Contents

Volume 8, Issue 3, September 2014

Book Reviews

Unequal Power, Unequal Reach

Reflecting on Iran-Bahrain Relations

Mitchell Belfer

Observers and media commentators remain divided over the role that Iran has played in stoking political tensions inside Bahrain. While some are convinced that geostrategic calculations are undoubtedly behind Tehran's encouragement of sectarian violence between Bahrain's Shia and Sunni communities, others think that Manama has exaggerated the extent of Iran's involvement in the Kingdom's political crisis. Either way, this small and sparsely populated Middle Eastern state remains more than capable of keeping Iran's seemingly growing influence over its domestic affairs in check – provided that it sticks to a three-point plan.

The View from Tehran

Iran's historical and strategic interests in Bahrain predate the emergence of the Islamic Republic. Tehran has never fully accepted the independence of the Kingdom (formally declared in 1971) and continues to maintain that the island state is one of Iran's 14 provinces. Underpinning this sentiment is the fact that approximately 50% of Bahrainis are Shia Muslims, some of which share close sectarian affinities with Iran. Proximity is also an important factor. Given that Bahrain is located close to the sensitive Strait of Hormuz, Tehran is wary of the role that the Kingdom could play in applying pressure on Iran. With

its modern port facilities and related infrastructure, Bahrain offers the ideal staging post for international powers seeking to project power throughout the Persian Gulf and safeguard access to its oil and gas reserves.

Adding to Iran's sense of strategic vulnerability are Bahrain's relations with the other Gulf monarchies. With its close military and political ties to the West, Tehran has long viewed Saudi Arabia as a formidable rival and a major obstacle to its own bid for regional hegemony. As part of its attempts to offset the challenge posed by Riyadh, Iran has consistently sought to apply pressure on Bahrain. Tehran's strategies have ranged from shunning bilateral dialogue and confidence-building measures with Manama, to using Bahrain's political crisis to keep the embers of violent sectarianism burning.

Party Support

In the case of the latter, Iran's attempts to manipulate Bahrain's domestic politics might have been aided by its close ties with some of the Kingdom's main opposition parties. These include the al Wefaq bloc, a legitimate Bahraini political organization with a seemingly credible agenda. The al Wefaq bloc's current Secretary General (and original founder) Ali Salman was hand selected for a leadership post by one of Bahrain's leading Shia clerics Issa Qassim. In 1979, Qassim offered his spiritual support to Ayatollah Khomeini's leadership of the Iranian Revolution in return for Tehran's support for his bid to assume religious authority over Bahrain under very similar circumstances.

During the 2011 unrest, Qassim called on his followers to crush Bahrain's security forces, while Ali Salman openly agitated for the demise of the al Khalifa government. Around the same time, the al Wefaq gave orders to its fringe group, the radical Youth of 14 February movement, to launch attacks on public and private properties belonging to the Kingdom's Sunni and expatriate communities. These included the targeted killing of police officers and Shia opposition figures loyal to Manama, as well as car bombings and arson attacks. Speculation also continues to grow over the Youth's links to Hezbollah and Iran's al-Quds Force, ties that are thought to have facilitated arms smuggling networks, military training and financial assistance.

Three Steps Forward

Hard evidence of support for the most radical wing of al Wefaq will undoubtedly add substance to arguments that Iran has helped to turn Bahrain's long-standing political tensions into a low-intensity insurgency. If so, then Manama must show that it is up to the task of countering Tehran's influence over Bahrain's Shia community and address the conditions on the ground that make political dissent such an attractive proposition. It can do so by focussing on three core issues.

To begin, Bahrain must acknowledge that it can only counter the threat posed by Iran by maintaining its alliances with regional and international partners. First and foremost, Manama should look to the security apparatus provided by the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), particularly if it can offer assistance along the lines of 2011's Peninsular Shield Force deployment. However, the GCC members are by no means united on the threat posed by Iran, given that Oman and Qatar have far better relations with Tehran than the likes of Bahrain and Saudi Arabia.

With this firmly in mind, Manama should also look at constructing a second ring of strategic partners to complement – and possibly even replace – its relations with the GCC. Two potential allies stand out. Turkey's status as a frontline NATO member in the battle against the Islamic State – not to mention its general opposition to Iran's nuclear program – undoubtedly offers Bahrain a completely different sense of strategic depth. And then there's Azerbaijan, a predominately Shia but nonetheless secular state that has experienced its fair share of border tensions and diplomatic spats with Iran. Both states could provide Manama with opportunities to build up strategic ties that could place further pressure on Iran's northern and western frontiers. If this occurs, Tehran might then have to revisit and rethink its aspirations for regional hegemony.

To complement what is effectively a strategy of containment, Bahrain must also limit Tehran's ability to agitate inside the country. In this respect, Manama should redouble its efforts to address Bahrain's deep-seated socio-political and economic disparities and construct a deeper sense of national identity. The signs seem encouraging. In the aftermath of the 2011 violence, King Hamad bin Isa Al Khalifa set up the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (BICI), a body which made 26 recommendations on how to reduce the country's domestic tensions through reforms. Since then, however, the Bahraini gov-

ernment has been criticized for slowing down on implementing key reforms and is accused of glossing over human rights issues. Consequently, Manama must do more and continue to develop a political system that reflects the needs of all citizens, irrespective of their ethnic or religious background. It should also take the bold decision to exclude the al Wefaq and its associates from the reform process. This would send a powerful message to ordinary Bahrainis that the government is not prepared to work with political organizations that receive the type of external support that effectively undercuts the Kingdom's law and order mechanisms.

Finally, Bahrain needs to realize that it is currently losing the information war with Iran. Since the mid-1990s, Tehran has expended tremendous energy and resources on developing a tech-savvy propaganda campaign to flood cyberspace and traditional media with messages that reinforce Iran's regional power aspirations while at the same time debasing the rule and legitimacy of its adversaries. These include multimedia channels with a distinctly Arabic component, such as Al Alam and Al Vefagh. Admittedly, such channels are difficult to counter in an information age. However, Bahrain's practically non-existent counter-propaganda strategy is puzzling and needs to be reversed. Put simply, the Bahraini government needs to do more in terms of projecting its narratives not just for countering Iran, but also for the sake of national identity and cohesiveness.

The (Uncertain) Road Ahead

There's no guarantee that these steps will completely eradicate Iran's strategic interest in Bahrain. They will, however, demonstrate that Manama is prepared to up the ante against Tehran. In addition, this approach undoubtedly reinforces that the Iranian-Bahraini relationship is asymmetrical by nature. Bahrain will never have the military muscle or geopolitical clout to counter Iran's regional aspirations on its own. However, by paying due care and attention to its precarious domestic situation and working in concert with its international and Middle Eastern allies, Manama should be able to weather whatever regional storm that awaits it in the years ahead.

Author's note: This article was first published by ISN Zurich

Research Articles

The New Age of US–EU–Chinese Relations and Dilemmas

Miloš Balabán

This article examines the world's key actors – the US, the EU and China – and analyses their political, economic and security relations as well as their stances on geopolitical and global economic development. Asia-Pacific is investigated as the chief determinant of global development and also, thanks to US-China relations, as the new geopolitical centre of gravity. This research explores the contradictory nature of this relationship, which though mutually beneficial in terms of economic cooperation, shows signs of distrust in political, economic and security relations, generating potential conflict. These actors are promoting many approaches. The dilemma that the US currently faces in this relationship is whether to contain China as a threat or accommodate it as an equal power. The US's potential treatment of China not only influences how China performs in the Asia-Pacific region, but also has repercussions for the EU. The key question for the EU is to what extent it should take on security commitments in the Asia-Pacific region. This article concludes that despite the contradictions in the bilateral relations between the "West" and China, it is desirable to achieve what Kissinger called 'co-evolution of interest.'

Keywords: the United States, China, Europe, Asia-Pacific, crisis, limits interests, alliance, conflict, cooperation, containment, pivot, military strategy

Introduction: The Global Shift toward Asia-Pacific

According to the US National Intelligence Council's 2012 study *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds*, the next two decades will mark an increase in China's economic and political power and a shift of the global

economic engine to the Asia-Pacific region.[1] Moreover, at the end of the third decade, Asia will overtake both the EU and North America in a number of indices, such as GDP, population statistics, military spending and technological investment, with other things being equal. As the study further reveals, by 2030, China will become the world's largest economy, replacing the US. While as a result, the "Western" influence will decrease, the US and EU will retain sufficient economic, technological and military power in global affairs. Following this logic, a new era of world history is approaching, with China being the new global power, ending 500 years of "Western" dominance in world affairs. This will heavily affect the US's image since its superpower status will be eroded and, in the best case, will become 'first among equals.'[2] Consequently, the declining US influence will reflect in the EU's global role as well.

Notwithstanding the balance of power, global developments in the next two decades will chiefly be determined by the contradictory relations among the US, EU and China.

The US in an Age of Adjustment

The beginning of the millennium has been marked by a change in the priorities and positions of the hitherto strongest global power: the US. The era of unchallenged American dominance (*Pax Americana*) is a thing of the past. What comes instead is an "age of adjustment" to the new global political and economic realities worldwide closely associated with the tenure of the 44th US president, Barack Obama. Three major tasks to be fulfilled during Obama's term of office are: 1. ending the decade-long wars in Iraq and Afghanistan inherited from the previous administration; 2. carrying out large-scale internal reforms to restore the economic competitiveness of the US; and 3. standing up to the growing political, economic and security power of China. According to William:

> Obama and his national security team believe that the United States needed a new strategic doctrine to match changes in the world, including the ending of US deployment in Iraq and impending force reductions in Afghanistan. A new doctrine was also needed to reflect the slowing US economy, tighter constraints on US resources and an urgent commitment to cut the widening gap between America's rich and poor.[3]

The slowdown of the US economy is also linked to the "internal crisis" – the factor that according to Ferguson, is contributing most to the erosion of the US's global position. This position largely depends on successful financial management without which the US can hardly remain the world's greatest military power.[4] Currently it is financial management precisely that is one of the US's major problems: US debt is projected to grow in upcoming years (with the $16.7 trillion [USD] owing in 2013 expected to reach $18.6 trillion [USD] by 2015), and already this impedes US political, economic and military power on a global scale. The Congressional Budget Committee outlook predicts that by the end of the 2010 decade, the US government will be forced to earmark 17% of its income just for interest payments (from 8% in 2009). In this respect, if almost one-fifth of the US budget is to be spent on interest payments, military spending is likely to further decline.

The financial impact of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq must also be considered. Bilmes has analysed both wars in detail, concluding that they will cost the US between $4 and $6 trillion [USD] over the long term. These numbers represent approximately one-third of the projected US debt in 2015. The US has already spent $2 trillion [USD]; further funds will be needed in the long run for veterans' care.[5]

The US Defence Department is already preparing for defence cuts: the total amount saved on defence over the next decade should reach $500 billion [USD]. Sequestration realities are also evident in the department's internal 'Strategic Choices and Management Review' published by US Secretary of Defence Chuck Hagel in July 2013. The budgets for military headquarters should be reduced by 20% with military salaries and benefits due for reform. Troop numbers may be cut substantially as well: as military conflicts with the US engagement draw to a close and America abandons the COIN (counterinsurgency) strategy, land forces will be scaled down (the lowest of the proposed targets is 420,000 in the active component and 490,000 in the Army Reserve). The tactical air force and C-130 transport aircraft will also be subject to reductions. In sequestration debates, doubts have even been expressed about the planned acquisition of the costliest weapons system in history: F-35 JSF fighters (the US government wanted to purchase 2,443 of these fighters for $391 billion [USD]). Sequestration may, thus, diminish the US potential to engage in military conflicts and project power on a global scale.[6]

The defence budget's impact can also be seen in the altered US military strategy published in January 2012 under the title 'Sustaining US Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense.'[7] The document clearly signals that the US is abandoning its traditional two-war strategy (maintaining the ability to wage two conventional wars simultaneously); instead, it is moving towards a full focus on winning a single armed conflict while avoiding defeat in a potential second conflict. The main emphasis is put on the US's deterrence potential.

Miloš Balabán

The new military strategy also states that 'China's emergence as a regional power will have the potential to affect the U.S. economy and our security in a variety of ways.' This acknowledgement signals the readiness of the Obama administration to focus US political, economic and military potential on the Asia-Pacific region. It also means that the US will engage less in other regions of the world. Donilon, national security advisor to Obama, explains that the White House has carried out a strategic review of priorities which revealed an imbalance in the US's global projection of power. According to Donilon: '[I]t was the President's judgment that we were over-weighted in some areas and regions, including our military actions in the Middle East. At the same time, we were underweighted in other regions, such as Asia-Pacific.'[8] Practical steps by the administration have followed this conclusion: during NATO's operation in Libya (2011), the US opted to "lead from behind;" it has also given only modest support to the French operation in Mali (2013) and has maintained a very reserved stance on the possibility of engaging in the Syrian conflict (2013).

Europe's importance in US policies is gradually diminishing as a logical consequence of post-Cold War history. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist bloc underpinned by the military strength of the Warsaw Pact, Europe ceased to be the primary focus of interest for US power. Instead, the US's key power struggles shifted towards the Asia-Pacific. Therefore, it makes no military sense for the US to maintain a huge American military presence in Europe: since the end of the Cold War, 85% of American troops stationed in Europe have been withdrawn. During the Cold War, Europe was home to 450,000 American troops stationed at 1,200 military bases, while today the US maintains only 21 such bases for 61,000 troops in total. As has been mentioned, the reduction of the US military presence is largely economically motivated (i.e. by budget cuts).

Nevertheless, the US still regards Europe as one of the world's key regions for several reasons. The two sides of the Atlantic are bound together by shared values, historical and security ties embodied in NATO and, last but not the least, by strong economic ties. The numbers underpin these facts: bilateral trade reached €702.6 billion in 2011; daily trade in goods and services between the US and the EU is worth €2 billion while bilateral direct investment comes close to €3 trillion. Together, the US and the EU generate almost half of global GDP (47%, of which the EU is responsible for more than 25% and the US for over 21%) and almost a third of global trade (the EU = 17%, the US = 13.4%).

The US-China: Relations and Dilemmas

Notwithstanding the US's stable European orientation, the principal focus of its global political, economic and security strategy is relations with the People's Republic of China. Due to this shift in US priorities, China overshadows US-EU relations in many aspects: the Sino-American connection has become the world's most important bilateral relationship.

Over the last forty years, China has undergone a fundamental transformation, moving from economic irrelevance and political isolation to the status of a respected global actor. The US has also contributed to this change since the American business spirit has combined with Chinese trading talent to form the US-China tandem. The data listed below show this clearly:

1. Annual bilateral trade exceeds $500 billion [USD] (2012: $536 billion [USD])
2. The US is China's second largest trading partner (the EU is the largest)
3. China is the third largest trading partner of the US, after Canada and the EU
4. China is the largest exporter to the US (exports stand at $425 billion [USD])
5. China is America's largest creditor: its holdings of US government bonds are worth $1.2 trillion [USD]
6. 60% of Chinese foreign currency reserves (with a total value of $3.31 trillion [USD]) are held in US dollars (which means that China is interested in the US dollar's stability).

Against this backdrop, there are factors that pit the two against each other: their histories, ideological and cultural differences and security interests. According to Donilon, in US-Chinese relations 'there are elements of competition and cooperation.'[9] On his first official visit to China in April 2013, US Secretary of State, John Kerry, defined Sino-American relations as a 'new power relationship' and a 'new type of relationship.' Still, the reality is somewhat more complex. US military expert, Betts, may got to the heart of the matter when he wrote that Washington must decide whether to treat China as 'a threat to be contained or a power to be accommodated.'[10]

Containment is already being applied. In the new US military strategy (January 2012). The document noted that China and Iran continue to pursue asymmetric means to counter the US's projected power capabilities. The US therefore aims to invest in the military capabilities required to operate in anti-access\area-denial environments.[11] Even the current level of the US military presence in the Asia-Pacific indicates a continued reliance on military power as one of the tools for containing Chinese influence. With a budget representing 40% of global arms spending, the US is certainly able to maintain strong military capabilities in the Asia-Pacific.

The Pacific is home to the largest regional headquarters of US armed forces, with 330,000 military personnel, 180 ships, 2,000 aircraft, five ground-force brigades and also two marine divisions stationed at Japanese and South Korean bases. Moreover, the US navy controls the main sea routes from the Persian Gulf to Asia. According to (former) Defence Secretary Leon Panetta, in 2012 the US planned to concentrate 60% of all its naval forces and capabilities in the Pacific by 2020.[12] The US also decided to station 2,500 marines in Darwin, Australia on a rotational basis.

However, this heightened projection of US military power in the Asia-Pacific is also a consequence of increased tension in the South China Sea. Its islands give rise to numerous territorial disputes between China on the one hand and Japan, Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia and Brunei on the other. Recently, these tensions and disagreements have accumulated (re: between China and Japan)[13] despite China's successful resolution of eleven long-term territorial disputes with six neighbouring countries over the past fifteen years. Some of the aforementioned countries opposing China (Japan and the Philippines) are US allies try-

ing to take advantage of the US "military umbrella," while others (e.g. Vietnam, involved in a war with the US some forty years ago) seek military or political cooperation with the US as a way of counterbalancing China. And, the US provides military aid to Taiwan.

The official Chinese reaction to the US's "Asian Pivot" is undoubtedly negative, highlighting an 'anti-Chinese subtext' in the increased US presence in the region. Chinese officials' statements are quite resolute, stressing China's readiness to counter the increasing military presence of a foreign power in its geographical backyard. Former Chinese president and Chinese Communist Party general secretary Hu Jintao declared at the party's 18th national congress (October, 2012) that China was firm in its resolve to uphold its sovereignty, security and development interests and that it would never yield to any outside pressure.[14] His successor, Xi Jinping made a similar statement at a "collective education session" of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee January 2013: '[F]oreign countries should not expect that we will trade on our own core interests, nor expect that we will eat the bitter fruits of damaging our country's sovereignty, security and developing benefits.'[15]

The above statements by Chinese leaders should be understood in a broader historical context since one of the tenets of present Chinese policy is the resolution never again to accept any kind of inferior international status. This is the result of the First Opium War (1842), a century-long curtailment of China's sovereignty referred to by Chinese historians as the 'Century of Humiliation.' This period ended only with the establishment of the People's Republic of China on 01 October 1949.

To prevent history from repeating itself, China is very assertive about its priority strategic interests, supporting them with both military and economic power. Since March 2010, these priority interest areas have been the South China Sea, Tibet and Taiwan. China's rising military budget evidences the growth of its military power: from $32.1 billion [USD] in 2000 to $143 billion [USD] in 2011 (as estimated by the Stockholm Institute for Peace Research (SIPRI)). Even so, the Chinese military budget bears no comparison with its US counterpart, which according to SIPRI data, reached US$711 billion in 2011 (making China's military spending five times smaller).[16]

But China is also developing certain military capacities and capabilities to counter the projected US power. One example is the Chinese

space programme because of which China became the third country in the world capable of launching its own spacecraft in 2011. This may be one of the reasons why US experts have predicted that despite the massive difference in US and Chinese nuclear warhead potential (China's intercontinental ballistic missile arsenal ranges from 70 to 75), both countries will eventually reach mutual vulnerability level.[17] The shooting down of an old weather satellite by a mid-range ballistic missile in January 2007 confirmed China's possession of anti-satellite weapons. This fact makes the US take Chinese nuclear capabilities seriously: eight of the fourteen US nuclear submarines are permanently deployed in the Pacific.

Miloš Balabán

As a result, China is paying increased attention to developing its navy. In 2012, its first aircraft carrier Liaoning was launched,[18] and the deployment of DF-21 D anti-ship long-range missiles (designed for an attack on US aircraft carriers) is still in progress. This makes clear the Chinese strategic intention: to deny the US navy access to the western part of the Pacific and thus prevent it from approaching Taiwan.

China's capacity for cyberspace operations is also on the rise. In this context, the (former) US Defence Secretary, Harold Brown, concluded that reaching 2030 without a major confrontation between the US and China will be an important achievement. The US will probably hang onto its military power predominance for at least the next fifteen to twenty years. An asymmetrical war could, however, undermine America's advantage if China, in addition to infrastructure attacks, resorted to cyber-attacks on the US electronic and satellite systems.[19] Moreover, the Sino-American cyberspace rivalry could affect bilateral trade relations: a resolution passed by the US House of Representatives in March 2013 bans all purchases of information systems wholly or partly manufactured in China, except for those vetted by the FBI to rule out the possibility of cyber espionage or sabotage.

Pragmatic Relations, But No Chance of a "G-2"

It is becoming clear that there is the potential for an open US-China military confrontation. Yet, from their embryotic form Sino-American relations have been based on political pragmatism. China established bilateral relations with the US in 1972 during the Cold War (largely due to the efforts of Henry Kissinger, who was then national security advisor to President Nixon). China's intention was to create a counter-

balance to the USSR, with which it fought a costly border war against in 1969. Conversely, the US saw the rapprochement with China as an opportunity to deepen the international isolation of the USSR. Despite similar initial intentions, Sino-American relations were tested by many turbulent moments over the following three decades including the Tiananmen Square protests (1989), the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade during the NATO operation against Yugoslavia (1999) and the Hainan Island incident involving a clash between Chinese and US military aircraft (2001).[20]

There are many signals that China does indeed take a pragmatic view of bilateral relations with the US in the Asia-Pacific region. When he was China's Deputy Foreign Minister, Cui Tiankai highlighted this issue in an article published in *China International Studies* (2012). Commemorating the 40th anniversary of Richard Nixon's first visit to China (21-28 February 1972), this article analysed the situation in the Asia-Pacific, noting that positive interactions between China and the US foster the interests of both countries as well as serving those of all states in the region. Moreover, the Asia-Pacific region is large enough to hold both China and the US.[21]

This conclusion was developed further by General Xiong Guangkai, a prominent Chinese military official in an article in *International Strategic Studies*. According to Guangkai, security in Asia is inseparable from US foreign policies. In his words, Asian countries want China and the US to face the challenges in the Asian security space jointly and assume joint responsibility for providing security, maintaining communication and coordinating steps on key regional issues.[22] A presidential meeting between Xi Jinping and Obama (September 2013) in the framework of the G20 negotiations in Russia confirmed these conclusions. On this occasion, Xi Jinping declared that 'the Asia-Pacific is the region that best displays [the] shared interests of China and the United States' and that 'the scope for bilateral cooperation is larger than the differences.'[23]

US-Chinese bilateral cooperation strongly affects security policy, including, for example, the US-China Strategic Security Dialogue, consultations on Asia-Pacific issues and the twelve China-US defence consultations involving top military representatives on both sides. The two countries have also established a hotline for direct communication between their defence ministers – a framework that previously

existed between the Cold War superpowers (the US and USSR). This arrangement between China and the US epitomises the new and exceptional status of US-Chinese relations.

US-Chinese security cooperation also covers such issues as non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) (e.g. the six-party talks on the North Korean and Iranian nuclear programmes) and combating terrorism and piracy. Evidencing the latter, China's active participation in anti-piracy operations in the Gulf of Aden shows that it is assuming greater responsibility for global security.[24]

According to the Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED), it is, however, extensive economic cooperation which is the most important ingredient of bilateral relations, and this is still present between China and the US. The growing importance of US-China bilateral cooperation may raise speculations about the emergence of a "G-2" – a core axis of power in 21st-century global governance.

In 2009, former national security advisor to President Carter, Zbygniew Brzezinski, defined the basic tasks and contours of this 'Group of Two' in a *Financial Times* article titled 'The Group of Two that Could Change the World.'[25] Brzezinski concluded that despite the competitive nature of the US-China relationship, the level of mutual dependence between these countries requires them to discuss not only issues of bilateral cooperation, but also global ones (e.g. the widening and deepening of geostrategic cooperation beyond the immediate need for close collaboration to cope with the economic crisis). According to Brzezinski, an informal "G-2" is especially needed in an era in which the risks of a massively destructive 'clash of civilizations' are rising and must be eliminated. It is therefore essential that the US-China dialogue contain a very broad range of regional and global issues such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Indian-Pakistani relations, North Korean and Iranian nuclear programmes, WMD non-proliferation, climate change, stepping up UN peacekeeping activities in failed states and enlargement of the existing G-8 to G-14 or G-16 to develop a more inclusive response to global challenges, especially the economic crisis.

Nevertheless, China has been reluctant to respond to this vision, partly because of the influential legacy of Deng Xiaoping, the father and animating spirit of Chinese reforms. In the 1990s, Deng declared that China should maintain a low profile and be a calm observer of international affairs, never claiming leadership, hiding its capabilities

and biding its time. He did not explain, however, why China should hide its capabilities or when "its time" would come. Even so, China continues to follow Deng's strategy. Internationally, it rarely initiates activities that could be interpreted as attempts to revise the existing global order. The focus of its international policies is definitely economic development or economic cooperation "in all directions," which cements China's regional and global position. This approach is also advocated in the 'China's Peaceful Development' document – a de facto declaration of China's political, economic and security priorities in today's world. It states, among other things, that 'China has decided upon peaceful development and mutually beneficial cooperation as a fundamental way to realise its modernisation, participate in international affairs and handle international relations.' The document also notes that the strategy of peaceful development distinguishes China from other rising world powers, who, as their global ambitions grew, fought over colonies and spheres of influence, often opting for military expansion into other states.[26]

The official stance also indicates the limits of China's engagement in tackling global challenges and crises. There is a marked cautiousness, perhaps stemming from the realisation that Chinese policies must ensure the country's continued smooth modernisation through economic development since this is the basis for domestic political and economic stability. Brzezinski's vision of a more active Chinese involvement in global affairs – not only in economic matters, but also in politics or security – is seen by China as potentially dangerous as it could negatively impact both its international standing and its domestic policy. Undoubtedly, China follows the lessons learned from recent international engagements by the US (especially those in Iraq and Afghanistan), which left America weakened. Still, it should not be overlooked that, despite this official self-circumscription of Chinese foreign and security policy, there is an internal debate in China about the possibilities and parameters of its international engagement. According to Shambaugh, the debate reflects the conflicted nature of Chinese foreign policy, which oscillates between efforts to 'join the club' of world powers, the wish to remain a regional power and the ambition to retain the title of 'leader of the developing world.'[27] Yan Xuetong has a distinct voice on this internal debate. In late 2011, Xuetong wrote that since only the US and China can afford to spend more

than $100 billion [USD] annually on military budgets, we are seeing a transition 'from one superpower and several strong powers to two superpowers and several strong powers.'[28]

But Xuetong's article (dubbed the 'Chinese foreign policy manifesto' by Russian and Chinese studies expert Mikhail Mamonov[29]) also produced other conclusions. One of these is that interfering in other countries' internal affairs is justifiable, i.e. China has the right to define its 'core interests' whose defence may even require extreme measures. The article also calls for a redistribution of responsibility and leadership powers in multilateral organisations to enhance their effectiveness. A key element is the emphasis on China's readiness to consider a potential increase in its responsibility for global processes by consulting the US.

*Miloš
Balabán*

A Heightened Geo-Economic Confrontation between the US and China

Xuetong's conclusions could be taken to suggest that the emergence of a "G-2" is a viable long-term prospect in the development of Sino-American relations. However, increasing economic competition between China and the US in the Asia-Pacific, which has taken on new dynamics since the end of 2012, contradicts this assumption. Currently we are witnessing the emergence of two competing regional economic groups led by China and the US. China supports the formation of a new regional economic coalition – "ASEAN[30] + 6" – comprising the ten ASEAN countries plus Australia, China, South Korea, Japan, India and New Zealand. At the ASEAN+6 Summit in November 2012, participants announced the opening of talks on the establishing of a "Comprehensive Regional Economic Partnership" (CREP). It can be assumed that this group, with a total population of three billion people and an aggregate GDP of $17 trillion [USD], would be dominated by China, representing nearly half of this population and 50% of the GDP.

In contrast, the US supports another kind of regional economic cooperation: the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) founded in 2005. Currently, this consists of thirteen Asia-Pacific countries and also includes Latin American states.[31] The US declared that it regards TPP as a basis for a regional free trade area. Just as China has a leading position within the CREP, the US can dominate the TPP (generating 75% of its aggre-

gate GDP). In many cases, the two groups have also offered membership to the same countries (which are now conducting pre-accession negotiations). Brzezinski commented critically on this recent development:

> I'm sorry that the Trans-Pacific Partnership idea that we are propagating doesn't include China. I think that this is a mistake. But I also know there is a Chinese proposal, for an Asian cooperative sphere, which does not include us. We are both making mistakes.[32]

The clash between China and the US over the status of the Asia-Pacific as an economic hegemon also has geopolitical implications. The transatlantic area is currently seeing efforts to establish the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) between the EU and the US; they aim to create a trade bloc representing almost half of global economic output and remove existing trade barriers between the two transatlantic actors. At the beginning of Obama's second term, TTIP was nicknamed "economic NATO." The phrase was coined by American lawyer and diplomat C. Boyden Gray whose article 'An Economic NATO: A New Alliance for a New Global Order' was published by the influential US think-tank this Atlantic Council, chaired until recently by US Defence Secretary Chuck Hagel.[33]

The diminishing importance of the "old NATO" for US security is being discussed by the US security and political community. The core of the debate is America's criticism of European NATO members' declining military capabilities and the consequential US reluctance to "make up" for this deficit at the expense of its own budgetary stability. In this context, the concept of an "economic" NATO, represented by TTIP, might enable Europe to play an important economic role in US strategic interests. According to economic forecasts, by 2030 none of the European countries will be among the most developed economies in the world. Thus, TTIP may be one of the prerequisites for Europe's continuing influence on global affairs. The main prerequisite, however, is definitely the completion of European integration, which looks to be difficult given the EU's existing economic problems.

Obama may try to integrate the two regional economic blocs (TTP and TTIP) creating an "alliance" of US associates in North America, Europe and the Asia-Pacific. This would give the US the opportunity to reverse the decline of its global political and economic clout in recent years and face the rising political and economic influence of China.

