

The Problem of Economic and Political Security in the Middle East

Kamaletdinova Kamila ¹

¹ Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies 2nd year student of the Master's degree in International Relations and World Politics

Annotation:

Currently in the Middle East often armed conflicts and war. After 11 September 2001, these conflicts are not only regional, but also international. They have a devastating impact on the lives of the people of this region. Families are destroyed, children cannot go to school, people are unable to meet even the most basic needs. We can say that the political and economic security is the most pressing problem in the middle East.

Keywords: economic security, political security, armed conflict, war, Middle East, interdependence.

Undoubtedly, the nature and level of the economic system of any state largely depends on the political environment - the forms of political government and political regime, the nature of political power, the level of development of civil society, the personality of the country's political leader, the composition of the political elite, the degree of development of the country's political system, etc. As noted by Ch. Merriam: "In reality, politics and economics have never been separated from each other. There is practically no political movement that does not reflect economic interests, or an economic system in the preservation of which political order would not be the most important factor. One of the main problems of social organization is the relationship between the economic and political parts of the organization and the government. It influences the nature of the organization at the city, state, national and international levels."¹.

The famous French political scientist F. Beneton wrote that "the functioning of the economy is subordinated to politics in various ways: the economy is free only when politics does not impose a

¹ Beneton F. Introduction to Political Science. Moscow: The Whole World, 2002.

command economy, this free economy presupposes the security of exchange and, consequently, public order, it also presupposes a system of property rights, which only political power can re-establish"².

The levels of economic security are determined by the following factors:

1. The priorities of the state's economic policy in relation to industries that provide a competitive advantage for enterprises of the national economy.
2. The economic and military-political power of the country and its competitive position in the global economic system in strategically important areas of development.
3. The orientation of the country's institutional system to support the branches of the industrial economy, on which the level of national security depends.
4. The parameters of the sectoral and regional structure of GDP, the strategic importance of sectors of the national economy and regions of the country to ensure national security.
5. The availability of reserves of strategically important material goods of the first and highest order in amounts sufficient to ensure economic security in conditions of force majeure.
6. The geopolitical and economic-geographical position of the country and the associated location of productive forces on the territory of the country. As well as access to domestic and foreign resources.

Aspects of activities that directly affect and are aimed at maintaining the most effective level of economic security :

- Development, adoption and execution of legislative acts that optimally ensure the preservation and maintenance of this level.
- Control of budget execution and prevention of misuse of funds.
- Fighting corruption at all levels.
- Investments in the development of new technologies and knowledge-intensive industries.
- Strengthening and optimizing the activities of the special services and the army.
- Development and optimization of the political and economic system of government.
- In-depth comprehensive analysis and creation of conditions for the prevention of emergency situations, including man-made disasters, and the most effective elimination of possible consequences.

The most significant feature of the development of the geopolitical situation in the Near and Middle East is that it is here that the greatest number of intra-State conflicts, wars and armed conflicts have occurred in recent decades on the basis of interstate political, economic, interfaith, inter-clan and interethnic disagreements, contradictions and confrontation. And the trend continues. The most recent examples in this regard are the events of the so-called the "Arab Spring", the armed conflict in Syria, the armed clash between Israel and the Palestinians of the Gaza Strip and the constant escalation of military threats against Iran by the United States and Israel

The Middle East is home to the centers of three world religions - Christianity, Judaism and Islam³. The intersection of their interests often generates tension and conflicts, and all this will persist

² URL: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_danger_is_a_danger.

³ Naumenko T. V., Grinyuk A. I. The problem of culture in the aspect of intercultural communication // Philosophy of economy. 2013. № 6.

indefinitely. The interests of not only regional but also major world powers intersect here. This has been the case for many centuries. In this regard, the 21st century will not be an exception.

The years 2010-2012 were a period of violent internal political upheavals and armed conflicts for a number of Arab countries in the Middle East and North Africa (Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Yemen, Tunisia, Libya). These events have been dubbed the "Arab Spring" in the information field and in the current political lexicon. As a result of mass urban protest rallies of the population, street clashes, protesters with the police and the military, situations of nationwide rebellion and armed confrontation have arisen in a number of these countries. As a result, the presidents of Tunisia — Ben Ali, Egypt — Hosni Mu-barak, Yemen — Ali Abdullah Saleh lost their posts. Several governments of other countries have been dismissed. During the armed rebellion in Libya, directly supported by France, Britain and other NATO countries, as well as Saudi Arabia and Qatar, the head of state and one of the leaders of the Arab world, Muammar Gaddafi, was killed⁴.

