

Peace Process in the Middle East after 9/11

Sara Novák

Political and International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.



Abstract

The Middle East occupies a unique geographical and strategic position. Hence, it is not a coincidence that every great power in history has sought to advance its interests in the region. In addition to its geographical and strategic uniqueness, the Middle East is the birthplace and spiritual center of the three most important monotheistic religions, namely Christianity, Judaism and Islam, as well as the greatest single reserve of oil. Last, but not least, due to its geopolitical importance, any inter- and intra-state conflict in the Middle East has the potential not only of destabilizing the region as a whole or upsetting the regional balance of power but also affecting global stability. For these reasons, the Middle East has been a major center of world affairs; an economically, politically, and culturally sensitive area. The purpose of this volume is to provide an account of international relations in the contemporary Middle East. To address the question of regional order, attention will focus on the policies of external actors – such as the United States (US), Russia, China, the European Union, and the United Nations – as well as on regional hegemonic aspirations and resulting rivalries.

Keywords: Peace Process, Middle East, 9/11.

I. Introduction

Social interactions are either associative or dissociative. Cooperation is joint activity in pursuit of common goals or shared rewards. Competition is a form of social action in which we strive against each other for the possession of or use of so limited material or non-material good.

Conflict is a dissociative social interaction, universal and ever present process in human relations. Conflict is a process of seeking to obtain rewards by eliminating or weakening the competitors. Though normally violence is associated with conflict, it can occur without it (Martin, 1983).

There are distinguished different types of conflict such as: War, Feud or fictional strife, litigation, conflict of impersonal ideals, personal conflict, racial conflict, class conflict, and political conflict, corporate and personal conflict (Jawa & Chaichi, 2015).

Many factors mentioned by scholars that effect for conflicts. Briefly stated the causes of conflict are: individual differences, cultural differences, clash of interests and social change. Horton and Hunt have classified the effects of conflict as follows:

Integrative Effects

Define issues, leads to resolution of issues, increases group cohesion, leads to Alliances with other groups, Keeps group alert to members' interests.

Disintegrative Effects

Increases bitterness, Leads to destruction and bloodshed, leads to intergroup tension. Distrusts normal channels of co-operation. Diverts members' attention from group objectives.

A view towards understanding those processes which lead to a more desirable human condition, endorse that cooperation and non-violent behavior attending among people of society are desirable and functional. The 3 Peace Conceptions have played a key role in initiating an intellectual climate that promotes research on peace. The first of these conceptions is that rational reasoning implies that peace is a natural condition and not war. The principle behind this is to do enough research and present ideas to decision makers who will then prefer peace and avoid conflicts and war. The second conception is that war is sinful according to almost all religious traditions. The last of these three conceptions is pacifism which means that pacifism is supposed to a fundamental power in human behavior (Gart, 1992).

A state of unpleasant type of conflicts is international conflicts that occasionally lead to wars. Academics and students in the world's oldest universities have long been motivated by an interest in eliminating international conflicts and suggesting solutions for maintaining world peace. Even though philosophers and individuals like thought made several attempts to understand peace and the

philosophy of peace, it was only after the Second World War in the 50s and 60s that Peace Studies developed as a formal academic discipline. Peace studies (iridology), is an interdisciplinary effort aiming at the prevention, de-escalation, and solution of conflicts. Peace Studies is classified in the following ways:

Multi-level Approach

The discipline attempts to survey intrapersonal peace between single individuals, neighbors, ethnic factions, states all the way up to civilizations.

Normative Approach

In this regard, Peace Studies essentially involves judgments regarding values and what is “good” and what is “bad.”

Multi-disciplinary Approach

Includes elements belonging to Political Science, Psychology, Economics, Sociology and Anthropology among others.

Multi-cultural Approach

This approach has so far remained a far-fetched dream since the vast majority of Peace Institutions are based in the West.

II. Statement of the Problem

This study is dedicated to examine “Nationalism” as actual blockade to successful peace among nations of the Middle East. Nationality is based upon the sense of common sentiment. Patriotism and Nationalism are two forms of Nationality sentiments. Nationalism no doubt serves as a source of integration within the state, but it is dangerous when it denies the common interest that binds nation to nation. Then it becomes jingoism, ethnocentrism or chauvinism, which is intolerant and boastful, or imperialism, which seeks territorial expansion and political domination. When nationalism separates one people from another, it impedes the development of harmonious inter-group or international relations and sows the seeds of international rivalry and wars. In its pure form, nationalism may be a beautiful ideal, but in its narrow form it becomes a cause of serious division between man and man.

Since the close of the Second World War the interest in globalization and world community has become greatly intensified. Peace studies programmers emphasize the goal of defining and furthering 'ways of working toward a just and harmonious world community.

III. Discussion

Not every plan for a settlement is a complete peace plan. Some of the recent proposals are expressly designed to subjugate one side or the other and cannot be considered "peace plans." Some of the initiatives are intended to be the basis for a peace plan or a scheme of arriving at a peace plan, but aren't comprehensive solutions and don't pretend to be. See how many states? An explanation of most of the different proposals follows (Gurr, 1993).

