TRANSFORMATION OF THE MIDDLE EAST AFTER THE ARAB SPRING

ABSTRACT

Middle East and North Africa are for the long time mostly objects of international politics of outside powers. World reordering reflects on the local turbulences. Prospects for the consolidation of regional countries not dominated by the West were shattered in the Arab Spring and in its aftermath. IN short period of turbulences several changes are transforming the communities and international relations from Morocco to Iran. Deep crisis of governance and instability of borders, dying Peace process, the birth of the ‘Islamic State’ and general chaos are spreading through the region. They are both shaped by the conflicts initiated mostly by the USA, but also by their rising inadequacy and impossibility to control and calm the anarchy.
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Introduction

‘Winter is coming’ is frequently repeated motto of the noble family Stark in the bestseller fiction epic saga “Songs of fire and ice”, and it may apply to the immediate period after the outbreak of the events in the Arab world named as Arab Spring. Turbulences that swept the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) in the western media called Arab Spring, soon started to be described as the...

---
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winter. This game of words, spring-winter, induces the negative effect of the events and ongoing crisis in the region. Middle East, three years after the beguining of the ‘spring’ is still in turmoil and is with each passing year ever more chaotic. This may be corroborated by the results of the praised (in mass media) ‘democratic’ chaos. The outcomes are characterized mainly by the growing instability: crisis of the governance and even the state dissolution like in Libya, fading and changing borders among the formally still existing Arab Republic of Syria and Iraq and appearance of the new type of a state — Islamic state or Caliphate — aimed to ‘finally’ reverse the state engineering in the region born in decolonization process. Yemen was on the brink of the division throughout the 2014, and is heading towards federalization.

The Southern and Eastern Mediterranean – North Africa and the Middle East, as the immediate European Union neighborhood are of the highest importance for the EU security. These regions are a significant strategic source of raw materials for the Union member’s economies (source of fossil fuels and of number of ores and minerals) but they are also markets for services and final products from EU.

But, what becomes more and more evident is that regional EU ideologically driven policies of democratisation and regional cooperation with repeated failures of its Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) missions are constant show of flagrant bankruptcy of the EU.

Legacy of the USA military aggressions and actions are anarchy and state failures of countries that suffered the American democratic assistance. After the occupation of Iraq, sectarian violence erupted, it was followed by Da’ish occupation of one third of the Iraq, dissolution of the Iraqi army (trained by the USA) and the strengthened Iranian influence. Iranians replaced and partially substituted previous grip of the Americans over Baghdad. After all, in Iraq Americans are trying to repel Iranian influence by returning troops and private contractors, (officially to help fight against the Da’ish), in Yemen, US army was

---

extensively bombing with drones the anti-governmental forces and yet the Shia fighters won and took over the capital city Sanaa in September 2014.

Russia played badly in letting Libya go (votes for the UN SC Resolutions 1970 and 1973) but it assured the presence in the region by supporting and assuring the Syria against the US led military intervention.

Western policy in the region is conditioned by its expansionist agenda at the world level. Confrontation with the new rising poles, China, Russia and others necessitates the domination of other countries and regions, in this case of the Middle East.

Wars and foreign influence marked the region even before the Arab Spring. Is anything actually changing? What are the characteristics of the changes regarding the international relations and Middle East politics?

Our assumption is that the changes as the birth of the new kind of state — so called Islamic state — and contemporary spread of the failed states along with evident dying of the Middle East Peace process are different but parallel processes, changing the region.

In this paper we will present the features of the region before the outbreak of the processes named as ‘Arab Spring’ (or regionally as Islamic awakening). Afterword we will briefly examine the nature of the turbulent Arab Spring. Third chapter will describe current situation, with focus on the influence of the great powers, the regional policy of the Egypt and Turkey, the Middle East Peace process. Final chapter will provide the answers on the initial research questions.