Strictly objective and clear assessments of the events of the "Arab Spring" do not seem to have appeared today. Nevertheless, it cannot be said that they were all spontaneous, spontaneous and uncontrollable. It was felt that the accumulated dissatisfaction among the population of most Arab countries with their living conditions and existing orders was actively fueled both from within and from outside. After all, we know the history of this area and its place and role in the modern general geopolitical history of the world. And this was confirmed by the way these events developed and by their results.

The problem of ensuring national security and its foundations in the context of globalization has its own specifics when it comes to certain countries, specific regions - from Afghanistan to Algeria, from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. To some extent, such a spatial overview turned out to be accidental. Getting to know him allows you to pay attention to one important circumstance: how huge, it turns out, is the zone of instability covering the regions of East Asia, the Middle and Middle East, and the Mediterranean. At the same time, it should be noted the following:⁵

- high saturation of conflicts of various natures: interstate, intra-state; interfaith and intra-confessional, ethnic. Some of these conflicts have a long history and require special therapy;
- economic backwardness. Only a small group of countries with small populations and access to oil has been able to provide a consistent standard comparable to industrialized countries. The asymmetry mentioned above in the context of global economic development is particularly obvious here;
- a high degree of militarization. Some countries are some kind of record holders in the purchase of weapons.

And, perhaps, it is worth mentioning one more factor. In recent years, a very alarming trend has emerged, namely, the radicalization of Islam, which is acquiring militant and extremist forms that are dangerous both for the States themselves and for their neighbors. The internal terrorism of Islamists observed in Algeria has been supplemented by international terrorism, which Russia has faced in the North Caucasus and Kyrgyzstan in Central Asia.

The world of Islam is facing an internal challenge today. The authority of this faith will largely depend on how well Islam copes with this challenge. It is quite obvious that strengthening global and regional stability and security is impossible without resolving the conflicts existing in this area, a number of which have acquired a protracted long-term character. At the same time, it must be

⁴ URL:<http://mir-poHtika.ru/2551-osobennosti-i-tendencii-razvitiya-geopoHticheskikh-processov-na-bHzhnem-i-srednem-vostoke.html>

⁵ Naumenko T. V. "The Fourth power" as a sociological category // Credo new. 2007. No. 2.

stated that the potential for distrust, hostility, and suspicion is extremely high and creates enormous difficulties in finding ways to overcome them. And yet, there is no other choice.

Economic power, on the other hand, is not something formalized, represented by the relevant institutions. This is the power of wealth, capital, and the ability of representatives of capital to influence political decisions and public policy in general. For the most profitable use of capital, they influence the government in various ways, seek benefits, most-favored-nation treatment, and influence the legislative process in their interests. As the political scientist M. Duverger noted, economic coercion is very close in origin to physical coercion. Anyone who can deprive a person of his means of livelihood easily obeys him. Moreover, political power and economic coercion are closely linked. As a general rule, in all historical epochs, the class that owns the means of production and wealth has both political influence and holds power.

Without a doubt, economic and political power are not necessarily concentrated in the same hands. It is true that in the liberal states of the 19th century, the power of money existed almost in its purest form. Today, this is no longer so true: trade unions, workers' parties, various kinds of groups, and high-ranking officials form a large number of centers of power competing with financial and industrial magnates. The situation of such pluralism guarantees, however, some freedom. But it is very fragile: the very development of technology encourages more and more state intervention in the economy, which generates a tendency to concentrate political and economic power to unprecedented proportions. The level of economic support for the process of formation of political power plays a very significant role. No less important is the role of the economic factor in the process of legitimizing political power, i.e. in ensuring the trust and support of the people. The most respected are those Governments whose policies ensure high rates of economic development and contribute to improving the standard of living of the people. Therefore, as the famous French political scientist Jean Blondel wrote, "modern political leaders do not have to choose whether to implement a policy of continuous development of their countries or not. They should only pursue such a policy, otherwise they will not be able to stay in office"⁶.

