arabia to meet any future Iraqi threat(22).

The presence of American troops in Saudia Arabia was widely criticized by Muslim and some Arab countries. It was widely used as a political propaganda against Saudia Arabia where the holy shrine of Muslims lie. Later, it has became target of attack from different Muslim organizations. According to Defence Secretary William Perry during his recent visit to Saudia Arabia", it was pointed that US forces clearly perceived the threat they were facing(23).

TURKEY:

The Turkish authority put all their military bases under the service of coalition forces. Turkey, bordering Iraq in north, was facing Iraq Kurdish problems. Since Turkey was a member of NATO naturally it supported American and western forces. Turkey was recipient of financial aid, due to closure of its oil pipeline. Turkey sent 100,000 troops comprising 14-15% of total to the allied forces". Turkey closed down Iraqi pipelines borders to Iraq and allowed US aircraft to use Incirlik air base for air strikes(24).
SYRIA:

Syria with deep enmity after splitting of baath party President Hafiz al-Assad adopted tough stand against Iraqi regime. Since the Soviet Union was not in a position to provide him the military equipment to which he had got used to it. This crisis provide him a rare opportunity to come close to the west, who waged intensive media war describing his regime as the most dictatorial and bloody in the area, sponsoring terrorism. Even USA had put Syria in the list of countries who support and sponsor terrorists. After the erupt of Gulf crisis in which Syria participated, by 19,000 troops with US led forces. Syria was declared no more terrorist state. President George Bush met with Hafiz and held talks with him in Geneva. It was US President Carter, who had talks with the Syrian leader in 1977. Britain also restored diplomatic ties and European community resumed economic aid for Syria.

PAKISTAN:

Pakistan being a faithful American Muslim client, sent troops of 10,000 to join the US lead forces. Pakistan Prime Minister Nawar Sharif and Foreign Minister Nawab Zada Yagub Khan, claimed that Pakistan troops were despatched to Saudia Arabia only to protect the holy places. When Iraq started terming the war as a holy Jehad against the western non-believers the public opinion in Pakistan and political religious parties like Jama-et-Islam and Jamat-ul-Ulma Islami which had benefitted from Saudia Arabia finance in the past becomes pro-Iraq.
The government realized that it committed a blunder. So, Nawaz Sharif tried to turn the tide of sympathy against Iraq. He declared that Iraq was never a friend of Pakistan and never supported it. He appreciated the friendship of Saudia Arabia. In fact Saudia Arabia previously used to recruit Pakistani for the border police, but the Pakistani, however, forgot that even Iraq has donated money to the Bhotto Islamic nuclear bomb.

BANGLA DESH:

Bangladesh lost no time to enter the race. Having the vast pool of labour in the rich Shaikhdom and other Gulf country Bangladesh decided to send its troops to Saudia Arabia. However, neither it could afford to offend American nor rich Arab countries upon whom it depended through their citizen who bring home hard currency.

CANADA:

Canada send 1,800 troops and a squadron of planes, some destroyers plus medical and surgical team in the Gulf crisis in support of coalition forces.

ITALY:

After the invasion on 15th of January, the Italian Parliament called for an emergency session which continued for 12 hours, and finally, decided that Italy should stand by the coalition against Iraq. Prime Minister Giulia Andereatti defended the decision by saying, he acknowledged his country's
indebtedness to American for liberating their country from Mussolini’s fascism. Hence, he added Italian participation in the Gulf war was repayment of this debt. In fact the Vatican and Catholic church have had a considerable say in the foreign policy of Italy. That is why Italianian attitudes was incorhent right from the beginning of the crisis.

The Pope appealed for a peaceful solution rather than war. The church in Italy and the Pope was known for their anti-jews attitude. Yet, Italy sent 1,500 troops and $160 million in aid to nations worst affected by sanctions. In addition, US was authorized to use Italian military bases, merchants ships used to transport US troops and equipments. The geo-political location of Italy with its bases in mediterranean sea offered a valuable logistical support to multinational forces.

MOROCCO:

Royal Morocco although sent 15,000 troops, but favoured an Arab solution for the crisis.

NETHERLANDS:

Netherland sent 950 troops, $4 million refugee relief, $48 million bilateral aid, 50,000 NBC suits given to Turkey and 2 units of partial missiles, 2 howk saqadrons sent to Turkey.

AUSTRALIA:

Australia participated by sending 840 troops and medical surgical team in the war against Iraq.
BELGIUM:

Belgium sent 650 troops, one billion Belgixjun for British and French military operations, NBC equipment for Turkey, medical equipment, air and ground transport mens to support US, UK, France and the Netherlands, 2800 hospital beds, 50 medical personnel.