The US, Asia and Europe Drawn Apart by Divergent Economic and Political Interests

There are many obstacles on the way to achieving the vision outlined above. Firstly, maintaining existing alliances with the US-friendly Asian states may be a challenge since these countries face a difficult dilemma. On the one hand, they wish to retain US security aid while, on the other, they have an equally strong interest in economic cooperation with China, which influences their socio-economic development and stability. It remains to be seen which of the two interests will prevail. From an economic standpoint, however, it is clear even now that Japan, South Korea and ASEAN states value their trade relations with China far more than those with the US. Moreover, many Asian countries with strong development dynamics are fierce competitors of the US in international commerce. This raises an interesting paradox: while the US holds a "military umbrella" over its Asian allies, the states thus sheltered are becoming increasingly prosperous due to their economic relations with China and also because their own economic boom is not significantly retarded by large-scale arms spending. Their prosperity is, thus, achieved partly at the expense of the US. Therefore, it is not entirely unthinkable that the US, confronted with financial challenges, will demand that its Asian allies shoulder a greater share of financial responsibility for the American military presence. This, in turn, could cause some tension in bilateral relations.

US–EU–Chinese Relations

There are several reasons why the US wishes to diversify its "portfolio of alliances" in the Asia-Pacific. Panetta made an appeal in this direction during his last European tour (January 2013), stating that 'Europe should join the United States in increasing and deepening our defence engagement with the Asia-Pacific region ... Europe should not fear our balance to Asia; Europe should join it.'[34] In practical terms, this would mean greater military involvement of the EU and NATO in Asia, alongside the US. This is not a new idea in the case of NATO. In 2004, the then US ambassador to NATO Nicholas Burns came up with the concept of a "global NATO," which was developed two years later by his successor, Victoria Nuland. The core of the concept was the strengthening of NATO's cooperation with Australia, Japan and South Korea so as to make the alliance a truly global military power. This possibility of "going global" was also the focus of NATO's November 2006 summit in Riga, Latvia; this failed, however, to win support from the majority

of member states despite UK endorsement. The concept's most vocal opponents were France and Germany, which allegedly feared that such "strategic globalism" would undermine NATO's internal stability and have a negative impact on relations with China and Russia. In addition, most NATO members were and still are reluctant for purely practical reasons: with their limited military capabilities (further weakened by crisis-induced spending cuts), taking on new strategic commitments in the Asia-Pacific would hardly be practicable.

From a military perspective, the most important capability for operating in the region is the naval force. But only 3 out of 28 NATO members have navies capable of operating in oceanic waters. Among European NATO members, France is the only state equipped with an aircraft carrier (the Charles de Gaulle) and experts believe that NATO's presence in the Asia-Pacific can only be symbolic.[35] However, an even greater obstacle to the EU and NATO's more active engagement in the Asia-Pacific lies in the divergent political and economic interests of the US and Europe. Escalating existing or potential security tensions in East Asia that are visible in territorial disputes, might significantly damage European interests as the EU has strong trade ties with the region (four of its ten "strategic partners" – China, Japan, South Korea and India – are East Asian countries). The EU also faces another major risk: in contrast to Europe, the whole Asia-Pacific region has no institutional security framework that would prevent bilateral and regional conflicts or, in case of their breakout, facilitate their peaceful settlement. This is one of the reasons why the EU and the US jointly participate in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). In June 2012, ARF held top-level negotiations which led to the signing of the US-EU Statement on the Asia-Pacific Region. The document declares that the parties can act jointly to help solve issues in the region such as maritime security, WMD non-proliferation, cyberspace security and fight against piracy.[36] The same interest in cooperation is reflected in the 'Guidelines on the EU's Foreign and Security Policy in East Asia' document (June 2012), which confirms that the EU has a strong interest in partnering and cooperating with the US on foreign and security policy challenges related to East Asia.[37]

However, most European governments are unwilling to engage in the region beyond expressing diplomatic support for US actions. There are two principal reasons for this attitude. Firstly, Europeans want to avoid being "dragged" into the US-Chinese power race that largely de-

26

termines Asian developments in political, economic and security terms. Additionally, they do not want to engage with the dilemma mentioned earlier: whether to treat China as a threat to be contained or an equal power to be accommodated. The strength of EU-Chinese economic ties is evidence that EU governments are interested first and foremost in economic cooperation. China is the EU's largest source of imports and the second largest destination for European exports after the US (e.g. in 2012 total bilateral trade between the EU and China reached €434 billion). Moreover, Germany is China's most important European trading partner, responsible for a solid third of EU-China trade (€144.3 billion in 2012). The basic logic of the EU approach has also been echoed by French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius, who said, during his August 2013 visit to Indonesia, that the French 'pivot' to Asia will focus on diplomacy and trade.

Miloš Balabán

The second reason for the European reluctance to engage more actively in the Asia-Pacific is the realisation that the EU's first priority must be the security and stability of its own neighbourhood, especially North and Sub-Saharan Africa, the Sahel and the Middle East. In view of the EU's strategic interests, the Asia-Pacific is of secondary importance. Within both the US and the EU, there are voices arguing in favour of a convenient division of responsibility between the two key global actors: if the EU focuses more on its own neighbourhood, the US will be free to engage in other regions. The UK Defence Secretary Philip Hammond declared quite openly in Singapore (June 2013) that the future will mean 'Europe doing more in its own backyard as the US tilts to [the] Asia-Pacific.'[38]

Afterthoughts: The Parallel Evolution of Interests – A Path to Stability

In viewing Europe's engagement with Africa solely in this context, Hammond may have overlooked one geopolitical reality which shows how interconnected the interests of the key global actors have become. Recently the EU has also begun to pay attention to Africa in the security context since many countries of the African continent, so close to Europe geographically, have come under the pressure of radical Islam. Recent developments in Mali, which necessitated direct military intervention by EU-supported French troops, are just the proverbial

27

tip of the iceberg. Enormous economic and societal instability in Africa, which leads to state failure, is likely to persist.[40] Notwithstanding the relative economic boom in a number of African states, nicknamed the "African Lions" (Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, Zambia, Angola, Uganda, Rwanda and Ethiopia), Africa has many foci of security instability. Examples are the Darfur conflict in West Sudan; the existence of Somalia, a failed state serving as a base for terrorist and pirate groups operating in Sub-Saharan Africa; the Horn of Africa and the Gulf of Aden; and the September 2013 Islamist attack on a commercial centre in the Kenyan capital of Nairobi.

It is not only the US, freed to intervene in other world regions where its interests are at stake, that may benefit from Europe's interest in Africa's political, economic and military stability. Another beneficiary will definitely be China, which has been expanding rapidly into Africa in recent years. This can be described as an unexpected state of affairs among the three global actors. However, it should be noted that the EU and China take different approaches in their relations with African countries.

The Asia-Pacific region will reflect the real scope of the convergence of interests since it is a new geopolitical and economic centre of gravity of high importance for the US, the EU and China. The competition between the West and China for political, economic and security influence will definitely continue, but according to Henry Kissinger, the US, EU and China should focus on a co-evolution of interests and accept that these will never be identical. This veteran of American diplomacy, who opened the way for the normalising of US-China relations, believes this to be the only path towards the Pacific Community without which Asia's future might copy that of Europe on the eve of the First World War (Kissinger 2011). With the centenary of its outbreak approaching, Kissinger's words should not go unnoticed.

∽

MILOŠ BALABÁN heads the Centre for Security Policy, which forms part of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University in Prague. He can be reached at: *balaban@fsv.cuni.cz*.

public to Changing Economic, Social, Demographic, and Geopolitical Realities' (vg20132015112).

Notes

1   National Intelligence Council (2012), *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds.* Available at <http://www.dni.gov/files/documents/GlobalTrends_2030.pdf>

2   F. Zakaria (2008), *The Post-American World*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.

3   W.R. Smyser (2012), 'The Obama Doctrine,' *The Atlantic Times*, 09 February. Available at <http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_contentHYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"&HYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"view=articleHYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"&HYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrineHYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"&HYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"catid=62%3Afebruary-2012HYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"&HYPERLINK   "http://www.the-atlantic-times.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=489%3Athe-obama-doctrine&catid=62%3Afebruary-2012&Itemid=2"Itemid=2> (accessed 18 September 2013).

Leading American economist and Nobel prize winner Joseph Stiglitz notes that the top 1% of Americans receive about one-fifth of all income and control more than one-third of all wealth. More than 80% of income goes to the highest-earning 20% of the population, while the living standard of the middle classes stagnates. According to Stiglitz, the deepening welfare inequality in American society undermines economic growth and weakens democracy. See Stiglitz (2012) *The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future*. W. W. Norton & Company, p.448.

4   N. Ferguson (2009), 'An Empire at Risk,' *Niall Ferguson*, 14 December. Available at: <http://www.niallferguson.com/journalism/finance-economics/an-empire-at-risk> (accessed 11 August 2013).

5   J.L. Bilmes (2013), 'The Financial Legacy of Iraq and Afghanistan: How

Wartime Spending Decisions Will Constrain Future National Security Budgets.' hks Faculty Research Working Paper Series rwp13-006, March. Available at <https://research.hks.harvard.edu/publications/workingpapers/citation.aspx?PubId=8956> (accessed 16 July 2013).

6   According to Andrew Krepinevich, president of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessment and a leading us expert on defence budgets and military strategy, the defence budget cuts threaten to curtail investment into capabilities which the United States may not have in sufficient supply in the future. Krepinevich believes that while the United States will still be able to take part in peace operations, wars like those in Afghanistan and Iraq will be beyond its capacity, and if future conflicts require weapons to facilitate enemy elimination, the United States might not be capable of engagement.

7   us Department of Defense (2012), 'Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense.' Available at <http://www.defense.gov/news/defense_strategic_guidance.pdf> (accessed 12 October 2013).

8   T. Donilon (2013), 'The United States and the Asia-Pacific in 2013,' speech to the Asia Society, New York, 11 March. Available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/03/11/remarks-tom-donilon-national-security-advisory-president-united-states-a> (accessed July 16 2013).

9   Ibid.

10 R. Betts (2013), 'The Lost Logic of Deterrence,' *Foreign Affairs*, March/April. Available at <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138846/richard-k-betts/the-lost-logic-of-deterrence> (accessed 14 September 2013).

11 us Department of Defense, 'Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense,' pp. 4-5. Available at <http://www.defense.gov/news/defense_strategic_guidance.pdf> (accessed 12 October 2013).

12 E.L. Panetta (2012),'Shangri-La Security Dialogue,' speech delivered in Singapore, 02 June. Available at <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1681> (accessed 22 July 2013).

13 The escalation of the Sino-Japanese dispute over the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands caused a 3.3% drop in bilateral trade in 2012.

14 Hu Jintao (2012), 'Firmly March on the Path of Socialism with Chinese Characteristics and Strive to Complete the Building of a Moderately Prosperous Society in All Respects: Report to the Eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China,' speech delivered at the opening of the 18th National Congress of the cpc, 08 November. Available at the Qiushi Organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China website <http://english.qstheory.cn/leaders/201212/t20121210_199290.htm> (accessed 27 September 2013).

15 A. Lomanov (2013), Куда приводит китайская мечта, *Mir i politika*, April. Available at <http://mir-politika.ru/4950--uda-privodit-kitayskaya-mechta.htmlHYPERLINK "http://mir-politika.ru/4950--uda-privodit-kitayskaya-mechta.html%3e%20(accessed">HYPERLINK "http://mir-politika.ru/4950--uda-privodit-kitayskaya-mechta.html%3e%20(accessed" (accessed 06 October 2013).

16 sipri (2012)*, sipri Yearbook 2012*. Available at <http://www.sipri.org/year-

book/2012/files/sɪᴘʀɪʏʙɪ2Summary.pdf.>

17 Center for Strategic and International Studies (2013), *Nuclear Weapons and U.S.– China Relations*, Available at <http://csis.org/publication/nucle-ar-weapons-and-us-china-relations> (accessed 23 July 2013).

18 Originally called *Varyag*, this rebuilt vessel (an aircraft cruiser in the Soviet classification) used to belong to the Soviet navy. Begun in the mid-1980s, its construction was in progress at the time of the breakup of the Soviet Union. The unfinished carrier was assigned to Ukraine, which, however, lacked money to complete the construction, and in 1998, auctioned the vessel off to China where it was to serve as an amusement park. China eventually decided to complete, modernise and use its purchase in order to gain experience in operating this category of vessels. The aircraft carrier was launched into service on 25 September 2012.

19 H. Brown (2012), 'America's Trouble with China,' *Project Syndicate*, 19 November. Available at <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/from-competition-to-confrontation-for-the-us-and-china-by-harold-brown> (accessed 14 September 2013).

20 In April 2001, a ᴜs reconnaissance aircraft collided in mid-air with a Chinese fighter plane in the area between the Chinese island of Hainan and the ᴘʀᴄ military base on the Paracel Islands. The pilot of the fighter plane died as a result of the collision, and the 24-member crew of the damaged ᴜs aircraft had to resort to an emergency landing at Hainan Island airport, where they were subsequently detained and interrogated. After eleven days, the Americans were released, and ᴜs representatives sent Chinese leaders what is known as the 'Letter of the Two Sorries.' It expressed regret at both the death of the Chinese pilot and the aircraft's unauthorised entry into China's airspace and emergency landing on Chinese territory.

21 C. Tiankai (2012), 'Firmly Promote the China-ᴜs Cooperative Partnership – Commemorating the 40th Anniversary of the Shanghai Communique.' *China International Studies*, March/April.

22 X. Guangkai (2013), 'Asia's Peaceful Development and How It Relates to the U.S.' *International Strategic Studies*, 2nd Issue, p. 3.

23 *China Daily* (2013), 07-08 September.

24 Two Chinese destroyers and a supply ship operate in the Gulf.

25 Z. Brzezinski (2009), 'The Group of Two that Could Change the World,' *Financial Times,* 09 January. Available at <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/d99369b8-e178-11dd-afa0-0000779fd2ac.html#axzz2ZsW3gt9R> (accessed 23 July 2013).

26 Information Office of the State Council, the People´s Republic of China (2011), *China's Peaceful Development*, Beijing, p. 30.

27 D. Shambaugh. (2013), *China Goes Global: The Partial Power,* Oxford University Press. Shambaugh identifies seven main schools of thought: Nativism (isolationist nationalism); Realism (activist nationalism); the Major Powers School, which sees the conduct of international affairs in terms of a concert of powers; the Asia First group; the Global South School, which believes China's main international identity is that of leader of the developing world; Selective (realistic) Multilateralism; and Globalism (liberal

institutionalism). As for the relative strength of these ideological positions in the various Chinese institutions relevant for foreign policy-making, the Chinese army is the domain of the Realists, while the Ministry of Foreign Affairs prefers the concert-of-powers perspective and leadership in the developing world.

28 Y. Xuetong (2011), 国际格局由一超多强转向两超多强 (*From One Superpower and Several Strong Powers to Two Superpowers and Several Strong Powers*), *Global Times*, 30 December 2011, p.14. The original article is available in Chinese at <http://www.carnegietsinghua.org/2011/12/30/%E5%9B%B-D%E9%99%85%E6%A0%BC%E5%B1%80%E7%94%B1%E4%B8%80%E8%B6%85%E5%A4%9A%E5%BC%BA%E8%BD%AC%E5%90%91%E4%B8%A4%E8%B6%85%E5%A4%9A%E5%BC%BA/ex3w> (accessed 27 September 2013).

29 M. Mamonov (2012), 'The Return of the USA to Asia,' *Russian International Affairs Council*, 12 September. Available at <http://russiancouncil.ru/en/inner/?id_4=786#top> (accessed 27 September 2013).

30 ASEAN includes Brunei, the Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.

31 Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, South Korea, Canada, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the United States and Vietnam.

32 Z. Brzezinski (2013),'China's Biggest Challenges Stem from Success,' *Global Times*, 18 March. Available at <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/768876.shtml> (accessed 18 September 2013).

33 B.C. Gray (2013), 'An Economic NATO: A New Alliance for a New Global Order,' *Atlantic Council Issue Brief*, February. oAvailable at <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/files/publication_pdfs/403/tar130221economicnato.pdf> (accessed 06 October 2013).

34 Leon E. Panetta (2013), 'Remarks by Secretary Panetta at King's College London,' transcript of speech, January 18. Available at <http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=5180> (accessed 27 September 2013).

35 M.R. Farley (2012), 'European Powers No Longer Have Role Across Pacific,' *Global Times*, 14 August. Available at <http://www.gobaltimes.cn/content/726942.shtml> (accessed 28 September 2013).

36 US Department of State (2012), 'US-EU Statement on the Asia-Pacific Region', 12 July. Available at <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/07/194896.htm> (accessed 29 September 2013).

37 Council of the European Union (2012), 'Guidelines on the EU's Foreign and Security Policy in East Asia,' 15 June. Available at <http://eeas.europa.eu/asia/docs/guidelines_eu_foreign_sec_pol_east_asia_en.pdf> (accessed 29 September 2013).

38 Philip Hammond (2013), 'Military Modernisation and Strategic Transparency,' speech delivered by the British Defence Secretary, at the Shangri-La Dialogue, Singapore, 01 June. Available at <http://www.iiss.org/en/events/shangri%20la%20dialogue/archive/shangri-la-dialogueue-2013-c890/third-plenary-session-51af/hammond-922f> (accessed 29 September 2013).

39 The "Sahel" working group of the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Armed Forces Committee of the French Senate has drawn up a report titled 'Sa-

hel: Pour une approche globale' (submitted for debate on 03 June 2013). This document estimates that the population of the Sahel, which comprises eight North African states, including Mali, will in thirteen years grow from the current 81 million to 120 million. This will naturally generate enormous welfare, health care, public health, nutritional and educational challenges, which may, in turn, create a breeding ground for Islamic terrorist groups, infiltrating into the everyday life of local societies. The report assesses the situation as a potential direct security threat at Europe's threshold.

US–EU–Chinese Relations

China's Multidimensional Juggle

The Challenges of A Rising Power

Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres

As the 21st century unfolds, it is almost unarguable that East and Southeast Asia will be increasingly important in global economic, political, and security affairs. China, often depicted as a state which is continually violating human rights, is dealing with recurrent internal problems such as corruption, economic rebalancing, growth rate slowdowns, income inequality, pollution, and social unrest. Globalisation and strong interdependence between states in the international system create spill-overs: problems experienced in one region are felt in other regions. For example, economic and financial struggles in Europe and the US have impacted China in many ways. China now realises that increasing the interconnectedness of economic and political relations in the international system truly magnifies the shocks and aftershocks of boom and bust cycles. These have forced China to seek alliances and partnerships elsewhere, with much closer commercial ties between China and Southeast Asia being in-sync with the expanding architecture of regional interstate collaboration. Slowly but surely, China is rising as a regional and global power.

Keywords: China, US, democracy, foreign policy, alliances, geopolitics South China Sea

Scan this article onto your mobile device

Introduction

From 2000 until 2013 the US has been swinging from crisis to crisis: Afghanistan, the Boston bombings, corporate bailouts, debt ceiling hiccups, Detroit's bankruptcy, Egypt, financial meltdowns, govern-

ment shutdown, insolvency, Iraq, Iran, Libya, violent shootings, North Korea, Pakistan, real estate bubbles, September 11, Syria – and the list goes on and on. These events, while regrettable, are opportunistically leveraged by rivals, especially China: they became aware that as the US was distracted with domestic affairs instead of international relations or foreign developments it stole the media spotlight away from Beijing. But for all the unfortunate experiences in the US, China has not remained immune and the media continues to be laden with stories of how China was busy dealing with internal challenges: abuses of power, corruption, economic rebalancing, growth rate slowdowns, income inequality, pollution, uneven geographical development, and social unrest (etc). Given the strong interdependence between states in the international system, problems experienced in one region are felt in other regions: economic and financial struggles in Europe and the US have impacted China in ways that have brought to light the interconnectedness not only of systems but also of people, and the way in which globalisation gives *new* meaning to transnational and global issues. In short, China has realised that increasing interdependence of economic and political relations in the international system truly magnifies the shocks and aftershocks of "boom and bust" cycles.

These shocks and aftershocks have forced China to seek alliances and partnerships elsewhere. Much closer commercial ties between China and Southeast Asia are in-sync with the expanding architecture of regional interstate collaboration. These ties are not only conducive to politically friendly environments but also reduce the probabilities of interstate conflicts. Neighbours will be more open to Chinese ambitions if they perceive it as a constructive and understanding partner. It has become clear to most Asian states that increasing interdependence can be either reciprocally cooperative or mutually damaging, so a collectively supportive mind set is in everyone's interest.

As the 21st century unfolds, it is almost unarguable that East and Southeast Asia will be increasingly important in global economic, political, and security affairs. Because this region is, by any account, poised to become the true engine of global growth, 'greater American political engagement, and especially an expanded US military presence,' is expected by Asian nations.[1] But China is not Asia. The continent boasts dynamic powers like Japan, India, and South Korea, which enjoy, to varying degrees, close relationships with the US. Yes, many scholars

agree that the tectonic size of the Chinese economy, its accumulated foreign-currency reserves, and its growing military forces grant it increasing influence in world affairs. Yet, these do not necessarily imply that China becomes the de facto regional superpower. Events in this century seem to suggest that the political awakening of youth populations worldwide and the revolution in social media and telecommunications is shaping national and international discourses in globally important issues. Our world is now sculpted by the interaction of collective emotions, popular perceptions, and confounding narratives of societies that are no longer influenced by a single hegemonic power.[2] China cannot assume it has a well-delineated path to global stardom.[3]

Over the last four decades, China has profited from the liberal economic order crafted by the us and its European allies after wwii. Because China's economic growth has been driven by exports to rich countries, many scholars believe that Chinese leaders will not only strengthen the prevailing open trading system but also defend it (evidence of this strengthening is China's desire to protect key shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean to the South China Sea). China's reliance on overseas investments, financial interdependence, Western consumerism and tourism, us and European educational institutions, cutting-edge technologies, and foreign currency inflows will keep it anchored to an economic order that rewards certainty, transparency, legal rights, and peace while punishing uncertainty, corruption, torts, and wars. Being a part of this economic order calls for certain predetermined features that facilitate commerce and trade between parties, as well as demanding most participants to abide to widely agreed trade rules and codes of conduct. While this may hold true, Bremmer warns that China's autocratic capitalism is not only oriented to maximise profits but also to 'maximise the state's power and the leadership's chances of survival.'[4] And this type of capitalism runs the risk of placing political continuity and national security ahead of profits and wealth protection. As a consequence, China's revenue streams are destined to the acquisition of material possessions and the accumulation of key 'resources in the hands of the state...to project power internationally.'[5] It seems that China will continue to evolve in this economic order with its unique characteristics.

This evolution has proved beneficial as it opened space for prosperity and security to flourish. According to World Bank data, China's an-

nual percentage growth rate of GDP at market prices from 2008 to 2012 was 7.8%. This was 5.6% more than the 2.2% rate of the US.[6] In some circles China has gained clout for its still-impressive growth rates during and after the global economic downturn from 2008 to 2011. The subprime mortgage debacle and the financial crisis in the US, along with the ensuing recession, when combined with huge bailouts in the EU, have led many commentators to wonder if the Chinese model of autocratic capitalism with significant government involvement may be preferable to democratic capitalism. But state interventionism kept growth steady and unemployment low while accepting inflation, inefficiencies, productivity losses, and market disruptions. This top-down tinkering masked more fundamental economic, financial, and structural concerns that will surely come back up later on.

Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres

Indeed, the Chinese politburo has identified a number of scenarios that could threaten economic growth, political legitimacy, and social stability: widespread acknowledgement of a deep culture of corruption and cronyism; loss of societal trust on leadership; income disparities between rich and poor; popular discontent and urban unrest; unbridled nationalism; and rising unemployment. These domestic issues, while contained and tactfully handled, provide us a glimpse of the still very relevant national challenges that policymakers have to deal with alongside regional affairs. Experts on Chinese politics in the East and West agree that regime survival is the highest priority of its rulers. This prioritisation is undergirded by solid national plans and policy actions aimed at dealing with crises without showing confusion, deficiency, or weakness; while communicating to its population that China is making progress nationally and internationally as a modern country.

This work examines China's difficulties in finding a sustainable economic footing, an acceptable role in world affairs, and strategic relationships without rising fear or suspicion. It takes a closer look at multidimensional issues including, but not limited to, democracy, diplomacy, economics, geopolitics, foreign policy, financial and real estate markets, transparency, and the environment. The main argument is that China is realising how challenging it is to be an established power and that juggling complex national, regional, and international problems can be a truly daunting task.

Democracy and the Rule of Law

Authoritarian states, such as China and Russia, have tightened their anti-democratic grips. In fact, today, democracy is waning slowly in every region of the world. The precise cause of this global democratic downturn can be linked to the slowing or reversal of economic growth. But one can also add the more general travails of globalised modernity: economic inequality, weak social welfare systems, stagnant wages, rapid spread of debilitating diseases, rampant urbanisation, environmental degradation, and increasing migration. These interrelated factors give autocrats and authoritarians short-term advantages in winning the electoral support of fearfully anxious middle-class constituencies, which adduce that further political change invites economic ruin. In diagnosing the troubled state of democracy worldwide academics quickly point out democracy's failure to reliably deliver economic security, shared prosperity, and social wellbeing.[7] However, it is still difficult to argue that non-democracies will ultimately perform any better than well-run democracies; or to establish their authority and legitimacy as alternative models of political rule.

An argument can be made against a strong reversal of democracy around the world. Evidence and practices gathered over the past 60 years suggest that, over the long run, democracy, growth, and the predictable peace among democratic nations trumps over communism and dictatorships. But if one assumes a global rebalancing of power as emerging countries start sharing the burden of international issues and spending their wealth without external directives, there is reason to worry about countries still making transitions into democracy. As Diamond noted in 2009:

> support from an external authoritarian power can insulate a dictatorship that might otherwise be susceptible to western leverage, as with China's role in sustaining dictatorships in Burma and North Korea against extensive western sanctions and Russia's obstruction of democratic pressures on regimes in Armenia, Belarus, and Central Asia.[8]

As far as China is concerned, it has been years since its scale has been tilted toward authoritarianism—but more are welcomed.[9] Recently, China has found it hard to control people's interests in the outside world, especially via the internet, movies, and books or through international travel. The Chinese are demanding more freedoms as they

are exposed to countries were democracy reigns. They are witnessing the full spectrum of creativity, entrepreneurship, and innovation that arises from free and open exchange and communication between peoples, and how alternatives in the form of diverse political parties give way to competing opinions and views to be studied, reconfigured, and harmonised openly.

Diplomacy: Tinkering as They Go

The tactical configuration behind Chinese diplomacy and foreign policy choices include political legitimacy, concerns of China's international status, domestic stability, growth and antiterrorism. Its leaders are testing their roles in intergovernmental institutions and multilateral arrangements with hopes that participation will grant them an influential spot at the negotiating table as well as recognition as an established power. But as China played its cards in the UN Security Council it was clear to others that self-interest and zero-sum calculation frequently informed policymaking. A relevant consideration in geopolitical and geostrategic calculations in East and Southeast Asia is that China's regional ambitions are becoming more visible, with military assertiveness and nationalistic impulses undermining the carefully crafted messages of growth infused with peace, moderation, and patience. Yet China understands that Australia, India, Japan, Vietnam, and other ambitious states will compete for regional pre-eminence in the economic, diplomatic, and military domains, which sets off pre-emptive policies and actions that may result in misinterpretations. Also, there are features of Chinese nationalism that affect foreign policy and these, in turn, have put pressure on policymakers to move beyond their traditional distrust of multilateral diplomacy.

Globalisation Delivers its Lessons

Concerns over intellectual property, rising wages, and volatile fuel prices are leading many foreign firms to rethink the wisdom of setting up shop in China. In fact, a re-conceptualisation is taking place as multinational companies are building up sourcing in Canada, the US, and nearby countries such as Mexico. Given the exigencies of rapidly fulfilling orders closer to customers, maintaining efficient supply chains, the

broader use of just-in-time inventories, the steadily increasing share of sales occurring over the internet, and expanding regional trade with Latin America, the business of low-cost and dubious-quality manufacturing in China is tapering. These economic forces are forcing leaders to diversify the economy and broaden income sources.

The Chinese economy still lags far behind in technological innovation, now considered a main propeller of growth. China contributed 14% of global research and development spending in 2012, compared with nearly 24% for the EU and 29% for the US.[10] As its economy develops, Chinese businesses have had to increase salaries to retain workers and cope with inflation. So, in the interest of comparison, the monthly wages for garment workers in four different countries are: $48 in Bangladesh, $100 in Vietnam, $235 in China, and $1450 in Oklahoma, US. China can no longer rely on the export-driven model of the past—it must build on the accumulated wealth of its people to boost domestic consumption and foster regional trade.

State capitalism has created economic and market disruptions, including banking and finance. Foroohar, an economic observer and commentator for *TIME*, noted that

> China used the financial crisis of 2008 as a reason to put the brakes on opening up its banking system. But state-owned banks have lent out mom-and-pop depositors' money at minimal rates to overzealous property developers, creating a real estate bubble of epic proportions: Chinese loans have grown by 20% a year since 2007 and are up to a whopping $10.2 trillion. While it's impossible to know for sure, some financial experts estimate that as much as $3 trillion worth of that may go bad.[11]

In short, top Chinese leaders will continue to fine-tune the links between national prosperity and political legitimacy, while adapting to international variation in demand, supply, and investment.

Geopolitics: Asian Prosperity and Security as Priorities

The "China-hawks" on the US's National Security Council and in the Pentagon want an economically revived Japan with more resources to build up its defence capabilities. Tellingly, in a speech at a Washington think tank, Shinzo Abe, Japan's Prime Minister, said that he is willing

to do this in order to have a Japan that is not only diplomatic but also assertive in the region. The continuing gaps in wealth and power between the US and China are still a deterrent to the establishment of regional hegemony by coercion or the threat of force. Separately, the Russian government is eager to profit from China's economic progress and weapon purchases;[12] while Chinese policymakers view Russia as a critical ally on the world stage. This relationship sets off suspicion in the U.S. as their cooperation vetoed military action against Syria during its civil war.

Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres

China's participation in humanitarian and peacekeeping operations is still taken with trepidation. For example, India, a regional power, has expressed anxiety and doubt over the deployment of Chinese navy ships to the coasts off the Horn of Africa to conduct anti-piracy operations. To the Chinese government, it is obvious that its military and naval build-up sets off fear instead of calm reassurance. Chinese scholars have for long wondered why US deployments are positively received and some have concluded that the US has built an institutionalised framework of influence through the promotion of liberal ideals and the establishment of international norms that are synced with US principles of acceptable demeanour. As these norms are embraced by more and more countries in the international system, US ideas, influence, and thinking become legitimised. This trust and legitimacy is so strong that the US counts on more than 50 military allies, while China has practically none. The bias upsets China's leaders as they wish to be trusted.[13]

The possibilities of seeing Chinese belligerence in East and Southeast Asia are often overstated. China is very well aware of the military disparity between it and the US, plus the potential for full diplomatic isolation in the international system if Chinese intervention occurred. It is not helpful either that the majority of the world's industrial nations are not only democratic but also aligned to the US. A regional challenge to the established influence of the US will be surely met with a strong military reaction, followed by condemnations, recriminations, and sanctions. In recent years China has seen the power of Western coalitions in enacting economic and trade sanctions on countries, and the devastating effect it has on recipients as well as neighbours. From Cuba to North Korea and Russia to Syria, these examples paint a picture of targeted disciplinary actions. In other words, any weak country

that chooses to deviate from the norm will be punished, isolated, and not allowed to benefit from the liberal economic order sustained by its benefactors. It has for long been a relatively effective tool of diplomacy without the legalities of occupation and war. It also reveals to China's leaders that the world's prevailing status is one largely influenced by the US and its many allies: a powerful group that dictates order and structure. As it stands, China's actions and reactions in its backyard are somewhat constrained by US military might, strategic encirclement by allies in Asia, and a diplomatic front composed of rich democratic supporters.[14] In the end, China cannot help but notice that the targeted outliers share common characteristics: autocracy, dictators, oppressive to people, pugnacious, and ideologically shaped by communism.

Even if containment and restraint does not play out because of US economic-military decline at the hands of its dysfunctional government and bipartisan discords, China will find it very hard to become the de facto regional power given that this scenario would imply the total collapse of other powers in the Asia-Pacific, from Australia to India to Japan. Moreover, national collapse does not necessarily translate into outright subservience, much like outliers do not break their backs to acquiesce to US directives. To do so, China would have deploy force against these countries, and its immediate neighbours, and force them to follow its lead. That said, it is unlikely that China will become a regional hegemonic power anytime soon, and less so if a regional power grab ensues. Traditional and emerging powers that are not heavily vested in weapons sales understand that conflict and war results in economic decline, and that if they want to stay in power their populations need to bank on national prosperity to secure their votes. Indeed, a regional "power club" that keeps each other in check is the most likely picture to emerge in Asia: an international configuration with rough parity and focused on peace.

As one narrows scenarios it becomes evident that China's economic growth has strategic impacts on US power, and only insofar as accumulated wealth is translated into military strength. If it turns out that China becomes the US's prime global competitor, there is wisdom in supporting other emerging countries in the Asian continent. For example, a strong and wealthy India, as well as a powerful coalition of Southeast Asian countries, can become strategic assets to American attempts to contain China. On the other hand, to have Brazil, Turkey,

South Africa, and Vietnam as staunch allies and defenders of the liberal economic order improves US odds. Even if China gives life to its idea of expelling the US from the Asia-Pacific region, this will be a complicated task to accomplish: regional control will present difficulties so long as Taiwan retains its independence and remains tied to the US for its protection, and so long as ASEAN, Australia, Japan, South Korea, and a litany of smaller countries host bases and troops.

Claiming National Strategic Interests in the South China Sea

And then, there is the South China Sea which spans from the Singapore and Malacca Straits to the Strait of Taiwan. It is considered as one of the world's most disputed bodies of water because of its strategic value. China, by recalling historic maps, lays claim to nearly the entire sea. Its claim overlaps with the maritime claims of Brunei, Malaysia, Philippines, Taiwan, and Vietnam.[15] As claimants hash out details, disputes emerge. These disputes threaten to destabilise Southeast Asia and even raise the risk of drawing the US into a conflict with an increasingly assertive China given that sovereign territory, natural resources, and national pride are at stake. To Chinese policymakers, exercising sovereignty over the South China Sea is a national strategic interest because more than half of the world's merchant tonnage, a third of crude oil trade, and half of liquefied natural gas trade pass through its waterways. China has assumed a reactive approach to disputes since it *perceives* that US economic, political, and military power is in decline. This approach has been followed by remarks from Chinese officials to US diplomats that the South China Sea is a core interest to China: a posture that was reaffirmed to (former) Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Whether the sea is a 'core interest' or not is irrelevant given that the government has continued to underline the protection of China's territorial integrity at any cost; which the US interprets as the islands and waters in South China Sea. Evidence of its importance can be glanced out of a Chinese defence report, released in April 2013, declaring that Chinese leaders will resolutely take all necessary measures to safeguard its national sovereignty and territorial integrity. At the heart of the claim lie reserves of gas and oil, fisheries, protection of ships and oversight of routes. But as the US continues to prefer dialogue, diplo-

macy, intergovernmental institutions, and rule of law instead of outright conflict, China will find itself utterly contained at the negotiation table; unless it breaks its repeatedly insistent promises of non-intervention, peace and collective growth.

But global economics are an entirely different matter.

Investments Abroad: A Blessing or Curse?

While Chinese investments in Africa have been criticised for their voracious exploitation of natural resources, many scholars argue that these monetary inflows have aided the continent to improve a large number of socioeconomic parameters. Radalet asserts that Africa's recent success – child mortality is down, as is the number of people living in extreme poverty – is a direct result of more democratic governments, a new class of civil servants and businesspeople, rising foreign investments and sounder economic policies.[16]

As critical resources start dwindling around the world, nationalism is seeing a resurgence and regional powers begin to exhibit signs of protectionism and influence exertion in order to carve out backyards or spheres of influence just like the us did in Latin America and colonial Europe in Africa and South Asia. Russia is extending its power position in the former Soviet countries while China has been active diplomatically and militarily in asserting control over the East and South China Sea and India claims oversight and rights in the Indian Ocean. If one takes these actions as signs of what is in store in the near future, the world can expect clashes between regional powers vying for gas, oil, and other natural resources to fuel their economies.

These investments in other countries are not only aimed to secure resources to sustain economic growth but are also diversification tools to avoid having a country so dependent on exports. It is clear that many countries are thirsty for foreign investments as they are trying to modernise their economies and boost their trade balances. In some regions China emerges as the ideal investor as countries move away from us dominance and as they broaden their clientele for products and services given that successful enterprises are usually followed by lucrative trade agreements. The problem for China is that the us is still too powerful, influential, and rich to justify swapping.

Financial Markets: Is Trouble Looming?

Driven in the late 1990's by Beijing's large infrastructure investments and most recently by the Chinese Government's stimulus plan to combat the economic impacts of the global financial crisis, the Chinese bond market has quintupled in size to $4.1 trillion since 2004.[17] For some time now the government has been worrying about an explosion in lending by the country's numerous banks – not all of which have been judicious lenders. By June 2013 Chinese banking regulators tightened access to cash by limiting banks sources of funding.[18] A collateral damage of reining in lenders was the quick selloff in the country's multitrillion bond market; an event brought about by banks selling bonds to raise cash to honour withdrawals and make loans. These massive trades in fixed-income securities bolstered critics of China's financial system, who highlight its bond market as an underappreciated source of systemic risk to the country as it faces challenges in controlling fast-rising lending under a weakening economic environment. The issue at hand is that most bonds are not only held but also traded by the country's banks.[19] This concentration of bonds within the banking system consolidates risk that in most other nations are spread out among thousands of individual and institutional investors. Additionally, there are concerns over the bond ratings in the marketplace: critics say they are unrepresentative of credit quality and price valuations. The current bond rating system makes it difficult for analysts and investors to assess creditworthiness as well as the efficacy and reliability of state regulators.[20] It is with this delicate domestic background that China tries to move ahead despite setbacks. Many observers have noted that 'there is an inevitable tension between a bank regulator's mission of maintaining financial stability and the wider aim of promoting economic growth' by politicians. Therefore, foreign regulators are likely to force Chinese banks to create fully-capitalised units.[21]

Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres

Real Estate: Chinese Investors Bet on the US's Recovery

Investors from China – including Macau and Hong Kong – have emerged as the second-largest foreign buyers of buildings and homes in the US (second only to Canadians). The state-owned Bank of China has replaced big European banks as the largest foreign lender in commercial real estate deals in the US. As of mid-2013, the Chinese

government owned more than $1 trillion of us treasury securities; the issue has been that these investments generate little returns as a result of low interest rates. Chinese and other investors are betting on a real estate rebound, with the expectation that the potential returns in us commercial property will be higher than in other countries. In addition to buying commercial and residential real estate, the Chinese are emerging as powerful financiers of other institutions' deals. A number of Chinese development firms are also lining up notable us commercial real estate projects such as luxury condominiums, lakefront townhouses, and waterfront neighbourhoods in order to profit from increasing us consumer confidence and a more surefooted economic recovery. The China Investment Corporation, which is China's main sovereign wealth fund, has taken direct stakes in properties, and also has invested billions of dollars in real estate funds overseen by large private investment funds in the us. All these indicators suggest that China is strategically investing its large foreign-currency reserves as it integrates more fully into the capitalist global economy.[22] In the end these bets will very much depend on China's internationally behaviours as there are widening beliefs that Chinese enterprises could be punished if the country behaves badly.[23]

Trade, Technology and Threats: Making Friends, Worrying Foes

In Central Asia, when a new gas or oil field is discovered, the pipelines head to China instead of Russia. During 2013, in Turkmenistan – China's largest foreign supplier of natural gas – Chinese officials 'inaugurated production at the world's second-biggest gas field, Galkynysh.' Nearby, in Kazakhstan deals, worth 30 billion us dollars,' included a stake in Kashagan, the world's largest oil discovery in recent decades.' And, in Uzbekistan, 15 billion us dollars in gas, oil, and uranium deals were signed. The Chinese state media has reported that trade volumes with Central Asia reached $46 billion dollars in 2012, up 100-fold since independence from the ussr two decades ago.[24] This economic interdependence is critical to China, chiefly when it comes to security issues in Central Asia given that the Chinese government's main concern as nato forces withdraw from Afghanistan is the threat posed by Uighur separatists and their supporters in this volatile region. If seen

purely through this prism, Chinese investments in Central Asia are aimed at promoting growth, peace, and stability by creating jobs, raising incomes, and improving living standards in a mountainous region that shares 1,750 miles of borders with China's western provinces.[25] But not all countries trading with China are willing to open their domestic markets.

In 2005, the RAND Corporation issued a report characterising Huawei, China's telecommunications behemoth, as part of a 'digital triangle" made up of the Chinese military, state-controlled research institutes, and consumer-driven technology companies, all of which are aligned to significantly improve China's defence capabilities. Additionally, US Congressman Dutch Ruppersberger, a member on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, commented that: 'We believe that China has the means, opportunity, and motive to use their telecommunications companies against the United States…and that the Chinese government is working with them and is involved.'[26] Indeed, US corporations and politicians are increasingly anxious with the rapid rise and global reach of China's top technology companies, especially after the explosion in Chinese cyber-attacks on the US government and business in 2012 and 2013.[27] China has learned that free trade is *not* free and that open markets are *not* really open.

Misperceptions and Misunderstanding

In the US, the level of distrust and scepticism towards China reflects the persistent worry that China's fast-growing economy, even though it has slowed, threatens jobs in a weak American economy, and that China's portrayal of itself as a newly confident and rich power – with a growing military capability – is a posture that is internalised as threatening to both Americans and Europeans. Moreover, American media outlets have had consistently negative coverage of China and Chinese issues in the news. For example, China's tense relations with Japan and Vietnam are thought to have contributed to the uneasy perceptions of China and its leaders. In 2013, there were reports in magazines and newspapers that wealthy Chinese families send their children to top colleges, schools and universities in Europe and the US, in some cases crowding out equally deserving applicants with fewer resources. This is also believed to be another sore spot that is breeding resentment.

But if world leaders realise that China is a rising power trying to do what is best for its people and its economy, then some of the international behaviours displayed may be better understood as actions and reactions of a country finding its footing in the international arena. Europe and the US have the opportunity to accommodate Chinese ambitions within a cooperative framework, one that internalises the shift in power from West to East and profound respect for the development of national priorities that align with a supportive economic structure.

Many believe that if China democratises, the chances of great-power wars will be drastically reduced. But if it does not, it will only widen the already existing divide in the world: one part authoritarian and the other part democratic. The question is: for how long can the world prosper given the increasing interconnectedness and interdependence of economic and political systems? Should China resist pressure to democratise and counter all reform forces as its populations calls for more freedoms, the US and its allies will be forced to work hard at preserving and promoting the democracy-pegged liberal economic order that is grounded on western principles and values. This work will rely on existing institutions (i.e. ASEAN, NATO, and the UN) and new ones, as well as on international laws and accepted norms of conduct. In parallel, for the order to survive attacks and erosion, the West will have to convince rising powers that abidance is in their best interest, and that the strengthening of an agreed order will reinforce the notion that a superpower is *not* needed given that the institutions, norms, rules, and regulations will in a way replace the need to have overwhelming hegemonic power to keep ambitious states in full check.

Strategic Opposition to the US

In the first half of 2013, National Security Agency contractor Edward Snowden left Hawaii to Hong Kong, and then to Moscow, after having leaked secret documents about US intelligence and surveillance operations. This was accomplished with the knowledge and support of China. This act highlights the assertiveness, determination, and willingness of new rising powers to challenge the United States in matters that affect the global commons. In addition to protecting Snowden from capture and extradition, Chinese government policy actions toward Syria have blocked the UNSC for two years (with Russian help). This blockage pre-

vented any sort of joint international action to stop a protracted civil war and to choke the genocidal tendencies of Bashar Al-Assad, Syria's president. Moreover, the Chinese People's Liberation Army launched cyber-attacks and hacked American companies and public institutions. This worried Washington. As if this was not enough, China carried out joint naval exercises with Russia, which, coupled with China's tepid support to end Iran's nuclear weapons programme, has undermined US policies in the Middle East, as well as endangering its energy and security interests given that any effort to coordinate additional sanctions and restrictions to halt enrichment may not come to fruition.

Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres

China is aware that the US is overstretched with futile wars and domestic political gridlock, all of which provides fertile grounds for Chinese leaders to better advance their own interests by kicking down the White House while it is most vulnerable. China is not interested in a second Cold War; it will settle for a tired and weaker US that softens its rhetoric and tone in the Asia-Pacific region. China continues to seek diplomatic clout with developing countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America by constraining US initiatives in Central Asia and the Middle East. This strategy may prove beneficial because states that resent American hegemony find pleasure in the sustained decay of the world's strongest power. This approach is hinged on the perception that China's political ideology and economic model is stronger than the one embraced by the US, and that its foundational principle of non-intervention underlines the impossibility of meddling in a country's sovereign affairs. Chinese leaders know that supporting a leadership overthrow could always backfire on them, so the marching order is not to interfere and let it be.

China's calculations in foreign policy are informed by cost-benefit analyses. Chinese strategists perceive the US in decline, fatigued with wars they could not win, burdened by alliances that no longer are viable, and losing influence with countries that have traditionally been receptive to its power. The lack of measurable results in a number of strategic objectives further support the idea that lawmakers in Washington are *not* in tune with the shifts in power and the economic changes that are taking place around the world. Hawks in Beijing interpret US foreign policy initiatives as offensive and downright hostile, with a number of military officials asserting that Washington is out to constrain Chinese power at any cost. When it comes to the promo-

tion of democracy, many in the politburo believe it is a macabre plan to undermine the evolving economic model of China. If the US supports Southeast Asian countries in their maritime claims in the South China Sea, Beijing internalises these actions as curtailing its regional influence – an intentional push against Chinese ambitions to build a regional sphere of influence. And, it is with this calculation that leaders of the Chinese Communist Party find more benefits than costs in pestering the US.

China understands that the US will continue to be wary of its partnership with Russia and its trade agreements with ASEAN, as well as its continued economic diplomacy in Africa and Latin America. The Chinese government has not been shy of expressing its interest in resources in Central Asia and the South China Sea, which explains why commercial bridges are being built with many countries in these regions – especially with those disengaged from US assistance and protection. China is a rising power in global and regional affairs that is more than willing to gravitate in support of Russian truculence as they understand it as a further burden for American policymakers. For commercial reasons China will maintain good working relations with the US but this convenient utilitarianism should not be confused with strategic long-term engagements.[28]

China is now an inescapable force in the international system. It is a state with its own interests, and its own plans. Agreeing or opposing US actions and policies is mere rhetoric that any state in the system can initiate, but the resulting behaviours following that rhetoric will matter as players define their space in view of developments in the global arena. The avoidance of interstate confrontation between China and the US will depend on the levelheadedness of its leaders and the stakes of the underlying dispute, but above all, any conflict will be limited by long-term impacts on prosperity and security. Indeed, transnational threats and global security issues cannot be managed without European and Chinese cooperation. The US will continue to protect its trade interests while acknowledging that Chinese leaders face challenges in addressing their own domestic economic problems, including pollution, inequality, and employment. As it is argued here, both China and the US are pleased to see each other busy with domestic problems.

As for Europe, both China and the US are interested in maintaining commercial ties, financial stability, and socio-cultural exchanges. In

Beijing, leaders are not discounting the possibility of having a world temporarily guided by three powers: a G3 transitioning into regional pockets of influence according to the dominant country that emerges as iterative power grabs play out. This arrangement, whether it occurs or not, calls for increased attention by China, Europe, and the US to economic and military power shifts.[29] This attention to actions and re-actions as well as proposal and counterproposals will define the power balancing dynamics in a world in rapid flux.

Foreign Policy and the US

In a sober assessment of US foreign policy, CFR President Richard N. Haass wrote that the US must place greater emphasis on domestic investments and policy reforms given that the country is

> nearly going over fiscal cliffs, threatening not to pay our bills to creditors, cutting much needed investments in human and physical capital, stealing from our children by refusing to rein in spending on retirement and Medicare, and educating people from abroad who want to stay and contribute to this society – and then refusing them the opportunity to do just that.[30]

Additionally, Haass warned that schools, colleges and universities are not preparing younger generations with the abilities, skills, and tools to efficiently compete in a globalised world, and that, to make matters worse, the US has embarked on an unsustainable debt path that will likely retard the much needed economic recovery of the country. Indeed, by mid-2011, the US credit agency Standard & Poor's downgraded the US credit rating from top-tier AAA 'by one notch to AA-plus on concerns about the government's budget deficit and rising debt burden.'[31] The above matters to China because – as of December 2013 – they hold the largest share of US debt, which is a little less than one quarter (~$1.3 trillion) of the total $5.6 trillion in foreign-held debt.

A stronger emphasis on national affairs, from economics to politics, matters to the world at large. Only if the US gets its act right and puts its affairs in order will it be able to set an example that other countries around the world will want to emulate. In effect, the US must first find ways to recover its economic stardom and creative strengths in order to judiciously accumulate the resources necessary to deal with the emergence of military and political competitors or to discourage

anti-American coalitions wishing to diminish its clout around the globe. It is no secret within US foreign policy circles that the US has been underachieving nationally and overreaching internationally, akin to a risk-loving gambler spending away on a borrowed credit card. As the White House shifts its attention away from China (and Russia) to deal with internal matters it opens the door for competitors to exploit weaknesses and to leverage all advantages.[32]

China finds itself with luck on it's side as the US political system is all too often gridlocked, tightly roped into acrimoniously divergent views so far apart that conciliation seems nearly impossible. At the same time, the democratic system is a victim of its own machinations: an unprecedented polarisation at the hands of Democrats, Republicans, civil society, and special interest groups. These special interest groups represent associations, businesses and corporations, labour unions, and retirees, that when working together bring depth and breadth to public debates, along with handshakes, money, and pressures. Yet, within this complexity, that for the last 237 years has worked for better or worse, it is still not clear who speaks for "the people" as a social construct or who is looking out for the best interest of the nation. Given this situation in which politics and money are mutually complementary in decision making, China is not that different that the US: both countries using available powers to secure advantages and gains in a fiercely competitive world. However, there are limits to what China can do with economic superiority and military force, so national complexities beat regional realities that in turn trump international abstractions.

Transparency and Global Standards Warranted

According to a Pew Global Survey, Americans view China in a markedly less favourable light in 2013 than in 2011, and that Chinese attitudes toward the US have also soured, a sign that the two countries are drifting apart at the level of public opinion. The figures showed that 'since 2011, China's approval ratings in the US have dropped 14 points to 37%, the lowest rating for China in any region in the world. Negative attitudes toward the US among the Chinese rose to 53%, a 9-point increase.'[33] This may be due to bad press coverage. Sure enough, in 2013, Obama's White House and US corporate executives tried to convince Chinese

President Xi Jinping and his government that evidence of outright theft by the People's Liberation Army is set to damage China's growth prospects and reduce incentives of foreign companies to invest in China. Internationally, the collective concern over the longer-term is that Chinese hacking may end up establishing a new set of standards for web-based commerce and traffic, with few or no penalties for the theft of creative inventions or intellectual property.

Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres

While generally lax and permissive, the Chinese government has been seen as acting tough against foreign companies they have determined to have engaged in unethical business practices. In mid-July 2013, authorities barred GlaxoSmithKline's finance director for China from leaving the country while they carried out an investigation into bribery, corruption, and fraud. This travel restriction came as the Chinese government ramped up an anti-corruption campaign against GlaxoSmithKline[34] (GSK) and other foreign pharmaceutical companies. The case is grounded on accusations that GSK used 'local travel agencies to bribe doctors, hospitals, medical associations and government officials in an effort to bolster drug sales and get regulatory approvals.' Chinese authorities are *not* known for bold moves against high-ranking business executives working in China, but commentators expressed surprise because 'the government has been extraordinarily public about the case, offering details and strong denunciations of what occurred and going as far as saying the fraud allowed the drug maker to raise prices in China, defrauding consumers.' In reaction to these accusations, government officials harshly criticised the company and its executives. For instance, the head of the economic crimes unit at the Ministry of Public Security suggested that GSK China operated in the country like a traditional criminal organisation.[35]

The Environment: Turning a Blind Eye

The Chinese government has, for long, been dismissive of claims that its environmental position is delicate and indifferent to findings that a large number of cities in China suffer from significant pollution levels in air, land, and water. The evidence is abundant. In March 2013 thousands of dead pigs were founds in creeks and rivers supplying Shanghai's water, a shocking discovery that has drawn attention to the country's recurrent toxic pollution. Some reports suggest that pollu-

tion alone contributes to over 700 thousand deaths each year, with the consequent economic costs by health care, lost productivity, and workers' family compensation, if any. Other examples include decades of toxic contamination of Tai Lake – a basin that holds China's 3rd largest body of freshwater, providing water for 30 million people – by Beijing's industries, which was labelled as a major natural disaster; the soil and water in Tianying, a manufacturing centre in north-eastern China, has been contaminated by lead runoff; wheat grown around Tianying has been found to carry 24 times the permissible level of lead; in Linfen, the country's coal-burning centre, once fertile farmlands are now populated with huge mines that spew thick columns of choking smoke, which has been linked to lung cancer and upper respiratory diseases; and in Urumqi, a cultural centre and transport hub for 3 million people in northwestern China, tests consistently report concentrations of airborne sulphur dioxide that are ten times the level that the us deems safe.[36]

Final Reflections

The flourishing of democracy in China can be thought of as the inevitable and expected outcome of political evolution – an iterative harmonisation with international norms that support social progress, collective security, and shared prosperity. But adopting democracy may prove to be a difficult and lengthy process given that traditionalists and old-school officials of the Chinese Communist Party know that the configuration of ideas and balance of power in any region can invariably affect the breadth and depth of influence in countries within that region. This can partly explain why leaders and policymakers in China (and Russia) are bent on bulwarking their countries from accountability, democratisation, modernisation, free speech, and popular scrutiny. To them too much is at stake. In their calculation, they stand to lose everything and gain nothing. The key questions are: Is China democratising anytime soon? What would it mean for the West?

A reasonable argument can be made that a democratic and supportive China could more easily earn the trust of Europe and the us, thus facilitating the sharing of influence, power, and responsibility with a rising power.[37] But China seems convinced that economic performance and military might will force traditional powers to open up

the international space to newcomers, whether they want it or not. A cursory reading of history points out that democracy and its messy machinery of checks and balances takes time to work supportively for any given nation, yet there is evidence that forces and groups within China are demanding more and more freedoms as the Chinese government – with the passing of time – continues to align with a liberal economic order to create jobs, increase incomes, and sustain growth that has been used to cement its legitimacy. The West will continue to exercise strategic patience with China, waiting for it to stumble so that domestic or regional sparks catalyse the much waited "wave of democratisation" in Asia.

China's Multi-dimensional Juggle

From a strategic standpoint, China, as well as Russia and other authoritarian states, prefer to prevent displays of US power in the international system because it erodes any perceptional gains they have scored in the court of global public opinion. Autocrats and dictators around the world are pleased to see a weaker US and stronger competitors; to many of them this is evidence that world politics are becoming more inclusive and that the playing field is levelling. Yes, China rarely does anything that is fundamentally unsupportive of its vital strategic interests; however, the Chinese government understands that participating peacefully in an international liberal economic order is the safest path to increase its wealth, power, and security. This rationale undergirds its support of capitalism, free trade, and open markets, while remaining autocratic.[38] China's leadership is disinterested in upholding a world order they did not create and that was not designed with their inputs and interests in mind. Reluctant, too, is the Chinese government to take on burdensome and expensive global issues and responsibilities given that these are mostly inherited problems caused or exacerbated by traditional powers. Therefore, the balancing act of amassing economic and military power while remaining aloof and quiet will continue on display.

In the near future, it may also be relevant to consider that while China is vying for a unipolar regional scheme within a desired multipolar world featuring a weakened US, they may not attain the experience, knowledge, wealth, and military power to nourish and sustain such an idealised hierarchical structure.[39] Furthermore, in crafting a pathway into the future, China is *not* likely to be satisfied with a world order that favours Western values: political parties, voting, dissent, legal

rights, free speech, investigative journalism, and religious plurality, to name a few. Countries change as they acquire and accumulate power. They review, reformulate, and amend their ambitions, behaviours, interests, policies, and rationales. With this in mind, who is to say with any degree of certainty that China will stay peaceful, non-intrusive, and non-interventionist? If China ends up significantly influencing the global order, the international system can expect institutions, systems, norms, and values that conspicuously display Chinese features and ideals.

China's autocratic capitalism is effective in making decisions and launching actions on economic and financial matters in the short run, but it remains to be seen if this type of governance is, in the long run, accommodating and elastic enough to allow for adaptation to a rapidly evolving international environment where power, security, trust, and wealth are so tightly interconnected. As global power is shared, the world will witness incomprehensible alliances and partnerships. Here is an example: In an attempt to shore up allies in the region, in 2012 China suggested to Australia's 'foreign minister Bob Carr that Australia might have to choose between China and the United States.' While this offhanded suggestion created friction as it invited disloyalty to a long-time ally, it also presented an upcoming conceptual conundrum to Australian leaders given that the country is 'close to China economically but close to the United States strategically' and ideologically. Chinese political strategists know this very well, to the point of acknowledging the fact that throughout Asia Pacific this same 'dualism is so widespread' to become a nuisance.[40]

With the us busy with Afghanistan, Iran, Russia, Ukraine, Iraq and Syria, as well as deeply trenched with its combative Congress, Chinese leaders might come to understand that, for policymakers in Washington, containment of China is not a perfect policy but an option with costs and risks that are much more easily mitigated and understood than those of outright war with a rising power. In addition to the above, Chinese leaders need to understand the evolving strategic landscape so they can embrace a national and international renewal aimed at revitalising China's global role.

SIGFRIDO BURGOS CÁCERES is an international consultant and author of *The Hungry Dragon: How China's Resource Quest is Reshaping the World* and *China's Strategic Interests in the South China Sea: Power and Resources*. He may be reached at: *sbc_london@yahoo.com*

Notes

1   Jeff Begner (2013), 'No Escape: The Middle East Fails to Cooperate with Obama's Pivot,' *The Weekly Standard,* 19:3, p. 24.

2   Zbigniew Brzezinski (2012), *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*, New York: Basic Books.

3   A. L. Friedberg (2011), *A Contest for Supremacy: China, America and the Struggle for Mastery in Asia*, New York.

4   Ian Bremmer (2010), *The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War Between States and Corporations?* New York: Portfolio/Penguin.

5   Arvind Subramanian (2011), *Eclipse: Living in the Shadow of China's Economic Dominance,* Washington, DC: Institute of International Economics, p. 153.

6   The World Bank website, Data, GDP growth annual: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG> (accessed 14 July 2014).

7   Kagan observed that: 'human beings yearn not only for freedom, autonomy, individuality, and recognition. Especially in times of difficulty, they also yearn for security, order, and a sense of belonging to something larger than themselves, something that submerges autonomy and individuality—which autocracies often provide better than democracies.' Robert Kagan (2012), *The World America Made*, New York: Knopf, p. 23.

8   Larry Diamond (2009), *The Spirit of Democracy: The Struggle to Build Free Societies Throughout the* World, New York: Henry Holt & Company, p. 113.

9   Commentators note that 'for the past decade both autocracies [China and Russia] have done their best to block or at least slow down efforts by the United States and Europe to put pressure on dictatorships in Sudan, Zimbabwe, Libya, Syria, Iran, Venezuela, Burma, and North Korea.' See Kagan (2012), p. 72.

10 See Roger Altman (2013), 'Why the Economy Could…Pop,' *TIME*, 12 August 2013, pp. 24-28.

11 R. Foroohar (2013), 'The End of Easy Money,' *TIME*, 15 April 2013, p. 16.

12 By tallying each country's share of global conventional-arms imports, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) used data from 2008 to 2012 to find the world's biggest weapon importers and found that the top 5 buyers are located in Asia: India (12%); China (6%); Pakistan (5%); South Korea (5%); Singapore (4%).

13 For details, see Yan Xuetong (2011), 'How China Can Defeat America,' *The New York Times*, 20 November 2011.

14 See Yong Deng and Fei-Ling Wang (eds) (2004), *China Rising: Power and Motivation in Chinese Foreign Policy*, Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.

15 Sigfrido Burgos (2013), *China's Strategic Interests in the South China Sea: Power and Resources*, London: Routledge.

16 Steven Radalet (2010), *Emerging Africa: How 17 Countries Are Leading the Way*, Washington, D.C: Center for Global Development. For related issues see Sigfrido Burgos Cáceres (2011), 'Towards Concert in Africa: Seeking Progress and Power through Cohesion and Unity,' *African Studies Quarterly*, 12:4, pp. 47-61.