Politics is talked about as the art of the possible. This can be attributed to economic policy with even greater justification. No economic policy is able to bring the country out of a deep crisis in a few days. However, no country can fail to pursue a certain economic policy. It varies from country to country: everything depends on the economic condition of the country, on the strategic course pursued in it. Economic policy changes at different times, even within the same state. It cannot be the same in countries with developed market economies and in countries in transition to a market economy. In other words, economic policy is dynamic in its structure, directions, and goals, just like life itself.

After the military actions in Iraq, the number of regional politicians who consider nuclear weapons to be almost the only guarantee against foreign interference is constantly growing. They believe that the possession of such weapons may be the subject of a lucrative diplomatic bargain. It is advisable to consider the fundamental problem of the transformation of the role of the nuclear factor in the GCC countries in the context of the general multilevel security problem in the Middle East.

The relations between the GCC member countries can be considered as the first level. The second level, including the first, covers Egypt, Sudan, Israel, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, Cyprus, Turkey. The third level of security can be represented by the relations of all the above-mentioned states and expanded at the expense of Iran and Afghanistan. The external level is determined by relations with extra-regional global forces.

⁶ URL: <http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php?nArtId=814>

When analyzing the state of the security system in the Middle East, it is important to keep in mind that before 1991 there was a bipolar structure of international relations. Small countries generally adapted to this system, which left room for maneuvering between the poles, although in each case the maneuver was limited by an appropriate set of factors. At the same time, the risks were more predictable. Currently, in the presence of multivariance, they are more difficult to calculate.

Consideration of the contradictions within the framework of the first level of the chosen security model, formed by the six monarchies of the Persian Gulf, shows that over the past three decades of the twentieth century, they were mostly latent, not taking the forms of open conflicts. Having the same type of regimes with ruling family dynasties, similar social structures, pursuing common goals at the subregional level, defending common interests in the oil market, these states interacted quite closely with each other. Under the influence of specific reasons, the degree of tension between the Arabian monarchies sometimes increased. Nevertheless, the situation did not get out of control and did not assume the character of an open military-political confrontation. All the Arab monarchies of the Gulf had to take into account the opinion of the "elder brother" - Saudi Arabia, which resorted, if necessary, to appropriate pressure to prevent a split.

The influence of Israel, Turkey, Egypt and Syria on the security of the Persian Gulf was indirect rather than direct. It affected through the participation of these countries in the formation of the military and political situation in the Middle East, the involvement of the Gulf States in the Arab-Israeli confrontation and the peace process, the traditional Arab-Turkish rivalry, Israel's interest in weakening Iraq, Iran and Saudi Arabia, which support the Arab states. Egypt and Syria sought to establish their presence in the Persian Gulf primarily in the expectation of receiving loans and credits from the oil monarchies, so the range of their actions in this region was more limited. The Iran-Iraq factor, which also covers the third level of the security problem, posed the greatest danger to the GCC countries until 2003, since both Iran and Iraq claimed a dominant role in the Persian Gulf zone. Moreover, if the KSA limited its foreign policy ambitions to five neighboring monarchies, then Iraq harbored the idea of extending its control to the entire Arab part of the Gulf (including Saudi Arabia), which in practice led to the distancing of all GCC regimes from the radicalist Baghdad.

However, the "Arab Six" countries saw a special danger to their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity in Iran, which claimed unconditional dominance in the subregion, reinforcing its claims by building up the military machine, the most powerful during the Shah's rule not only in the Persian Gulf zone, but also in adjacent areas. The military and technical weakening of Iran during the Islamic Revolution did not reduce the degree of its foreign policy claims, but only gave them an ideological justification. In the context of the growing Iranian threat, the security problem has come to the fore for the GCC countries.

The leading industrialized countries that make up the outer tier of the security model under consideration are strategically linked to the Persian Gulf, an important source of providing them with hydrocarbon fuel and energy raw materials. Within the framework of the existing bipolar world, the West and the USSR defended economic and military-political frontiers in this region, but failed to hold positions in Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan. Western countries have relied on the Arab monarchies, which still remain in their sphere of influence. Within the framework of the modern unipolar system of international relations, the task of ensuring security in the Middle East is set differently. Despite the lower stability compared to the bipolar system, the monopolar structure of international relations, especially over a long period of time, turns out to be temporarily preferable for small states that can join a superpower in order to protect themselves from a very real external threat. Thus, unipolarity can be tactically useful for some countries in certain conditions. A similar situation has developed in the Persian Gulf since the 90s of the last century, when the potential Iranian threat and Iraqi aggression brought the GCC countries even closer to the United States and

other Western states. However, it is reasonable to assume that, as these sources of danger are eliminated or weakened, as well as in the event of the emergence or intensification of new challenges and threats, the interest of the Arab monarchies of the Gulf, and, first of all, Saudi Arabia, in the American "umbrella" may decrease. Consequently, their dissatisfaction with monopolarism may increase, which creates obstacles to the realization of their own interests.