GULF CO-OPERATION COUNCIL:

This include, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, Saudia Arabia, UAE, (Saudia send 67,500 troops and paid 11,593 billion paid, 5,246 billion pledged, UAE, Bahrain, Oman Qatar 10,000 troops, UAE alone $4 billion ($4,097 billion paid). Kuwait of course it is 11,500 reorganized in Saudia Arabia plus it has paid 11,099 billion, $4,907 pledged.

AFRICAN TROOPS:

Some countries from the African continent also sent forces during the Gulf crisis. Those they were Niger 500, Sengal 500 Sierraleone 200.

OTHERS IN TERMS OF TROOPS:

Spain sent 500 troops and facilities, logistical support; Sweden 500 troop, $20 million in humanitarian and economic aid, field hospital and medical personnel; Poland 400 troops plus military field hospital; Denmark 300 troops 9 million Krona to UK, 5.5 million Krona for humanitarian assistance, 25 million Krona of the economics financial assistance, NBC equipment to
Turkey, medical equipment and staff to Turkey and Saudia Arabia C-130 for transport, Danish ships in Gulf to act as supply ships, Argentina 200 troops a missile destroyers, Czechoslovakia 200 troops, Greece 200, Norway field hospital, fuel for US ship in Gulf, Philippines medical personnel\(^{32}\).

OTHER IN TERMS OF FINANCE:

Moreover, some countries played supportive role by financing the coalition. Luxembourge $2 million to Western European partners, $3.3 million economic help to Turkey, Jordan and Bangladesh, $1 million were, $5 million to USA; Finland $11.2 million in humanitarian and economic aid; South Korea $385 million ($163 million paid $222 million pledged)\(^{33}\).

LIBERATION PROCESS:

I. DESERT SHIELD OPERATIONS:

After Iraqi invasion to Kuwait on 2nd August, President Bush directed the Secretary of Defence Dick Cheney to go to Saudia Arabia to discuss the situation and announce the following national objectives.

1. Immediate, unconditional and complete Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.
2. The protection of the United States citizens in the region.
3. The stability and security of nations in the Persian Gulf region.
4. The restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government.
This statement soon after invasion established the national goals of the United States in the region. To achieve these objectives formed the basis for subsequent UN resolutions. The events unfolded within weeks. The word "unconditional" withdrawal would play a major role in ensuring the status coexisting before the war.

In Saudi Arabia the major contributing nations, France and UK plus Arab states, set up special consultative arrangements. Saudi Arabia King Fahd was kept informed of all major developments and likely future course of action. Prince Khalid, as supreme commander of the Saudi armed forces, exercised overall command in the threat of operations prior to the hostilities. An informal planning group was established to ensure close co-ordination between US central command and other national contingents. The existing Saudi air defence command organization was incorporated as much as possible into the coalition's air defence arrangements.

Saudi Arabia having relatively modern infrastructure in terms of ports and air fields, also made the introduction of large quantities of military equipment and personnel easier.

On 16th January 1991, the French national assembly like the United States Congress approved the US use of force and placed French forces under US control for war operation. Greece approved the use of its military bases and ports for logical support of US forces. On these supportive notes "desert shield" was established. Although the world did not yet known its origin.
II. DESERT STORM OPERATIONS:

On 17th January, "operation desert shield" got transformed into "operation desert storm". Th General Schewarzkopf and his staff well established the principle of war and were given their due weight. The existing doctrine of the air land battles was developed even quite earlier. It was examined to meet the requirements of combat against a third world military power in the geographic specifics of the Kuwait theatre of operations. The scrutiny was made on enemy posture and resources, concentration force, deception integration of command and control, etc. To conduct an intensive air war to achieve the following conditions were laid down:

1. Destroy Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological facilities.
2. Destroy Iraq's military installation and supporting industrial complex.
3. Suppress hostile air defence (air forces, surface to air missiles system and air defence artillery) to allow unhindered use of Iraqi air space for prosecution of operation.
4. Destroy Iraq's long range missile potential.
5. Carry out aggressive demonstrations in the Persian Gulf with naval forces.