**Before the spring**

In order to understand the region one needs to illuminate the larger context particularly in the situation when no Middle Eastern country is world power but is often client of outside players. This is mostly the result of the decolonisation, out of which most of the Arab states had emerged. Institutional weakness and lack of tradition and identity makes these societies less immune to great economic or political crisis.

MENA countries are largely energy and providers of raw materials while most of them (except for Israel, Iran, Lebanon and Turkey) are importing all finished products and are, as far regards security, recipients and not providers (again with minor exceptions of Turkey, Iran, Egypt and Syria until 2011). It is significant that in the framework of the global conflicting interests, Iran, Iraq and
Syria planned to build the gas pipeline since 2007 in the wider chain from Mediterranean Sea to China, sort of the gas silk road. Of course, this pipeline was planned to sideline the Turkey and Israel. Dominant security provider and politically dominant outside power are United States of America. Contestants of the American global power are rising national economies that challenge, although passively, new order of post sovereignty. These countries, Russia, China and partially India are taking over markets in the Middle East and are thus representing an alternative for the politics of the countries in the Middle East and in North Africa.

Beside this, in March 5, 2007 issue of New Yorker famous investigative journalist, Seymour Hersh wrote that “The U.S. has also taken part in clandestine operations aimed at Iran and its ally Syria. A by-product of these activities has been the bolstering of Sunni extremist groups that espouse a militant vision of Islam and are hostile to America and sympathetic to Al Qaeda.”

The dominant processes in the region prior to the ‘Spring’ were 1) establishment and consolidation of the American military presence which was growing until 2009, when the withdrawal from Iraq started. As long as the foreign armies were fighting against terrorism in the Middle East, Muslim anger against ‘the crusaders’ was growing and local regimes had big problems over legitimacy to cooperate with Washington and London. In the same time support in the West for the fight against terrorism was constantly diminishing; 2) Arabian authoritarian republican regimes gained power on outdated policy of Pan-Arabism and socialism (Egypt, Syria, Tunisia, Libya). Their ongoing internal crisis was aggravated with the world economic and financial crisis, 3) diminishing economical influence and trade of western European countries with the Middle East and constant rise of the trade with China and Russia; 4) political rise of the religiously oriented political movements in several regional countries as in Egypt, Morocco, Turkey and in Tunisia; 5) departure, evolution and stagnation of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, that initiated with the dissolution of the Soviet bloc (Madrid conference in October 1991). It stalled after the 2007, the year in which Russia started to question the manifestations of

---

the American global hegemony. Wider Middle East peace process progressed in the 1990s (Jordan 1994), to be stagnating in 2000s; 6) Syria withdrew its army from Lebanon in 2005, after the accusations by the Western countries over the assassination of the Lebanon’s Prime Minister Hariri; 7) USA military drone attacks started to grow mostly in Pakistan (after the Spring they initiated also in Yemen and in 2014 in Iraq); 8) In the outside world the multipolar system was rising which was regionally met with the strengthening of Iran and Turkey.

Both USA and EU countries were not able to cope with the economic advance of the Global East and losing their primacy in MENA region in peaceful times. Only major crisis could again justify the western military intervention and presence could perpetuate their dominance over the Arab world. This partially happened with the Arab Spring and further events.

The dominant regional role of United States of America and its NATO allies (Great Britain and France) was opposed only by two countries from Morocco to Central Asia: Iran and Syria. Libya, guided by Gadhafi, was largely autonomous but with fragile army and thus unable to deter foreign aggression. For this reason Colonel opted for the bilateral agreements with the western countries and signed the agreement with Italy which eventually had a clause that stipulated prohibition of the military attack from the Italian soil on its African neighbor. Many of regional countries, Algeria, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco and Turkey, were collaborating with international financial institutions in sectorial reforms, advancing privatization, but with a slower pace than in Europe. As Gregory Gause III noted “But these economic reforms backfired on those governments that embraced them most fully: Cairo and Tunis. Although both Egypt and Tunisia had achieved decent economic growth rates and received praise from

---


6 Why Libya was attacked see in: Slobodan Janković, „Libijska kriza i njene posledice”, pregledni članak, Međunarodna politika, God. LXII, br. 1142, april–jun 2011, IMPP, Beograd 2011, str. 30-51.


the International Monetary Fund as recently as 2010, politically driven privatizations did not enhance the stability of their regimes.”