1. Given that nuclear weapons continue to play a certain and important role in regional power balances, it is possible to identify factors that stimulate the processes of its spread.
2. The discrepancy between the actual role of the state and the role it claims in the region. In this case, the desire to possess nuclear weapons looks like a desire to gain the necessary prestige, but in fact it is a desire to provide military technical conditions for the formation of one's own sphere of influence within a particular region.
3. A sense of strategic vulnerability in the face of stronger neighbors or a more powerful highly developed state, causing a desire to obtain nuclear weapons as soon as possible, which, if it does not ensure the fulfillment of "offensive" tasks, then at least insures the country from complete defeat and guarantees the internationalization of the conflict in a crisis situation.
4. The desire of the regional center of power to ensure its hegemony by cutting off the opportunities of other countries in the region to effectively use allied ties with extra-regional forces to counter this hegemony.

Theoretically, it can be assumed that with a certain development of the international situation, Saudi Arabia's interest in possessing nuclear weapons is likely to increase due to each of these factors.

1. if the KSA wants to gain a leading position in the Middle East with the weakening of not only Iraq, but also Iran (which is possible, for example, after military actions against the latter);
2. when Saudi Arabia feels a real danger coming from nuclear Israel, Iran (in the case of its creation of nuclear weapons), or even the United States.

With the KSA striving to ensure its hegemony in the Middle East in the event of Iraq's independence, under the leadership of the Shiite government after the withdrawal of coalition troops and under certain circumstances, relations of cooperation between the KSA and Shiite Iran may arise, including in the military-strategic field. Then the third factor will be considered as stimulating the process of nuclear weapons proliferation in Saudi Arabia.

As for Egypt, it is likely that in the coming decades, it is theoretically possible to assume the influence of only the second of the above-mentioned factors as an incentive to possess nuclear weapons in the event of a feeling of real vulnerability in the face of Israel.

In general, it can be noted that under certain conditions, in relation to both Egypt and Saudi Arabia, several approaches to the possession of nuclear weapons that already exist in different regions can be predicted and evaluated accordingly:

1. Nuclear weapons as a deterrent to ensure the military and political survival of the state;
2. Nuclear weapons as a means of deterring a regional or global enemy possessing WMD;
3. Nuclear weapons as a means of deterring superiority in conventional weapons;
4. Nuclear weapons as a means of achieving political hegemony at the regional level;
5. Nuclear weapons as a means for profitable diplomatic bargaining, as well as as an object of national and confessional pride⁷.

⁷ URL: <http://www.wpec.ru/text/200709130945.htm>

There is also no doubt that the political system of society cannot function normally without adequate economic support for political processes. Therefore, the interconnection and interdependence of the political and economic systems of society is a universal phenomenon characteristic of all States in all periods of their history. Practice shows that the impact of the economic system on the political system is manifested in many ways

References:

1. Beneton F. Introduction to political science. M: The Whole World, 2002.
2. East: problems of regional security: Institute for the study of Israel and the Middle East. Russian Academy of natural Sciences. M: GNU RF “NIOPIK”, 2000.
3. Duverge M. Political institutions and constitutional law / Anthology of world political thought. M., 1997. So 2. .
4. Merriam Ch. Including New aspects of politics / Politics: a reader / Ed.: Professor M. A. Wasylyk, Assoc. M. S. Vershinin., M: Gardariki, 2000.
5. Naumenko T. C., Grinyuk A. I. The problem of culture in the aspect of intercultural communication. Philosophy. 2013. No. 6.
6. Naumenko T. C. “The Fourth power” as a sociological category. New Credo. 2007. No. 2.
7. URL: https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Экономическая_безопасность.
8. URL:<http://mir-politika.ru/2551-osobennosti-i-tendencii-razvitiya-geopoliticheskikh-processov-na-blizhnem-i-srednem-vostoke.html>
9. URL: <http://www.m-economy.ru/art.php?nArtId=814>
10. URL: <http://www.wpec.ru/text/200709130945.htm>