For a period of 43 days the coalition air forces prosecuted an air war, the likes of which has never been witnessed before and is not likely to be seen again in this generation.
The coalition forces fielded approximately 2,700 modern combat air crafts including sophisticated combat helicopters supported by indeterminate number of pilots. In 43 days they flew over 110,000 stories of all types (combat, combat support, surveillance and battle field logistics) covering 2,500 stories a day peaking at over 4,000 stories on 28 February 1991, for a reason not known. The Iraqi air forces put up no resistance. However, the Iraqi airforce the sixth largest and most expensive air force in the middle east collapsed on January 26, after producing nothing for its nation. The air war was temporarily eclipsed by two ground actions on the southern Kuwait-Saudia Arabia border.

In one action the Iraqi sent a battalion into Kuwait in reconnaissance mission. This is a probing attack intended only to gather information about the enemy with a subsequent return to the original position. The coalition reaction was so violent that the Iraqis had to send another tank battalion to extricate the first the other action closer to the Gulf coast the Iraqis made another reconnasissance and occupied a deserted city named Khafiji.

The US marines lost twelve who were killed in the action. The rain of bombs of the coalition forces was estimated to have exceeded the total tonnage dropped in world war II. The coalition suffered their losses from mechanical failure not by enemy fire with losses of one B-52 and two helicopters. Scuds continued to be fired into Israel and Saudia Arabia\(^\text{11}\).
In diplomatic ring Saddam Hussein practiced the old device of (divide and conquer) when he told envoy Yevgeny Primakov that he was ready to extend "Co-operation" in attempt to stop the war. Meanwhile, the coalition air forces continued to struck hard at strategic targets in the Baghdad area. Fifty oil wells were set a blaze in Kuwait. The US marines and navy worked together with Saudia Arabia troops to bombard a major Iraqi troops concentration in Kuwait, thus operation and other attacks on Iraqi forces were being carried successfully. On 13th February, 1991, Soviet Concillor Primakov went back to Moscow reporting that he had seen sign of hope for negotiations to end the war. The Coalition members of the UN Security Council prevented an open discussion of the war, which if they heared would have provided too many opportunities for propoganda speeches by Iraqi supporters. However, they agreed to hold closed sessions beginning on 14th February.  

Desert storm was a military master piece in both planning and execution at both the strategic and tactical levels. Once any political government has decided that, military means must be employed to achieve national objectives, the military's objectives are two fold; to destory the enemy's ability to fight and to crush the enemy's will to fight.

The allied forces through "desert storm" had planned to ensure that Iraq's strategic targets were completely destoryed. Their airoplanes were flying over Iraq's air space without fear
of retaliation. More than 90 Iraqi aircraft had sought safety in Iran. The massive bombings by the coalition forces reduced Iraqi air capabilities and reduced its threat. Meanwhile, in a new era of diplomacy began when Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz arrived in Moscow to discuss ways to end the war. The United States without committing itself to any agreement said that it would welcome any unconditional withdrawal the Soviet Union could work out with Iraq.

On 26th February, the Soviet Union presented a plan for an Iraqi withdrawal and later the Iraqi government announced that in accordance with this Soviet move Iraqi forces had been ordered to begin withdrawing. At the same time the White House responded that only a public statement by Saddam Hussein himself, in which he announced an unconditional withdrawal and acceptance of all the pertinent UN Security Council resolutions would bring a cease-fire. Baghdad's compliance of these terms conditions were necessary as Iraqi actions in the past had been less than trustworthy.

President Bush said, he would require more than a radio announcement purporting to come from the Iraqi government he might jeopardize the lives of coalition men and women. By holding cease fire, later that evening the UN Security Council met to consider the events of previous hours but adjourned without taking any action. The Foreign Minister Tariz Aziz said in a letter to the United Nations that Iraq would accept those
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Security Council resolutions which pertained to Kuwait sovereignty (662) and liability for damages under international law (674) after a cease-fire and demanded for end of mandated embargoes.

POST WAR SCENARIO:

On 5th March, 1991, the Security Council adopted resolution 686, and Iraq revolutionary command council decided that all its decisions subsequent to 3rd August, 1990, regarding Kuwait were nul and void. Subsequently, "all laws, decisions, regulations, instructions, directives and measures issued by virtue of the decisions of the council referred to in para I are abrogated and all the effects arising there from are nullified". The Kuwaiti government resumed functioning on 6th March, and life returned to normalcy. The Amir of Kuwait thanked UN on behalf of his people. Iraq started releasing the prisoner of war by 4th of March.