17 The Chinese bond market does not work as bond markets in Europe and the United States. In China, the bond market has a bond-ratings system where nearly every company gets top scores and bonds are rarely downgraded. Also, it is overseen by a patchwork of regulators with overlapping and redundant roles. The market is largely closed to foreign investors and offers few protections for those bond buyers that are willing to risk their clients' money.

18 By allowing interbank loan rates to rise, the Central Bank of China limited the market for loans between local banks, leaving some of them – those with small capital reserves – scrambling for cash. Banks responded by selling short-term bond holdings, which tend to be more liquid and therefore easier to trade in the financial market.

19 According to data from the Financial China Information and Technology Company, for 2012 bond ownership in China was: 64.5% by banks, 9.5% by funds, 6.5% by government, 8.5% by insurance companies, and 11% by other entities.

20 Shen Hong (2013), 'Banks Keep Tight Grip on China's Bond Market,' *The Wall Street Journal*, 16 August 2013, p. C2.

21 For a broader discussion, see 'Chinese Banks: Open for Business,' *The Economist*, 19 October 2013.

22 Julie Creswell (2013), 'Chinese Investors Pursue US Property Deals,' *The New York Times*, 25 June 2013.

23 For example, the US has considered giving companies the right to retaliate against Chinese cyber-attackers with counterstrikes of their own. Also, regional belligerence in Asia can be punished via economic-financial sanctions.

24 China is the biggest trading partner of four of Central Asia's five countries. Most gains are on gas and oil imports, which drove Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, both with large energy reserves, into China's arms.

25 Editorial, 'China in Central Asia: Rising China, Sinking Russia,' *The Economist*, 14 September 2013, p. 51.

26 Michael Schuman (2013), 'Inside the Chinese Company America Can't Trust,' *TIME*, 15 April 2013, pp. 36-38. Additionally, Cheng Li, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., said that Chinese telecommunications and military interests are tightly concatenated given that telecom, as a whole, is considered part of a national defense industry in China. Given the extent of influence by the state, this is not at all surprising.

27 See Zachary K. Goldman (2013), 'Washington's Secret Weapon against Chinese Hackers,' *Foreign Affairs*, 8 April 2013 and David E. Sanger and Nicole

Perlroth (2013), 'Hackers from China Resume Attacks on US Targets,' *The New York Times*, 19 May 2013.

28 Leslie H. Gelb and Dimitri K. Simes (2013), 'A New Anti-American Axis?,' *The New York Times*, 6 July 2013.

29 Ian Bremmer (2012), *Every Nation for Itself: Winners and Losers in a G-Zero World*, New York: Portfolio.

30 For a sobering approach to less interventionism, see: Richard N. Haass (2013), 'Bringing it All Back Home: Why the Smartest Foreign Policy Choice for the US Now Is to Focus on Domestic Affairs,' *TIME*, p. 19.

31 Walter Brandimarte and Daniel Bases (2011), 'United States loses prized AAA credit rating from S&P,' *Reuters*, 6 August 2011.

32 Gideon Rachman (2010), *Zero-Sum World: Politics, Power and Prosperity after the Crash*, New York: Atlantic.

33 See Jane Perlez (2013), 'In China and US, Mutual Distrust Grows, Study Finds,' *The New York Times*, 18 July 2013.

34 UK's GlaxoSmithKline is one of the world's biggest drug makers with $42.98 billion in sales for 2012.

35 David Barboza (2013), 'China Bars GlaxoSmithKline Executive From Leaving During a Bribery Inquiry,' *The New York Times*, 17 July 2013.

36 For more specific details, see 'Four Essential Facts about China's Eco-Mess,' *TIME*, 25 March 2013, p. 8.

37 Ian Bremmer and Douglas Rediker (2012), *What's Next: Essays on Geopolitics That Matter*, New York: Penguin.

38 The figures speak for themselves: annual GDP growth for the entire world was an estimated 0.3% between 1500 and 1820; 1.6% between 1820 and 1950; and 3.9% between 1950 and 2000. For a broader look at the collective gains from lasting peace, open markets, and free trade, see: Kagan (2012), p. 40.

39 Sigfrido Burgos and Sophal Ear (2013), *The Hungry Dragon: How China's Resource Quest is Reshaping the World*, London: Routledge.

40 Ross Terrill (2013), 'The View From Across the Pacific: Washington Gains a Friend in Canberra,' *The Weekly Standard*, 19:3, p. 23.

Across the Lines of the World State

The Case of the United Nations

Aleš Karmazin

This article asks how the United Nations (UN) tries to overcome the modern state system and focuses on the most important UN efforts which could potentially situate it as a form of world government. This study's title – which may be read in two contrasting ways – illustrates a certain ambiguity in the UN's efforts. The first reading implies the overriding and exceeding of the modern state system in order to reach a new political order while the other holds that the new political system to be achieved through UN activities is faraway and that the UN and the new order are separated on different sides of some barrier. By examining the significance of the Euclidean concept of lines in modern Western thinking and reviewing the most common arguments for the world state, it is shown that the UN ultimately operates within a framework of Western modernity and is unable to transcend this limitation. The UN's aspirational move to exceed the modern state system always returns to the categories and ways of thinking which were established alongside that very system.

Introduction

The UN has always been connected with aspirations of overcoming the limits of the modern state and the Westphalian state system. Leaving aside the (more or less) persistent view that the world was in need of an organisation with global reach that could transform inter-state re-

lations, which preceded the actual establishment of the UN, a similar intention was strongly articulated shortly after the UN's foundation when the new destructive power of the atomic bomb made scientists and (to a lesser extent) politicians think about the UN as a global controller of force. Such straightforward statements about the creation of a global (quasi-)state from the UN have a negligible presence today, but the UN still aspires to override the limits of the modern system of states.[1] However, despite the ambitions of many politicians and theorists to give the UN the form of a global government, it has never become much more than an international organisation, i.e. an organisation founded on an agreement among sovereign states.[2]

Just as the UN's efforts to become a world government-like organisation are ambiguous, the title of this work may be read in two contrasting ways. The first interpretation suggests the surpassing and exceeding of the modern system of states in the interests of a new political order. The other maintains that the new political order to be reached through UN activities is faraway and that the UN and the new political system are on opposing sides (of some barrier). Helped by a re-examination of both the philosophical meaning of the modern concept of lines (boundaries) and the most important motives for creating the world state, this paper focuses on the UN's attempts to move beyond the modern state system. This research also shows that the UN's long-term efforts to expand its own limits as an organisation established for international politics and become a representative of world politics, persist despite a strong tendency to mask them and not present them explicitly. The aspirational move beyond politics as we know it is connected with not just the redefinition of the UN but also ultimately with the redefinition of the international system and the global level of politics and – most importantly – of where such politics should be located. While international politics suggests two fundamental (and opposite) levels of politics – 1. politics among states and 2. politics within states – world politics presupposes a more global politics that is located in a unified humankind and dissolves the boundaries of nation states. It is not obvious what such a world politics would or should be like.

This study focuses on key UN-related efforts to move beyond international politics and establish itself as an organisation of world politics. In other words, it asks: *how does the UN try to exceed or overcome the modern system of states?* Beyond its explicit concerns, this question

can help us understand what a world politics might mean (and what it could resemble). The explicit concern of the question is the mechanisms which are effective in attempts to exceed or transcend the modern state system. Such mechanisms are necessarily connected with: 1. moving past or crossing over what separates international politics from world politics and 2. movers and/or moments that express the instabilities and imperfections which need to be overcome, as well as ideal points and/or equilibriums which need to be reached. The former (number 1) relates to the nature of borders or lines, while the latter (number 2) conveys the reasons, motivations and visions for these moves. As such, both numbers 1 and 2 are employed as categories of inquiry. Although number 2 seems far more important for exploring our central question, this work follows-up on a claim made by Walker about the crucial significance of boundaries/borders/lines.[3] In some sense, this work provides a more empirical elaboration of Walker's claim. At this stage, it must be said that since attempts to turn the UN into a global governing body with strong powers have largely been side-lined, this study focuses on the most important current initiatives which are associated with "moving beyond" international politics rather indirectly.

The thinking in this work is stimulated by two (seemingly opposed) positions. The first argues that as long as we continue thinking about politics through the heritage of Western modernity, it is impossible to move beyond the modern state. If we are unable to overcome the modern philosophical foundations of politics, some form of the modern state will constantly re-appear in our thinking.[4] This study is a re-articulation of this position. The second view holds that the world state is inevitable due to the imperfections of the modern state system. This claim is especially represented in the work of Wendt,[5] who makes use of previously influential arguments about the inevitability of the world state.[6] According to the first position, the second view expresses a desire which is inherently built into the modern system of states. Thus, although these two traditions take different stances, they are complementary in some sense.

Wendt introduces the concept of "attractors," which are end-states or ideal states of a social system towards which that system tends to evolve.[7] He argues that the world state is the attractor of the modern state system. For the purposes of this work, I distinguish between this

general attractor (the world state) and specific attractors, which are more concrete reasons/motivations/causes that show why the state system should move towards the world state. In this respect, the most important specific attractors for Wendt (though he does not label them as such) are the universal human community and the world security government. The issue of attractors relates to the second category – number 2 – of our inquiry.

Aleš Karmazin

Besides articulating the difficulty of 'moving beyond,' Walker offers a view of borders as something essentially problematic.[8] Political science and International Relations (IR) have failed to recognise the importance of the deeper philosophical assumptions on which the current concept of borders is based. According to Walker, modern borders are conceived as Euclidean lines without width, and this then influences the possibilities for movement across borders and (especially) *beyond* them. This study tries to fill a gap in the social science understanding of borders since the common sense view remains that borders do not need to be explained as a political phenomenon and do not help to explain other political phenomena. Surprisingly, this gap is present not only in IR[9] but also in many other social sciences such as sociology and social anthropology.[10] Borders (or lines) are perceived in this paper as an enabling and constraining factor which helps us to interpret and understand the possibilities for moving beyond such borders. This consideration of lines connects with the first category – number 1 – of our inquiry.

The following part provides theoretical background about borders/lines and attractors while at the same time indicating their interconnection. The next two sections each focus on a specific attractor identified by Wendt; they cover the issues of human identity and security. These two chapters offer key examples that illustrate the role of attractors and lines in moving beyond international politics. Although many other concrete cases could be selected, this paper highlight only the most prominent ones.

Theoretical Background

This section introduces the two main categories through which our central question – the significance of A) borders/lines and B) attractors – is examined in more detail. Walker[11] makes the crucial and, until

now, largely neglected argument that contemporary political thinking about borders (or 'lines,' in his language) tends to conceptualise them as Euclidean lines without width.[12] This conceptualisation leads to the view that there can be no meaning *within* these lines and that they simply and sharply separate political identities, which subsequently have the clear-cut character of "us-them," "here-there." The clear-cut distinction fuses with modern thinking about political identities, as recognised and observed in post-positivist approaches in the social sciences. These approaches show how the structure of primary political identities and affiliations to primary political units (nation states) is built upon an existential ontology of identitarian pluralism which distinguishes between us/me and alterities to the self.[13]

Despite this critical observation, Walker does not elaborate on this issue further or in more empirical terms. If, then, we want to grasp the nature of lines more closely, it is necessary to understand that the Euclidean conception of lines is a substantivist and non-relational one.[14] This can be discerned from the very basic definitions provided by Euclid himself:

A point is that which has no part. A line is breadthless length. The extremities of a line are points. [...] A surface is that which has length and breadth only. The extremities of a surface are lines. [...] A boundary is that which is an extremity of anything.[15]

Lines are extremities, which does not mean that they mark an end beyond which there is nothing, but that they are demarcations of one specific part of space, i.e. that part only and not any other. One's position in any space can always be clearly defined since the space can be described by a coordinate system. Once a line is drawn in a space, that space is divided into two planes from which it follows that the planes cannot overlap and one's position is either "here" or "there." Aristotle worked within this Euclidean tradition when he conceived of the nature of boundaries as lines and wrote of *x*'s position in space: 'the first thing outside of which no part [of *x*] is to be found, and the first thing inside of which every part [of *x*] is to be found.'[16] Because a line is just a series of points which have no spatial size, crossing a line is unproblematic and is not accompanied by any changes in one's own structure or composition (one remains the citizen of a state, a modern political subject). On the other hand, however, this move does mean situating oneself within a different identity (as a citizen of different

64

state, a different nation). After someone crosses a line, they take on different characteristics and their identity is changed.

This conception of space and lines contrasts with the medieval one which is considered immediately below. Comparing these two models can help us grasp the specificity of the modern version. While the focus on the medieval conception of lines (and space) does not directly support my argument, a short analysis is, thus, useful for heuristic purposes in order to show the particular and contingent character of the modern political conception of lines. This is important since a broad and implicit argument of this study is that we are too embedded in modern schemes of thinking about politics. Although the model discussed here may not have been the only conception of lines in the Middle Ages, it was probably the most important one. According to this medieval concept, the known world (*orbis terranum*) was bounded by final frontiers that were considered impossible to overcome. As these were the absolute limits of space, there was nothing beyond them – or to be more precise, anything outside this *orbis terranum* was impossible, false or too absurd to be true. These were the limits of both space and thinking. On the other hand, the space within the *orbis terranum* was understood as common to the whole of humanity (deemed similar to Christendom in this paradigm) and the *orbis terranum* was not sharply separated into distinct communities with clear differences from one another.[17]

While this conception of space and frontiers proposed a unified human community (all people were basically thought of as descendants of Adam and Eve and part of the great community of Christ's followers), there was also an awareness of the differences among people living in different geographical regions. The paradigmatic form of travel connected with this medieval conception of space, lines and frontiers was the pilgrimage, which had several expected outcomes. They included the overcoming of prejudices and differences and their absorption or containment in the pilgrim's personality.[18] On one hand, thus, it was impossible to really move beyond the thinkable realm as outlined in the conception of space and frontiers. On the other, there was an option to leave one's particular community or place of living without crossing any strict lines between here-there or us-them, and thus, without losing one's identity but only developing and enhancing it.

The Case of the United Nations

Euclidean lines determine a mode of separation not just between states but also between the domestic and the international levels without setting any absolute frontiers. There is always a significant other in relation to the self-identity of a nation or citizen just as there is always something beyond the modern system of states. If a person wants to move from inside (i.e. from the realm of domestic politics) elsewhere, he or she inevitably reaches the realm of international politics since there is no space between the domestic and the international; similarly, there is no grey area located inside the line between the domestic and the international. Thus, the domestic-international division is influenced by the same clear-cut lines.[19] Like the move between the domestic and international realms, the transformation from international to world politics – at least in the modern sense and based on the modern imagination of a global state/government – requires a change through which the international realm must be overcome and a space reached that has a new and clearly distinguished quality.[20] In this sense, clear-cut lines (which establish something new and displace or subsume the previous stage) are also at work between international and world politics. The UN today is an extremely interesting case because it clearly aims to avoid utopian transformations into a world state, now seen as unnecessary and potentially dangerous, and at the same time, it is still trying to fulfil the ambition – set as part of the definition of the UN at the time that it was established – to act as an organisation encompassing the whole of world politics.

According to Wendt, the world state is the attractor of the modern state system, i.e. it is a stage towards which the international system has been evolving.[21] Although this teleological way of thinking is not universally shared, Wendt provides a sound restatement of why we may need a world state and why the modern state system could be heading towards such a state, and captures the reasoning of politicians and academics on this topic. As a general attractor, the world state is connected with three concrete attractors or end-states which are built into modern politics. Although Wendt does not use the term "specific attractor," it is clear that he distinguishes three logics behind the creation of the world state. I consider "specific attractor" to be a useful label here since it distinguishes the importance and "power" of each logic. Wendt does not think that states will give up their sovereignty automatically, but rather that it is the nature and mechanisms of

the modern international system which will propel them to do so. He mentions three mechanisms: 1) the logic of the market,[22] 2) the struggle for group and individual recognition and 3) the logic of anarchy. Each one has its own respective attractor: 1) the global common market, 2) a global institution which recognises both universal human community and particular identities, 3) a global security institution. In Wendt's eyes, these three mechanisms do not work separately, but each one has the potential to constitute a specific world state-like organisation. As noted, these logics or attractors are very commonly cited in explanations of the suitability, necessity and/or inevitability of the world state by other scholars and politicians. They are also apparent in the UN's own attempts to situate itself as a global governing body. The next two sections of this work focus on the arguments within the UN for a global human community and world security. The issue of markets is not dealt with since it is the least visible in the UN's argumentation.

Aleš Karmazin

Attractors and lines are not two separate issues; rather, they work within a specific nexus and influence each other. As long as the goal is to overcome the problems inherently associated with the contemporary state system, including the issues of anarchy and human belonging, and as long as we think about security and identity in modern terms, these attractors determine the possibilities for overcoming the lines of the modern state system and creating some kind of world state as the solution. They demarcate not only the modern system of states, but also the basic nature of the space beyond. Such modern lines both allow for a path beyond the modern state system and constrain the possibilities of that terrain. The modern logic of these lines suggests that something must exist beyond the boundaries of the current state system. This "something" is the world state and not, for example, a configuration of overlapping or multiple spaces (as might be projected, for example, by neo-medievalism). The transport of the main modern visions and motivations for establishing a political organisation occurs along with the move beyond the modern state system. This move is made across modern lines, which do not change the structure of the subject or object (e.g. the issue, problem or theme), but rather situate that subject or object in a different context. Modern arguments for political organisation based on the need for security or the recognition of a sense of belonging (a common humanity or identity) are, thus, carried over into advocacy for the world state. In other words, proponents

call for the building of the world state along similar lines to the way modern political theory argued for the contemporary sovereign nation state. If, however, these security and recognition arguments are taken seriously, then the modern state should not be the final goal. In order to overcome the modern state system and its difficulties once and for all, we need to move towards a world state (or some similar form) as the "Other" beyond the modern lines of the current state system, and this is so for the same reasons that the modern state and the modern system of states were built.

Global Humanity and Its Recognition

Some indications that the UN is a representative body of world humanity can be found in the UN Charter though these signs are overshadowed by the understanding of the UN as an international organisation that prevails both generally and in the Charter, which begins with:
   We the peoples of the United Nations determined

   to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice
      in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
   to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and
      worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and wom-
      en and of nations large and small, and
   to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the ob-
      ligations arising from treaties and other sources of international
      law can be maintained, and
   to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger free-
      dom. [23]

   The formulation 'we the peoples' may imply a world fragmented into particular nations rather than a unified humanity, but the subsequent specification of goals to be achieved by the peoples of the United Nations frames the 'peoples' in a different way. The Charter uses terms and sets goals which indicate an indifference to national borders; these include, for example, 'faith in fundamental human rights,' which is not only about the human rights that may be guaranteed by a national framework, but also concerns a somehow higher and more general faith in these rights, and 'succeeding generations,' a phrase used es-

pecially in connection with humankind (and which helps to suggest an issue for the history of humankind). This language also suggests that the UN might want to work as a guarantor of international law, i.e. by standing above particular states. All this suggests that the phrase 'the peoples' is indifferent to national borders and relates instead to humankind and that the proposed goals cannot be reached through a solely national framework.

The Charter, thus, shows partial awareness of global issues which need to be governed or at least coordinated at a global level. While these signs in the UN Charter are not clear enough to frame the UN unambiguously as an organisation of world politics and a unified world humankind, they are the seeds from which many stronger contemporary portrayals of the UN as a kind of world government grow.[24] It is useful therefore to examine two important strategies which help to present the UN as a world political organisation. The first one locates the UN as the true representative of global civil society[25] while the second relates to the UN through its secretaries-general, who often act as representatives of universal world values. According to the first strategy, the UN creates a concept of "global civil society" that needs to be represented, and it also locates itself as a government-like body in this regard. According to the second, the secretaries-general aim to act as world politicians.

The first discursive strategy does not directly follow up on the signs in the UN Charter though their indirect influence may be suspected. Instead, it focuses on the phenomenon of global civil society (GCS) and the UN as its representative. This strategy treats GCS as something that is obviously present in contemporary politics. It does not offer any lengthy defence of why a truly global civil society should be regarded as an indisputable fact; it is crucial to this reasoning to pretend that the existence of GCS is self-evident. The UN's basic and most fundamental approach to GCS can be succinctly encapsulated in the following quote from the UN's website: 'The United Nations is both a participant in and a witness to an increasingly global civil society.'[26] The objectivisation of GCS as a fact is a result of the way that the UN distances itself from the process of GCS's creation, i.e. by playing the role of witness. The UN does not situate itself as a direct governing body of GCS but rather as an organisation which is helping GSC to develop. This is apparent from the above quote (in which it has the role of a 'participant') as well as

69

from many other more extensive UN documents and strategies intended to support the development of GCS. It is also worth noting that both the roles in which the UN places itself discursively – as witness and as participant - are often cited in different UN documents.[27] These two roles are then supplemented by a third position, which might be called "leader of the cooperation." This can be seen in the following statement by Ban Ki-moon which appears as a motto on the UN website:

> Our times demand a new definition of leadership – global leadership. They demand a new constellation of international cooperation – governments, civil society and the private sector, working together for a collective global good.[28]

This third role is built on the two previous positions as well as on the UN's denial that there exists, or might be, any other actor capable of co-ordinating GCS at global level. The UN constructs itself as the only actor who is able to represent and coordinate GCS while framing the modern state as the proper location where critical political authority should reside. Thus, the UN strikes a balance between international politics (where "proper" state authority belongs) and world politics (where the UN supports the "natural" process of enhancing GCS). This approach is especially obvious in the strategic documents of different agencies and programmes.[29]

While this discursive strategy claims that civil society has overcome national boundaries and needs a helping hand that must come from a "world political organisation," it is manifestly unwilling to create a link between GCS and the UN as a governing body. Instead, it asserts that the UN should act in a world-oriented manner that has global as well as local reach. Operating at a local level means working in a specific place that belongs to a nation state, however a world organisation addresses local issues independently of the framework of the nation state and the international system. In contrast, local developments are framed by the need to enhance GCS cohesion since these local issues are understood not as national problems but as matters of GCS. In this sense, the lines are crossed into the realm of world politics. Nevertheless, as has been noted, the UN does not want to directly challenge state authority. This is why it does not propose the creation of any new world authority. As long as the UN aims to develop GCS and its world orientation, however, it needs to position itself as an actor which can work at world level. Immediately upon establishing itself as a player

in world politics, the UN rhetorically returns proper authority to the nation state. While modern sovereignty remains based on the 'society – political authority' relationship[30] and the main referent of modern sovereignty is "the people,"[31] the acknowledgement of society as global creates an attractor in the need for a globally operating authority encompassing the global and world-wide nature of society. Society's move "across the lines" (beyond national borders) compels a similar journey which should be made by the political authority. The UN's effort to balance international with world politics connects to a series of moves from international to world politics and back again.

Aleš Karmazin

The second main discursive strategy, which is far more straightforward, relates to norm entrepreneurship and the activities of the secretaries-general. Here it is useful to note that although (nearly) all secretaries-general have repeatedly related their authority to tasks specified in the UN Charter, i.e. to their bureaucratic position,[32] from the very beginning of the existence of this office, they have aimed to increase their influence along with the importance of their post and the range of their political powers. Instead of being mere bureaucrats, as defined in the UN Charter, they tend very often to act as political representatives; they present themselves quite frequently as politicians who stand for universal interests and world values in contrast to the particular self-interest of national leaders.[33] Their self-promotion as politicians whose interests are universal is also connected to their norm entrepreneurship. Rushton thoroughly examines the promotion of democracy by the former UN secretary-general Boutros-Ghali.[34]

The advancing of democracy in this case was situated in – and defined through – the context of other norms such as development, peace and human rights which should help to change democracy into an inherently global issue. Boutros-Ghali's 'Agenda for Peace' portrays the secretary-general as a world politician who – with the help of other global institutions such as the World Court – is working globally for peace and democratic dialogue.[35] Similar attempts to frame democracy and peace can be found in the views of (former) Secretary-General Kofi Annan,[36] who suggested that the world is facing new challenges which cannot be addressed through the old sovereignty framework. In fact, the old sovereignty system is regarded as an obstacle to finding new solutions. This creates the need for further coordination and decision-making in the framework of the UN Security Council. Apart from

the causes of democracy and peace/security, the norm entrepreneurship of Boutros-Ghali and Annan also entails efforts portray themselves as spokespersons of and for global humanity, which connects with the previously examined discursive strategy. Similar attempts can be seen in the activities of many other secretaries-general.[37]

All these norm entrepreneurship activities and initiatives of secretaries-general push certain topics from their original domestic location (democracy) or international placement (security, human community) to a level beyond the international. This "promotion" to a higher level includes two related restatements. The first one claims that issues like democracy, human community and security are primarily embedded in a world (and not in any national) framework; in other words, their nature is global or universal. The second re-articulation points out that these issues should be solved by establishing an environment like the domestic one at global level through the secretary-general as a world politician, the World Court as a tool for overseeing world democracy and the Security Council as a decision-making body for security concerns. The solution by its very nature rests on a) an analogy with the domestic (even if the environment more closely resembles a confederation of states whose interests are coordinated by several higher institutions) and b) a move from the small to the large. This move from the small (the nation state) to the large (federation- or confederation-like institutions beyond states) presupposes 1) clear lines dividing the state and the modern state system on the one hand, and world politics (the world state) on the other hand and 2) the transporting of domestic logic to global issues across these clear lines.

World Security

This section focuses on the UN's attempts to serve as a world security organisation. These efforts are best summarised and expressed in the concept/principle of "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P), which has recently been developed to theoretically justify, politically legitimise and practically guide such measures. While this may seem obvious, it is worth noting that R2P is not an exception to the UN's approach to military engagement but rather it follows from previous UN military (peace-keeping/peace-building) missions and humanitarian interventions. It may be regarded as a concentrated expression of prevailing

views on security within the UN. R2P's indirect precursor was Annan's evaluation of the role of sovereignty in contemporary security affairs.[38] Annan expressed R2P's core claim in his argument that in an emerging humanitarian catastrophe where a large number of people inside a state are at serious risk of suffering or being killed, the international community – represented primarily by the UN – should act to protect these endangered people even if this means violating national borders. As the leader of the international community in such cases, the UN, he claimed, should act 'in defence of our common humanity' since 'humanity is, after all, indivisible.'[39] Following-up on Annan's argument, R2P establishes the principles under which the international community has a responsibility to intervene and protect citizens from mass atrocities where their own nation state has failed to do so.[40]

This conceptual basis for waging military actions, thus, presupposes that at certain times, security cannot be guaranteed via the traditional framework of the modern state system. At these specific moments, states are neither the main referential objects nor the main subjects (actors) of security. To the contrary, the people become the main referential object whose security should be provided by the international community with the UN as its leader. The role of the UN here is not to monopolise the legitimate use of violence or to establish a world army but rather to be able to mobilise the international community in order to defend people in a nation state. The people inside that state are not defended primarily due to their citizenship rights – R2P is rather indifferent to these kinds of rights – but rather by virtue of the fact that they are humans and belong to a common humanity.[41] According to the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) report, which first developed the R2P concept, describes it in most detail and also defines its basic meaning (subject to later revisions), R2P interventions are justifiable under certain conditions; one of these is the "just cause" situation of 'serious and irreparable harm occurring to human beings.'[42] This motivation clearly shows disrespect for the traditional schema of the modern state system.

At these specific moments, security should be provided through a world politics framework while the traditional logic of the modern state system is put aside. These are exceptional instances which might possibly be compared with Carl Schmitt's exemption for cases when a world authority declares the need to provide security via a different

mechanism and political logic. The aim of R2P, however, is not to establish a world authority which could declare exceptions as it wishes, thereby formulating a new kind of world political authority; it is rather to institutionalise the world political framework as an exceptional means of providing security within the existing system of the UN, current international law and modern states, and to connect this with the proper form of state authority. After such an exception arises and the humanitarian crisis is solved, the political framework should revert from this exception for world politics to its normal state. This "normal" state is twofold. Firstly, it is the state of international politics where proper political authority is vested in the nation state (and not the UN). Second, it is the framework in which the proper form (or domestic regime) of nation states is established. In other words, although it might seem like the exception describes some ultimate form of authority and politics as occurs in Schmitt's political theory, in fact it co-defines and re-affirms international politics.

As Weber observed,[43] humanitarian interventions work to establish the proper state of authority, which is specified by the Western liberal 'standard of civilization.'[44] Weber's argument is also valid for R2P. The initial ICISS report on R2P did not understand sovereignty and human rights-based intervention as contradictory concepts but rather complementary ones.[45] The final form of R2P was agreed at the 2005 World Summit, which recognised that:

> [e]ach individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility and support the United Nations in establishing an early warning capability.[46]

These words show clearly that R2P is reconstructing an image of rightful state authority and actions ('encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility'); according to R2P, this embraces certain duties (i.e. prevention of criminal acts including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity). The ultimate aim under R2P is not to carry out interventions, but to define proper author-

ity and enforce and supply it when it fails. As both Reus-Smit and Weber remind us, sovereignty has never been a self-referential norm.[47] In this case, R2P helps to co-define sovereignty and establish its referents. This all means that R2P fundamentally works in the framework of the modern sovereign state and state system.

Aleš Karmazin

The UN and other defenders of R2P argue for the complementarity of R2P as a tool for providing security, and traditional international security mechanisms as another means to reach the same end. This shows that R2P is connected with the assumption of repeated movements across state borders. (In some cases, states will respect traditional "Westphalian" sovereignty and use established mechanisms such as ensuring the balance of power and diplomatic power relations to manage their international relations; at other times, borders can or even must be legitimately crossed in order to protect humanity.) Similar repeated movements are presumed across the lines between international politics and world politics. These transitions from one mode to another are seen as unproblematic, and the possibility of repeated movement across the lines from "here" to "there" and back again is presumed. The nature of the lines is truly Euclidean in these cases since they do not preclude these shifts. Contrarily, Euclidean lines make these moves easier since actors passing across the lines are not confronted with lines of any width. In other words, there is nothing within the lines which would hamper their movement.

Conclusion

Several attempts to move from international politics to world politics are under way in the UN today. The mechanisms for these moves work through what has been called the lines-attractors nexus. The nature of Euclidean lines creates an opportunity to move beyond these same lines; they are not final frontiers, but demarcations between two different spaces that do not preclude the option of crossing from one to another. The mechanism of the attractors is, in turn, based on the possibility of moving towards an end-state or equilibrium.

