

GREAT POWERS' COLD WAR AND ITS IMPACT ON REGIONAL SECURITY: WEST ASIA AS AN ANALYTICAL MODEL STUDY

Mohammad Saleh Bani Issa, Jadara University

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at studying and analyzing the reasons that stood behind demonstrate with linkages west Asia with the great powers. It also analyzes and assesses how all sides acted in their national self-interest, and how the great powers (USA, USSR) worked carefully for their influence in avoiding a direct confrontation that could pose a threat to world peace, thus the region has become a battle by proxy between them.

The study reached into a point that the region has been and continues to be the focus of the attention of the international powers and remained a theater of conflict and competition. A prominent and active role has played in formulating the policies of the region, the founding of Israel creates a continuous problematic and critical situation in the region, and the study showed how the great powers dealt with the new state, either during the establishment or beyond.

Keywords: Great Powers, Regional Security, West Asia, Arab Israeli Conflict, Cold War, Regional Countries.

INTRODUCTION

Middle East area remained known by that name until the end of World War II in 1945, then known as the West Asia region. This area includes most of the South Asian countries of the former Soviet Union to western Pakistan, as well as countries that lie between Turkey and Afghanistan in the west to the east including Asian Arab countries, with a population of about 325 million people as of 2016, covering a geographic area as the size of the United States.

The West Asia region, occupies an important place in international relations, it has witnessed many conflicts over the past decades since World War II. The strategic importance of the region based on that is the only land bridge, which combines the three continents, Europe, Africa and Asia. It also a center of global communications because of the short sea and air channels linking Asia with Europe and the continent of Africa, so the strategic importance of this region, no one can ignore that. And in addition to the geostrategic importance, it is a center of Arab-Islamic culture. Where is home sacred to all three monotheistic religions, Christianity, Judaism and Islam, which it earned both regional and international religious importance alike.

The region is the richest in the world in terms of gas and oil fields, and the appearance of large quantities of oil reserves with a view of the early twentieth century, made it the competition between the major industrialized nations in the world, such as US, UK, Russia and France, to control the environment oil sources. Another advantage is characterized by the addition to natural sources, is the Arab-Israeli conflict. The idea of the Jews to get themselves to a national

homeland in Palestine was part of the imperialist strategy that encouraged later on the Balfour Declaration in 1917, through different stages until it formed and announced as the state of Israel in the heart of the Arab world in 1948.

The region also contains of three ideological concepts: Arab nationalism, Zionism and Western imperialism, these concepts have played a prominent and significant role in making and identifying the region's policies since the end of World War I. West Asia faced, a new problem known as the Cold War started after World War II, which made the region a part of the international politics, particularly between the only then bipolar; Socialist Pole led by the communist camp, the former Soviet Union, and Capitalist Pole led by the imperialist camp, the United States of America.

The Study Importance

Interestingly to question, why West Asia region has not seen blessings of security and freedom, stability and peace, while many other regions of the world seen with such blessings. The study will be more important if it is deemed strength and persistence of the problem in terms of the presumption of a humanitarian nature than political. So efforts and attempts seek here to examine and analyze the nature of the problem and the international attitudes towards the problem itself. The study seeks to identify the elements are responsible for complicating things and unwillingness to find a solution to the problem. This context requires analytical study of all regional and international positions. It may be very important to know the factors that brought about direct changes from time to time in the Arab, regional and international attitudes towards the problem since 1948. Surely, the analysis which the study seeks to is directly related to the role played by the great powers to pursue a policy of competition with each other to secure their interests by capturing wealth and dissemination of ideas among peoples of the region. Although, the great powers competing, making the region unstable both in political and security for several decades, leaving a bundle of various issues such as the arms race issue, especially with regard to weapons of mass destruction, as well as establishing the cause of the concept of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which resulted in various problems, such as refugees, water poverty and unemployment. As international competition prominent role in furthering the cause of terrorism regionally and internationally, because of the unfair major countries attitude towards the requirements of the region and its affairs and policies. The international competition also played a major role in the dispersal of the Arab nation and divided it into many states, and not allowed them even to think about their dream of unity. Therefore, it is imperative for regional countries of a rethink, in order to recover its dignity, sovereignty, freedom, stability and security.

The Study Hypothesis

In order to get the best view of the various efforts and initiatives for the liquidation of the tense climate, the study has served to focus on the basic premise as the rivalry between the great powers which have been playing a major role in the continuity of the bad condition of the region, who are still suffering from it. It is possible to perceive that the economic, strategic and ideological interests of the major powers have affected directly or indirectly on positions of the regional countries, especially with regard in making and taking the political decision

independently, leaving the region live far from progress, freedom and self-reliance. So, the study has been freed to test this hypothesis.

The Study Objectives

The study focused on several objectives: First, study the manifestations initially and roots of international competition in West Asia. Second, study the background of the links between the regional countries and its relationship with the West. Third, analysis how to pursue the great powers and work for national interests in the region. Fourth: study the outputs of the international competition between the great powers and its implications on the national security interests relating to the regional countries. Fifth: study the cause of the desire of the great powers in keeping the region in a state of instability from time to time.

The Study Methodology

Through the previewing of the study objectives, the study follows historical, analytical, experimental and comparison methods.