On 7th March, UN high level mission decided to go to assess Kuwait to check damage to infrastructure. This mission was sent in response to the Kuwait government. The UN Security Council on 3rd April adopted a resolution which formally ended the Gulf crisis. It was sponsored by Belgium, France, Romania, UK and Zaire, the vote was 12 to 1 (Cuba voting against), with 2 abstentions (Ecuador and Yemen). This resolution specifies the terms and conditions by which international peace and Security would be restored in the region.
Resolution 687 of April, 1991:

Part A: Asked Iraq and Kuwait to respect the violability of 1963, international boundary and called upon the Secretary General to help demarcate the boundary.

Part B: Requested a UN observer unit to monitor demilitarized zone established under resolution.

Part C: Asked Iraq to unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless of all its chemical, biological weapons and ballistic missiles of more than 150 km range. Iraq was also required to submit locations, number and types of such weapons. There would be a UN team to inspect the sites of all chemical, biological and missiles capacities. It would also supervise their destruction. The IAEA would inspect Iraq’s nuclear capabilities and would submit a plan for their destruction or removal.

Part D: Asked the Secretary General to report the return of all Kuwaiti properties by Iraq.

Part E: Reaffirmed Iraq’s liability under international law for any direct loss, damage or injury to foreign governments, national and corporations, as result of its occupation of Kuwait.

Part F: Stated that all prohibitions against sale or supply of food and other necessities for civilians were to be lifted and that other bans would be lifted methodically.

Part G: Called upon Iraq to extend all necessary cooperation to international committee of red cross to facilitate the repatriation of all Kuwaiti and third country nationals.

Part H: Called upon Iraq to inform the Security Council that it would not commit/ support any act of international terrorism.
Part I: Declared that a formal cease fire between Iraq, Kuwait and coalition countries would come into effect with Iraq acceptance of resolution 687\(^{(47)}\).

The resolution laid down conditions for permanent cease fire and destruction of Iraqi chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Iraq’s initial reaction as expected was predictable. Iraq described the conditions laid down as dangerous and unacceptable. As it ignored Iraqi’s economic difficulty, which was completely paralysed by US led coalition forces.

Iraq apprehended it the coalition forces were to stay on the southern Iraq or if their conditions were met, the council have no authority to establish security in the region. Iraq made further efforts to evade the UN mandate it sent a letter to the Security Council challenging the authority of the UN to destroy Iraqi equipment used in the improvement of Scud missiles. The complaints of victimization of Iraq by coalition forces was used repeatedly in government propaganda campaign throughout year Baghdad resented continued UN sanctions, as well as, the UN supervised destruction of much of Iraq’s military potential\(^{(48)}\).

The United Nations accordingly established Iraq-Kuwait observation mission (UNIKOM), which was to function under the command of the UN. It rested in the Security Council and under the authority of the Council. The chief military observer was responsible to the Secretary General, who, in turn, was to report regularly to the Security Council on the operations of the UNIKOM. The purpose of UNIKOM was to monitor the Khor Abdulla
water way between Iraq and Kuwait and demilitarized zone extending 10 kilometers into Iraq and 5 kilometers into Kuwait. The border was established between Kuwait and Iraq under 1963 agreement. Therefore, ‘Iraq become a pointer to the future, that any nation who dare stand up Washington might plunge in a risk being obliterated, and its boundry redrawn, as per US design and interest’(49).

The Challenge to Iraq’s Sovereignty:

After the end of hostilities, the Kurds fell into trap of believing that the West would support their struggle for independence. They rose in revolt against central government in aftermath of 1991. In the uprisings they succeeded in regaining control of almost of the Shi’ia south. But they failed to control the marsh lands which proved impenetrable to infantry and armour. Their failure turned the area into an ideal shelter for military deserters e.g. Shi’ia oppositions activities and ordinary outlaws complicating the situation even further was the fact that the Marshes traversable only in small boats, bordering Iran allowing Tehran to transfer aid to the area relatively easily(50).

The Kurds dominated the oil belt in the north and north-east of Iraq. They are a part of ethnic groups that spills over Turkey, Soviet Union, Iran, Iraq, Syria. They have long tradition of fighting both Turkey and Iraq aspiring for independence.
The main faction of Kurds belong to patriotic union of Kurdistan (PUK), and the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP), headed by Mustafa Barzani and PUK by Jalal Talabani. Their prospect of achieving independence therefore, was quite impossible, as "they were threatened by severe economic problems, internal conflicts in the Iraqi Kurdish camp, cross border tension with Turkish and Iranian Kurds, hostility of neighbouring countries and opposition of the international community to emergence of separate Kurdish entity. One of the most pressing problems for Kurds - was economic as it was land locked. Its total dependence lie on the good will of Baghdad or neighbouring countries"^51^.