We can draw some specific conclusions from or in connection with this nexus:

First – the UN fundamentally operates within and re-affirms the two distinct political spaces (imaginaries) of international and world poli-

tics. Some of the main modern motivations and visions for organising politics and creating the state, i.e. the need for security and for the recognition of identity, are carried over into the UN's attempts to serve as a world political organisation. The UN's move towards world politics occurs across modern lines which do not change the structure of issues/problems/themes but only situate them in a different context. The UN's actions in the sphere of world politics are motivated by the same reasons which modern political theory invoked to establish the sovereign nation state.

Second – as is obvious, the UN's shift towards world politics is propelled by two traditional specific attractors, namely the issues of human community/belonging and security. This has been pointed out by Wendt and many other authors before him since both these issues and the need for their resolution seem to stem from the modern state system. In contrast to many other more simplistic visions of the world state and world cosmopolitanism, there is a clear inclination here towards a highly sophisticated understanding of what world politics means and when and how this can be reached. The UN's efforts rely on the elaboration of the highly theoretical concepts of R2P, global civil society, changes in sovereignty and possibly several others, and the actual shift from international to world politics based on these concepts also involves highly complex reasoning. R2P, for example, sets out in detail the conditions when "Westphalian" borders can be suspended and how this action should be justified theoretically.

Third – there is also great wariness and fear about the world state as an absolute Leviathan; efforts are evidently being made to avoid utopianism, which has been discredited due to previous failures to establish a world political organisation (like the League of Nations). This attempt to eschew the utopianism of the world state is perhaps the most important reason for the sophisticated reworking of world politics in UN rhetoric (using theoretical concepts such as R2P, GCS and changes to sovereignty). The function of world politics here is to articulate a world of better political relations (based on genuine awareness of common humanity rather than the motivations of particular interests) without falling prey to the trap of utopianism.

Fourth – there is an observable reliance on domestic analogies and solutions as well as categories derived or exported from the nation state (e.g. civil society → global civil society, world courts, depictions of the secretary general as the head of, or a spokesperson for, world politics),

and this facilitates movement beyond the modern state system. The fundamental shift from international to world politics, thus, depends on quite a simple move from small to large. This is the case despite the mentioned reluctance of the UN to create (world) state-like solutions. This "masked" small-large move is enabled by the modern character of lines and space, which assumes that transporting something across the lines means establishing its identical reflection in another plane. That reflection is then described by the same coordinates. This movement does not seem problematic since during the actual crossing of the lines, objects/subjects are not confronted with anything of meaning (the lines lack width and cannot possess any meaning) which could change the identity of objects/subjects.

Finally **–** the UN's endeavours are not as straightforward as Wendt's teleological movement towards a final goal. The UN relies quite often on the achievement of a balance between international and world politics. What is striking about the UN's efforts is not the balance, however, so much as the basing of its world politics proposals on several moves from international to world politics and back again in order to reach that balance. This type of movement towards world politics requires and works through repeated alternation between international and world politics and a recurring crossing of the lines. Modern lines create a necessary background for this mode of operation since the repeated transport of meaning, objects and subjects across the lines from one plane (or space or realm) to another is mechanical to some extent. The movement across these lines, which establish different planes with different identities, changes the identity of subjects/objects, but it does not alter their structure since the lines do not exert any force (or contain any meaning) which could do so.

<div align="center">

∾

</div>

ALEŠ KARMAZIN is affiliated to *Global Politics* – where he serves as editor – and may be reached at *ales.karmazin@gmail.com*

Notes

1 Peter G. Danchin and Horst Fischer (eds) (2010), *United Nations Reform and the New Collective Security,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Derek Heater (1996), *World Citizenship and Government: Cosmopolitan Ideas in the History of Western Political Thought,* London, Basingstoke: Macmillan, ch. 6; Mark Imber (2006), 'The Reform of the UN Security Council,' *International Relations*, 20(3), pp. 328-334; Spencer Zifcak (2008), *United Nations Reform. Heading North or South,* London, New York: Routledge.

2 Richard A. Falk, Samuel S. Kim and Saul H. Mendlovitz, eds. (1982), *Toward a Just World Order,* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press; Hidemi Suganami (1989),*The Domestic Analogy and World Order Proposals,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3 Rob B. J. Walker (2010), *After the Globe, Before the World,* New York, London: Routledge.

4 Sergei Prozorov (2009), 'Generic Universalism in World Politics. Beyond International Anarchy and the World State,' *International Theory*, 1(2), pp. 215-247; Sergei Prozorov (2011), 'Is World Politics a World Away?,' *Contemporary Political Theory*, 10(2), pp. 286-289; Walker (2010)

5 Alexander Wendt (2003), 'Why a World State Is Inevitable,' *European Journal of International Theory*, 9(4), pp. 491-542.

6 Daniel Deudney (1995), 'Nuclear Weapons and the Waning of the Real-State,' *Daedalus*, 124(2), 209-231; Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1977), *Phenomenology of Spirit,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

7 Wendt (2003)

8 Walker (2010)

9 Chris Brown (2001), 'Borders and Identity in International Political Theory,' in Mathias Albert, David Jacobson and Yosef Lapid, eds., *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory,* Minneapolis: Minneapolis University Press, pp. 117-137.

10 Tim Ingold (2007), *Lines: A Brief History,* London, New York: Routledge, pp. 1-5.

11 Walker (2010)

12 I use the phrases "modern lines" and "Euclidean lines" interchangeably in this paper.

13 Jacques Derrida (1996), *Politics of Friendship,* London: Verso; Chantal Mouffe (2000), *The Democratic Paradox,* London: Verso; Prozorov (2009); John Agnew (1994), 'The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory,' *Review of International Political Economy*, 1(1), pp. 53–80; Carl Schmitt (2003), *The Nomos of the Earth in the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europeanum,* New York: Telo Press, pp. 87-90.

14 Martin Jones (2010), 'Limits to "Thinking Space Relationally",' *International Journal of Law in Context*, 6(3), p. 245.

15 Euclid (1908), *The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements,* Cambridge: The University Press, book I, definitions 1-3, 5-6, 13.

16 Aristotle (1995), '*Metaphysics,'* in Jonathan Barnes, ed.*The Complete Works of*

Aristotle, vol. 2, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 1022.

17 Jens Bartelson (2009), *Visions of World Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ch. 3.

18 Bartelson (2009); Norbert Ohler (1989),*The Medieval Traveller,* Woodbridge: Boydell Press; Susan Reynolds (1997), *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 8.

19 Even what might be called transnational NGOs work within these underlying spaces, with the only difference being that they operate in many countries and cooperate with international organisations and other NGOs and governments, etc. Their "transnationalism," however, really involves a higher quantity of domestic-international interactions. They have not been able to restructure the basic realms of political identities and authorities.

20 Walker (2010)

21 Wendt (2003)

22 Although Wendt does not elaborate on this category in detail, he indicates the significance of this logic; see Wendt (2003), p 494. For a more explicit discussion, see also Alexander Wendt (2002), 'One World State is Inevitable,' *Big Ideas Public Lectures*, available at <http://bigideas.tvo.org/episode/171875/alexander-wendt-on-why-a-one-state-world-is-inevitable> (accessed 03 May 2012).

23 *The Charter of the United Nations,* available at <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/> (accessed 03 May 2012), Preamble.

24 Dianne Otto (2005), 'Non-Governmental Organisations in the United Nations,' in John A. Hall and Frank Trentmann, eds., *Civil Society. A Reader in History, Theory and Global Politics,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 292-297.

25 For the purpose of this paper, it is not necessary to examine the specific structure of global civil society. That structure seems to be at least partly different from the traditional understanding of "national" civil society (due, for example, to the more important role of NGOs within global civil society as well as other factors).

26 *UN and Civil Society,* available at <http://www.un.org/en/civilsociety/index.shtml> (accessed 20 January 2013).

27 See, for example, *United Nations Global Compact,* available at <http://www.unglobalcompact.org/howtoparticipate/civil_society/index.html> (accessed 20 January 2013)

28 Ban Ki-moon (2009), *Speech at World Economic Forum, available at United Nations website,* <http://www.who.int/hiv/universalaccess2010/worldsummit.pdf> *(accessed 20 January 2013).*

29 Thomas Fues (2007), 'Millennium Development Goals and Streamlining the UN Development Architectures,' *International Studies*, 44(1), pp. 23-37; *The Millennium Development Goals: Eight Goals for 2015,* available at <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/mdgoverview.html> (accessed 03 May 2012); *The Declaration of Responsibilities and Human Duties,* available at <http://globalization.icaap.org/content/v2.2/declare.html> (accessed 03 May 2012); *Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth*, available at

Aleš Karmazin

79

<www.g20.utoronto.ca/2010/g20seoul-consensus.pdf> (accessed 04 May 2012).

30   Francis Harry Hinsley (1986), *Sovereignty,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Michel Foucault (2007), *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

31   Christian Reus-Smit (1999),*The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press; Christan Reus-Smit (2001), 'Human Rights and the Social Construction of Sovereignty,' *Review of International Studie*s, 27(4), pp. 519-538; Cynthia Weber (1995), *Simulating Sovereignty: Intervention, the State, and Symbolic Exchange,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

32   Simon Rushton (2008), 'The UN Secretary-General and Norm Entrepreneurship. Boutros Boutros-Ghali and Democracy Promotion,' *Global Governance*, 14(1), p. 98.

33   Kent J. Kille and Roger M. Scully (2003), 'Executive Heads and the Role of Intergovernmental Organizations: Expansionist Leadership in the United Nations and the European Union,' *Political Psychology*, 24(1), pp. 175-198; Howard H. Lentner (1965), 'The Diplomacy of the United Nations Secretary-General,' *The Western Political Quarterly*, 18(3), pp. 531-550.

34   Rushton (2008)

35   Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1992), *An Agenda for Peace. Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-Keeping,* available at <http://www.unrol.org/files/A_47_277.pdf> (accessed 04 May 2012).

36   Kofi Annan (1999), 'Two Concepts of Sovereignty,' *Economist*, 16 September; Kofi Annan (2004), 'The Causes of Conflict and the Promotion of Durable Peace and Sustainable Development in Africa,' *African Renaissance*, 1(3), pp. 9-43.

37   Rushton (2008); Lentner (1965); Stephen M. Schwebel (1969), *The Secretary-General of the United Nations. His Political Powers and Practice,* New York: Greenwood.

38   Annan (1999)

39   Ibid.

40   *2005 World Summit Outcome,* available at <http://www.who.int/hiv/universalaccess2010/worldsummit.pdf> (accessed 04 May 2012), p. 31.

41   Ibid, paragraphs 138, 139.

42   ICISS (2001), *The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty,* available at <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf> (accessed 03 May 2012). It should be noted that not everything in this report was subsequently accepted.

43   Weber (1995), ch. 7

44   Reus Smit (1999, 2001); Gerrit W. Gong (1984), *The Standard of "Civilization" in International Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

45   ICISS (2001)

46   *2005 World Summit Outcome,* available at <http://www.who.int/hiv/universalaccess2010/worldsummit.pdf> (accessed 04 May 2012), paragraph 138.

47   Reus-Smit (2001), Weber (1995).

Interregional and EU–ASEAN Relations

Achievements, Challenges and External Influences

Vasiliki Papatheologo

Interregionalism is a pragmatic strategy for action by the EU, and a tool to extend norms and European values to the developing world while promoting global governance. To this end, the EU has developed several interregional and trans-regional frameworks around in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Focusing specifically on interregionalism as an EU tool to promote regional governance in the East Asia region, this study examines relations between the EU and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) as a practical instance of pure interregionalism. This investigation negotiates the internal functions of interregionalism in EU-ASEAN bilateral relations along with its achievements and the challenges of bilateral interregional relationships. The work also deals with some external influences on EU-ASEAN interregionalism and highlights the great and regional powers (specifically the US and China) and their attitudes to the interregionalism being promoted by the EU to ASEAN and more generally in the East Asia region.

Keywords Interregionalism, European Union, ASEAN, China, US, European Values

Introduction

Historically, interregionalism was an innovation of the EU's external relations framework as well as a product of the EU's status as the

Scan this article onto your mobile device

pre-eminent actor of its type. Since interregionalism's initial unfolding – as an external relations framework – it has developed into a distinct layer of the architecture of global governance and part of the international system.[1] Indeed, as a new wave of regionalism emerged over the last two decades, regional organisations have made efforts to establish themselves as real and significant international actors. In this context, interregional relations between regional entities have intensified, transforming the landscape of interregionalism from an EU-centred policy into one in which multiple actors play a part.

Nevertheless, the EU's version of interregionalism continues to be characterised by intense institutionalisation and the EU's own extensive integration. Specifically, the EU's international relations exist, to a large extent, in the interregionalism framework, reflecting a consistent search for structures within which to couch the EU's relationships with its external partners. Indeed, the importance of group-to-group relations is recognised in the Commission's claims that regional integration provides a chance to rationalise external relations and international cooperation.

Internationally, the EU becomes a normative power by exporting norms and values around the globe via interregionalism, which is the main tool of EU foreign policy. The interregionalism concept plays three key functions in EU external relations: first it aims to manage global interdependence; the primary axis of EU foreign policy. Second, it is a tool for achieving further regional governance since it facilitates the regionalisation process and establishes the "actorness" of regional entities. Finally, it attempts to manage political and economic dialogue with other partners and regional actors. In this sense, interregionalism is both a practical EU strategy and an alternative world order for managing global interdependence.

As an EU external policy tool, interregionalism enables the EU to expand its role in the East Asia region. It is true that the EU lacks an active role in East Asia and its main motives are economic at both multilateral and bilateral levels based on the upping of its economic and normative power. Interregionalism may, however, also provide a chance to the EU to actively participate in East Asia and so become a mediator of the balance of power there.

Admittedly, the EU's approach to East Asia remains fragmented when compared to its relations with other regions such as Africa and

Latin America. This is largely attributed to the culturally heterogeneity and diversity of the region and the geographic distant it is from Europe. From a geopolitical point of view, the EU's role as a global power in Asia remains limited, and in this context, Asians see the EU more as a normative civilian power and example of regional integration potentially applicable to Asia than as a great power.

In focusing on the EU's position on Asia and exploring the place of interregionalism in its Asia policies, it is important to note that the EU's strategy in Asia is broad and divided into four main approaches. The first of these is bilateral and includes the EU's relations with its main Asian partners such as China, Korea and Japan. The EU's bilateral relations with these Asian countries mainly involve trade and investments. The second approach is multilateral and concerns the EU's participation in multilateral forums in the East Asia region such as the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) where the EU acts more as a normative power than a strategic one. In a multilateral forum such as the ARF, the EU's role remains limited since the US and China are the major actors in the East Asia region. Nevertheless, the EU's participation in ARF is a sign that the promotion of multilateralism is one of the main axes of the EU's external policies in East Asia. The EU's third way to East Asia relates to transregionalism within the framework of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM). The EU has a coherent role in the ASEM as a norm-making power. As an example of transregionalism or complex interregionalism however, ASEM has limited utility given the low level of actorness of its Asian partners, particularly since, in the ASEM context, East Asia is not represented as a united region but rather through separate, disparate Asian member states. The fourth EU approach deals with pure interregionalism, focusing on the EU-ASEAN relationship, which is a practical instance of this strategy. Through the EU-ASEAN region-to-region interaction, the EU is able to construct an external identity and present itself as an ideal type of regional institution and a normative power in external affairs.

The main goal of this study is to demonstrate how interregionalism works in the EU-ASEAN relationship and, in particular, to explore interregionalism's theoretical functions in this context. The influence of external factors is assumed here by reference to the role of great powers such as the US and China in the regionalisation process in East Asia as well as their place in EU-ASEAN interregionalism. A review of

the existing literature provides the theoretical background for inter-regionalism along with the reasons for its existence from a global governance standpoint. This existing literature, however, approaches the eu-asean relationship in terms of bilateralism and does not engage with its interregional dimensions or the role of interregionalism as a theoretical framework. Against this backdrop, this work considers internal factors in eu-asean interregionalism which can be traced to International Relations theories and to the bilateral features of the eu-asean relationship.

Functions of Interregionalism in EU-ASEAN Relations based on International Relations Theories

The answer to this study's inquiry into how interregionalism works in the eu-asean bilateral relationship can be found in International Relations approaches and interregionalism's theoretical framework. In particular, while asean and eu models of regionalism may seem similar, this resemblance is only superficial; they are very different and contradictory formulations. In the eu's case, integration was a legally established, deep-seated process based on a strong institutional strategy involving the sharing of sovereignty and its common exercise. In contrast, asean integration has been of a regional process that makes space for the consolidating of national sovereignty and for nation and state-building. Its goal is consolidation and not the sharing of sovereignty.

In order to unpack the eu-asean relationship as a case of 21st-century interregionalism, it is important to consider a theoretical framework for interregionalism. This can also help in understanding how the diversity and complexities of these two regions have been handled both within the eu and in the context of their interregional relationship. Distinguishing materialist, ideological and institutional theories is useful in order to grasp the ways that the three become entangled in this relationship in practice. The theoretical framework must also show how diverse eu-asean relations coexist and interact in the multi-level character of eu-asean relations.

The eu and asean share a commitment to regional integration as a means of fostering regional stability, building prosperity and addressing global challenges. In addition, the eu fully supports the renewed efforts of the asean to build closer relationships among its members.

The first function of interregionalism relates to *identity building*. The concept of collective identity formation stems from constructivist notions of actor identity. This is based on the argument that the fundamental structures of international relations are social in nature and that these structures, rather than simply facilitating and constraining action, help to sculpt actor interests and identities.[2] As an increasingly institutionalised structure of region-to-region relations, interregionalism offers a platform for contact between regional actors as well as a venue for socialisation and, thus, a framing context for the construction of collective regional identities and awareness. In other words, interregionalism is an example of the claim that as the "dynamic density" of interactions increases, so too will the potential for endogenous transformations of identity.[3]Where no firm identity has previously been established, a collective identity is more likely to be formed through interaction with an external "Other" if the external dialogue partner is a significant, more coherent entity. When it comes to identity building in the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship the EU, as a normative power, promotes interregionalism in order to spread norms and values which facilitate regional integration and actorness.

Vasiliki Papatheologo

The second function of interregionalism in the EU-ASEAN relationship is *institution building*. Recognition of the importance of institution-building within interregionalism comes from the liberal institutionalist emphasis on the role of institutions in mitigating against potential causes of conflict; institutions instead generate cooperative outcomes and have a legalising effect on international relations. This stems from the view that institutions matter in world politics. Interregionalism involves the creation of a cooperative dialogue structure, moving into a formal arrangement. The process of interregional institution-building therefore helps strengthen the institutionalisation of international politics.[4] Another institutionalism-based interpretation holds that EU-ASEAN interregionalism is a way of institutionalising dialogues between the two entities. On a broader view, this is part of the globalisation of world politics at a multilateral level.

Interregionalism's third and final function is *providing balance*. More specifically, the notion that interregionalism performs a balancing role in international relations comes from realist conceptions of actor competition. From this view, anarchy and a self-help approach to security lead to the accumulation of power individually or as part of a temporary coalition. The result is the emergence of a relatively stable

balance of power. While on the traditional realist approach, such power is defined in terms of territory, population, resources and military capacity, in the globalised world of the new interregionalism, power is increasingly seen to be founded on economic strength. Interregional balancing therefore constitutes a system of checks and balances developed through the diversification of political and economic relations and designed to avoid marginalisation and consolidate a multilateral system of shared principles, rules and norms. When potential courses of action are limited through a multilateral framework and the threat of economic and political marginalisation, the ability of any pole to act unilaterally is constrained. Through the structure of interregionalism, regional actors have sought to limit their dependence on others, remedy structural and relational imbalances of power and guarantee the preservation or promotion of their political and economic interests.

The EU-ASEAN relationship includes all three described functions of interregionalism. Yet, while identity building and institutionalisation are based on internal factors and the motivations of the main participants in interregionalism, i.e. the EU as the exporter and the ASEAN as the recipient, the third function of balancing power includes both internal and external factors and motivations. As such, it gives a more rounded and realistic explanation of the function of interregionalism.

So, when it comes to the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship, the reasons why regional entities and external actors (global powers) each participate in and support interregionalism are largely ideological and based on the globalisation of world politics. At the same time, however, the realist explanation can provide an answer about how interregionalism actually works since when practising interregionalism, the main motivation is balancing power within institutional-interregional frameworks.

Opportunities and Challenges in EU-ASEAN Bilateral Interregionalism

The EU-ASEAN bilateral interregional dialogue is largely defined by what is achievable when qualitatively different regional actors meet. It is clear that the EU's aspirations for dialogue draw from ideas of capacity building and globally active varieties of interregionalism. Even so, the ability to deliver on these goals has been determined largely by the

asymmetry between the EU and the ASEAN as actors. Of note here is the failure of interregionalism to rekindle the EU's hopes regarding its role in the broader architecture of global governance. The strategy has not delivered the cooperative multilateral partnership so often highlighted as central to the EU concept of interregionalism. This is despite that investments in the post-bipolar world have been crucial to the interregional relationship.

Three features of EU-ASEAN interregionalism may therefore be highlighted. The first concerns the place of economic balancing as an effective basis for cooperation. It is in the economic sphere that the EU's actorness is primarily to be felt, and there are unsurprisingly concerns over market access, trade and ASEAN relations. The performance of bilateral interregionalism at global level has failed to meet these expectations. The main problem has been the limited actorness of both the EU and the ASEAN. Second is its continuing emphasis on the functions of a globally active interregional relationship. With the rise of global governance institutions in the post-bipolar era, these functions have increasingly been seen as the measure of success of the EU-ASEAN Charter integration project. This may change, however.

A third and final feature stems from the asymmetrical actorness of the EU and the ASEAN. The interregional relationship has been characterised by the performance of actions linked to capacity building for interregionalism. Alongside the non-purposive construction and reinforcement of ASEAN collective identity, one consequence of engaging with a more coherent regional "Other," is an increasingly strategic process of region building. Both the EU and the ASEAN have used EU-ASEAN interregionalism as a mechanism for fostering Southeast Asian regionalism. Within the architecture of interregionalism, a range of programmes have been set up with the aim of increasing the capacity of ASEAN Secretariat as an interlocutor in the integration process. Further, ASEAN has elaborated clear goals for its own integration; this capacity-building process has become strategic.[5]

In this context, subsequent bilateral interregional agreements have formally recognised the EU-ASEAN relationship. In the era of the 1983 Cooperation Agreement with the European Commission, the Cartagena Agreement recognised the establishment of sub-committees, while the 1989 EC-Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) Cooperation Agreement formally acknowledged engagements at ministerial level. Three core

elements make up the backbone of the EU's bilateral interregionalism with ASEAN. The first is the ministerial level meeting, which takes decisions in pursuit of interregional goals. The ASEAN EU Ministerial Meeting (AEMM), for example, is convened every 18 months with representatives of both the EU and the ASEAN. The second, the Joint Cooperation Committee (JCC), assists the institution at ministerial level; it comprises officials from each region and is called at least once a year. The third consists of the subcommittees and working groups established by either the ministerial level or the JCC. These subcommittees are issue-based and include a trade group along with others bearing on specific issues in EU-ASEAN relations.[6]

As a mechanism of interregionalism, the AEMM enhances the political dialogue. Human rights promotion is another feature of the EU's advancement of interregionalism to the ASEAN. More specifically, the EU supports the work of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission for Human Rights (AICHR), the overarching rights promotion and protection body in the ASEAN. This support exists through regional dialogues, seminars and technical cooperation programmes. EU-ASEAN cooperation takes place in regional and international forums including the UN and the ASEM, where it is seen as a way of strengthening the multilateral system. In contrast, the EU's own motives for promoting regional cooperation are to maintain peace, activity and stability and continue bolstering ASEAN's central place in the evolving regional architecture. Furthermore, the EU is involved in the areas of maritime security, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, peacekeeping operations, military medicine and counter-terrorism. In parallel, it adds weight to the role of the ARF where the ASEAN is the primary force promoting peace and stability as well as dialogue and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

In terms of implementing pure interregionalism, the EU uses the political dialogue arising from its security/political cooperation with ASEAN, to address a number of "non-traditional" security activities. These include, for example, promoting dialogue and cooperation on ways to tackle transnational crime and supporting the implementation of the ASEAN Convention on Counter-Terrorism. Further, the EU and the ASEAN cooperate closely in the areas of conflict prevention, peace-building, crisis management, disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This joint work happens through workshops, seminars and exchanges of best practices and experiences.[7]

Economic cooperation is another crucial area of EU-ASEAN relations. The EU promotes dialogue and the provision of technical assistance to the ASEAN when it comes to economic and social policy. This is done with a view to contributing to sustainable development. Taken as a whole, the ASEAN is also the EU's third largest trading partner outside Europe (after the US and China).

Alongside trade negotiations with individual ASEAN members, the EU cooperates closely with the whole ASEAN region. This cooperation is maintained through:

1. EU-ASEAN dialogue, which includes discussions on trade and investment issues at ministerial and with senior economic aide levels.
2. Seminars conducted by the EU and the ASEAN Secretariat on topics such as regional economic integration, liberalising services, technical barriers to trade and trade facilitation.[8]

Cooperation concerning energy security is also part of the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship. The focus here is on promoting energy security and efficiency along with conservation measures and technologies. The EU supports the stimulation of regional programmes for ASEAN on developing alternative energy sources as well as nuclear energy and safety.

Socio-cultural cooperation is one of the main tools for promoting EU-ASEAN interregionalism. This entails cooperation on "low" political matters like education and health, and person-to-person contact. In the education sector, for example, the EU encourages the mobility of students and academics between ASEAN and EU higher institutions.

Promoting exchanges among cultural artists and scholars is another way of strengthening EU-ASEAN relations. In the health sector, this cooperation is enhanced by encouraging exchanges of knowledge and experiences among public health and medical experts. Gender equality is a further focus for cooperation through the exchange of experiences and practices. The EU offers programmes and policies on the wellbeing of women, children, the elderly and people with disabilities. Regarding disaster management, the EU has boosted its cooperation with the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management by sharing experiences and support related to best preventative practices. It also encourages partnerships with relevant stakeholders, including local communities, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), civil society and private enterprises.

Vasiliki Papatheologo

89

In science and technology, the EU promotes cooperation in research and technical innovation under the Seventh Framework Programme and the Horizon 2020 Programme. This includes support for the ASEAN's establishment of a network of science and technology centres of excellence to foster closer cooperation and the sharing of research facilities. Such closer cooperation facilitates exchanges and the greater mobility of scientists and researchers. Concerning global environmental challenges, the EU offers technical support and capacity building to assist with the ASEAN's implementation of implementing Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAS) and the ASEAN Climate Change Initiative (ACCI). Moreover, the EU encourages sub-regional cooperation to boost socio-economic development and sustainable water management.

In terms of institutional support for ASEAN, the EU first of all supports measures to build the capacities of the ASEAN Secretariat and other ASEAN institutions. Second, it promotes exchange programmes with the ASEAN and particularly between the EU Commission and the ASEAN Secretariat. Finally, the EU endorses the establishment of institutional links between the Committee of Permanent Representatives to ASEAN (CPR) and the Committee of Permanent Representatives in the EU (COREPER). Connections include through exchanges among officials, the sharing of best practices and visits.[9]

Key Challenges for EU-ASEAN Interregional Relations

Multiple challenges have been evident in the EU-ASEAN relationship since the signing of the 1980 Cooperation Agreement. The first of these challenges is the absence of a clear cooperation agenda. Economic balancing factors have instead been the primary force behind the EU-ASEAN relationship, and they form the basis for cooperation that is supplemented by political and security-based reactions to external triggers. This default economic setting for EU interregionalism is the product of the EU's role as an economic actor in this context. In the EU-ASEAN relationship especially, economic goals have largely been defined in terms of the self-focused balancing function of interregionalism.

A second challenge lies in the contrast between the fulfilment of the functions of EU interregionalism associated with capacity building on

the one hand, and the failure to meet increasing expectations for dialogue linked to the high-end aspects of a globally active interregionalism on the other. These high-end functions are expressed in the strategy documents of the AEMM and the Commission.[10]

Regarding the challenges of EU-ASEAN bilateral interregionalism, it is also clear that each side has a different top priority in the relationship. For the EU, China is undoubtedly the biggest priority in Asia, and most political energy and economic resources have been concentrated there even in the context of an overall deficit of EU involvement in Asia. For the ASEAN, in contrast, the number-one priority relationship is with the US not only because it is the ASEAN's main trading partner but also since it is the key strategic player in Southeast Asia. The presence of the US provides an important guarantee of regional security, especially as a counterpoint to the growing power and influence of China. To a large extent, the ASEAN has assumed the EU to be a player whose instrumental balancing function in the region lies in moderating American and Chinese influences.

In addition, there is the issue of the EU's dual identity as a strong and coherent actor in matters of "low" politics such as trade and economics where the EU acts with a single voice, and a weak and divided actor in "high" political areas like defence and security where it has multiple and contradictory voices. The fact that the EU has played no role in the regional security framework – a structure traditionally dominated by tough security questions and the risks of conflict between states - has contributed over the years to reducing the EU's relevance in the Southeast Asia region. Security awareness in that region is acute.

Moreover, ASEAN enlargement in the second half of the 1990s decreased the level of cohesion inside the ASEAN and created a two-speed process and a more insular orientation that is aggravated by the economic and social crises of the Asian financial meltdown. Significantly, it has also generated the Myanmar problem, which has been a stumbling block in EU-ASEAN relations. The regional process has lost momentum because of a lack of leadership after Indonesia left that role, exhausted by its own domestic turmoil.

Finally, to reiterate, despite their surface similarity, the ASEAN and the EU models of regionalism are different and conflicting. For the EU, integration was a legally established intensive process driven by a strong institutional strategy involving the sharing of sovereignty and

its common exercise. In contrast, the ASEAN clearly sought to create a regional process that allows space for the consolidating of national sovereignty and nation and state-building. Its focus has, thus, been consolidation rather than the sharing of sovereignty. Nevertheless, there is interest in developing para-diplomatic links between EU regions/subnational governments on one side, and subnational governments and regional players in ASEAN countries on the other.