In the wake of the Arab Spring Middle East countries mostly had the same regimes as in the last decade of the Cold War. With the exception of semi-occupied and war torn Iraq and Lebanon, Arab countries from Morocco to the Persian Gulf and Aden were authoritarian republics and traditional absolute monarchies. Despite the changes in Europe and in sub-Saharan Africa the Middle East and the North African countries had only one change of the regime, and even that was induced by forces from outside the region – after the occupation of Iraq in 2003, by the USA and its allies. Rest of the countries seemed to be intact by the global changes in the world order. Or it only appeared to be like that?

As far regards the Middle East Peace process, it was evident after the failure to implement the Road Map plan (A Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict agreed in 2003), that possibility to achieve the two state solution is constantly tending toward zero. Not to say that even the Road Map was itself a move to save the process after the start of Second Intifada. Holding this process ‘on the life support’ helps American strategy of projecting itself as the impartial broker and justifies its influence in the region.

Indeed, mediation in the peace process always had two direct aims for the US foreign policy: to isolate the regional enemies by not including them in the peace negotiations and to aid the Israel and try to pacify it with the Muslim countries, by formally preaching the dying Peace process.

When USA was dominant at the world level it involved the EU and Russia in the process (Road Map 2003). It did that out of need to cooperate in the divisions in the West after the unilateral decision to invade Iraq and scandal over false evidence of the existence of the WMD and nuclear program in Iraq. Since economic and political rise of the Russia was evident at least since the 2006, Washington organised the summit in Annapolis, USA (November 2007) on the Middle East Peace talks, as the only arbiter. According to Primakov, USA falsely promised to support the organization of the next meeting in Moscow, but it never happened. 10

---


As the Arab Spring continued the Peace Process fell out of focus of many Arab states. Syrian sectarian war, Islamic state, Iranian nuclear program and falling price of petroleum are more important to the emirs, which, by the way, cooperate with Israel.

Economic rise of the global East (East and south Asia, and Russia) as the manufacturing centre, capable of protecting its energy and ore riches is perceived as a threat for the transnational elites originating in the West. To deter and reverse this process is one of the goals tendered by the global elite. This view is clear in the words of Zbignew Brzezinsky, as in the speech made in October 2011.11

To stop and reverse the economic and therefore the political growth and expansion of Chinese and economy of other non-western powers series of events were planned and organised. In this context Arab spring was announced years before. Not only in the words of the former NATO general secretary and then aspiring presidential candidate for the White House, general Wesley Clark in San Francisco 2007,12 but even before by the American president himself and the group G8.

**Heat of the ‘Spring’**

After the Cold War, this region seemed to suffer little changes except for the adaptation to the dominant role of the USA and its allies in the region. Same families and often same persons maintained the rule over Arab countries from Morocco to Iran. Theocratic regime in Tehran continued to be the regional foe of the Sunni monarchies, of Israel and of USA. Yet, world economic and financial crisis and rising new multipolar order with previously announced policy of democratization of the Greater Middle East (in 2003 and in 2004)13 were outside

---


processes that rushed changes of the old regimes with outdated ideologies of Pan Arabism in Egypt and corrupt regime in Tunisia.

Outbreak of the wave of protests and uprisings in the region paired with foreign direct and non-direct military interventions was highlighting the polarization at the world level, already exposed over the Georgian war (2008) and in minor measure over the Kosovo self-proclaimed independence (2008) backed by the Western countries and opposed by many countries led by Russia and China.