While allied forces withdrawing from Iraq. Immediately rebellions by Shi'aa in the south and the Kurds in the north tooth. So, an imminent danger of civil war appeared in the horizon of Iraq. The Kurds appealed for outside help. Saddam Hussain to suppress Kurdish rebellion used chemicals to crush them. In counterly offensive key towns in northern Iraq were captured by insurgents. The US demanded that in order to enable the Kurdish refugees to go back to Iraq. Safe heaven should be created in Iraq for the refugees under the UN protection. While US administration was eager to play the role of international gendarme for the cause of Kurdish separatist in Iraq, it was consistently turned a blind eye to as spirations of the Kurdish population in neighbouring Turkey. It will be remembered that Turkey as a member of NATO was a frontline state in the allies campaign against Iraq^52^.
The US and allied forces imposed no-fly zone inside Iraq to protect Shi’ia and Kurdish in the safe-heavens zones. This became a dangerous precedent as it negated the concept of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the UN member states. Therefore, whatever the real motives behind the no-fly zone policy it did not serve Shi’ia interests in sharp contrast to the Kurdish case intervention by the west on behalf of Shi’ia as it laged a year behind the one undertaken by Kurds. When it did take place it was virtually almost repeated entreaties by Shi’ia opposition. The turn of no fly zone into heavens zone like that of the Kurds so as to grant real protection to the Shi’ia were disregarded. The no fly zones, as described by one of the Iraqi Journalist as another attempt to colonies the Iraqi sky by the coalition forces.

Whatever, the Shi’ias failed to jeopardise the territorial integrity of Iraq. The most likely scenario, which emerged was continuation of same sort of Kurdish self-rule, which was guaranteed by Iraq.

U.N. Destruction of Iraq’s Nuclear Installations:

The UN Secretary General set up a commission as mentioned in Part C of the Security Council resolution 687, which intended that within 45 days after the adoption of the resolution the commission would start inspecting and destroying Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction. The commission had another 45 days to carry out the action.
On April 23, 1991, UN Secretary General appointed a Swedish arms control expert and American deputy to head the commission. The sole task given was the destruction of Iraq’s chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. This Iraqi government sent a communication to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna on the state of its nuclear facilities as per 687 UN resolution requirement. Iraq made further efforts to evade the UN mandate when it sent a letter to the Secretary General challenging the authority of UN to destroy Iraqi equipment used in the improvement of Scud missiles.

Iraq sent the Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Azia to New York to plead Baghdad’s case. When the Security Council took firm stance, Aziz subdued and agreed. Western nations made ready their military forces in the Gulf and stepped up their warning of military action. Iraq President claimed that Iraq might have lost a battle, but had in effect won a triumph in the war against the 30 states aggression.

The situation became complicated once more when Iraq refused to the UN team to inspect suspect military facility at Abu Gharaib (near Baghdad). The delay in allowing permission by Iraq authority enabled them to remove sensitive equipments. This statistics supported by Iraq were countered by UN. Iraq was accused for non-co-operative attitudes. Iraqi ambassador to the UN was asked to explain the lapses. The game of cat and mouse between Iraq and UN inspection team went for sometimes, in which.
Iraq could manage to hide all sensitive documents. But due to tremendous pressure by the US, UK and other allied forces, through Security Council Iraq agreed, and affirmed its commitment to continue its co-operation with (UNSCOM), and international atomic energy agency in carrying out its obligations under Security Council resolution 687. The UNSCOM agreed to respect Iraq’s legitimate Security Concerns.

When the IAEA findings were made public this exposed the double standard policy adopted by USA and western countries, who expressed deep concerns, but often ignored the reality they were pursuing as financiers and suppliers of those arsenals to Iraq. However, Iraq, “accepted the humiliating term and agreed to destroy stockpiles of arsenals under the UN inspection teams”. But this dichotomy would remain as reminder to most third world countries.

New Security Environment and Its Implications in Middle East:

The Gulf crisis was the first epoch making significant conflict involving the armies of Arab states and US led powerful coalition army of the West against Iraq. Still, the US failed to ensure viable security system for the region that has remained vital to its interests. Paradoxically, the defeat of Iraq and destruction of its economic infrastructure and military machine during the gulf crisis highlighted the American inability to handle a situation of this sort on its own without substantive moral and material support from other countries. All the
strategies Washington adopted, so far met with failure, and have proven to be ad-hoc in nature.