Sometime in the mid-1970s the term peace process began widely used to describe the American-led efforts to bring about a negotiated peace between Israel and its neighbors. The phrase stuck, and ever since it has been synonymous with the gradual, step-by-step approach to resolving one of the world's most difficult conflicts. In the years since 1967 the emphasis in Washington has shifted from the spelling out of the ingredients of 'peace' to the 'process' of getting there. ... Much of US constitutional theory focuses on how issues should be resolved – the process – rather than on substance – what should be done.

The United States has provided both a sense of direction and a mechanism. That, at its best, is what the peace process has been about. At worst, it has been little more than a slogan used to mask the marking of time (Makdisi, 1978).

The visit of Anwar Sadat, the President of Egypt, to Jerusalem in October 1977 signaled a dramatic change in the pattern of Arab-Israeli relations which was called Camp David Accord. The move, which made recognition of Israel a fait accompli, stunned the Arab world. Yet, most of the Arab world followed Egypt in negotiating peace with Israel after the 1991 Gulf War (Sandelowski, 2000).

In 1991, just after the First Gulf War, a breakthrough occurred when US president George H.W. Bush (with the help of Secretary of State James Baker) called a conference in Madrid, Spain between Israel and the Arab nations "directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict ... which ... was to serve only as a preamble to direct bilateral and multilateral talks between Israel and its neighbors.

In July 2002, the "quartet" of the United States, the European Union, the United Nations, and Russia outlined the principles of a "road map" for peace, including an independent Palestinian state. The road map was released in April 2003 after the appointment of Mahmoud Abbas (AKA Abu Mazen) as the first-ever Palestinian Authority Prime Minister. Both the US and Israel called for a new Prime Minister position, as both refused to work with Arafat anymore (Barak, 2005).

Following the Camp David Accords of the late 1970s, Israel and Egypt signed a peace treaty in March, 1979. Under its terms, the Sinai Peninsula returned to Egyptian hands, and the Gaza Strip remained under Israeli control, to be included in a future Palestinian state. The agreement also provided for the free passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal and recognition of the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba as international waterways.

In October 1994, Israel and Jordan signed a peace agreement, which stipulated mutual cooperation, an end of hostilities, and a resolution of other issues. It was signed at the southern border crossing of Arabah on October 26, 1994 and made Jordan only the second Arab country (after Egypt) to normalize relations with Israel. March 1983, Israel and Lebanon signed a ceasefire agreement (Klieman, 1980).

The roadmap for peace or "road map" for peace is a plan to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict proposed by a "quartet" of international entities: the United States, the European Union, Russia, and the United Nations. The principles of the plan, originally drafted by U.S. Foreign Service Officer Donald Blome, were first outlined by U.S. President George W. Bush in a speech on June 24, 2002, in which he called for an independent Palestinian state living side by side with Israel in peace: "The Roadmap represents a starting point toward achieving the vision of two states, a secure State of Israel and a viable, peaceful, democratic Palestine (Morgenthau, 1948).

The Saudi-initiated plan for a comprehensive peace calls for settlement of the Palestine-Israel conflict and other outstanding disputes, followed by termination of the state of war that has existed between Israel and all Arab countries and recognition of Israel. As part of the Palestinian settlement, the plan calls more or less explicitly for return of the Palestinian refugees to Israel. This plan has been revived by the Arab League summit of 2007 (Duri .A. A, 1987).

In February 8, (2005) four Middle Eastern leaders gathered at Sharm el-Sheikh, in order to declare their wish to work towards the end of the four-year Al-Aqsa Intifada. The four were: Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon; Mahmoud Abbas, President of the Palestinian Authority; Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak; and King Abdullah II of Jordan.

In his June 4, 2009 Cairo address to the Arab and Muslim peoples (see Address by President Obama in Cairo, June 4, 2009) , United States President Barack Obama called for a Palestinian state to be established side by side with Israel, and demanded an end to further Israeli settlement construction. The White House had also set a deadline for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to respond to Obama's Middle East peace initiative (Klieman, 1980).

A report by Strategic Foresight Group has estimated the opportunity cost of conflict for the Middle East from 1991-2010 at \$12 trillion. The report's opportunity cost calculates the peace GDP of countries in the Middle East by comparing the current GDP to the potential GDP in times of peace. Israel's share is almost \$1 trillion, with Iraq and Saudi Arabia having approximately \$2.2 and \$4.5 trillion, respectively. In other words, had there been peace and cooperation between Israel and Arab nations since 1991, every Israeli citizen would be earning over \$44,000 instead of \$23,000 in 2010. In terms of the human cost, estimates range from 51,000 fatalities (35,000 Arabs and 16,000 Jews) from 1950 to 2007, to 92,000 fatalities (74,000 military and 18,000 civilian from 1945 to 1995)

Two elements of "common territory" and "common sentiment" go to make up a community, how far are these two elements found in the Middle East community?