The Study Historical Background

The Palestine issue is located in the heart of West Asia, and the permanent conflict between the Arabs and Jews made great powers plan their policies carefully to this conflict, bringing attention of care to the region on broad international scope. And over the past several decades, the Middle East area, specifically the region of West Asia didn't be save of interfering of the great powers in affairs and policies of its countries, and the region has become a Kitchen for the great powers foreign policies. Despite of direct and indirect great powers intervention, the region remained free and has not managed or governed by any side individually.

The strategic objectives that the West Asia gained made the great powers to look at it with interest without other regions in the world. In the nineteenth century, the region has witnessed interventional policy in its internal affairs, the influence of imperialism and colonial policies which allowed the great powers greedy to compete with each other in the twentieth century. And that led to the creation of a sort of instability and uncertainty in the minds of the peoples of the region and made them lose confidence in manage their countries affairs by themselves.

Because of the growing rivalry between the great powers and put their hands on majority countries of the region, it had to play a major role in convincing the countries of the region to work against each other in order to achieve their interests and ambitions for the implementation of the colonial scheme that achieves their objectives. For great powers, a country may be their friend and another country it may be the cat's claw to their enemy (Carl, 1984).

The ambition of the great powers in West Asia was increased and widening after World War II. In 1948, Britain was the only country which involved in the policy and affairs of the Arab-Israeli conflict. In 1956, France and Britain shared common interests in the region; they together lunched direct action against Egypt after the nationalization of the Suez Canal. In 1967, America and Soviet Union had direct intervention in the Arab-Israeli conflict, and worked together to establish and support the Jewish presence in Palestine. In 1973 things were changed

between them, where stop against each other but without confrontation. So there are different forces at different ages and eras played a prominent role in the history of the region.

The great powers were convinced that the region was one of the causes of tension and competition in the world, and that the issue of borders between the countries of the region is a living example of the direct intervention of the great powers in their external mediation to resolve regional affairs. In any study of the region after World War I, there is a negative Arab position on the idea of democracy, but Britain and France hastened to introduce the idea of democratic parliament to it. And worked to divide them among themselves, and worked to entice Arabs to freedom and civil freedom, and made the Arabs see their old leaders as corrupt, which affected the ideas of the Arab nation and fragmentation.

Until the end of World War I, America did not have any ambitions in the region. The American policy was to overthrow and contain the communist policy and its spread in the region, and also to support and protect Israel. The Americans were planning to lay their hands on the strategic sea and air channels and passages passing through the region (Georgiana, 1946).

Study and Analysis the Cold War among the Great Powers in the Region

Since the early hours of the first clash between the Arabs and the Jews in 1947-1948, the great powers were quick to strengthen their policies in order to preserve their national interests. In 1948, both America and Russia welcomed the establishment and support Israel in the implementation of the resolution of the partition of Palestine (No. 181) of 1947 and blessed the establishment of the Jewish state. The Soviets considered that the establishment of the Jewish state was the only way to support socialism, to dispose of the British presence and to increase their influence in the region. While America considered its absolute support for the establishment of Israel to maintain the internal American situation because of the Jewish influence that dominates domestic and foreign policy makers in America. After the establishment of Israel, the 1948 war broke out between the Israeli state and the Arab countries represented in Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and Iraq, but the great powers called on the involved parties to the conflict to stop the clashes that the Security Council adopted on July 15, 1948, which ended with Arab anger because of lost many lives and loss much of Palestinian property (Abba, 1977).

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union contributed to the establishment of a Jewish state in the region. American recognition of Israel's independence came after Soviet recognition. It also described the Soviet Union in that era as the faithful and only friend of Israel, while the American position was somewhat flexible and it was only to support the idea of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine (Lacqueur, 1959). When the Arab fighting forces moved to Palestine in 1948, they were criticized by the Russian press as aggressive. Israel received the absolute support of the world's largest and most powerful countries, especially the American financial, military and political support (David, 1967). While the Soviet Union supported the policy of mass immigration to Israel, especially Soviet Jews with expertise and competencies, which numbered more than a million people and today, constitute about 25% of the Jewish people in occupied Palestine.

When Egypt needed foreign help in building the Aswan High Dam, the US administration promised to help. But the aid was accompanied by two conditions: that Egypt stop buying arms from the Soviet Union and that Egypt sign a peace treaty with Israel. The aim of stopping the

deal with the Soviet Union was to fear the exchange of Egyptian cotton (white oil) with weapons, while the aim of signing a peace agreement with Israel was to pull Egypt out from the cycle of conflict. America believes that there is no real war between the Arabs and Israel without Egypt (Lacqueur, 1959).

It follows from the above that the exploitation was clear and obvious; the American administration wants Egypt to extend its hand to Israel in time of need after it stopped dealing with the Soviet Union. It is known that the Soviet support of Arab nationalism was to stand against the international charter that was held in Baghdad with the support of America, where the former Soviet Union declared at the time that the Soviets had no choice but to get the friendship of the neutral Arab countries and that was clear sympathy in the Soviet newspapers since 1955 (Michael & Shimon, 1973). However, America did not leave it that way. It sent a message to then Egyptian President Jamal Abdel Nasser, if the Soviets support Egypt with arms and America supports it by building the High Dam, Nasser himself will decide the difference between the two supporters, and could recognize who the true friend of Egypt (James, 1959).