Lacking a holistic direction and still largely dominated by economic factors, EU-ASEAN relations have not just registered a clear decline in recent years with trade and foreign direct investment (FDI) flows dropping and political relations becoming hostage to the Myanmar problem: the relationship now runs the risk of turning into a secondary one. Changes in Southeast Asia, and especially the progress in democratisation and human rights standards which brought the ASEAN closer to the EU, have so far had no major impact on - or even contributed to - the reinvigoration of the relationship. Excessive governmentalisation, the dual identity of the EU and its ambiguous status as an international player and the divergence between EU and ASEAN models of regional integration, are some of the structural obstacles that account for current difficulties. These challenges have been assumed in the literature and framed against the qualitative difference in the actorness of the two regions when defining the real nature of the EU-ASEAN relationship.

This point about the asymmetrical relations between the EU and the ASEAN leads us to interregionalism's final balancing function, which is itself influenced by external factors. In particular, great global powers such as the US and China have an impact on EU-ASEAN interregionalism, which serves as a tool for balancing power and stability in the East Asia region. In this context, interregionalism expands the EU's role as a mediator in the region. In terms of external factors, the US and China as global powers view this interregionalism positively as an opportunity for regional governance and stability.

External Actors in EU-ASEAN Bilateral Interregionalism: The Role of the Great Powers

Turning to the external influences and, in particular, the role of the great powers in EU-ASEAN interregionalism, the key argument is that

EU-ASEAN interregional relations are in fact influenced by changes in the balance of power in the East Asia region. Even a realist explanation of EU-ASEAN interregionalism should take into account the ideological reasons why states (great powers) participate in and support interregionalism based on institutionalism and multilateralism. More specifically, we can make the case that the key great powers involved in the East Asia region (the US and China) can influence EU-ASEAN interregional relations and they are actually positive about interregionalism. This is because interregionalism is, on the one hand, an institutional tool which can provide a platform for multilateral cooperation and regional governance, and on the other, a way of ensuring the balance of power and stability in the East Asia region.

Vasiliki Papatheologo

As may be guessed from the range of areas of cooperation among the EU, the US and the ASEAN, the US approves of EU-ASEAN interregionalism. This is for a number of key reasons. First, the EU and the US remain allied and share many of the same fundamental governing and social values and aims in East Asia. Second, interregionalism is a tool for promoting multilateralism in the region, and third, in the face of regionalisation, interregionalism can be a tool for balancing power in the East Asia region. Through interregionalism, East Asia has the potential to be a region where more than one or two superpowers (the US, China, India, Russia, etc.) and regional entities (ASEAN, ASEAN+3, the EU etc.) are active. In sum, the US takes an affirmative view of the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship because the EU, its ally, shares its foreign policy values, and at the same time, the interregionalism concept can facilitate multilateralism and promote a power balance in the East Asia region, which is the main concern of US policy on East Asia.

To give a full picture of the impact of external factors on interregionalism, it is necessary to explore the role of China as a regional power in East Asia and, by extension, its involvement in and positive take on EU-ASEAN interregionalism. Lastly, we can consider China's overall attitude to the EU's role in East Asia as an exporter of interregionalism.

China takes a favourable view of EU-ASEAN interregionalism because interregionalism is a platform for balancing power in the East Asia region. In addition, through EU-derived interregionalism, China has the chance to learn how to promote regional governance and participate actively in forming a regional identity. By responding positively to interregionalism, China may eventually have the opportunity to

advance its own image as a "responsible power" both regionally and globally. The institutional framework of the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship, thus, has China's approval since China itself intends to be a responsible power in the Asia-Pacific region by improving the institutional framework there. Turning to the EU-China relationship, China sees the EU as a trading partner as well as a civilian and normative power from which China can learn how to foster regionalism. The EU example can, thus, give lessons to China about how to implement and actively participate in the regionalisation process in East Asia. From a geopolitical point of view, the EU's geo-strategic role in the East Asia region is limited since the main axis of EU foreign policy is promotion of interregionalism and multilateralism through a systematic institutional framework. The EU has no strategic interest in the region beyond increasing interdependent trade with its Asian partners and the flow of investments. In this context, China looks positively on the EU's intentions in the region and sees the EU as a partner and not a competitor since China benefits from trade with the EU and, at the same time, the interregionalism which the EU is promoting gives China the chance to learn how to deal with regional organisations in the area.

More generally, external factors in the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship, including the roles of the great powers and the international system influence the functions of interregionalism. The impact of the great powers on EU-ASEAN relations is, however, positive: on the one hand, the US sees EU-ASEAN interregionalism as a chance to balance power in the East; on the other, China approaches EU-ASEAN interregionalism as first an opportunity to interact with regionalism in East Asia and prove itself ready to emerge peacefully as a responsible power and second a chance to learn from the EU example of building up regionalism. Experiences of the EU-ASEAN relationship indicate that the reasons why states participate and interact with interregionalism relate mainly to the functions of identity building and institutionalising international relations. Still, states which participate and interact with interrregionalism do so with the motive of achieving balance in an interregional framework. This is the function that interregionalism serves in the international system and especially in EU-ASEAN relations given the fact that the East Asia region contains actors with a diversity of intentions when it comes to the balance of power and given the potential for China's leadership. The latter is a factor which motivates both the US as a great power and other regional powers to look for

94

ways to achieve balance within multilateral, regional, transregional and interregional forums.

Conclusion

Having analysed the EU-ASEAN relationship as an example of pure interregionalism, we may infer that interregionalism can work successfully in a context of regional actors. The EU-ASEAN relationship interregionalism is, thus, effective as a result of the high level of regional actorness of the two parties. To this end, the EU promotes interregionalism to the ASEAN as an existing regional entity in East Asia. In its multilateral approach to Asia, the EU's role remains limited within an economic and political framework since the great powers such as the US and China enjoy more influential positions. Within the ASEM structure, the East Asia region lacks real actorness and thus, the results of interregionalism are not so effective. In the EU-ASEAN relationship, however, the EU takes an active role by promoting interregionalism as a "stabilising instrument" for the East Asia region and promoting regional actorness and governance. It is assumed that the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship is influenced by internal and external factors. The internal factors consist of the political, economic, social and interregional characteristics of the bilateral relationship, the functions of interregionalism based on International Relations theories and the EU's own motives in promoting regional actorness and governance using interregionalism as a tool in its external policies involving the ASEAN. The external factors which influence the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship are defined by the role of key great powers, which act in East Asia with a view to the balance of power and stability in the region. In particular, the great powers (specifically the US and China) are positive about the EU-ASEAN interregional relationship, which is mainly driven by ideological and institutional factors but whose results address stability, regional identity creation and governance in the East Asia region. By supporting interregionalism, the US strengthens its role in the region and preserves its allies. China, on the other hand, has the chance to promote itself as a responsible power in the region by participating in the creation of regional governance. This is a practical way in which it can increase its role in the region via multilateral and interregional methods.[11]

VASILIKI PAPATHEOLOGO is affiliated to the School of International Studies of Renmin University of China in Beijing and may be reached at: *info@cejiss.org*

Notes

1 Alan Hardacre and Michael Smith (2009), 'The EU and the Diplomacy of Complex Interregionalism,' *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 4, pp.167-188.

2 See Alexander Wendt (1995), 'Constructing International Politics,' *International Security*, 20:1, pp. 71-81.

3 Alexander Wendt (1994), 'Collective Identity Formation and the International State,' *The American Political Science Review*, **88:2, pp. 384-396.**

4 Mathew Doidge (2011), *The European Union and Interregionalism: Patterns of Engagement*, Ashgate Publishing, p. 36.

5 Ibid, pp. 60-71.

6 Ibid, pp.60-71.

7 European Commission website, 'Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN),' last modified 09 September 2014, <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/countries-and-regions/regions/asean/>

8 Council of the European Union website, 'Bandar Ser Begawa of Action to Strengthen the ASEAN-EU Enhanced Partnership (2013-2017),'< http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/129884.pdf>

9 Ibid.

10 Doidge (2012), pp. 60-71.

11 Please note that this work made use of various other sources in the formulation of its main strands of argumentation including: David Camroux (2007), 'The EU, China and ASEAN,' at: <www.notre-europe.eu/uploads/tx_publication/eu-asean-Camroux_01.pdf> (accessed 12 December 2014), pp.1-10; Yeo Lay Hwee (ed) (2004), *The Eurasian Space: Far More Than Two Continents*, Singapore: ISEAS Publications; Jürgen Rüland (1999), 'The EU as an Inter-Regional Actor: The Asia-Europe Meeting,' article presented at the conference titled: *Asia and Europe on the Eve of the 21st Century*, held on 19-20 August 1999 in Bangkok at Chulalongkorn University, published in: Suthiphand Chirathivat/Franz Knipping/Poul Henrik Lassen and Chia Siow Yue (eds) (2001), *Asia-Europe on the Eve of the 21st Century*, Bangkok: Saksopha Press, pp. 43-56; Paul Welfens, Suthiphand Chirathivat and Franz Knipping (2010), *EU-ASEAN: Facing Economic Globalisation*, Springer Publishing; Melitsas Spyros (2011), 'Interregionalism: The Case of FEALAC,' *Institute of International Economic Relations*, Athens: Greece; Mathew Doidge (2011), *Inter-Regionalism and Regional Actors: The EU-ASEAN Example*, Ashgate Publishing: London and Jürgen Rüland (2006), 'Interregionalism: An Unfinished Agenda,' in Heiner Hanggi, Ralf Roloff and Jürgen Rüland, (eds) (2006), *Interregionalism and International Relations*, London: Routledge, pp. 295-313.

Religion, Identity and Citizenship

The Predicament of
Shia Fundamentalism in Bahrain

Abdullah A. Yateem

In 2011, Bahrain witnessed an unprecedented wave of political protests that came within a chain of protest movements in other Arab countries, which later came to be known as the "Arab Spring." Irrespective of the difference in the appellations given to these protests, their occurrence in Bahrain in particular poses a number of questions, some of which touch upon the social and political roots of this movement, especially that they started in Bahrain, a Gulf state that has witnessed numerous political reformation movements and democratic transformations that have enhanced the country's social and cultural openness in public and political life. Despite this pro-democratic environment, the political movement rooted in Shi'a origins persisted in developing various forms of political extremism and violence, raising concerns among Sunni and other communities. This work evaluates the origins of Shi'a extremism in Bahrain.

Keywords: Middle East, Bahrain, Shi'a fundamentalism, Islam, Arab Spring, violence, Iran

In the course of the year 2011, Bahrain witnessed an unprecedented wave of political protests,[1] and that came within a chain of protest movements in other Arab countries, which later came to be known as the "Arab Spring". The names that have been, and are still being, given to the Bahrain protests were widely varied: "revolution," "terror," "uprising," "ordeal," "protests," "crisis," depending on the political perspec-

Scan this article onto your mobile device

tive of the speaker or writer; fresh names are still coming up on a daily basis.[2] Irrespective of the difference in the appellations given to these protests, their occurrence in Bahrain in particular poses a number of questions, some of which touch upon the social and political roots of this movement, especially that they started in Bahrain, the Gulf state that has witnessed since the beginning of the first decade of the third millennium numerous serious reformation and democratic transformations. Bahrain, a country normally known for social and cultural openness, has witnessed an atmosphere of a noticeable degree of democratic and liberal practices in both the public and political life.

However, the fact that is worthy of considerable attention is that, despite all this atmosphere of political openness that has characterized that decade, and continues to do so, the political movement rooted in Shi'a origins persisted in practicing various forms of political extremism and violence. Thus, with the start of the protests of the "Arab Spring" in other Arab countries, extremist Shi'a organizations started their protests in the streets of Manama. They were soon joined by the chief Shi'a movement, *al-Wefaq* and some other prominent Shi'a clerics known for their fundamentalist leanings.[3] Then, some prominent leading Shi'a figures in the leftist and nationalist movement found themselves standing on the side of the religious fundamentalist Shi'a leaders. With the passage of time, this protest movement went deeper in acquiring a sectarian character, thus establishing its Shi'a identity and belonging, and came to be led by the religious leaders of Shi'a fundamentalism.

Despite all forms of political and media activities, within and outside Bahrain, this movement remained far from gaining acceptance amongst the Sunni community and with varied sections of the Shi'a community itself; it rather triggered opposing extremist trends in the midst of the Sunni community, which were opposed to all demands of those protests.[4] This study, then, seeks to shed some light on the contradictions experienced by this protest movement in Bahrain, by presenting an anthropological perspective on the social roots of the Shi'a fundamentalism movement standing behind these protests. The purpose of that would be to show the effect of the Shi'a fundamentalism on the experience of religion, identity and citizenship in the Bahrain society, in general, and in the Shi'a constituent in particular. This essay will examine all that, by firstly, providing a critique on some

social sciences scholarship which conducted research in Bahrain's society, culture and politics. Secondly, it will throw some light on Bahrain's major social constituents, with particular emphasis on the Shi'a ones, and on the major socio-political transformations which took place within and among these constituents. Thirdly, it will bring some observations from the field on the practice of Shi'a fundamentalism among Shi'a constituents, on its hegemony and terror practice over the years, on the resistance to that practice, and on its effect on the identity and citizenship crisis it has created among the Shi'a. Finally, this essay will try to contribute for better understanding of the problem by suggesting some proposals and recommendations for ways of getting out of that crisis.

Academic Morality and Politics: A Critique

A number of anthropological studies, in addition to other studies belonging to diverse field of inquiries, such as: political sciences, international relations, history and sociology, have come out at the beginning of the third millennium, which made the Bahrain's society, culture and politics, its main subject of study and analysis. Despite the seriousness, originality, and good scholarly status of some of these studies, and despite the good scholarly conclusions they came up with, some of them were characterized by scholarly weakness and unacceptable bias, even to the degree of lack of academic ethical standards; the studies in this latter kind will be the subject of our discussion in this section of the present paper.

Despite the diversity of their subjects matter, quite a large number of these studies, however, have failed in making a fair and objective reading of the society, culture and history of Bahrain. For some of these studies have either started from extremely biased and prejudiced standpoints, or depended profoundly on publications that were overwhelmingly far from accuracy and truth.[5] Worst among these publications, however, were media materials produced by media sources belonging to politico-religious formations related to the Shi'a religious fundamentalist movement in Bahrain, under diverse appellations.[6] It is no secret nowadays that this media machine is backed by the information platform of the Iranian government and Hezbollah in Lebanon. This media machine has filled the Internet with numerous fabricated

and falsified pieces of information, as part of its ideological and political warfare on the state and the society in Bahrain since the 1990s, and is still playing the same role.[7] These misinformed data included falsehoods, such as: the Bahraini population comprises a Shi'a majority of 60-70% and a Sunni minority of no more than 30-40%; and that the "Shi'a majority has been struggling for democracy and freedom against the Sunni minority that runs the country through ruling dynasties opposed to both the Shi'a majority and democracy."[8]

Another example of misinformation is that: "the political reform that has been accomplished in Bahrain since the beginning of the third millennium, is nothing but the result of the struggle of the Shi'a majority, and the Sunni community has had nothing to do with it; it can be said that the king of Bahrain was forced to make these reforms." Thus, the social and political life in Bahrain is depicted as being "under the rule of a tyrannical dictatorial authority, reflecting the spirit and culture of the Sunni hegemonic minority."

Looking at these studies would lead any serious observer to find out that they reiterate, naively, the negative typified picture of Bahrain, which is now crowding the provocative political media platforms opposed to the Bahrain government, without the least effort on the part of the writers to check the accuracy of that information. Thus it is clear that most of the writers of those studies have hastily started searching for data and examples, some of which are ethnographic in nature while others are sociological, which was the result of a conscious effort on the part of some, and unconscious on the part of others, so that to avoid going out of that typified framework and picture, which was considered by them a betrayal to "the solid objective facts" or mere opinions of other researchers." It will also be seen that some of those studies have, in accordance with this Bahraini context, placed what they called the "persecution of Bahraini Shi'a" within a more generalized context, that of the "persecution of Arab Shi'a," and consequently it will be seen as a part of the "Islamic Shi'a awakening" or the "Shi'a rise" in the Arab world.[9] It will also be found that, starting from this misinformed typified perspective leaked by the fundamentalist Shi'a information machine to European and American universities and research institutes, one of the serious results of this state of affairs was depicting all Sunni fundamentalist activities, specifically after September 11th, as reactionary terroristic activities, antagonistic

to the West and to modernity and democracy. On the other hand, Shi'a fundamentalism was portrayed as a "popular movement struggling for freedom and democracy against the hegemonic Sunni fundamentalism and its arrogant and overbearing tyrants like Saddam Hussain in Iraq, the Saudi dynasty in Saudi Arabia, and the al-Khalifa dynasty in Bahrain, and so on.[10] That is why it is not bewildering any more to find out that most of these kind of researchers who came to Bahrain to conduct their studies were, immediately upon setting foot in Bahrain, connected to friends and activists from the Shi'a community. They even favoured staying in Shi'a villages and city neighbourhoods, enjoying incomparable hospitality and cooperation from those activists and their relatives, who made sure that the pens, cameras, and recorders of those researchers would carry the "facts" as seen by those narrators and commentators. Thus, according to the narration of those modern day researchers, the *ʿAshurā* rituals that had been performed by Muslim Shi'a for years and years, became an expression of the "tyranny and persecution" suffered by contemporary Shi'a, which extended back in history to the time of the martyrdom of al-Imam al-Hussain.[11] Consequently, we have come to see those researchers as if being possessed by an obsessional ritualistic state of persecution complex implanted in the mind of the Shi'a individual, whom we believe is a victim himself of clergy persecution; so much so that some of those researchers sounded more Shi'a Imamite than the Shi'a themselves.[12]

Even a brief look at these studies would show clearly how remote they are from scholarly objectivity in their look at the society and culture of their subject matter, the Bahraini society in the case at hand.[13] These studies ignore the dangerous sectarian dimension of this fundamentalist Shi'a movement, which probably matches now the Sunni fundamentalist movement in its apex years, and how it was able to carry most of the Shi'a community away from the rational route towards a better life based on the values and principles of modernism and enlightenment on the grounds of justice, freedom, and equality.[14] One says in the occasion, that these studies have regrettably contributed to the attestation of this typified image based on the persecution complex that the Shi'a clergy is trying to plant in the Shi'a mindset, confirming the concepts of hate and exacting vengeance against the killers of al-Imam al-Hussain. The Iranian Shi'a clergy has placed most Shi'a adherents within a hateful cocoon hostile to modernism and enlight-

Abdullah A. Yateem

enment, confirming many of the false myths and superstitions, making the individual Shi'a in the position of either latent or active hostility awaiting vengeance against the killers of al-Imam al-Hussain.[15]

Researchers in those studies have deliberately, and with surprising insistence, thrown intensive investigative light on the subject of "social drama," which Shi'a fundamentalism has tried to establish as a lived status quo in Shi'a villages and urban neighbourhoods,[16] whether through celebrating all-year-round religious festivals or through employing and exploiting social occasions like marriages or deaths to ruminate tragedy and persecution feelings and establishing them as everyday life routine. It has become, in the words of one of those researchers, a "culture of tears."[17] Thus, those researchers visiting Bahrain had in front of them a "social drama" enacted on the socio-religious level, represented in the religious rituals held on the day of ʿAshurā, and other occasions observed continually all year round for the birth or death days of one of the twelve Imams or the female descendants of the Prophet Muhammad. The other social drama, however, has a political nature, concentrating on exploiting the religious occasions through projecting the religious past on the daily experienced political presence. The scenes of this drama are often concluded by instigating confrontations and clashes with law-enforcement forces by breaking laws and regulations.

What role is there for those new researchers with their studies during the uproar incidents of these social drama? It can be said that most of these researchers have directed their attention in their studies to either the socio-religious drama or to the socio-political one. Now, the researcher feels that he has a "religious showcase" through which he observes dramatic scenes and increasingly climactic ritual rhetoric, increasingly interspersed with grief speeches, to move on gradually to a wave of weeping and wailing, to self torment by beating chests with fists, beating backs with metal chains, concluding with beating heads with canes and swords to draw blood. After observing this religious drama, a researcher would move on to the "political showcase," guided by one of his village sponsors, or reporters, to unearth the relationship between the historico-religious personas that performed their positive or negative roles in history and other characters in the present revealed through insinuation by the mullah, the orator, or the reciter throughout the rituals of ʿAshurā or other occasions; or to observe the

consequences of that political drama whose scenes would be enacted in the form of confrontations championed by the youths who had taken part in the drama, but this time, the confrontations and skirmishes would be with the security forces at village entrances. A few hours later, the researcher, happy with his observations in spite of being exposed to some tear gas during the confrontations, accompanied by his companions and reporters, some of whom had taken part in the scenes of that social, religious, and political drama, to be provided with the necessary explanations of the scenes and what lies beyond the scenes. These sittings could probably be attended by clerics with their white or black turbans to add a touch of joy and charm to the sitting, and we would see the researcher dutifully scribbling what is being said, and even dictated, to him.[18]

The question that comes to one's mind after this intended description of a stereotype field-experience encountered by those researchers is: where does the moral responsibility towards Bahrain's society and culture, which they claim to be studying, lie? The first problem that faces those studies and their writers is that they confirm a typified image of Muslim Shi'a void of scholarly objectivity; they, rather, do great harm to this social constituent of Bahrain. Those researchers have also deliberately turned a blind eye to the real sufferings of this constituent, whether in cities or villages, through the control and hegemony practiced by religious fundamentalism on them through its diverse political, religious, and even social organizations. It can be clearly seen that this practice has the aim of imposing a certain specific cultural identity and way of life derived its general framework and its details from the pattern imposed by the mullahs and the clergy in Islamic Iran, which was subsequently exported to villages and urban quarters in Lebanon and Iraq, which have fallen under the control of pro-Iran Shi'a fundamentalist organizations like Hezbollah, for instance.[19]

In the case of the Bahraini example at hand, those researchers seem to deliberately ignore the state of sharp contradiction the Bahraini Shi'a nationals experience under the predominant control of Shi'a fundamentalism in villages and in the outskirts of towns,[20] amid the teachings of the clergy, social puritanism, cultural deprivation, and the absence of any aspect of leisure and recreation. For instance, there is not even a single shop in these villages and neighbourhoods to sell modern songs and music tapes or CDs; while, on the other hand, these

places abound with tapes of religious speeches and chants known as "*al-Rawadid*" (religious chants mourning the martyrdom of al-Imam al-Hussain) and mobile phone ringing tones, which have become of a religious nature in their majority.[21] Those Western researchers indeed go far in ignoring developments in contemporary social and cultural life in most streets and cities of Bahrain and proceed to picture the state of the Shi'a neighbourhoods as a testimony of the "state of deprivation imposed on the population of the Shi'a villages and quarters," without, naturally, making any objective remark about who is responsible for that state of deprivation. The burden of responsibility for this is on the shoulders of the Shi'a fundamentalist movement here in Bahrain, which repeats similar experiences made by similar movements in Iran, Iraq, and Lebanon, as well as experiences by other fundamentalist movements of a different nature in Egypt, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.[22] Those researchers seem to insistently keep hidden the fact that a great many of the populace of those villages and quarters, from among those who do not subscribe to the predominant fundamentalist trend, find it necessary to travel abroad during those religious festivals, which are official holidays. They travel to neighbouring Gulf states to escape the miserable state they find themselves in or the confrontations that activists of these fundamentalist movements instigate with the security forces.[23]

Social Constituents and Transformation:

For research purposes, we shall suppose that the main constituents of the Bahrain society, from the social and cultural viewpoints, in the sociological sense, are: 1) the first constituent known as *al-ʿArab al-Suna* (the Sunni Arabs), 2) the second known as *al-Baḥarna* (the Arab Shi'a), and 3) the third known as *al-ʿAjam* (Shi'a of Persian origin).[24]

al-ʿArab al-Suna: It can be noticed that the social transformations experienced by Bahrain ever since the beginning of the twentieth century have contributed to the integration of the Sunni Arab constituent, in all its varieties, in the melting pot of the mother Arab civilization and in its local, cultural symbols embodied in the Gulf identity.[25] We are here then facing a social constituent characterised by increasing internal harmony and perfect integration in the general Arab civilization melting pot as embodied in the Gulf culture and identity; subse-

quently, this constituent has had no problems in its society belonging to the mother one, that of the Arabian Peninsula. Neither does it see in its social or political system any abnormality; that is to say in envisaging the Arab conquest of the land, led by the Khalifa family, as the conquest that rededicated its belonging to the mother Arabian Peninsula, and putting an end to all forms of Persian attempts to dominate it.

Abdullah A. Yateem

al-Baḥarna (**sing.** *Bahrani*): As for the second social constituent, customarily called *al-Baḥarna*, one notices that its speed of integration with local communities in cities and rural areas was accelerating, considering the great numbers of Shi'a Arabs emigrating to Bahrain from al-Qatif, al-Muhammara, and Southern Iraq during the last sixty years of the twentieth century. The most prominent attachment of this constituent was to the Arab civilization and to its mainstream Arabic culture, being led in this by the elites of the *Baḥarnat al-Manama* (the Baḥarna of Manama) comprising the traditional merchants, social notables, the intelligentsia, business men, and technocrats, who received their modern education in Bahrain and abroad. Those elites were characterised by the depth of their Arab attachment and by being involved in political action of Arab nationalist nature.[26] A look at the names of some of the political leaders would be enough to ascertain this historical briefing. But then, what happened?

This social constituent witnessed what looked like a social rebellion against its elites, following the Iranian revolution in 1979, which went hand in hand with an ebb in the Arab nationalist movement. This state of affairs led to what looked like the overthrow of the urban leading elite, to be supplanted by another religious elite attached to the rural areas.[27] The Iranian revolutionary leadership was able to absorb this new religious elite that was leading the Shi'a Arab constituent within its project for exporting its Islamic revolution and its project to revivify the Safavid ideology and its concept of *wilayat al-faqih* (Guardianship of the Jurist) as an alternative for the *Jaʿfari* ideology with its *Akhbari* (traditional) school of jurisprudence.[28] Consequently, we have witnessed within the ranks of this Bahraini social constituent political movements and organizations gaining prominence and working side by side with traditional religious institutions, such as *ḥawzat* (sing. *ḥawza,* Shi'a religious training centres) and *mātam* (mourning centres), towards deepening the gap between this social constituent and the Arab constituent related to the Arab civilization as embodied in the

105

culture of the Arabian Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula, and increasingly joining the projects of the new transnational sectarian attachment, embodied, this time, in Iran, the seat of the Guardian Jurist, and in the religious authorities in Iraq. Furthermore, it is worth noticing in this regard that all these transnational religious authorities endowed themselves a halo of exaggerated sanctity amount sometimes the limits of divinity. What impact did this state of affairs have on the constituent under study?

A new and different attachment and identity, based on sectarian belonging first and foremost and above all other considerations, including national attachment, was replacing the original national identity. This new state of affairs put this Arab Shi'a constituent in a state of deep identity crisis, and it was taking place despite the eye-opening calls of some Shi'a clerics as to the dangers latent in that state. That was why it was not surprising to read and hear about the state of "abduction" experienced by members of the Shi'a sect in Bahrain as well as elsewhere, causing much suffering to many of its elites and intellectuals; so much so that the current state is becoming a serious threat to their existence, in the present as well as in the future.

Let us come closer to that state of affairs, by providing some eyewitness experience of the form of hegemonic practices which have been carried out in the Shi'a communities by fundamentalists. In an interview with him in one of the national newspapers, Sheikh Mohsin Ibn Abdul-Hussain Al-Asfoor, a very well known cleric from *Akhbari* school, documents the following: "throughout the last seventeen years, *al-Wafaq* terrorist leaders have bullied and harassed the nonpartisan people who did not show loyalty to them, besides they isolated them in their communities. They have brought the opportunists, that is to say those who follow their ideas and dogma, more closer to them; later they dressed them up with turbans and instituted them as leaders of disorder and terror in the villages ... On the other hand, they fought against the elites and notables in every village and eliminated their social and political role, and instead of that they ordained their loyalist followers as leaders in those communities".[29]

The second testimony in this context, provided by Hassan Abdullah Al-Madni, who is a civic writer; originally comes from Jedhafaz village, and also belongs to the same sect: "The political facades of so many *mawātim,* (*mātam* sing., Shi'a religious centre) are taking the colour-

ings of political parties, the most prominent of which being the posters of Bahraini, Iranian, Iraqi, and Lebanese religio-political leaders, pointing to the political orientation of the organizers and attenders of these gatherings. The battle grew increasingly fiercer in the 1990s between the organizers of these gatherings, which served as a political platform for them, and the opponents to this direction of politicizing this originally religious institution."[30]

It has become obvious that the diversified methods, coupling solicitations and threats, employed by the new religious and political elites that have taken charge of this social constituent since the Iranian revolution, have worked towards placing that constituent in a state of mythical oppression complex for which the contemporary Arab history and civilization can in no way be held responsible. Iranian revolutionary clerics have been working towards creating a myth of *ahal al-bait* (Prophet Muhammad's close kins) in an attempt to create a common space between the Persian historical oppression complex used historically to justify the establishment of Safavid Shi'asim and the ideology of the *wilayat al-faqih*. The state of abduction experienced by this social constituent, attempting to divert it from its Arab attachment and identity and deprive it from its inborn right to genuine citizenship, has led to it losing its educated, secular and nationalist, leaderships and elites, a great number of which had had the honour of participating in the building of the modern state ever since the beginnings of the twentieth century. One of the jeopardy of this state of abduction and the absence of civil educated elites has been the possession on the part of the new leaders of the political Shi'a street and public, departing from the villages and moving to the cities, and pushing them into frequent confrontations with the state, on one side, and with other social constituents, on the other. Many of these confrontations, some of which had the character of attempting to create political crises while others tended to mere violence and street fights and terrorism, were steps in a serialized scheme aiming to gradually exhaust the state, weaken its structure, and spread corruption in it, facilitating a final assault at a later stage, emulating similar projects in other Arab societies. The clearest illustration of the current state of this social constituent in Bahrain is probably what happened during the "February Ordeal", where this social constituent was forcibly pushed into this ordeal in the wake of its abduction by its new elites which put the sectarian loy-

alty and attachment in place of their national belonging. The individual in this social constituent found himself in a state of shock, facing a wall of the other social constituents, wondering whether he was supposed to persevere with his isolationist policy under the effect of the state of mythical oppression complex dedicating sectarian loyalty at the expense of genuine citizenship and national belonging. This constituent now faces a crucial choice and has a dire need, much like other similar Arab social constituents of the Shi'a belonging, to perform full integration in the Arab culture and society, and to stay away from states and powers opposed to the Arab culture and identity that abuse their policies on racial hatred and contempt to the Arabs, especially theocratic state like Iran.

al-ʿAjam (**sing.** *ʿAjami*): Coming to the third social constituent of the Bahraini society, we can define it as the Shi'a constituent of Persian descent, locally known as *al-ʿAjam*. Unlike the other constituents, *al-ʿAjam* are characterised by a shared and unified ethnic identity, but only in appearance, belonging to ancestors descending from various regions of Iran.[31] However, in factual terms, this constituent is widely diversified and torn by internal differences, due to class-related diverse backgrounds, and ethnic and kinship differentiations. This has made this constituent the least homogeneous and internally integrated of all in Bahrain. The ethnic, sectarian and cultural background of this constituent played a role in making the first generations of its migrants less amenable to integration in the mainstream and overwhelming social constituent. One of the reasons for this lack of integration was the tense and hostile relationship between the country of destination, Bahrain, as a new home country, and the country of origin, Iran, as the old home country. The aggressive and expansionist policies of the various governments that came to power successively in Iran played a role in making this Bahraini social constituent live in a state of doubt in view of the animosity between the old home and the new home countries. This fact is quite obvious to any student of history, that this particular problem has been created by the political recklessness and idiotic policies of the regimes in Iran, starting with the establishment of the Safavid state in the days of Shah Ismael Ibn Haidar in the early sixteenth century, up to the problems created by the present regime of clerics and mullahs. This comes after decades of losing wars with neighbouring states like the Ottomans and the Afghans during the past centuries, through the expansionist ambitions during the Pahlavi

Shah monarchy in the twentieth century, up to new expansionist ambitions of the present regime clothed with the mottos of the Islamic revolution working through the projects for exporting the model of the Islamic revolution of Iran to Arab and Muslim countries, especially those containing Shi'a populations. The question arises here: what does this historical background have to do with the integration problems of this third social constituent in Bahrain?