Bread intifadas or what started as a food riots led to the quick overthrow of the regimes in Tunisia and Egypt and long demonstrations in Saudi Arabia, Bahrein, Yemen, Morocco and Jordan and the western led rebellion in Libya.14

What occurred since the end of the 2010 is change of the borders of the Sudan, general instability of the borders, social and economic crises and rise of migration driven by these factors. Two coups (Tunisia, Egypt) occurred and few Arabian GCC (Persian Gulf Cooperation Council) countries established the partnership with Islamic extremist groups in Libya and in Syria.

So called ‘revolutions’ were greeted by the western politicians and corporate media in Egypt in Tunisia, and in Libya (which served as the pretext for the aggression) but not elsewhere. In fact there was no western intervention against the regional suppression of demonstrations in Saudi Arabia, in Bahrain and in Yemen. On the contrary Saudi Arabia military intervened in Bahrain and in Yemen against the demonstrators without any kind of sanctions by the West. USA assisted the intervention in Yemen by using heavy drone bombing.

Democratic experience with the victory of Muslim Brotherhood ended with the military coup in Egypt (July 2013).

Several states failed: first Sudan in 2011 then Syria, Iraq, Libya and failing Yemen. In the meantime rose new entity — brutal ‘Islamic State’ (Da’ish). So called ‘Islamic state’ is being bombed by USA and its allies (France, UK and

Australia), as well by several Arab countries. But, active in the battle against takfiri jihadists in Iraq are also Iran and in Syria Hezbollah.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{Western scholar on the Arab Spring}

Portrayal of the Arab Spring as autochthonous serial process is major representation of this process even among the scholars, at least those in the West. Not only the Arab Spring, but also other processes related to it, like dissolution of Iraq and the advance of the Islamic State, are explained by Anglo-American academics as regionally and locally inspired. Hence, Monica Duffy Toft, an Oxford professor, when writing about Iraq, she puts the blame on Maliki governance and its corruption for the failure of the army and \textit{de facto} division of the state.\textsuperscript{16} She fails to present the results of occupation and the legacy of the first US imposed CIA collaborators Challabi and Allawi that led the state after the period in which the proconsul Bremmer ruled over country. On the same path are conclusions of LSE professor Toby Dodge who served as the councilor of American general and later CIA director David Petreus. Dodge obviously, when publicly analyses the situation in Iraq is unable to mention and identify American and British role.\textsuperscript{17}

F. Gregory Gause III, famous scholar on Middle East politics, much more balanced then previously mentioned, fails to present the USA destructive policies, pointing at them as non-well elaborated, as string of mistakes, but still consistent with the longer term strategy in the region. Gause mostly tries to interpret the processes in the Middle East, just like most of others, as inherently local with minor foreign influence.\textsuperscript{18} All this analysis are being done in an age of the globalization of the capital, globalization of the economic and thus political

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Though Iranian officials claim that Iran “will not interfere militarily in Iraq and Syria, but the Islamic Republic continues to provide support to both countries against ISIL in the form of defense consultancy and humanitarian aid.”, in: “Iran general killed during battle against ISIL in Iraq”, \textit{Press TV}, Dec 28, 2014, Internet, http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/12/28/392168/iranian-commander-martyred-in-iraq/, retrieved on 28/12/2014.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Toby Dodge, “From the ‘Arab Awakening’ to the Arab Spring; the Post-colonial State in the Middle East”, \textit{LSE} Internet http://www.lse.ac.uk/IDEAS/publications/reports/pdf/SR011/FINAL_LSE_IDEAS__fromTheArabAwakeningToTheArabSpring__Dodge.pdf, retrieved on 28/10/2014.
\item \textsuperscript{18} F. Gregory Gause III, “Beyond Sectarianism: The New Middle East Cold War”, \textit{Brookings Doha Center Analysis Paper} Number 11, July 2014, pp. 27.
\end{itemize}
influence, in an age of the erosion of the national sovereignty of democracy (Colin Crouch)\(^1\) in the age of the rising international dominance of the transnational corporate class.\(^2\) This is being product of the some of the officially best western scholars on the Middle East, in the years when even Princeton thorough research publishes already diffused notion that United States are no more democracy and that the decisions and the policy are guided almost entirely by the interests and the will of the big lobbies and not according to the will of the majority or for the common good.\(^3\)