The lack of calm and stability has contributed to the penetration of communist thought and its spread among the countries of the region. To cut the way for the Soviets, America worked to create what is known as the regional defense organization, which was denounced by Moscow, accusing Washington of seeking to limit it and wants to be alone in the region. America quickly signed the Baghdad Pact between Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Britain in 1955. Noting that America was not a member but contributed to provide members logistical support in economic and weapons.

The Soviet Union exploited the tense situation between the Arab countries and the American administration against the Suez Canal issue (1955-1956). It was proposed to buy Egyptian cotton in 1955, which led to the creation of a global cotton crisis in America and Europe. America and Britain tried to distance Egypt from the Soviet orbit when they wanted to support Egypt financially and morally in the construction of the Aswan Dam on the Nile. But after Egypt recognized China as a communist, relations changed and took a turn for the worse, which negatively affected the British-American support project for Egypt. These changes were accompanied by an environment conducive to the Soviet invasion. The Soviet leadership offered Egypt support for the construction of the High Dam. The Soviet leadership also pledged to support many Arab countries both materially and morally in order to achieve their Arab unity. This reflected positively on the Arab confidence towards the Soviet Union, which became the great weight and presence in the region.

In view of the foregoing, it is noted that the great powers have been able to practice their policies by spreading the spirit of competition and obtaining the greatest number of regional interests. The arms issue in 1955 and the problem of the High Dam in 1956 are examples of the tension, competition and international exploitation of the entire region.

The Egyptian policy in 1956 focused on the nationalization of the Suez Canal, which led Britain and France to wage war against Egypt. The former Soviet Union threatened to bomb London and Paris with missiles if British and French forces were not withdrawn and the aggression against Egypt stopped. Because America did not want the Soviet presence in West Asia, America called for an end to the British, French and Israeli tripartite aggression against Egypt. The Soviet government also called on America, Britain and France to cooperate with them to resolve the issue peacefully, not to interfere in the internal affairs of regional countries,

and to dispose of the military alliance and the withdrawal of foreign forces from the region and provide unconditional economic support to the regional countries. Because of the American insistence on widening the gap between the Arabs and the Soviets, America rejected the Soviets idea, and even worked to maximize the situation. It threatened to use nuclear weapons against the Soviets if Moscow attacked London and Paris. The declaration of the Soviet psychological war to strike Paris and London if the aggression against Egypt was not stopped had a positive effect, forcing London and Paris to comply with the UN resolution (Somolansky, 1974).

With the beginning of the sixties of last century, the importance of the region increased in American policy. The Arabs became more fanatical and extremist in this period, and the influence armed Arab states increased with nationalism and socialism, which has upset America, because it has a direct impact on its interests in the region. According to American estimates, if national systems and Arab socialism succeed in leading the Arab world, the rest of the Arab countries cooperating with America will inevitably collapse, and thus America will inevitably lose Arab oil and other worthy interests in the region (Melvin, 1974).

The discovery of oil in West Asia and the increasing need for its derivatives have increased the region's importance internationally and specifically to America, where Arab oil is the indirect weapon for America, which supplying most of its military bases around the world. Arab oil has become the main reason for America's adherence to the region. While the Soviet Union did not want Arab oil as much as it was interested in winning China a communist state (Daniel, 1991).

In the past decades, every great power has stood in the way of the other. The Soviet Union wanted to drag America into trouble in West Asia; it did not succeed, even lost its biggest Arab ally in Egypt. The Soviet Union also made a mistake when it cut off diplomatic relations with Israel in the aftermath of the June 1967 war, leaving it out of the limelight between the Arabs and Israel. The Soviet leadership moved to prevent the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli war, but failed to prevent Israel from attacking surrounding Arab countries (Mustafa, 1982). The Soviet Union did not want to go to war because the war was not in its best interest, due to two important reasons for the loss or the win of the Arabs in that war. The Soviets believe that if the Arabs win the war, the Arabs become a powerful force in the region, relying on themselves and then reducing their dependence on others. But if the Arabs lose the war, the Soviets loss to many of their interests in the region. The Soviets, therefore, believe that the strategic balance in the region is not in their interest and may lead them to a comprehensive confrontation (Mustafa, 1982).

As for America, asked the parties for restraint and restoration of peace between them. It also criticized the Egyptian policy of closing some of the water crossings in the face of Israeli naval vessels. On May 25, 1967, former US President Johnson said in his letter to Nasser that avoiding war in the region was a supreme goal (Peters, 1978). However, the political initiatives to calm the situation did not yield fruit, which called on America to send its sixth fleet to the eastern Mediterranean to deter the Soviet forces and prevent them from intervening, adding a kind of moral support for Israel, which resulted in the brutal Israeli aggression on Egypt on June 5, 1967 (Gregory, 1981).

During the war, each of the great powers agreed not to intervene militarily and confront each other and to work together for a ceasefire. On June 10, 1967, the Soviet Union warned the US administration of the dangers of Israel's failure to accept a cease-fire, which would lead to the

explosion of the situation and lack of control over it, and which could lead to military operations. The US administration responded to the Soviets' demands, and told Israel the gravity of the situation and worked to withdraw its fleet near the Syrian coast (Alexander, 1983).