In view of these historical problems, the social leaders of the early generations of this constituent chose to follow the practice of isolation and maintained distance from local public affairs in an attempt to keep away from harm. With the passage of time, this attitude helped in entrenching the social and cultural seclusion of the local people of this constituent, contributing further to the slowing of the process of integration in the Arabic cultural milieu of the new home country, thus creating a rift in the cultural conscience, sense of belonging, attachment and cultural identity of this constituent; with a sense of torn citizenship. In view of the historical and social state that this constituent found itself in, thus it has been noticed that the case of ruptured belonging and double identity was transmitted from one generation to another, despite the involvement of later generations in educational programmes and projects sponsored by the state and their joining the employment of public as well as private institutions. In spite of all of this activity, however, a great sector of this constituent remained emotionally distanced from the spiritual and cultural fabric of the Arab culture to which their home country belonged. An indicative sign of this isolationist attitude and practice, and favouring the culture of the ancient ancestors is the leaning towards using the Persian language, in its diverse dialects, over the Arabic tongue; and the continued isolation from Arabic art forms in music and singing generally, and the local forms in particular. This has resulted, for instance, in lack of interest in these forms reaching the extent of aversion towards them. This seclusion, originated by hesitancy and lack of integration, was exacerbated by the elders discouraging their offspring from involvement in these arts, in practice and creation. This is why the student of society and culture in Bahrain will notice the absence of artists and singers practising these arts, whether from the *al-Baḥarna* or *al-ʿAjam*.

It would be unfair and unscholarly to generalise in this case without taking into consideration certain individual, and even collective, efforts from members of this constituent to escape the shackles of so-

cial and cultural seclusion, especially keeping in mind that the history of the Bahraini society has been free from bitter racial and sectarian tensions and struggles of the kind experienced by certain societies in the world. On the contrary, the Bahraini society has been governed by friendly relationships among its diverse constituents in the past as well as in the present. Directing this exhaustive light on the details of the integration problems of this constituent, however, only aims to investigate the problems that it suffers from in issues of identity and belonging, and how they reflect in its individuals practising genuine citizenship. We shall notice the negative impact of these problems in certain sectors of this constituent being dragged into sectarian defensive positions with the Shi'a political movement led by the new elite, propounding the idea of a new state taking its inspiration from the Iranian pattern of theocratic rule which is based on the concept of the *wilayat al-faqih*. We shall notice also that the isolationist practice of this Shi'a constituent of Persian origins, keeping its distance from Arabic culture, and its extolling the social and cultural values of the Persian culture, has contributed through successive generations to making it take the same position taken by the other Shi'a constituent, that of Arab origins, in marching behind the projects of the new religious elite taking inspiration from the model of sectarian ideology of the *wilayat al-faqih* and endeavouring towards its implementation on the ground. That was why we saw that the attempts to topple the established elites and values of the traditional Bahraini society taking place in the Arab Shi'a constituent were carried out in the midst of this constituent as well. Thus the same Shi'a religious elite, emanating from the Iranian clerical system, which had taken over the Arab Shi'a constituent, was in control in this constituent as well, despite the mutual historical animosity and contempt between *al-Baḥarna* and *al-ʿAjam*. Thus the transnational and trans-ethnic Safavid religious clergy was put firmly in power in the ranks of both constituents through the ideology of the *wilayat al-faqih* of the emulated jurist. Subsequently, these constituents were linked together to a hierarchical network of clerics headed by the guardian jurist.

Resisting Fundamentalism

It is worth considering in this respect, having examined the social and historical roots of these constituents of the contemporary Bahraini so-

ciety, to pause and investigate the resistance activities carried out by members of the Shi'a constituents of the Bahraini society, *al-Baharina* as well as *al-ʿAjam*, against the hegemonic policies practised by the Iranian clergy through its new elites trained and put in control by the religious training centres (*ḥawzat*) in Iran and elsewhere. This resistance took various forms: some Arab Shi'a families stood up to the attempts to control the *mātam* that they had worked towards establishing for decades, such as the families of Al-Arayed, Bin Rajab, Al-Mudaifʿ, Al-Asfoor, and other prominent Shi'a families of Manama.[32]

The resistance movement also took religious forms. In one of its forms the *Akhbari* school, traditionally predominant amongst Shi'a Arabs in the eastern Arabian Peninsula, stood up to the hegemony of the *Uṣuli* school (Fundamentalist School), which is known for its Iranian influence which is based on the ideology of the *wilayat al-faqih* as a chief pillar of the *al-ithna ʿashariyyah* (Twelver) Shi'a sect. From among these experiences we mention the stance of the jurists and scholars of the *Akhbari* Jaʿfari school in Bahrain, belonging prominent families, such as those clerics from of Al-Asfoor and Al-Mubarak families, and the outstanding role played by Sheikh Salman Al-Madani, and the society of which he was president, Al-Rabiṭa Al-Islamiyya (Islamic Association),[33] and the role still being played by Sheikh Mohsin Ibn Abdul-Hussain Al-Asfoor, grandson of the Sheikh Khalaf Al-Asfoor (d. 1934), historically known as one of the senior and most renowned cleric among the *Akhbari* school in Bahrain and the eastern Peninsula.[34] Sheikh Mohsin announced his opposition to the role played by the fundamentalist Shi'a movement represented by Sheikh Issa Qasem and the al-Wefaq society during the incidents of the February Ordeal, viewing it as a representative of Iranian interests and responsible for the sectarian division in the country. He asserted, "Nobody was supposed to be killed, but they created the right atmosphere for the killings then exploited the blood of those who were killed for their own benefit." Consequently, he announced his intention to form an alternative movement that would, in his opinion, be expressive of the Shi'a community.[35] Another obvious example of this resistance movement can be seen in the attitude of an ex-cleric of the Shi'a clergy, Sayyed Diaa Al-Musawi, who waged severe public criticism against the principles and policies of the Shi'a fundamentalist action on all levels, in Bahrain and elsewhere. He even went to the extent of giving up his religious role as a cleric and adopted an absolutely civil role.[36] These

resistance experiences derived inspiration from such prominent Shi'a clerics as the Lebanese Sheikh Mohsin Al-Amin, Sheikh Muhammad Mahdi Shamsuddin, Sheikh Ali Al-Amin and Sheikh Subhi Al-Tufyli besides other religious figures in Iraq and Iran. All these experiences were attempts to stand up to the centralized authoritarianism and hegemony practised in Bahrain through the hierarchy on top of which sits the guardian jurist, followed by political and religious organizations that may vary in terms of size and political and religious extremism, but move all in the orbit of the Iranian mullahs and clergy dedicated to the Safavid version of Shi'asim through the system of the *wilayat al-faqih*. In this regard, I quote the testimony of Hassan Abdullah Al-Madani, a writer and son of the late Abdullah Al-Madani, brother of the late Sheikh Suleiman Al-Madani, as cited in his aforementioned article, where he describes the bitterness of his experience: "The struggle reached its peak with the setting fire of the *mātam* of al-Qaaem (al-Imam al-Mahdi) in the neighbourhood of Jadhafs, against the background of the administration of the *mātam* refusing to hand it over to the group that was attempting to get control over the Shi'a street during the 1990s. That incident was alien to the culture of the Bahraini society; in spite of that no Shi'a group condemned it except the group related to Sheikh Suleiman Al-Madani God rest his soul, in addition to a number of Sunni clerics."[37] He proceeds to say in the same article, "The ravishing and abducting of the *mātam* did not stop at the clear religio-political facades taking over, like pure political parties, but, rather, the Hussaini *mātam* platform was shifted to become a propaganda centre for certain political groupings at home as well as abroad, and inciting hatred towards the state and towards independent religious symbols.[38]

Let us move now to a discussion of the other social Shi'a constituent, *al-ʿAjam*, to throw light on its experience with this religious tyranny and hegemony. Different forms of resistance have been clearly noticed among *al-ʿAjam* constituent against the religious authoritarianism led by the new religious elites and leaders after removing the traditional *al-ʿAjam*'s leaders and notables. From among the early experiences of this resistance, we mention that of Kazem Hussain Bushehri, the prominent member of the community, known then as the custodian of *mātam*, confronted the attempts of the *Shiraz*i movement, under the leadership of El-Sayyed Hadi Al-Madrassi, in the beginning of

the 1970s, to gain control over the Grand ʿAjam Mātam, thus using it for the religio-political activities of his movement. Kazem Hussain Bushehri stood up to Al-Madrassi and his movement, stating that the *mātam* was a religious place, a *mātam* for Al-Hussain not for politics.[39] The Grand ʿAjam Mātam persisted in its resistance to that hegemony by removing in 1981 all the posters and pictures of religious and political leaders that the Shirazi movement tried to post on the inner walls of the *mātam*.[40]

Abdullah A. Yateem

The few past decades have witnessed numerous similar experiences, with varied degrees of success and failure, by groups and individuals from other *mātam* attached to the ʿAjam community, in Manama and Muharraq, to stand up to religious hegemony and tyranny imposed upon by the new religious elites. This resistance can also be seen in the outright attitudes expressed by the traditional ʿAjam families, known for their loyalty to the monarchy and the royal family, boycotting all activities held by Shiʾa religious and political associations under the control of the new religious elites.[41]

In this regard, we may also mention the work of the Danish anthropologist Thomas Fibiger in his recently published study of aʿshura in Bahrain. Fibiger is considered one of the numbered European anthropologists who did field anthropological work in the present millennium. In his study, he observes the bitterness experienced by some *mātam* custodians as a result of facing up to the Shiʾa fundamentalist organizations and their leaders aiming to exploit their mourning and religious occasions for the benefit of their own anti-state projects, which was putting in jeopardy the religious freedoms enjoyed by the Bahraini Shiʾa in practising their rituals, compared to other Gulf States. One of the custodians of these *mātam* says: "I am opposed to using political causes during these occasions … The opposition here in Bahrain seeks to exploit this occasion to promote its political agenda during aʿshura; this is gross error. I have talked with them asking them to leave the ten days of the month of Muharram for al-Imam al-Hussain, they have the rest of the year, 355 days; leave these ten days to us (for mourning and devotions)."[42] In another instance, Fibiger records the manner by which this fundamentalism exploits the incident of the killing of al-Imam Al-Hussain politically by projecting it onto the social and political situation in Bahrain, through using sectarian feelings based on casting the Sunni community, represented by the al-Khalifa

ruling dynasty, as an extension to Muʿawiya and his son Yazid, mis-appropriating authority from Shiʾa in Bahrain and exposing them to the state of oppression they experience, in the sense that the Shiʾa community of Bahrain are an extension to al-Imam Ali and his son al-Hussain![43]

The Shiʾa fundamentalist movement, represented by its new reli-gious elites, has been using all forms of intimidation and inducement against all other Shiʾa groupings in Bahrain who challenged the pro-jects of appropriating religious beliefs. Thus we notice that while the Shiʾa groups in Bahrain witnessed a recession in moderate orientations based essentially on the roots of attachment to the Arab civilisation and identity, in its strategic depth represented by the Arab Peninsular culture; they experienced a rise in the religious and political militant extremist orientations based on dedicating the authoritarian rule of a single Shiʾa reference point related directly with the head of the Irani-an hierarchy, the guardian jurist.

Belonging and Aspired Citizenship

Presently, having had a look at the social roots of the crisis experienced by some social constituents of Bahrain in their belonging and identity and seen what confused practices in citizenship ensue as a result, we face the question: what next? Some of the problems experienced by Bahrain are exported from abroad, and in this case these problems are represented by ideologies and ambitions that come under the broad notion of exporting the Islamic revolution. These are some of the problems that have an adverse impact on Bahrain and other societies that are targeted by the theological regime in Iran for exporting their revolution. In this case, we envisage three types of solution: nation-al, regional, and international, in an attempt to minimize the threat caused by the Iranian regime to the Bahraini society and other Gulf and Arab societies as well.[44]

As for the other Bahraini social constituents, namely the Shiʾa, it is about time to work through their educated elites to make a thorough understanding, and a rational awareness too, of the extreme impor-tance of the Arab dimension of the Bahraini identity and the other strategic ones symbolized by the Gulf Cooperation Council headed by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the political and historical geography

of Bahrain. Coming to an awareness of this fact would necessarily be followed by another one: that Bahrain, by identity, attachment, and history, belongs to the Arab society and culture, whose as eminent principle has been clearly delineated in the Bahrain constitution. It follows that the Bahraini social constituents should realize that the Arab identity and belonging are the solid bases on which the Bahraini identity are constituted, in addition to the all-embracing Gulf identity that drives its roots. Based on this fact, it is the responsibility of the members of the educated elites of the *Baḥarna* and *ʿAjam* social constituents, that were subjected in the last few decades to several attempts to sweep them away from the natural state of the constants of the Arab Gulf society, and on which Bahrain has been established; it is their responsibility to liberate themselves from the captivation of the theological hegemony of the clergy and mullahs in Iran. It is this later regime which is trying to use any Shiʾa group in the Gulf, or the Arab World, in its power and regional struggle, and its exhausted plans to export its version of Islamic revolution.

The Arab nation, to which the Bahraini society belongs, expects from all its social constituents to continue their contribution to the ingenuity of Arab culture and civilization with creative production in the fields of thought, literature, art, and culture, exactly as has been the case since the ancient times: Bahrain will never be, anything other than an Arab and a Gulf nation; whoever chooses to take residence on its land will have to accept this reality and constants; which will continue to shape the basic feature of the Bahraini personality and identity, and to be the chief condition for genuine citizenship in it.

Conclusion

One of the consequence of the February Ordeal is probably the self examination that all Bahraini social constituents should undertake, aiming to assess their role in the building of the modern state in general, and in the political and democratic reform process embarked on some decade ago in particular. The February Ordeal not only proved the orderliness of the democratic process based on the principles of justice, freedom, and equality, but also demonstrated the fact that there is no way to accomplish all this and to safeguard the people's gains without a firm security system that would protect both society and state.[45]

The ten years that have elapsed of the democracy and the reform process have shown some failures and shortcomings in implementation, which calls for revision and quick intervention to rectify the process. Some of these failures could have provided the reason for, or justification for the continuation of, the members of these constituents and their elites reneging on the constants of the Bahraini society and the main pillars agreed upon by all constituents of the Bahraini society as represented in either the National Charter Action or the constitution. It is worth our while to cite some of these revisions and historically indispensable positions:

First: the need of the Bahraini people, in all its constituents, to proceed with peaceful coexistence in the light of the National Charter Action and the constitution through the coming decades, thus to plant firmly through practice and across successive generations the values of freedom, justice, and equality; in addition to the practice of genuine citizenship. It should be noted also that this state could not be attained and securely achieved without a firm security system to safeguard the gains of the society and provide safety and decent living to all the constituents of the society.

Second: working towards the revision of the standing law of political associations, in the light of the failures in implementation during the past ten years, especially with regard to allowing the establishing of political associations on religious or sectarian bases. It follows from this that the current law should be amended, or a new law should be enacted to put an end to the obstructive state of affairs we have reached; the new legislation should prohibit mixing political and religious activity.

Third: quick measures have to be taken to put an end to all forms of practices going against laws and regulations governing the public opinion institutions, which have led to the establishing of media institutions on religious or sectarian grounds, and working to put firm legislations criminalizing such practices. Fourth: revising various legislations concerned with religious institutions to subject them to clear legal regulations in terms of their numbers and areas of activity besides the scope and places of practising religious devotions. Probably the most prominent field that has to be kept under close scrutiny is that related to the content of the religious discourse and the extent of its commitment to the constants and national values of the society and the laws and regulations in the kingdom, to ensure keeping this

discourse away from the ongoing conflicts and from intervening in the public life and the civil liberties of citizens and expatriates abiding by laws and regulations.

<p style="text-align: center;">෴</p>

Abdullah A. Yateem

ABDULLAH A. YATEEM can be reached at *info@cejiss.org*

Notes

1   A great part of this paper has been based on ethnographic fieldwork carried out in many places in Bahrain, and among various social constituencies, during the years between 2002-11. I take this opportunity to thank all men and women from those constituencies: ʿArab Suuni, Baḥarna, and ʿAjam, who have been very helpful and generous to me, and above all patient enough to answer my demanding questions. I would also like to express my gratitude to my colleagues at the Centre for Historical Studies, University of Bahrain, and many other friends from outside the University, whose remarks and comments on this paper during its different phases, were of the utmost importance in the development of its arguments. However, the responsibility for everything being said or expressed in the paper is solely mine.

2   Unlike those commonly used terms mentioned above, the author inclines to use the term «February Ordeal», *aḥdath febrayer*, since it is the one which has been widely used by all members of social constituents in Bahrain. The author's usage of the term in this context is based on an anthropological perspective, which gives preference to the indigenous views and culture. As such, the usage in this context transcends those widely used terms in contemporary writings, of which their political, ideological and media intentions are neither hidden, nor ambiguous for the critical readers.

3   *al-Wefaq* is short term for *Jam'īyat al-Wifāq al-Watanī al-Islāmīyah,* (Al-Wefaq National Islamic Society). Other Shi'a political groups in Bahrain include: *Haq, al-Wafa, Amal, al-Khalas.*

4   For an illustration of the Sunni constituent's reaction to the February Ordeal, see the study carried out by Tora Tyssen on Sahwat al-Fateh:
    Tora S.Tyssen (2012), *The Awakening of a Sunni Street A Study of Causes and Consequences of Sunni Muslim Street Mobilization in Bahrain*, MA Thesis: University of Oslo.

5   One should draw attention to an exception in this respect which is the scholarly effort made by Baqqer Salman Al-Najjar, a sociologist from Bahrain, whose early studies and research in the Islamic movements and groups in the Arabian Gulf region played an important role in revealing significant aspects of its social and political role. Also, one should mention the recent scholarly effort made by Mitchell, a European scholar, on studying the impacts of Shi'a Fundamentalism on the political development and democracy in Bahrain, see:
    Baqer S. Al-Najjar (2007), *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi al-khaleej al-aʿrabi* (Religious

Movements in the Arabian Gulf), Beirut: Dar al-Saqi; (2009) *al-Bahrain fi ẓil al-niza aldhi yaḥiṭah* ((Bahrain in Light of the Surrounded Conflicts), Beirut: Dar al-Saqi.

Mitchell A. Belfer (2014), *Small State, Dangerous Region: A Strategic Assessment of Bahrain*, Frankfurt and Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford.

6   Regarding methods of spreading and promotion of false and fictitious information, and politically employing them in the media, see Belfer' study on how Shi'a fundamentalism in Bahrain and its political associations, such as *al-wafaq* and others, as well as its editors and journalists in the local press, continue to tell lies about the demographic structure of Bahrain and thus claiming superiority number as compared to the Sunnis'. Also, to disseminate a distorted information on the persecution of Shi'ite "majority" by the Sunni "minority", besides the policies and acts of discrimination "committed against them". We have a typical example provided here by Belfer in the role played for example by Mansoor al-Jamri, the editor-in-chief of Al-Wasat newspaper, who according to Belfer played a very damaging role in disseminating sectarian ideas and values which were very harmful to the present and future relations between known continuities and social fabrics in Bahrain, see:

Mitchell A. Belfer (2013) 'Demographic Warfare: Editor's Policy Analysis'. *Central European Journal of International & Security Studies*, 7, 1: 4-19.

Mansoor Al-Jamri (2010), 'Shia and the State in Bahrain: Integration and Tensions,' *Alternative Politics*. Special Issue, 1: 1-24.

7   See in this regard, the view which has been expressed by some Western researchers, e.g. Mitchell Belfer and Ali Alfoneh, and also that of Bahraini authors e.g. Tariq Al-Amer and Khalid Hejres, on the systematic media role played by the Iranian government and Hezbollah in Lebanon against Bahrain state and society during February Ordeal, until current days, and the relationship between those activities and Shi'a fundamentalism and its leaders in Bahrain.

Mitchell A. Belfer (2014), *Small State, Dangerous Region: A Strategic Assessment of Bahrain*, Frankfurt and Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford.

Mitchell A. Belfer (2011), 'Iran's Bahraini Ambitions', *The Wall Street Journal*, October 6, 2011.

Ali Alfoneh (2012), 'Between Reform and Revolution: Sheikh Qassim, the Bahraini Shi'a, and Iran,' *American Enterpirse Institute for Public Research*, No. 4, July 2012.

Tariq Al-Amer and Khalid Hejres (2011), *ab ʿād al-ḥaqiqa: arb ʿta ʿshar Febrayr, ukdhubat thawra*, (Dimensions of Truth: 14th February, a False Revolution, Bahrain: Manama Printing.

8   In this regard, one should draw attention, for example, to the work published by the Arab-American anthropologist, el-Sayed el-Aswad, who although contributed significantly to the anthropology of ritual symbolism among the Shi'a of Bahrain, his article, on the other hand, can be considered as an example when it comes to the misinformed historical statements which he reiterates. By relying on some misleading materials recently published by some of his Western sources, he, and some of his colleagues, relied on falsified information such as stating: "that the Arab pop-

ulation of Bahrain were exclusively Shi'a, and were conquered by a Sunni dynasty; the family of Al-Khalifa in the year 1783, who removed them from power." It is immensely surprising here that these historical fallacies are cited in this work, and in other works too, despite the availability of credible, reliable and well-known historical sources such as: John G. Lorimer, *Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia*; Fuad I. Khuri, *Tribe and State in Bahrain.* Especially that el-Aswad had already quoted them in other occasions. For those later works speak directly about the Arab ruler, Sheikh Nasser Al-Madhkur, from al-Matareesh, an Arab tribal leader who happened to reside at that time in Bushehr, a costal town in Fars province in Iran. As a matter of fact, none of the well knwon and widely recognized historcal sources have mentioned that Bahrain was governed by an Arab Shi'a ruler, *Bahrani*, from Bahrain?! See:

el-Sayed el-Aswad (2010), 'The Perceptibility of the Invisible Cosmology: Religious Rituals and Embodied Spirituality among the Bahraini Shi'a', *Anthropology of the Middle East*, 5,2, p. 61.

Louary Bahry (2000), 'The Socioeconomic Foundations of the Shiite Opposition in Bahrain,' *Mediterranean Quarterly, 1*, 3, p. 133.

Clive Holes (2005), *Dialect, Culture, and Society in Eastern Arabia* (Volume 2: Ethnographic Texts. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, p. 145.

Laurence Louër (2008), *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf,* New York: Columbia University Press, p. 16.

John G. Lorimer (1908-15), *Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Oman and Central Arabia*, Calcutta: Super-intendent Government Printing (republished by Gregg International, Westmead, England, 1970).

Fuad I. Khuri (1980), *Tribe and State in Bahrain:The Transformation of Social and Political Authority in a Arab State*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 23-34.

9   It is believed that works, such as: *The Shia Revival*, *Transnational Shia Politics* and *Reaching for Power*, are among the most influential ones which have been consulted for quite a few years in making Western foreign policy, and researchers, toward Shi'a politics in the Gulf and Arab World, see:

Vali Nasr (2007), *The Shia Revival: How Conflicts within Islam Will Shape the Future*, New York: Norton.

Laurence Louër (2008), *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Yitzhak Nakash (2006), *Reaching for Power: The Shi'a in the Modern Arab World,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Louary Bahry (2000), 'The Socioeconomic Foundations of the Shiite Opposition in Bahrain,' *Mediterranean Quarterly, 1*, No. 3: 129–143.

10   The two most noteworthy works in this regard, which are frequently quoted by other researchers, are:

Vali Nasr (2007), *The Shia Revival: How Conflicts within Islam Will Shape the Future*, New York: Norton., and Laurence Louër (2008), *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf,* New York: Columbia University Press.

With regard to researchers in the Gulf area, attention is to be drawn to the works of Madawi Al-Rashid, a Saudi anthropologist, who, in her writings and studies, drifted to side with the Islamic fundamentalist movements, Sunni as well as Shi'a, especially those antagonistic to the Saudi ruling fam-

ily and government, without the least scholarly objectivity expected from a well-known researcher like her; so much so that her writings came to reflect what can be described as a politically neurosis one. Among the recent argument and widely established in the Western media, which has been adopted too by Al-Rashid, is the one which contends that the ruling families and governments in Saudi Arabia and Bahrain resorted to sectarianism as a weapon against any form of uprising during the «Arab Spring» waves which swept the Arab World. Thus, according to Al-Rashid and Western media, the the regimes in these countries have used the fear of Suni of the Shi'a, by threatening the former of the later's religious and sectarian relationship with the theological regime in Iran!!

As a result of these kind of arguments, Al-Rashid has found herself becoming more and more as advocate and instigator of any «revolution» against the Saudi government and ruling family, al-Saud, rather than supposedly objective and sober anthropologist and academic. See for example her publications on the Shi'a fundamentalism in the eastern region of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as compared to a more objective ones, such as that of Al-Ibrahim and Sadiq's:

Madawi Al-Rasheed (2011), 'Sectarianism as Counter-Revolution: Saudi Responses to the Arab Spring', *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 11, 3: 513-526; (1998), 'The Shia of Saudi Arabia: A Minority in Search of Cultural Authenticity,' *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 25, 1: 121-138.

Bader Al-Ibrahim and Al-Sadiq Muhammad (2013), *al-ḥiraq al-shiʿyi fi al-Saʿudiya* (Shiaʿ Mobility in Saudi), Bierut: Arab Network for Research and Publishing.

11   Probably among the oldest anthropological studies containing such misleading generalizations, coupled with gross historical and ethnological inaccuracies, was the study which was conducted by the Danish anthropologist, Henny Hansen, on the status of women in the Bahraini village of Sar in the beginning of 1960s. From among the inaccuracies in this study was the statement that the population of Sar descend from Persian origins, coming to Bahrain during the Sassanid period! See my critical study of Hansen's work in this regard, and my other studies on the Danish anthropological experiences in the Arabian Gulf. As for the contemporary studies which, in turn, have produced and spread similar, incorrect sociological and historical generalizations, we may mentioned the ones of el-Sayed el-Aswad, Thomas Fibiger, Anke Reichenbach & Fatema Hashem, Laurence Louër, Louary Bahry, and Toby Mattiesen. As for the most obvious of these sort of studies, is the one of Justin Gengler, for dispite its effort to present itself as objective and sober academic, the reality was different: it adopted and defended all the political agenda of the Shi'a fundantalism, see:

Henny H. Hansen (1968), *Investigations in a Shi'a Village in Bahrain*, Copenhagen: The National Museum of Denmark.

Abdullah A. Yateem (2005), '*al-anthropologiyon al-dinamarkyn fi al-khaleej al-ʿAabi: Haney Hensen namudjan,*' (Danish Anthropologists in the Arabian Gulf: The Case of Henny Harald Hansen), *Journal of Social Affairs*. (UAE). Vol. 22, No. 88: 101-138.

Abdullah A. Yateem (2010), *al-anthropologiya al-urubya wa al-sharq al-awsat: al-namudhaj al-dinamarky,*'

(European Anthropology and the Middle East: The Danish Example), *Journal of Social Affairs*. (uae). Vol. 27, No. 107: 37-64.

el-Sayed el-Aswad (2010), 'The Perceptibility of the Invisible Cosmology: Religious Rituals and Embodied Spirituality among the Bahraini Shi'a', *Anthropology of the Middle East*, 5,2: 59-76.

Thomas Fibiger (2010), 'Ashura in Bahrain: Analyses of an Analytical Event', *Social Analysis*, 54, 3: 29-46.

Anke Reichenbach and Fatema Hashem (2005), '"Only a Third of a Banana". Dirty Joking as an Attempt to Maintain dignity', *Anthropos.* Bd. 100, H. 1: 73-89.

Laurence Louër (2008), *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Louary Bahry (2000), 'The Socioeconomic Foundations of the Shiite Opposition in Bahrain,' *Mediterranean Quarterly,* 1, No. 3: 129–143.

Toby Mattesen (2013), *Sectarian Gulf: Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, and the Arab Spring That Was'nt.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Justin Gengler (2001), *Ethnic Conflict and Political Mobilization in Bahrain and the Arab Gulf*, Diss, The University of Michigan.