Although Nathalie Tocci argues that EU neighbourhood policy is dead it blames it mostly on the exogenous factors and not on the ill designed EU policy. In effect, the EU never had policy of “more money, more markets and more mobility,” as she claims. On the contrary EU regulations for the trade relations are accumulating proportionally to the growth of the EU and foreign bureaucratic apparatus (working with the Union). EU offers money mostly for the seminars, trainings, consultancy, administrative reforms and similar and not for the investment in the economy and that is evident from different ideological – democracy promotion strategies of EU.\(^4\)

---


\(^3\) “When a majority of citizens disagrees with economic elites and/or with organised interests, they generally lose. Moreover, because of the strong status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favour policy change, they generally do not get it... Multivariate analysis indicates that economic elites and organised groups representing business interests have substantial independent impacts on US government policy, while average citizens and mass-based interest groups have little or no independent influence.”, in: Martin Gilens and Benjamin I. Page, “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens”, *Perspectives on Politics*, 12, (2014), pp 564–581.


Many scholars rushed to portrait, just as mass media, the self-immolation of one man in Tunisia as a trigger for the series of locally organised rebellions in the Arab world. But even the six cases of self-immolation, in Bulgaria, were not enough to stimulate similar process in the Balkans or at least in Bulgaria itself. Namely, the government did change but not the policies promoting neo-liberal economy against which hundreds of thousands protested and some of them were so desperate to kill themselves in officially democratic country. Immanuel Wallerstein is one of the dozens of scholars which tried to portray USA as benevolent or taken by surprise force which eventually joined the bad British and French in Libya without any hand in the Arab Spring itself. Brzezinski, sort of the global transnational class spokesman – public figure of Trilateral Commission, Bilderberg and Council on Foreign Relations, presents the same picture of Arab Spring – as independent action of young and deprived seeking more justice – although he puts it in wider prospective: “The foregoing crisis of global power is further complicated by the appearance of the sudden phenomenon of mass political awakening. Most recently in the Arab world, the now universal reality of political awakening is the cumulative product of an interactive and interdependent world connected by instant visual communications and of a demographic youth bulge composed of the easy to mobilize and politically restless university students and the socially deprived unemployed present in the less advanced societies.”


24 “In an romantic eulogy of the Revolution of the 1968 and its sequel Wallerstein claims even that “the Arab Spring has become simply one part of what is now very clearly a worldwide unrest occurring everywhere: Oxi in Greece, indignados in Spain, students in Chile, the Occupy movements that have now spread to 800 cities in North America and elsewhere, strikes in China and demonstrations in Hong Kong, multiple happenings across Africa.” In: Immanuel Wallerstein, “The contradictions of the Arab Spring”, 14 Nov 2011, Internet, http://www.iwallerstein.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/wallerstein-article-contradiction-arab-spring.pdf, retrieved on: 20/02/2012.


All these publications of established residents at the famous research centers were being produced while the evidence of the foreign background and push for the existing disaffection with the local regimes to materialize was evident all around the web.