In return, America began supplying Israel with the latest military weapons to remain militarily superior power to other countries in the region. The reason for America's direct bias toward Israel is, among other things: first: America's desire to control the entire region, where Israel has a strategic base to achieve its ambitions; second: to use Israel as a tool against any action or rule of Arab nationalism, third: to compete with the Arab countries and to remain economically backward and in need of continued American support and fourth: The Jewish presence in America and the influence of the media that promote to Israel as the only secular and democratic state in the region.

As for the Soviet assistance to the Arabs, is due to several reasons, the most important of which is the desire of the Soviets to build good relations with the Arab countries, especially those related to the Arab-Israeli conflict, which will enable the Soviets to be present and protect their allies and other strategic countries. On January 31, 1971, the Soviets threatened to supply Egypt with arms if America did not stop supporting Israel against the Arabs (Alexander, 1983). But America did not care about what the Soviet government was saying, but continued to supply Israel with sophisticated military pieces (Henry, 1979).

To reduce tensions, several meetings were held between the leaders of the two powers, known as the convergence of views or the memorandum of understanding (*détente*) in their relations. President Nixon and his Soviet counterpart Brezhnev held a summit in Moscow in May 1972 and another in Washington in June 1973. The aim was to remove the specter of war and military operations between them in the region. After the outbreak of the October 1973 war, the Soviet leadership denounced the Israeli aggression, declaring that Israel was an aggressor and demanded the liberation of all occupied Arab territories. There are clear reasons for the Soviets to stand with the Arabs at this particular time. The Soviets were well aware that the Arab issue had become an international issue and that all the countries of the world supported the Arab position in liberating their lands. At the same time, Soviets did not want to confront America and threaten world peace.

The United States was not aware of the critical situation in the region. Henry Kissinger realized that unlimited American support for Israel could pose a threat to US interests with the regional countries especially the Saudi Arabia. Fearing that Israel would fall as a result of the war, America supported Israel with advanced weapons and fighter jets. The US administration had asked the Soviet leadership to pressure the Arab side to stop the fighting; the answer was not encouraging from the Soviets. But after the increased American military support for Israel, the Soviets accepted the American demand to work together to stop the Arab-Israeli war. The October war had an impact on the memorandum of understanding between the great powers, while the war served as a challenge to (*détente*), which let small allied countries make their own political decisions in declaring war or peace.

The October 1973 war proved that the great powers were unable to lead the world, and that the memorandum of understanding between them did not prevent them from interfering in the affairs of allied regional countries (Robert, 1984). In the case of the (*détente*) laws, the great powers should extinguish the flame of war in the event of crises or others. When the Soviet leadership asked soviet nationals to leave Egypt and Syria and reported the bad situation before

the outbreak of war, the US administration denounced it as a breach of their understanding (Alexander, 1983).

In the October war, the great powers worked to create channels of understanding to preserve what had been agreed upon. They called on the warring parties to cease fire and it was agreed not to confront or use nuclear weapons against each other. However, there is a divergence of views on the Security Council's decision to cease fire, as the Soviet Union wanted to cease fire while keeping troops in place, while America wants to return troops before the outbreak of war that is before the 5th of October 1973. This has led to the deterioration of relations between them, and each of them has its own interest in its position and, more importantly, military buildup and armament with the latest types of weapons have enabled great powers to remain in the region to protect their interests and their clients with positive results and minimal losses (Henry, 1979). Thus, (détente) could not stop or prevent the war because the great powers aspired to their own interests. Their bilateral relations were also not because of (détente) but were more likely to avoid a certain war with nuclear weapons.

The most dangerous thing the Western countries and America faced in that war is the use of Arabs petroleum as a strategic weapon against them. The West Asian oil producing countries decided to stop the export of oil to Western countries because of America's policy and its absolute support of Israel against the Arabs (Abir, 1974). This has led to a kind of anxiety and fear among Western countries. American leaders began to beg the Arabs, which weakening the Israeli position, Israel then agreed to solve the thorny issues with Arabs through bilateral negotiations (Frazer, 1995). The years after the October War witnessed changes in the Arab position and gave a new role to the great powers. There was a new Arab balance that emerged with a great international recognition of the Palestinians. These years also witnessed a reduction of the Soviet role with the absolute increase of the only US sponsor role in West Asia (Liqueur, 1974).

The October 1973 war was the last real war between Arabs and Israel, and because of American unilateralism, which played a major role in the Arab-Israeli rapprochement which ended with the Camp David Accords between Egypt and Israel in 1978. It was the first step in the right direction towards a region free from wars and crises, The Soviet Union had a direct impact when relations with the Arab countries deteriorated, especially with Egypt after Anwar Sadat expelled thousands of Russians from Egypt and denied the Soviet debts. The Soviets then focused on Syria, which later became a soviet strategic ally in the region.

To the great powers were several goals look to achieve through October war, the US was looking to: isolating the Arabs from the Soviet Union; changing the Arab military situation that was used against Israel in October war; dividing the Arab countries and frustrating the efforts Arab unity. While the Soviet Union was looking to: maintain its influential presence in the region, and prevent the collapse of friendly and allied regional regimes.