In the post cold war world the Gulf crisis was perceived as a threat to the emerging structure of the world economy rather than peace and security. For, US, the world peace and security appears to be obscure in view of the changing alignments and power shifts. In today’s world peace can only be threatened by a nuclear confrontation on large scale. The process of massive transformation in the world power structure since late seventies, the world politic’s has been witnessing the emergence of new forces, which marked a genuine departure from the old pattern. The US hegemony began to decline with its internal economic difficulties, the rise of Japan as economic power, and its challenge to the liberal international order, and changing position of western Europe in the world economy. There are shifts from military conflicts to economic and technology areas.

Emerging New World Order:

Since the end of the Gulf crisis in February, 1991 and humiliating defeat of Iraq in six weeks, despite Iraq having a battle-hardened and about million of strong armed forces, that stood the eight years war with Iran. After end of war the US President George Bush talked of shaping a "new world order" in his speech to the United States Congress on 6th March, 1991. He outlined his country’s imperatives in the new world order that he perceived. Pointedly, he concentrated primarily on
shortsighted imperatives, which simply related to obtaining a status of stability in the Middle East. This policy can be summarised in the following points.

(i) Settlement of all conflicts that are nucleus danger points in different regions of the world;

(ii) Institutionalization of collective regional security arrangements;

(iii) Strict arms control regimes to deny the proliferation of nuclear weapons and related delivery means;

(iv) Reconstruction and development of areas that may have to be dealt with by use of military force to attain the above goals.

The United States has certain critical strategic imperatives that Washington felt to safeguard, and ensure its unchallenged position as the world’s primary political and military power. The US has made it clear to the third world countries, that any country threaten or generate a potential of threat to destabilize these imperatives, the United States, was particularly sensitive to the development of nuclear capacity among the non-nuclear regimes that could pose direct threat in future. The threat to American interests would be no more tolerated in the new international order. In fact Kuwait had a little strategic value to the Americans. The real threat was possibility of Iraq capturing Saudia Arabia along with Kuwait which was real threat to USA economic interests.
Both Saudi Arabia and Kuwait account for three fifth of the known reserves of the world oil. Letting Iraq getting away with annexation of Kuwait would have virtually given Iraq a green signal to repeat his coup against Saudi Arabia. "The US and its allies wished to drive home the lesson that in the post cold war, the global community will not tolerate maverick actions that threaten the international free trade system. The international trade has become very life blood of the integrated global economy that has come into being over the last 40 years. The international trade routes, in particular its seas lanes, have become the arteries of that economy any action that disrupts international trade causing a break in supply or sudden rise in prices, threatens not just one or a group of countries, but the whole world. It will not, therefore, be tolerated by the Western industrial power houses."

Therefore, the end of cold war, and collapses of Soviet Union provided the US an opportunity to shape the world according to its wish keeping in mind these paramount interests the Western powers are now trying to implement their policies through UN and other world forum, etc.

For decades Middle East region has attained strategic, economic, and political importance in the world politics, mainly due to the huge oil reserves. Prior to this the area had no strategic significance, except, as a water way, linking the western imperialist to their colonies in Asia.
The Gulf peninsula, with exception of Iraq, and Iran the remaining six Gulf states have identical political systems and idealogical orientations, similar international perceptions and foreign policy. Most of them shared similar political, social and economic aspirations. These states have been operating under some sort of heriditory Sheikhdom with pro-west orientation. Contrary to this Iran and Iraq have evolved republics with different, some what anti-west ideological orientation. The region has gained extra-ordinary prominence in modern times mainly due to increasing world dependence on oil as the primary source of energy. After 1973, oil embargo the western concerns to secure oil supply was bound to increase in the region. Out of eight gulf states, six small but oil rich states, Saudia Arabia, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Oman and Bahrain, and even Iran upto 1979, were vital pillars of U.S. policy in the region. They were under varying degrees of western influence.

This region remained as vital part of US interests, for access to the Gulf oil supplies at reasonable price in sufficient quantities. So, to the US foreign policy planners wanted to see the region in stability and were prepared to meet any challenge with coercive force.

To keep the US economic interest intact in the Gulf region Washington have invited huge Gulf investment in America. In return the US succeeded to have close market to American goods covering from cosmetics to weapons in the Gulf. In addition, the
multinational companies of the West operate in Gulf countries, who have generated profits in billions of dollars. Naturally, these were more than enough causes for Western concerns for tight security of Middle Eastern regions.