Arab Spring reality

Food prices hikes first tested in 2008 were repeated in 2010 in organization of the Goldman Sachs Bank. So called autonomous social networkers and organisers of the rebellions were financed, trained and equipped by the American government and the American corporations and NGOs. Russian sociologist Leonid Savin noticed the same logic of events. National Endowment for Democracy, financed by the US Congress has financed for years the civil society in Tunisia and other Middle Eastern and North African countries. American formally non-governmental organizations, financed by the American government or other state institutions, helped organize people who later managed and started the so called Arab Spring. These regimes were too slow with privatization and liberalization policies advocated by the USA and had aged rulers who cherished more their authority than wishes of the foreign don. On the other hand, in Egypt particularly, the army as major economic force in the country could not favour the

---


privatisation of its own facilities and industries. The army was not interested in aiming Mubarak no longer especially having in mind desire of his son Gamal to rule after the father at the expense of the army.\textsuperscript{30} That explains how less than one million people in the country of 80 million people toppled the authoritarian president. Ouster of aged Mubarak was desire of many forces: the global corporations behind the USA, the Egyptian army and of the Egyptian Islamic opposition of course. But the American pressure on the MENA region to join the globalisation of the world economy and by that to promote the process of the new post sovereign world order with the creation of transnational corporate cartels stronger than states could not be favoured by local elites.

Despite the presence of USA, British and other western troops in many countries from Saudi Arabia to Afghanistan, the Arab and Muslim world continued to advance the economic partnership with the Global East (China, Russia and India). This irritated not only the USA and the EU but the very concept of the change of the world order from the one based on the sovereign states to the system ruled by large corporations replacing the state functions even in the security arena (with private security and military companies).

In fact in the year 1990, contemporary EU member states accounted for the 51 percent of the African commerce while in 2008 their share was only 28 percent. Egypt as the most populous country and predominantly manufacturer economy has diminished share of the export to the EU “from 41 percent in 2000 to 29 percent in 2013. India was the second-largest market for Egyptian goods during this period, with an increasing share from 3 percent in 2000 to 7.7 percent in 2013.”\textsuperscript{31} Similar is the case with Turkey. In the same period the Asian share in African trade, mostly due to China and India outpaced the EU with 29 percent share of the African commerce. Russian export to Africa has been growing 25 percent per year in the period 2000–2008 and the Chinese export grew in the same period 39 percent per year.\textsuperscript{32} Trade volume between China and the WANA (West Asia and North Africa,


term used by the Chinese to describe 22 Arab states plus Turkey, Israel and Iran) or the Middle East, was $268.9 billion in 2011, with the year-on-year growth of 36.5 percent. Chinese trade with the sole Arab countries in that year reached $222.4 billion, an increase of 14%, a new record.34 Value of trade between India and MENA was "USD 135bn in 2012, up from USD 2bn in 2004."35 In fact even with the digitalization of economy and rise of the share of the speculative finance in the West (virtual economy) the real economy of the BRICS countries is so rapidly growing that nominally "(T)he share of developing economies in GDP at current exchange rates rose to 39% in 2011 from 24% in 1980."36 This partially explains how the share of export trade of EU with MENA countries dropped from 46% in the year 2000 to 30% in 2011.37

So what is actually going on in the MENA countries?

**Changes**

Transformation in the Middle East stems from internal and external processes, mentioned above which were rushed with the Arab spring. Crisis of governance and states based on post-colonial order produces new realities. Current state of the processes in the MENA region is characterized by negative phenomena which historically precede the rise of the new epoch. These are dying Peace process, the collapse of sovereignty and of state in part of the Middle East and the consequential instability which destroys entire regions and induces unprecedented waves of migration internally and internationally.

Middle East Peace process started in 1977 among the Arab countries and the Israel (Firstly between Egypt and Israel) and in 1991 initiated the Israeli-

---


36 Giorgia Giovannetti, “Trade Relations among Mediterranean Countries”, *IEMED, Strategic Sectors: Economy and Territory*, Mediterranean Yearbook 2013, p. 3.