In order to keep the region in a state of tension and to support its permanent presence there, the great powers have worked to find a new strategic way by providing arms to the region until the regional countries became in a state of arms race policy (Bernard, 1987).

Oil is also an important factor for the great powers in the region. In order to increase their influence, some kinds of competition and instability have to be found among the countries of the region. The situation was compounded by the fact that when America and the Soviet Union armed Iran and Iraq militarily in the seventies of last century, the US administration supported

Iran with sophisticated weapons worth \$ 10,400 million between 1972-1976. As well as the sale of Saudi fighter aircraft and missile carriers and surface-to-air missiles worth (6.000) million dollars in the same two years mentioned. The question is why America has sold these sophisticated weapons over the past decades. The reasons for this lie in America's fear of the fall of this rich part of the world in the hands of hostile leaders to US and to the West.

During the Lebanese civil war of 1975, which lasted for more than 15 years, the great powers had different positions towards them, which played an important role in changing them to a regional issue. Israel also played a major role in destroying the military base of the Palestinian resistance and weakening Syria, which sent its soldiers to Lebanon (Abdul, 1982).

The Arab states were convinced that the US administration alone could bring peace. On September 1, 1982, former US President Ronald Reagan announced his plan for peace, known as the Reagan Peace Plan, which emphasizes a just, comprehensive and lasting peace that can only be achieved by giving the Palestinians independent autonomy, in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The plan also opposes the idea of any increase or construction of Israeli settlements in the occupied Arab territories. It also demands that the Palestinians manage their land and lead themselves after the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories in 1967. It also demanded that the Arabs recognize the State of Israel as a sovereign state with the right to live in peace, but the American plan was not welcomed by the majority of Arabs (Ahmed, 1996).

Before the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, the international situation was neutral, but is changed after. The United States was unable to prevent Israel from attacking Lebanon, but it asked the warring states to stop the escalation (Julina, 1984). The US presence in Lebanon declined after the American naval explosion shook on October 23, 1983, forcing the US administration to withdraw its forces, ending the American incursion into the Lebanese problem (Blima & Paul, 1985).

West Asia has been a major focus of attention for the past eight decades, the United States increasing its economic ties with the region, especially on trade and oil imports. US imports of crude oil rose from 62 thousand barrels in 1970 to 646 thousand barrels in 1991, from 13% to 31% of total imported crude oil and 29% of the oil imports were from Saudi Arabia alone. US exports increased from US \$ 12 billion in 1984 to US \$ 18 billion in 1990. Imports increased from US \$ 6 billion in 1984 to US \$ 17 billion dollars in 1991. There is no doubt that the policy of the US administration and its will is to put its hand and keep its influence on the region in order to protect Israel and oil together.

Continuing competition and tension between the great powers has led to the support and delivery of various military pieces to the region, creating instability. The issue of the arms race has increased in frequency between the regional countries since the beginning of the eighties of last century, until the rate of import of weapons ranges became between 30-40% of the total import of weapons in the world. Moreover, more than 80% of arriving weapons to the region are originally from the five permanent members of the Security Council (Dalton, 1991).

The arms races have played a prominent role in the creation of major regional states such as Iran and Iraq. This has created a kind of instability that could impact on regional security. For the great powers, major regional states pose a threat to their direct and indirect interests in the region. Therefore, the Iran-Iraq war that broke out in 1980 was the result of the policy and the desire of the great powers and planning to create a state of continuous instability and destruction of the military arsenal in Iraq and Iran, and thus the great powers can ensure Israel's security and

other vital interests in the region (Elhary, 1984). So the Gulf War I (1980-1988) between Iraq and Iran was the beginning to get rid of regional weapons and military equipment and leave Israel alone without rival as a regional power state in the region (Mohamed, 1992).

To achieve its highest goals, America worked to study how to deal with Iraq and Iran, and wanted to deal with the secular state in Iraq at the expense of the ideological state in Iran. So it supported Iraq in its war against Iran. The support was clear, especially after 1982, when it realized that Iran was about to defeat Iraq, but the support was diminishing, and it ended completely after Saddam Hussein emerged as a war hero (Karsh, 1989).

America and its allies also wanted Saddam Hussein to emerge victorious from the war. In the spring of 1988, Saddam Hussein ordered the beating of Kurdish demonstrators in northern Iraq with poison gas, which upset American public opinion and Congress members and called on the US administration to impose sanctions on Iraq. However, former US presidents Reagan and Bush opposed this, considering that Saddam Hussein is the only person standing against Ayatollah Khomeini in the region.

At the end of the Iran-Iraq War, the US administration was convinced that Saddam Hussein was becoming more moderate. Where he is dealing diplomatically with the Palestinian leadership, recognizing the late Palestinian President Yasser Arafat as president of the Palestine Liberation Organization, ending his relations with the Palestinian armed factions and displaying a banner in finding compromise and peaceful settlement of the Arab Israeli conflict. The US administration also confirmed that Saddam Hussein had moved somewhat away from the Soviet administration, and his relations with the West was so close, even the neighboring countries were convinced that Saddam Hussein had become more moderate and no longer a threat to the region.