With the view of this fact my proposed research will test four following hypothesis for purpose of ensuring a community in the Middle East:

First proposal that this researcher is interested to follow up is that to reduce conflict and violent actions in the Middle East, and its geographical borders with other countries, finding some instruments and ways that are socially produced and this researcher have a suggestion of annexation

of all territories of Middle East to one territory. This researcher believes willingness of states of the Middle East especially powerful states and their populations to organize an area community regardless geographical, political border. This is one of ways that reduce violence and war among nations. For instance, it can be mentioned to Euro Union which has established by six countries in 1958 and has being extended whole of Euro continent .It is a good example because The EU operates through a hybrid system of supranational independent institutions and intergovernmental made decisions negotiated by the member states without changing in borders. This model can consider for the Middle East countries. As a result, the radical emphasis on political border can cause to increase conflict among nations and governments in today world.

Second solution for reducing war tension in Middle East is establishing democratic government, in other words whole the Middle East should be guided to being as democratic countries. Whole of the Middle East must turn into for having democratic government and structure and also all the population of the Middle East should to cooperate with each other for creating the peace full place.

Third principle that this suggestion in this proposal is to raise constantly political and economic awareness among all segments of population. Therefore, recommended democratic state can contribute that leads people to get their factual civil rights. This method prevents from monopolizing and controlling power in hands of this suggested model government. Population of the Middle East as a part of world community and must observe goodness of love toward each other as a common culture that binds them together. They must become conscious of the real cause and effects that create hatred and mistrust among them and Nations are not against nations.

Modifying approach and political views western countries and other countries about problems in the Middle East is another suggestion. Because unfortunately some countries especial western countries have led their politics according to their revenues regardless people's situation of the Middle East. In other words, other countries have more affected in happenings and problems the Middle East.

Decreasing traditional views of value political borders and creating common sentiment will reduce power imbalance among people of the Middle East. This state model end fear of states of the Middle East from expanding power by another state and therefore this model state shorten manufacturing of war instruments. So, a large amount of the world population's earnings are assigned for manufacturing war instruments and wars that can be invested for means of livelihood of world's population.

IV. Conclusion

Does this hypothesis produce practical prescriptions for managing or resolving area conflicts since "ideology always trumps objectivity and pragmatism? This researcher is full aware that in first glance such a recommended supposition is seems very imaginary, abstract, peculiar and strange. It is for the reason that these concepts are so much internalized, long-established and conventional that it is hard people even can dream of alternative and suggested models.

Furthermore it is inevitable many questions that may arise in suggesting this proposal. Whether powerful states of the world accept and endorse such sudden and asymmetrical change in the Middle East. Is it possible that this suggested idea without primary necessary changes, just with decision of states and nations of the world take place? How far this hypothesis can work out to eliminate power imbalances as the root of war and evil in the Middle East? What are resolutions for cultural differences that may increase conflict among people of the Middle East after this alteration?

A "rising power" is one that is rising economically, and its power is recognized by other states. They also project soft power and could change the status quo. A "regional power" is one that is located in a geographically defined region, is able to counter any coalition of surrounding states, and plays an influential role in regional affairs. It is increasingly becoming the regional hegemon. Middle East countries's military capabilities act as an effective deterrent against enemy forces, and will likely increase once the sanctions are fully removed. Iran, therefore, is, in fact, a rising regional power today.

V. Suggestion

Suggesting practical solutions to diminish quarrel and conflict in the Middle East.

Suggesting practical solutions for attaining equal distribution of rewards material and non-material among people of the Middle East.

Suggesting that this proposal help to reduce manufacturing war instruments and therefore creating a productive economic area system as substitute for present area economy.

Suggesting that in fact rivalry and quarrel is not among nations but among states of the Middle East. In this manner states police are against nation's integrity.

Suggesting that people can get rid of discriminations due to radical emphasis on political borders that lead to jingoism views. This proposal will have an effect on immigration policies.

References

- Barak, O. (2005). The Failure of the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process, 1993-2000. *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(6), 719–736. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343305057889>
- Duri A. A. (1987). *The Historical Formation of Arab Nationalism: A Study in Identity and Consciousness*. London, New York, Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Gart, M. J. (1992). *The warrior nation in search of peace*.
- Gurr, T. D. (1993). *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts*. Washington, D.C: Institute of Peace.
- Jawa, H., & Chaichi, K. (2015). Factors Influencing Consumer Behavior Towards Online Shopping in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Multicultural and Retrieved from* <http://ijmmu.com/index.php/ijmmu/article/view/19>
- Klieman, A. (1980). The resolution of conflicts through territorial partition: the Palestine experience. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22(2), 281–300.
- Makdisi, S. A. (1978). Flexible exchange rate policy in an open developing economy: The Lebanese experience, 1950–1974. *World Development*, 6(7–8), 991–1003. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(78\)90057-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(78)90057-8)
- Martin, D. W. (1983). *Research Dilemmas*. PsycCRITIQUES, Vol. 28. <https://doi.org/10.1037/021704>
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). *Focus on Research Methods Whatever Happened to Qualitative Description ?*