Palestinian Peace process which is smaller but is the core of the wider Arab-Israeli. After the Arab Spring, Muslim countries and in particular the Arabian monarchies are collaborating more with Israel. In 2013, “Israeli President Shimon Peres gave a secret speech to 29 representatives from Arab nations in November via livestream as part of the Gulf States Security Summit in Abu Dhabi… Everyone understood that this is something historic: The president of the Jewish State is sitting in his office in Jerusalem with an Israeli flag, and they’re sitting in the Persian Gulf talking about security, war on terror and peace.” 38 That was in the middle of the latest Israeli-Palestinian negotiations that ended without even the formal results in April 2014.

Disappearance of Libyan state, the wars on the territory of that former country, the changing borders or Iraq and Syria affecting the stability in Lebanon and in Jordan are moving an unprecedented number of immigrants, illegal and legal toward the EU principally. If the year of the Arab Winter (or Spring) hit the record high for the number of illegal immigrants who were detected entering the EU (141,000 people) in 2014, according to the preliminary data all records are broken. EU agency FRONTEX should publish that around 270,000 people were detected illegally entering the EU via sea or the land in the sole 2014. 39 “In October 2014 the UN refugee agency UNHCR said more than 165,000 irregular migrants had tried to cross the Mediterranean to Europe in the past nine months, compared with 60,000 for the whole of 2013.” 40 Size of internal displacement in Iraq as one of the consequences of nascence of the Da’ish is more than 1.7 million newly displaced persons from 1 January to 28 September, 2014. 41

However there are also positive processes in the sense of new constructions and not in its character: these are the creation of new entity — brutal ‘Islamic

State’ (Da’ish), and the enhanced security cooperation among the GCC countries, that got the speed after the ‘revolutions’ in Egypt and in Tunisia.

Less visible change is American fading ability to organize the new order. Namely, willingness of the USA and British elites to maintain dominant role by preventing other great powers from asserting their influence in the region and controlling the regional players, eventually resulted even with their influence being diminished in two important regional countries: in Egypt and in Turkey. Egyptian military government announced “preliminary deal in September (2014) for Cairo to buy arms worth $3.5 billion from Moscow” and other trade deals.42 Turkey in lieu of the attempted regime change by the American resident Fethullah Gullen and the creation of the autonomous Kurdish territories in Iraq and in Syria decided to play on two chairs and struck an energy deal with Russia at the end of 2014.

Failures in Yemen (with Shia fighters winning against western backed dictator), previously in Iraq, unsuccessful initiative to attack the Bashar’s Syria and the implosion of Libya show that Western planners are still able to destroy and seed anarchy but are unable to provide for the stabilization. After their direct or non direct interventions, countries in the MENA region are mostly drowning in the fratricide conflicts or the American opposed groups are taking advantage as in Egypt (the military), in Yemen (Shia group) and in Iraq (Iranian influenced government and the Islamic state). Clearly the American primacy in MENA countries has weakened to the point that it produces more chaos than stability. Other product is at least partial alienation of some regional countries from the USA influence. It is the case not only with mentioned Turkey and Egypt but that was early the case also with Iraq, or the larger part of it, as noted already in 2007.43

The inability of USA to impose its own policy and conflict of the West against Russia with another eye on China will reflect on the region. Much of the processes will be shaped based on the global interactions and conflicts among the big powers and regional alignments induced by sectarian clashes and existence of the Da’ish. Conflict in Ukraine is clear example of the nature of conflict between eroding dominance of the USA and the western elites on the

42 “One contradictory aspect of the new strategy is that, in Iraq, most of the insurgent violence directed at the American military has come from Sunni forces, and not from Shiites. But, from the Administration’s perspective, the most profound—and unintended—strategic consequence of the Iraq war is the empowerment of Iran.” In:

43 Seymour M. Hersh, “The Redirection”, op., cit.
one hand and the Global East (China, Russia, and India) on the other. West resorts
to chaos as ultimate mean to stop delay or reverse the process of the
multipolarisation of the world order destabilizing among others the Middle East.
In this process of the world reordering borders are becoming more fluid while
several states are failing or splitting into tribal and sectarian controlled territories.
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