In the 1980s, the relationship between America and Iraq was in an unprecedented state of good. In order to contain Iran and isolate the region, America grew more moderate of Saddam Hussein. After the Iran-Iraq War, America found itself with a new balance strategy. Israel has suffered a certain lack of sense of security. The collapse of the Iranian front played a major role in making Iraq a major regional military force, thanks in the first place to the United States. The US administration believed that it was easy to deal with moderate Saddam Hussein by following the policy of carrots and sticks. The carrot served as economic support and mutual trade, while the stick was a continuation of pressure on Saddam Hussein to end his traditional military program, improve his position on human rights, and help the United States in some of the region's affairs, especially on the Lebanon and Arab Israeli peace process issues.

Former US Secretary of State James Baker worked to bring about real peace between the Arabs and Israel and was convinced that after the Iran-Iraq war, Saddam Hussein became the effective mechanism for the Palestinian negotiator in his negotiations with the Israelis. The US administration also wanted Saddam Hussein to solve the civil war in Lebanon. This was not a secret when Saddam Hussein supported Michel Aoun against the Syrians in the hope that Iraq would tie its position with Syria in the talks held in Taif in Saudi Arabia October 1989. The US position on Iraq was determined by the use of chemical weapons, as James Baker said, the United States had to look ahead rather than to behind.

The cessation of the first Gulf War coincided with the collapse of the Soviet Union (1989-1990). The policy of the former Soviet Union was clear and influential on the policies of the regional countries. For decades, the region has been the scene of international competition among the great powers for their special interests, leaving instability, disputes and conflicts

between them in the region. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Moscow was certainly not interested in regional issues and wanted to remain neutral. The neutral Soviet stance on the region made some of the former Soviet Union allied countries realize that there was no radical solution to any issue without the US initiative. These shifts in the Arab ranks had strengthened the growing American presence until West Asia region became an era of absolute American pressure and control, especially after the end of the Cold War (Richard, 1991). And the enormous American pressure on the regional countries led them to work politically and militarily against Saddam Hussein in the international coalition to strike Iraq in the second Gulf war in 1991 and make them sit together on the table after the war to find peaceful solutions that related with the Middle East issue (Walid, 1991).

With the end of the Cold War, Moscow interest in the region diminished at all political, economic and military levels. However, Moscow still wanted to strengthen its relations with the Gulf States as the largest arms market in the world, the main source of oil and a source of investment for Soviet development and progress. However, international changes have changed the international strategic balance and the Soviet-allied regional countries were moving out of Soviet strategic space. The end of the cold war has had a major impact on the changing pattern of relations between West Asian countries and the great Powers.

There are many outstanding issues relating to religion, race, borders and natural resources that have threatened the security and stability of the West Asian region. All the countries of the region feel surrounded by enemies. It was natural for them to find a fertile environment for the acquisition of weapons, which helped the great powers to sell their allies sophisticated and enormous weapons, which want to create a kind of insecurity and stability in the region and remain dominant over it (Kemp, 1991).

After the first Gulf War, Iraq became a major regional state alongside Israel, threatening the interests of the great powers in the region. From the US point of view, Iraq had the ability to exert direct and indirect pressure on the Arab countries cooperating with America, so it was necessary to weaken it. The second Gulf War in 1991 was another American political game to destroy the Iraqi military force. During the war, America wanted to prove to the Arabs that it was defending Arab security against the Iraqi aggression, but the fact is that America is defending Israel first and oil the second.

America used the retail approach to achieve its objectives after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. It has mastered the game of scaring the weak, the rich tribal communities surrounding with environment of poverty. Nor has the US administration faced any difficulties in convincing Arab leaders, especially in the Arab Gulf countries, of Iraq's intentions to destroy their regimes.

The Second Gulf War had a major impact on the revitalization of the arms market in West Asia; the region witnessed unprecedented armament in an unprecedented scale. Studies indicate that all the permanent members of the Security Council; America, Russia, China, Britain and France played a major role in restoring the arms market to the region. And some of the countries of the region, especially the Gulf, where they have received about (45 billion) dollars of weapons and developed military systems since the end of the war and also announced spending (10 billion) dollars annually until the end of the 20th century in order to achieve a balance in Force within the region. Syria and Iran used to buy Russian weapons, especially warplanes and other weapons, in exchange for oil and hard currency, until military development and weapons in Iran became a source of regional and international concern.

The increase in the arms race between the regional countries after the Second Gulf War in 1991 is due to several different reasons, the most important of which is: the determination of some of the Gulf States to strengthen their defensive power in order to deter any aggression or possible attack from Iraq. The fall in the price of Russian weapons after the Cold War was another reason for armament, which also helped enable regional countries to purchase sophisticated weapons (Mark, 1993).

The region remained the focus of attention of the great powers, especially America, and will remain the subject of constant attention for various reasons, the most important: America's increasing dependence on Gulf oil, where the former American president George Bush (the father) said in a speech in 1990 that "*the United States is fighting and will be fighting for oil, the 20th century is an American century, an oil century*". America also continued to protect the security and stability of Israel from any possible Arab or regional threat (Arwa & Yousef, 1996).

Because of the direct protection and the seizure of Gulf oil and its resources, the direct and unmediated support of Israel, the diplomatic and political ties with the Gulf countries and the influence role as supreme power in the region, America had to understand and anticipate the counter-response that would result from national and Islamic movements which that might threaten the American interests in the region or in others and may reach America at home, and that the events of atheist 11th of September 2001 might be an indication of the beginning of counter-response and pressure on America to adjust its dual policies towards the region (Arwa & Yousef, 1996).