Hence, the USA initiated and adopted tough stand against Iraq during the crisis. To ensure the security of the region the US resorted to all the measures which so far have proved to be ad-hoc in nature which were adopted on trial and error basis. Earlier, the British decision to withdraw its troops from the Gulf region, prompted the US to come into to fill, what Washington dubbed as a global responsibility to fill the vacuum created by British withdrawal.

In 1971, the United States entered into an agreement with Amir of Bahrain for stationing a permanent naval station. To avoid incitement of local nationalist feelings, the Nixon Doctrine, called for projecting America presence in the Gulf as friendly assistance and training for local people to replace the Britishers specially in police department.

However, Saudia Arabia were largely concerned with dynastic matters and inter Arab affairs, the Shah of Iran had his own ambition of making Iran a great power and guardian of the Gulf. The United States preferred Iran, since Saudia had a large royal family and other people involved in policy making. Iran had advantage since the Shah was only one, who could decide on his owns. During that period Iran had relatively developed
infrastructure and man power potential. On this considerations President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kisinger flew to Tehran in May 1972, as a result agreements were signed. The outstanding policy of US in 70s, had culminated a massive transfer of arms to the Gulf countries.

The transfer of huge arms had contributed significantly to Iranian revolution of 1979. The people witnessed the Shah of Iran for lavish spending on arms and security than economic development. The new Iranian regimes adopted anti-West policy and called for the export of revolution which had complicated the situation in the region. Many smaller Arab states felt that Islamic Iran constituted a greater threat to their regimes than Bathist Iraq. Apart from the threat of their own natives of Shi‘ia communities, received Iraqs revolutionary message, declaring monarchy and Islam incompatible, criticised the monarhies for friendly ties with the west.

Saudia Arabia acted pre-emptively in tactical manner encouraging Iraq to contain Iran’s potentially disruptive influences in the region. There was also the risk of Iranian subversion, disturbances in Saudia Arabia’s eastern province. In 1979-80, there occurred plot in Bharain in December, 1981, disturbances at the Haj in 1981-82, agitation among Kuwait’s Shi‘ia community in March 1983, and an attempt on the Amir’s life in mid 1985. All Apprehension was raised they were either planned or run from Taheran.
Obviously, the Arab states in the Gulf area were never ready to accept any role for Iran on regional security arrangement. Their perceptions about Iran’s threat to their existence was so strong although deep differences ranges from ethnicity question to the cultural attitudes among themselves. Therefore, “Iran was neither part of the Arab world, nor its population part of the Sunni majority in Islam”. When Iran entered prolonged war with Iraq and started attacking Kuwait during the conflict propaganda was raised against Iran that its attempt was to destabilize the Gulf countries. Iran emerged from the war with sense of grievance against its neighbours. Unwilling to admit her hostility to its neighbours was the reasons which had united these states under Saudia Arabia and behind Iraq.

A strategy was formulated that regional security could assured which at least two or three major Gulf states were in agreement. In the 1970s similarity of interest among Iran, Saudia Arabia and later Iraq. But this arrangement was not enough to lead the co-operation on security matters. The case of Iraq and Saudia Arabia in the 1980s, illustrated that even co-operation between two of the three principal states was not enough without foreign involvement. During 1988–90, a fixation on the threat from Iran distracted the Gulf states from Iraq’s ambitions.

Hence, the invasion of Kuwait has not changed the concerns of Gulf co-operation council states, fundamentally to acknowledge that military assistance from the west is essential for their security and existence.
The small (GCC), states with problem of man power shortage, had impressed upon their governments the desirability and necessity of acquiring technologically advanced weapons at any cost from West. The prevailing differences amongst GCC governments forced them to acquire deterrence of military technology of the West and by reaching agreements with major powers. In case of the break down of deterrence the GCC armies expect to delay opposing forces until such times as international reinforcements could arrive in strength. The danger to the GCC states similarly did not only come from Iran, but also from Iraq. “Saddam Hussein had made no secret in his desire to see their overthrow, despite the obvious military defeat of Iraq the fear of what Iraq might attempt in the region in the future, should the present regime endure, underlie much of the concern of Iraq’s neighbouring states (G3).

The pampering of Iraq during the war proved counter productive for US security policy in the Gulf. Iraq was supported by Washington because it acted as buffer between Iran and the Gulf co-operative council states member and Israel. Therefore, in the aftermath of the war with Iran, Iraq instead of being an ally emerged the single most potential threat in the region capable to hit Western interests (G4).