The continuous change and volatility in the positions of the allies and the competing countries in many political elements, whether from inside or outside the region , creates a critical situation that would involve the great powers in the impasse and be unable to do any work that would protect their interests in the region.

RESULT

1. The study showed that the West Asia region hasn't seen security, stability and peace such as the rest of the regions of the world.
2. The study sought to identify the elements are involved and responsible for the continuation of the complexity and not desire to solve the problem.
3. The study reached into a point that the rivalry between the two great powers was behind the bad situation which the region is facing for many decades.
4. The study showed that for more than eight decades, the region has been in a state of backwardness, fear, instability, destruction and lack of civilizational presence, and it will remain so for many decades if the regional countries don't turn back to read their history and chart their accounts with the great powers that seem as allied countries, whom looking to that day to see the regional countries enjoy security, stability, progress and prosperity, but the opposite is true, because this situation is contrary to the great powers interests in the region.
5. The study showed the tricky and deceptive role played by the great powers of keeping the region always in need of help. In the light of that, they worked on the dissemination of seeds of enmity, threat, suspicion and discrimination among regional states. Enabling great powers of division the region into two types of regional countries, afraid weak countries and frightening strong countries, making of afraid weak ones to extend its hand to the great powers seeking aid, assistance and protection. The assistance for the great powers meant to promote the acquisition of disarmament, because of that the region has become one of the biggest weapon market in the world, by witch, could enabling the great powers of control the region and defend its self-interest.

6. The study noted that the region in the light of international competition has become a laboratory for the great powers testing manufactured weapons. The competition and the internationally supported arms race among the regional countries have enabled the great powers to test and market their weapons by opening the largest arms import market in the world, which was reflected negatively in the creation of a state of instability in the region when many countries in the region went running for arms after they believed that arms were the only means of self-defense.
7. The study find out that the spending of billions of dollars on weapons and other military programs that may be unusable has had a negative impact on the peoples psyche in the region and on their lives, whose regional leadership has been racing to acquire weapons to boast of at the expense of their people who live in poverty and hunger, prompting the regional individual only to think about how to get the strength of his day, leaving behind the concerns of the nation and its problems and the danger it faces.
8. The study indicated that the issue of oil, trade and Israel is expected to remain one of the priorities of the great powers to ensure their interests in the region; such policy will create regional instability that will put the region and foreign countries at risk and threaten the security and world peace alike.
9. The study indicated that the issues of nationalism, oil and Israel are the most important for the great powers for decades to come, all of which are intertwined and overlapping issues and can keep their control and dominance over the region. If the Arabs get unity, oil and Israel will be in danger. If oil is reduced or depleted, pressure on Arabs will be reduced, as will the absolute support for Israel will be reduced too. If the Arabs and Israel reach into a comprehensive, just and lasting peace, the region will be liberated. So it is not in the interest of the great powers to resolve the issue of the Arab-Israeli conflict; it is in their interest to sustain the conflict for decades to come.
10. The study declared that Arab nationalism in its broadest sense remained the eyesore as well as a source of disturbance for the great powers, and they reached to a point that if Arabs get unity, they will not get interests any more in the region. Thus, to keep Arabs out of unity was their main dream and object.
11. The study showed the importance of oil for the great powers; and what has happened in the region is caused by the conflict on oil, there was the first Gulf War and the second Gulf War and may be a third and fourth war and more because of the region's oil.
12. Thus, the region is living in a bad situation for many decades and will be so if the regional countries do not rethink and calculate their relations in how to deal with the external powers, they must know how to recognize a friend from a foe. And they must draw their future plans with themselves only.

CONCLUSION

The study of the modern history of the region reveals the great importance that the region of West Asia occupied, regionally and internationally, over the decades in making of international and regional policies, was the focus of the great powers that saw the planting of Israel in this part of the world is easier and closer to serve their interests than other regions of the world.

The conviction of the great powers, this region is the key to control whole of the world, because it is situated in the heart of the world, as well as it is rich in natural resources and the diversity of ideological, religious and human ideas spread throughout of it. Therefore, it made this region one of the causes of regional and international tension and competition in the world. It was the beginning of the international rivalry between the two poles at that time: the socialist led by the former Soviet Union, and the capitalist led by the United States of America.

The study showed that the international policy in the region does not distinguish between friend and enemy in the self-national interest. Today's friend is the enemy of tomorrow and today's enemy is the friend of tomorrow, the enemy of one's enemy is a friend to other. There are disparities and differences in the relations in this region, especially with regard to Arab-Arab relations, Arab- American relations, Soviet-Arab relations as well as Israeli-American and

Israeli-Soviet relations, as well as the Soviet-American relations, such relations were ups and downs depend only on private interests. The study proved that the bad situation that the region has been living for a long time is to satisfy the desire of the great powers that saw their own interest to keep the region away from security, stability and peace as well as away from the keys of development and prosperity, which reflected negatively on the peoples of the region, that able to spread social diseases and promote organized crime among communities and individuals in the region as a whole.

Arab unity was the obsession and direct concern of the great powers, which posed a threat to their interests in the region. The great powers played a big role in controlling the ideas of the Arabs and not allowing them to think even in a dream of unity. The policy of the Arabs in using the oil weapon against the West and America was an indirect indicator of Arab unity, which made the United States to plead Arab leaders, so, what will happen if the Arab unity took place at all levels of culture, society, politics and leadership. For a long time, the great powers, especially the US, have been working to prevent the Arab states from being united and planted elements of suspicion, racism, hostility and hatred even among the one society members of the regional countries.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the above results, the study recommends that

1. The regional countries should rethink on their unity and joint action in order to put an end to direct and continuous interference in their internal affairs from outside countries.
2. Regional countries should rethink on their relations with foreign countries in order to distinguish a friend from a foe.
3. Regional countries should get rid of the purchase of weapons from foreign countries to stop the competition between them and free the region of weapons market.
4. Regional countries should resolve their internal issues and differences with themselves only to reduce the interference of foreign countries.
5. Regional countries should pay attention to investing their money and wealth in development, modernization and improvement rather than buying weapons from Western countries.
6. Regional countries should plan their own future independently of foreign intervention; the Arab as well as regional countries alike has to rely absolutely on themselves in the manufacture of their policies and plans distant of dependence on external powers in their internal affairs.
7. Regional countries should learn from the past lessons and not allow foreign countries to inflame tensions in the region.
8. Regional countries must put an end to Western competition for their wealth and peoples.
9. Regional countries should identify the elements are involved and responsible for the continuation of the complexity and not desire to solve the Middle East Problem.
10. The researcher believes that in event of adoption of all or some of these recommendations, the region will inevitably free from external interference, even the security and stability will spread all over the region.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author(s) is/are grateful to Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan for the financial support granted to cover the publication fee of this research article.

REFERENCES

- Abba, E. (1977). *An autobiography*. New York: Random House.
- Abdul, M.H. (1982). *The strategic conflict of the great powers in the Arab world: Fact and expectations*. Baghdad.
- Abir, M. (1974). *Oil power and politics conflict in the red sea and the gulf*. London: Frankness.
- Ahmed, M.B. (1996). *Al Hussein and the journey of peace*. Dar Al-Masirah for Publishing, Distribution and Printing, Amman.
- Alexander, L.G. (1983). *Managing the US- Soviet rivalry: Problems of crisis prevention*. Boulder, Co: West View Press.
- Arwa, S., & Yousef, I. (1996). *The future of international politics towards the Middle East*. Amman: The Middle East Center for Studies.
- Bernard, R. (1987). *The powers in the Middle East, the Ultimte Strategic arena*. New York, Praeger.
- Blima, S.S., & Paul, M. (1985). *Superpower involvement in the Middle East*. Boulder, Co. West view Press.
- Carl, L.B. (1984). *International politics and the Middle East*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dalton, R. (1991). *The near East since the First World War*. London: Longman.
- Daniel, Y. (1991). *The prize*. New York, Simon of Schuster.
- David, M. (1967). *Russia, Israel and the Arabs*. *Mizan*, 9(3), 91-100.
- Elhary, M.S. (1984). *The Iran-Iraq war: A historical, economic and political analysis*. New York, St Martin's Press.
- Frazer, T.G. (1995). *The Arab-Israeli conflict*. London.
- Georgiana, G.S. (1946). *The United States and the Middle East*. Englewood Cliffe.
- Gregory, T. (1981). *Crisis management and the superpowers in the Middle East*. London: IISS.
- Henry, K. (1979). *White house years*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- James, D.E. (1959). *The Aswan decision in perspective*. *Political science quarterly, the academy of political science*.
- Julina, S.P. (1984). *The Reagan administration and the Palestinian question: The first thousand days*. Washington: Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Karsh, E. (1989). *The Iran – Iraq War: Impact and implications*. New York: St., Martin's Press.
- Kemp, G. (1991). *The control of the Middle East arms race*. Carnegie Endowment for international Peace.
- Lacqueur, W.Z. (1959). *The Soviet Union and the Middle East*. London.
- Liqueur, W. (1974). *Confrontation: The Middle East and the world politics*. New York, Quadrangle/the New York Times Book Co.
- Mark, F. (1993). *The arms race: Round 2*. Los Angeles Times.
- Melvin, G. (1974). *The United Stated against the third world: Antinationalism and intervention*. New York: Praeger.
- Michael, C., & Shimon, S. (1973). *The USSR and the Middle East*. New York, John Wiley and sons.
- Mohamed, H.H. (1992). *Gulf War, illusions of power and victory*. Al-Ahram Press.
- Mustafa, A.S. (1982). *Egypt's international behavior during the May-June 1967 crisis*. Ph.D. Thesis, Cairo University.
- Peters, M. (1978). *Superpowers intervention in the Middle East*. London: Croom Helm.
- Richard, K.H. (1991). The Middle East and the new world order: Rethinking US political strategy after the gulf war. *International Security*, 16(2), 39-47.
- Robert, O.M. (1984). *International conflict and conflict management: Readings in world politics*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall of Canada.
- Somolansky, M.O. (1974). *The Soviet Union and the Arab East under Khrushchev*. New York: Bucknell university press.
- Walid, K. (1991). *The Middle East beyond the environment of war*. Washington, DC, Center for Palestine Studies.