Iraq’s occupation of Kuwait no doubt was a blunder and strategic miscalculation. Saddam Hussain had ignored many ground realities and a consequence of ignorance of those facts Iraq was
reduced to its worst position as a sovereign state free to decide its internal affairs. The west refrained from destroying Saddam who might be considered as martyr by Muslims of the region. West was fearful of Balkanisation of Iraq and the impact of such developments could have altered the balance of power in the Persian Gulf region.

However, division of Iraq, Kurdish, and Shi’ia might have adverse affect on the neighbours specially Kuwait with large Shi’ia community. The Security environment in Middle East remained a matter of great concern not only to the Middle Eastern countries, who might have directly threatened. The Gulf region remained the largest source of energy supplyer. Any volatile development have had direct impact on stability and security of the other regimes. Instability in the Gulf could have an adverse impact throughout Middle East.

Iran, for example, was leading the opposition to Arab-Israeli reconciliation. The Gulf region being important source of support for Islamic movements in the Middle East and north Africa, conflict in this region such as Algerian civil war, in turn would have direct impact on Europe, specially in its southern region. It was also apprehended Iran within a decade might have developed missiles capability to deliver weapons of mass destruction (WMD), to ports of western Europe. This region for its unique geography have potential dysfunctional states. Iran was not happy to accept the new post cold war order. Her
dream of regional hegemony remain the most significant long-term ambition and threat.

The nations friendly to the United States and the west faced internal threat because of a substantial decline in their economy largely due to the lower oil prices. They were facing growing and conflicting political demands of the people. They also confronted successions problems. There were tension in the GCC states. There was internal instability within the Gulf co-operative council states. The tension and conflict among them could have been easily exploited by Iran and Iraq.

Therefore, Iran might have relieved by destruction of Iraq’s capability and continuing international embargo against Baghdad. Iran wanted opportunity to go ahead in her ambitions as the balance shifted in her favour with its present regimes. It might likely to caused tension on the region security environment.

On the other hand Iraq in spite of its defeat succeeded in holding together its armed forces. Iraq stood in the face of internal uprisings that could have put heavy cost on her. But growth in relative Iranian power might have increased the pressure on the US to ease upon Iraq.

Therefore, Iran was highly relieved by destruction of Iraqi capability. It was satisfied of continuing international embargo against. Iraq The United States and its allies needed a comprehensive strategy to reduce the threat and tension in the
Middle East, specially in the Gulf region. Hence, to avoid tension following measures should be adopted:

1. Strength the regional organization, namely the Arab league to play a more active role in the field of removing the disparity of economic nature. Cultural and economic cooperation plus security arrangements, to solve the border dispute.

2. The United States and its allies must develop a strategy for stability of the GCC states, Iran and Iraq are likely to attempt to promote conflict among GCC states or any internal dispute in both countries might have direct impact on GCC states. Like Kurds Shi'ia insurgents in Iraq. US and its allies should assist GCC countries to resolve their countries old border dispute, like Qatari-Bahrain or Saudia-Qatar border conflicts, since GCC states in the recent history of security co-operation among them illustrates that they are unlikely to reach an agreement.

3. Expansion of peace initiatives. Israel which has a significance military capability can play an important role in Persian Gulf security. Thus, reducing the US burden. This can happen only if Israel choose to participate in the Gulf security. The Israeli-PLO accord and the Jordanian-Israeli peace treaty can facilitate to being such co-operation. Several GCC states and Israel have a common threat perception that emphasises the threat from Iran and Iraq. So, Israel can provide equipment, technical assistance, sell arms and provide for USA prepositioning of its equipment for possible use in the Gulf. Some of the GCC states reluctant to co-operate openly with Israel on security issues. Their motives seemed to avoid antagonism to Iran or local Islamic fundamentalists. To encourage regional co-operation between Israel and the Gulf Security could be an important element in the post-peace process.
4. The United States and its allies in long term vision for Iraq and Iran. Washington should be open to integrating these states in the new regional order and should even consider supporting the establishment of additional structure for regional dialogue and confidence-building. When and if they abandon their desire for regional hegemony and work for peace stability in the gulf and broader middle east.

Therefore, in the post cold war era US and its allies have agreed to play more positive role in building new structural security environment in the region. During the cold war United States and its allies faced a global adversary and there was a central front in Europe that received their highest military priority. The absence of such a global rival has improved the global security environment for the United States and its allies qualitatively. Now, the Gulf has become one of the primary regional fronts for the West in a new era. It is in the United States, Interests to keep the threats small and preclude the domination of critical regions, like the Gulf by hostile regional powers. US and allied policies and their military power, have a key role to play in shaping the regional security environment."
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