12　Unlike Baqer Al-Najjar's scholarly effort, mentioned earlier, on observing the effect of Shi'a fundamentalism on Bahrain's society and culture and its negative consequences, others authors such as Nader Kazem and Ali Al-Dairy, have also tried to understand that problem; each of course in his own way. There were hopes that these two authors would make use of their academic and critical tools to bring about a useful critique on the thought and practice of the Shi'a fundamentalism and its role in the daily life of the ordinary Shi'a. The result, however, was a very disappointing one. Nader, for instance, has unfortunately presented in his (*istiʿmalat al-dhakira*) a historical perspective based on aggravating that historical persecution complex of the Shi'a individual in Bahrain throughout history; however, his writings do not include any critical reading of the Shi'a clergy. Whereas, Al-Dairy, on the other hand, has kept muddling in (*kharij al-ṭayfa*) with his existential experience with his own Shi'a sect, avoiding any serious engagement with problems created by the fundamentalists for the ordinary Shi'a; either at the sectarian, identity and citizenship levels. Having learned much from well known thinkers such as Muhammad Arkon and Ali Shari'ti, it was expected that Al-Dairy would establish his own critique by tackling the political experience left over by these religious movements in their way to gain more power and authority, so that to confront the identity and citizenship at the national level. He, instead, went in hurry to blame the state "for not letting the religious and sectarian groups live alone with their own culture and lives". He thought, it would have been better had the state left the Shi'a with their own "exceptional culture and sentiment"!!

There is still hope that these two serious academic writers, would present a rather more useful critical standpoint in this regard. For further details, see my elaborate critique in this regard:

Abdullah A. Yateem (2013), *al-Uṣulya al-Shiʿa fi al-Bahrain: man yajruʾ ʿalā naqdah?,' (*The Shiʿa

Fundamentalism in Bahrain: Who Dares to Criticize it?*, Al-Ayam*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 8896-8897, 18-19 August 2013.

Abdullah A. Yateem

Nader Kazem (2008), *istiʿmalat al-dhakira fi mujtamaʿ taʿaddudi mubtala bil tarikh* (Usages of Memory in a Pluralistic Society Afflicted by History), Bahrain: Maktabat Fakhrawi.

Ali A. Al-Dairy (2011), *kharij al-ṭayfa* (Out of the Sect), Madarik: Dubai.

13 These studies, for example, erroneously repeat circular information taken from each other, without the least effort to check new states of affairs or the transformations that took place in the Bahraini Shi'a community. For instance, they assert that the «traditional Akhbari jurisdiction school» is dominant in the Bahraini Shi'a community; which does not conform to the actual state of affairs going on for more than three decades, as this school has been removed from dominance by the «*Uṣuli*/ fundamentalist school» supported by the clergy in Iran and Iraq that holds up the concept of *wilayat al-faqih*. Worthy of notice here is the fact that most of these studies derive their information from the study of Fuad Khuri, the Lebanese anthropologist, who did his field work in Bahrain in the early years of 1970s. This shows how such pieces of information are regurgitated without taking the trouble of checking their accuracy, see:

el-Sayed el-Aswad (2010), 'The Perceptibility of the Invisible Cosmology: Religious Rituals and Embodied Spirituality among the Bahraini Shi'a', *Anthropology of the Middle East*, 5, 2: p. 61.

Fuad I. Khuri (1980), *Tribe and State in Bahrain:The Transformation of Social and Political Authority in a Arab State*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bahry, L. "The Socioeconomic Foundations of the Shia Opposition in Bahrain," (2000).

Laurence Louër (2008), *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf,* New York: Columbia University Press, p. 19.

14 Attention is to be drawn here to the attempts of the Bahraini Shi'a cleric Sheikh Issa Qasem – supported by fundamentalist Shi'a organizations, such as: *al-Wefaq*, *Amal*, *Haq*, *al-Khalas*, *al-Wafa*, and also the Islamic Scholars Council, *al-Majlis al-ʿAlmaay* – in placing all kind of obstacles against the Parliament and the Supreme Council for Women towards issuing new and modern legislations concerning woman's rights and family affairs, known as the «family law.» To be noted here also is the fact that the role being played by Sheikh Issa Qasem, currently, is a continuation of his past reactionary attitudes since the 1970s when he was a member of parliament where he fought hard towards issuing legislations prohibiting mixing between male and female university students, and prohibiting women seeking medical treatment with male doctors. He even, along with his colleagues in the religious block, stood against the presence of women in the *al-Wefaq* administrative council, or even allowing women to stand for general elections. In this regard, see the works of Baqer S. Al-Najjar and the study by Jane Kinninmonta, which documented the roles played by sheikh Issa Qasem and other clerics from the Shi'a fundamentalist movement, like Sayyed Alawi Al-Gharifi, Sayyed Abdullah Al-Gharifi, Hussain Najati, and Sayyed Jawad Al-Wadaʿi, in standing against the attempts to issue a unified national family law in Bahrain. Other studies, such as that of Alfoneh and Bahrainliberals, have also documented the role of Essa Qasem and other clerics, supported by Shi'a clergies in Iran, in hijacking the liberal and democratic transformations in Bahrain since the 1970s and converting its movements and mobility into a sectarian direction:

Baqer S. Al-Najjar (2007), *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi al-khaleej al-aʿrabi* (Religious Movements in the Arabian Gulf), Beirut: Dar al-Saqi.

Jane Kinninmonta (2011), 'Framing the Family Law: A Case Study of Bahrain's Identity Politics', *Journal of Arabian Studies*, 1,1: 53-68.

Ali Alfoneh (2012), 'Between Reform and Revolution: Sheikh Qassim, the Bahraini Shi'a, and Iran,' *American Enterpirse Institute for Public Research*, No. 4, July 2012. Bahrainliberals (2013), 'Shaikh Isa Qassim and the1970s' Syndrome,' http://bahrainliberals.com/editorial-team/shaikh-isa-qassim-and-the-1970s-syndrome/26/7/2013.

15 The reader may refer to the most obvious studies in this regard:
el-Sayed el-Aswad (2010), 'The Perceptibility of the Invisible Cosmology: Religious Rituals and Embodied Spirituality among the Bahraini Shi'a', *Anthropology of the Middle East*, 5,2: 59-76.

Thomas Fibiger (2010), 'Ashura in Bahrain: Analyses of an Analytical Event', *Social Analysis*, 54, 3: 29-46.

Laurence Louër (2008), *Transnational Shia Politics: Religious and Political Networks in the Gulf,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Bahry, L., "The Socioeconomic Foundations of the Shia Opposition in Bahrain," (2000).

16 My discussion of the concept of «social drama» in this context is based on the anthropological concept formulated by Victor Turner, see:
Victor Turner (1974), *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

17 In this regard, see: el-Sayed el-Aswad (2010), 'The Perceptibility of the Invisible Cosmology: Religious Rituals and Embodied Spirituality among the Bahraini Shi'a', *Anthropology of the Middle East*, 5, 2, p. 68.

18 Attention is drawn in this regard to some new, serious and critical efforts which have recently provided a different scholarly perspective, compared with stereotype ones on the Bahrain case and on the role of Shi'a fundamentalism, see in this matter Belfer's study:
Mitchell A. Belfer (2014), *Small State, Dangerous Region: A Strategic Assessment of Bahrain*, Frankfurt and Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford.

19 This being the case, it should not be surprising to see Ayatollah Ali Khameni, as the guardian jurist, and the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, standing by Shi'a fundamentalism in Bahrain in its spearheading of the violence and destruction campaign during the «Bahrain February Ordeal.» This movement was also supported by the Iraqi religious authority Ayatollah Ali Sistani, along with others, who refrained from showing any support to the popular movements demanding democracy in either Syria or Iran. For details on this, see:
Al-Sayyed Zahra (2011), *Iran wa al-Bahrain ... ḥudud al-luʿba* (Iran and Bahrain ... Frontiers of the Game), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12198, 16 August 2011.

Mehdi Khalaji (2011), 'Iran's Policy Confusion About Bahrain', *Real Clear World'*, Jun 28. http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2011/06/28.

20 In contradiction with these researchers and their studies, we see the critical conclusions of the Bahraini sociologist Baqer S. Al-Najjar, in which he criticizes the dangerous socio-political roles played by Shi'a fundamentalism in Bahrain, whether through their known religious leaders or through

their political and religious organizations such as: *al-Wefaq*, *Amal*, and other extremist movements like *Haq* and *al-Wafa*, *al-Khalas*, and also the Islamic Scholars Council, *al-Majlis al-ʿAlmaay* in his article «*al-Islam al-siyasi al-Shiʾa: qiraat al-ḥala al-Bahrainia*» (Shiʾa Political Islam: A Reading in the Bahraini Case), in:

Baqer S. Al-Najjar (2007), *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi al-khaleej al-aʿrabi* (Religious Movements in the Arabian Gulf), Beirut: Dar al-Saqi, pp. 62-84.

Baqer S. Al-Najjar (2011), *taqdim, Ali Ahmed Al-Dairy, kharij al-ṭayfa* ("Introduction" to Ali Ahmed Al-Dairy, *Out of the Sect*), pp. 11-22.

21 It is worth noticing here the refraining of most of the cultural writers, from among Shiʾa adherents, while belonging to modernist trends in thought and literature in the Bahraini press, from standing up to the religious clergy, or even writing about it, so as to enlighten the public about its social and political intimidation for the public life. To be excepted from such stance, however, is the significant role played by some progressive writers like Aqil Siwar and Samira Rajab. Also, some others writers who emerged from the furnace of experiences of facing the tyranny of the fundamentalist Shiʾa clergy, such as Hassan Abdullah Al-Madani and Sayyed Diaa Al-Musawi. See authors' treatment of this phenomenon in the Bahraini context:

Yateem, A. A., *al-Uṣulya al-Shiʾa fi al-Bahrain: man yajruʾ ʿalā naqdah*? (The Shiʾa Fundamentalism in Bahrain: Who Dares to Criticize it?, (2013).

22 It is important to pause here for a while, and look at the soical and political catastrophic consiqences resulted from, e.g. the ruling clerical oligarchy on the Irnaian society and state, or that of the Hezbollah's experience in ruling some towns and districts which came under his direct control during the civil war in Lebanon. See, for instance, the social and cultural remains of that experience in B'alabak, the most renowned city of its time.

Saeed Rahnema (2011), 'Retreat and Return of the Secular in Iran', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East,* 31, 1: 34-45.

Daryoush Ashouri (2011), 'Creeping Secularism,' *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East.* 31, 1: 46-52.

Hazem Saghiyeh and Besan al-Shaikh (2013), 'Baʿlabak: bawabat Suriya wa ḥarbah,' (B'alabak: A Gateway for Syeria and its Wars), *al-Hayat*, Newspaper: London, 30-31 July & 1 August 2013.

23 Worthy of consideration here is the perspective held by one of the Arab Sunni leaders, Sheikh Abul-Latif Al-Mahmoud, of the trend of events during the 'February Ordeal,' indicating the negative state of affairs created by the leaders of what is termed 'creative anarchy' by aggravating the problematic of citizenship, belonging, and identity amongst some components of the Bahraini community. I refer the interested reader to the views and writings of some Sunni writers and activists who published their views in the crisis, see:

Abdul-Latif Al-Mahmoud (2011), '*muqabala maʿa shaikh Abdul-Latif Al-Mahmoud hawal awadhʿ fi*

al-Bahrainin fi Febrayir wa fikrat insha tajmuaʿ al-wuhih al-wataniya,' (Interview with Sheikh Dr Abdul-Latif Al-Mahmoud on the Conditions in Bahrain in February and the Idea of Establishing the National Unity Gathering", *Al-ayam,* Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 8057, 2 May 2011.

Al-Amer, T., & Hejres, K, *abʿād al-ḥaqiqa: arbʿtaʿshar Febrayir, ukdhubat*

thawra,
(Dimensions of Truth: 14th February, a False Revolution, (2011).
Ghasan Al-Shahabi (2013), *ḥarak al-Bahrain*, *fi: al-Khalij we al-rabiʿ al-ʿArabi*, ("Political Mobility in Bahrain", in The Gulf and the Arab Spring: Religion and Politics.

24 Despite the fact that there are no published official percentage estimates of these constituents, according to a private unpublished study done by a research team in the Central Informatics Organization on the population structure of the Kingdom of Bahrain, the estimated percentage for Sunni Bahrainis stood at 51% and that of the Shiʾa at 49%, see:
Central Informatics Organization (2011), *'al-tarkiba al-sukkaniyya fi mamlakat al-bahrain: dirasa baḥthiyya ḥawl al-takwin al-ṭaaifi,'* (Population structure in the Kingdom of Bahrain: A Research study on the Sectarian Composition), *Al-ayam,* Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 8121, 5 July 2011.

25 For further socio-historical details on the Arabi Sunni, see: Abdullah A. Yateem (2013), *'al-judhur al-ijtimaʿiyya lil nukhab al-bahrainia: muqaraba thropologiyya,'* (The Social Roots of Bahraini Elites: A Historical Anthropology Perspective), *Al-Bahrain Al-Thaqafia.* Bahrain. Vol. 20, No. 71: 9-30.

26 In this regard, see some of the information about the *Baharana* elites of Manama cited in the works of Fuad Khuri and Abdul-Karim Al-'Arid:
Fuad I. Khuri (1980), *Tribe and State in Bahrain:The Transformation of Social and Political Authority in a Arab State*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Abdulkarim A. Al-Arayed (2007), *madinat al-manama khilal khamsat qoroun* (The City of Manama during Five Centuries), Bahrain & Beirut: *wazart al-iaʿlam wa almuasash al-aʿrbia lildirasat wa al-nashar.*
AbdulkarimA. Al-Arayed*, nafidha aʿla al-ṭarikh: bait al-aʿrayeḍ* (A Window to History: The Household of Al-Arid), Bahrain, n.d.

27 Kazem, N., *istiʿmalat al-dhakira fi mujtamaʿ taʿaddudi mubtala bil tarikh* (Usages of Memory in a Society Afflicted by History), (2008), p. 149.

28 For a detailed account, see: Al-Najjar, B. S., *al-Bahrain fi ẓil al-nizaʿ aldhi yaḥiṭah* (Bahrain in Light of the Surrounded Conflicts), (2009).

29 See the interview with: Sheik Mohsin Al-Asfoor (2013), *'harabat al-Wafaq al-wajaha and wa al-ayan fi kul qarya wa qdat ala durhim fi al-hayat al-siysyh wa al-ejtimaʿya','* (*al-Wafaq* bullied and harassed the elites and notables in every village and eliminated their social and political role), *Al-ayam,* Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No. 8851, 4 July 2013.

30 Hassan A. Al-Madani (2011), *al-mātaem laisat dakakin siyasiya aw ḥizbiyyeh,'* (Mourning Gatherings are not Political or Party Shop Houses), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12095, 5 May 2011.
Noteworthy in this regard also are data and references in the anthropological study cited below, which may not have been purposefully meant by the researcher, but, nevertheless, reveal the actual role played by this kind of religious culture in the real life, through the festivities of *ʿAshurā* and other occasions, in spreading feelings of hatred against the «other,» through displaying the oppressiveness suffered by the Shiʾa sect in its entirety, starting with the martyrdom of Al-Hussain, and is still going on today. It is the «culture of tears» in the words of one of the witnesses, El-Sayed el-Aswad, see:
el-Sayed el-Aswad (2010), 'The Perceptibility of the Invisible Cosmology:

Religious Rituals and Embodied Spirituality among the Bahraini Shi'a', *An-thropology of the Middle East*, 5, 2, p. 68.

31 For socio-historical description of the Persian immigrant community, in general, and the *al-ʿAjam* social constituent, in particular, in Manama, see: Nelida Fuccaro (2005), 'Mapping the Transnational Community: Persians and the Space of the City in Bahrain, c. 1869-1937', In Madawi Al-Rasheed (ed.) *Transnational Connections and the Arab Gulf*, London: Routledge, pp. 39-58.

James Onley (2005), 'Transnational Merchants in the Nineteenth-Century Gulf: The Case of the Safar Family', In Madawi Al-Rasheed (ed.), *Transnational Connections and the Arab Gulf*. London: Routledge, pp. 59-90.

32 These resistance experiences against the hegemonic and tyrannical prac-tices by the Shi'a fundamentalist movement in Bahrain over villages and popular neighborhoods in Bahrain are not much different from similar ex-periences in Iran, Lebanon, and Iraq. In this regard, see the summaries of the prominent American anthropologist Marshall Sahlins, the sociologist Baqer S. Al-Najjar, and the Lebanese writer Hazem Saghiyeh:

Marshall Sahlins (2011), 'Iraq: The State-of-Nature Effect', *Anthropology To-day*, 27,3: 26-31.

Baqer S. Al-Najjar (2007), *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi al-khaleej al-aʿrabi* (Religious Movements in the Arabian Gulf), Beirut: Dar al-Saqi.

Hazem Saghiyeh (2009), *nawaṣeb wa rawafeḍ: mulahaẓat ʿamma fi al-siyasa* (Sunnis and Shiaʿ: General Remarks in Politics), Beirut: Dar al-Saqi.

Hazem Saghiyeh (2011), '*tajjanub ayyi Iraq?*,' (Avoiding Which Iraq?), *al-Ha-yat*,Newspaper: London, Issue No 17658, 9 August 2011.

33 For more details and illustrations of the resistance movements against re-ligious tyranny, see the following sources:

Al-Najjar, B. S., *al-Bahrain fi ẓil al-nizaʿ aldhi yaḥiṭah* ((Bahrain in Light of the Surrounded Conflicts), (2009).

Al-Najjar, B. S., *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi alkhaleej al-ʿarabi* (Religious Move-ments in the Arabian Gulf), (2007).

Hassan A. Al-Madani (2011), *raḥal Al-Madani ... man yajru al-yawm ala aʿ-la-kalam*,' (Al-Madani Has

Departed ... Who Dares to Speak Today), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12052, 23 March 2011.

Hassan A. Al-Madani (2011), *mata nasḥab al-bisat min taḥt arjul al-mutaji-rin bi alamina*,' (When Shall We Pull the Rug from under the Feet of those Who Exploit Our Pains), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12081, 21 April 2011. Rasool Hujair (2001), '*laqad fashiltum, fastaqilou,*' (You Have Failed, So Step Down), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12082, 22 April 2011.

34 During the months after the February 2011 events, the number of Shi'a clerics opposed to fundamentalist Shi'a ideology multiplied in Bahrain; in addition to Sheikh Mohsin Al-Asfoor, Sheikh Abdullah Al-Muqabi intensi-fied his resistance to this fundamentalism, especially that represented by the hegemonic power of Sheikh Issa Qasem and other Shi'a fundamental-ist organizations attached to the *Shirazi* movement, most extreme funda-mentalist group belonging to *Uṣuli* school which is pro-Iran and adhering to the ideology of the *wilayat al-faqih*, such as: *Al-Wefaq, Amal, Haq*, *al-*

Khalas, al-Wafa, and *al-Majlis al-ʿAlmaay*.

35 See Sheikh Mohsin Al-Asfoor's statements to Bahraini and foreign press:
Sheik Mohsin Al-Asfoor (2011), 'Pro-government Cleric to start own Oppo-sition Party in Bahrain', *The Washington Times*, August 9, 2011.

Sheik Mohsin Al-Asfoor (2011), *'saaunshi ḥaraka siyasiyya jadida taqoud al-intikhabat al-qadi ma, Al-Wefaq tumathil al-mithal sl-saleḥ lill-masaleḥ al-Iraniyya wa ladayha agen da tadmiriyya,'* (I will found a new political movement to participate in the coming elections, Al-Wefaq is the ideal representative for Iranian interests and has a destructive agenda), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12192, 10 August 2011.

Sheik Mohsin Al-Asfoor (2012), *'tayyar Al-Wefaq majmuʿt ʿiṣabat tatafan-nan bi asalib al-tarhib wa al-takhrib wa al-baltaja,'* (The al-Wefaq current is a collection of gangs mastering the methods of bullying,   d e s t r u c-tion, and thuggery), *Al-Bilad,* Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 1447, 30 Sep-tember 2012.

Sheik Mohsin Al-Asfoor (2013), *'al-Wafaq telbas qinaʿ al-tashyaʿ likhidaʿ al-buṣtaa,'* (The *al-Wefaq* wears the Shia mask so that can deceive the simple people), *Al-ayam,* Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 8848-8849-8850, 1-3 July 2013.

Worthy of notice here is the fact that the extremist political and sectari-an character of Al-Wefaq National Islamic Society that came out clearly during the Bahrain February Ordeal is but the outcome of ideological and political nature of that society that derives its teachings and instructions from the Bahraini Shi'a authority of Sheikh Issa Qasem, who, in his turn, is known for his attachment to the guardian jurist in Iran and its religious and political system. This same diagnosis of *Al-Wefaq* has been reached by one of the serious students of Shi'a Islam in Bahrain, see:

Al-Najjar, B. S., *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi al-khaleej al-ʿarabi* (Islamic movements in the Arabian Gulf), (2007), pp. 62-84.

36 Sayyed Diaa Al-Musawi totally relinquished his religious role and im-mersed in civil action as a cultural figure in protest against the Shi'a fun-damentalist movement, to the degree of giving up his traditional religious attire, which distinguishes Shi'a clerics, and taking up a modern western outfit.

37 Hassan A. Al-Madani (2011), *al-mātaem laisat dakakin siyasiya aw ḥizbiyyeh,'* (Mourning Gatherings are not Political or Party Shop Houses), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12095, 5 May 2011.

It is worth mentioning on this occasion the fact that there are other sepa-rate incidents that exemplify the movement of Shi'a resistance against the new Shi'a fundamentalism. The experience of Sheikh Suleiman Al-Madani in standing up to the hegemony practised by Shi'a fundamentalism in Bah-rain was a clear example of this struggle; it was also one of the facets of the struggle between the local traditional *Akhbari* school and the «imported» fundamentalism, represented in this case in the *Uṣuli* school. Another ex-ample of the ongoing struggle is the incident involving some leaders of the fundamentalist movement protesting against the appointment of Sheikh Moussa Al-Oraibi as imam of the mosque of the Tublee neighbourhood in

2004, in an attempt to take control of that mosque.

Through its militant Shirazi movement, the Shi'a fundamentalism has carried out simliar hegemonic and bullyinng practices in the Eastern province of Saudi Arabia, such as al-Qatif, similar to those mentioned above. As a result several confrontations, similar to that of Bahrain's, took place between them and notables of Akhbari school, especially those followers of Imam al-Khoei of al-Najaf school, of Iraq. Other confrontations also occuried with leaders of leftists and liberal political groups, civil societies and clubs. In those conferntation, the Shirazi militants used extrem violent and terrorist actions againt their adversaries. see:

Al-Najjar, B. S., *alḥarkat al-dyniah fi al-khaleej al-ʿarabi* (Religious Movements in the Arabian Gulf), (2007), p. 67.

Al-Ibrahim, B. & Al-Sadiq, M., *al-ḥiraq al-shiʿyi fi al-Saʿudiya*, (Shi'a Mobility in Saudi, (3013), pp. 90-100, 129-136.

38 Ibid.

39 For more socio-historical information on the «Grand ʿAjam Mātam,» see Fuccaro, as for the Shirazi movement and its role in the Shi'a fundamentalism in Bahrain and the Arabian Gulf, and on the biographic background of its leaders, see Alfoneh's, Al-Amer & Hejres, and Bahrainliberals':

Fuccaro, N., "Mapping the Transnational Community: Persians and the Space of the City in Bahrain, c. 1869-1937", (2005), pp. 48-49.

Alfoneh, Ali. 2012. "Between Reform and Revolution: Sheikh Qassim, the Bahraini Shi'a, and Iran", (2012).

Al-Amer, T., & Hejres, K, *abʿād al-ḥaqiqa: arbʿtaʿshar Febrayr, ukdhubat thawra*,

(Dimensions of Truth: 14th February, a False Revolution, (2011), pp. 236-285.

Bahrainliberals (2013), 'The Al-Rissaly International Network,' http://bahrainliberals.com/editorial-team/the-al-rissaly-international-network/26/7/2013; "Bahrainliberals (2013), 'Ali Salman the Many Faces of Opposition,'http://bahrainliberals.com/editorial-team/ali-salman-the-many-faces-of-opposition/26/7/2013; "Abdulhadi Al-Khawaja Radical or Reformer", (2013); Bahrainliberals (2013), Bahrainliberals, 'Saeed Al-Shehabi Bahrain-Iran-London,' http://bahrainliberals.com/editorial-team/saeed-al-shehabi-bahrain-iran-london/26/7/2013.

Bader Al-Ibrahim and Al-Sadiq Muhammad (2013), *al-ḥiraq al-shiʿyi fi al-Saʿudiya* (Shia Mobility in Saudi), Bierut: Arab Network for Research and Publishing.

40 Such resistance to religious tyranny could possibly be counted as a facet of the passive resistance of the weak, as pointed by James Scott in his work: *Weapons of the Weak* , see:

James Scott (1985), *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

41 Increasing numbers of the Bahraini ʿAjam are coming up with varied strategies in facing up to the Shi'a fundamentalist hegemony over their daily public life. In recent years, some of them have been publishing their experiences on the Internet; see for example:

Adel, Muhammad, "Memoirs of a Bahraini ʿAjami," 2011, (ms).

42 Thomas Fibiger (2010), 'Ashura in Bahrain: Analyses of an Analytical Event', *Social Analysis*, 54, 3, pp. 35-38.

43 Ibid, pp. 42-44

44 In providing evidence for the fact that the Shi'a fundamentalist movement in Bahrain is annexed to the regime of the *wilayat al-faqih* in Iran, we mention   in this context the instance when a number of clerics, among the leaders of this movement, on 16 March 2011, addressed a letter, signed by followers of the grand ayatollah Khameni in Bahrain, to Ali Khameni, being the guardian jurist, and the president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, calling for his intervention to help «his children and followers in Bahrain in any fitting way.» The letter was written in the wake of the failure of the protest movement during the «February Ordeal in Bahrain,» and was published in Iranian media, see:
Al-Sayyed Zahra (2011), *risalat al-ḥaq wa al-sidq ila shiʿat al-Bahrain*,' (A Message of Truth and Right to the Shi'a of Bahrain), *Akhbar Al-Khalij*, Newspaper: Bahrain, Issue No 12198, 16 August 2011.
Khalaji, M, "Iran's Policy Confusion About Bahrain," (2011).
Alfoneh, Ali. 2012. "Between Reform and Revolution: Sheikh Qassim, the Bahraini Shi'a, and Iran", (2012).

45 It is worth mentioning in this respect what Marshall Sahlins, the American anthropologist, stated in his bitterly satirical article on the developments of the situation in Iraq, bringing to mind the bitter reality about narrow-minded beliefs in democracy and elections: «For those (American) who think that democracy is elections and that elections cure all, it is notable that the cycles of violence have been closely linked to the electoral process», see:
Marshall Sahlins (2011), 'Iraq: The State-of-Nature Effect', *Anthropology Today*, 27,3, p. 27.

Yet Another Version of the "Arab Spring"

Ramifications of the Syrian Armed Conflict for the Existing Arab Order and Beyond

Ibrahim A. El-Hussari

At the start of 2011, events began to unfold in some of the most stable Arab countries betrayed the signs of an unpredictable phase in local, regional and even international political life. Nine of the 22 Arab League members were, to varying degrees, undergoing unprecedented mass gestations promising a long-awaited if unscheduled divergence from the existing Arab order. While that order had been criticised widely for its chronic problems of entrenched bad governance, it was ordinary citizens in Tunisia who first belled the cat and crossed the fear barrier marking a new turn in modern Arab history. For a relatively short time, crowds of protesters in Tunisia, and then in Egypt, took to the streets and occupied public squares, shouting slogans in support of freedom, justice and dignity and against the two corrupt political regimes, which had allegedly whittled away state institutions, multiplied unemployment rates and caused mass poverty. Thanks to social media networks, the reverberations across Arab states were far-ranging as clashes between the masses and riot police were recorded and aired to the whole world. Later, in Libya, the situation turned especially tragic due to the heavy death toll and large-scale urban destruction caused when the conflict expanded to regular warfare and NATO staged a direct military intervention. It was only vetoes by both Russia and Syria at the UN Security Council that stopped a replay of the Libyan scenario in Syria.

130

Henceforth, the world became gradually divided over the implications of the blood-stained "Arab Spring," a term – coined by the Western media to describe a fresh cycle of Arab political life – that was unlikely to bloom in Syria, just as it has not, to date, flowered anywhere in the Arab countries swept up in the uprisings. This article considers yet another version of this "Arab Spring," addressing the repercussions for Syrian statehood and unity and the ramifications for the existing Arab order and elsewhere.

Arab Order and Beyond

Introduction

In his Philosophy of History, Hegel places great emphasis on the role of consciousness of freedom in the process of historical change and eventually the emergence of the state and its lawful institutions as the guarantors of that freedom[1] If other factors are acknowledged by other philosophers and schools of thought as parts of that process, then they have no valence in the Hegelian hypothesis where the dynamic nature of history allows for only one constant index: change. To this end, the Arab world, as a historical entity, is no exception. The various popular uprisings, which first erupted in Tunisia[2] and – thanks to rapid satellite media transmission[3] – incited much of the public to contest the dictatorship, corruption and bad governance of other Arab states in both Africa and Asia, cannot be arbitrarily put down to coincidence or some conspiracy theory as some Arab politicians and intellectuals have tried to do. In fact, there are solid reasons why the Arab masses made that historic move in honour of freedom, justice and dignity. These three vertices of the triangle variously labelled a "rebellion," "uprising," "Arab Spring," or "revolution," by Medias are part and parcel of people's conscious aspiration towards better living conditions and a better lifestyle. This is as true in Tunisia, Egypt and Yemen as it is in Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iraq and other Arab countries.[4]

The existing Arab order has been rotting and turning to dead wood for quite some time. In fact, the stale Arab political scene needs refreshing if not total replacement. Local and national political parties, long passive or indifferent to the pitiful Arab situation (and at times

accomplices to unpopular regimes) have found themselves running breathlessly on the heels of mass demonstrations, which have sustained heavy losses of life in order to effect a remarkable change to the governance structure and eventually the state apparatus. To add insult to injury, the unprecedented popular movement, which demands a real shift to democracy and socio-economic justice, has been overridden and hijacked by interventionist imperialist world powers[5] and direct support from the most backward Arab regimes applying political and financial pressure.[6] In the case of Syria, this includes lavish, blind spending on the rebels; the support of satellite-transmitted media campaigns to fuel and aggravate the ensuing armed conflict; and providing weapons, transport and sophisticated communication and media devices paid for in cash to serve rebels from scores of countries, some of which (Chechnya, for instance) are a thousand miles away. These insurgents, for the most part, do not come under a single military command and have various patrons and sponsors. Some of the rebels are Syrian army defectors and fugitives, others are non-Syrian Arab and non-Arab fighters (self-proclaimed jihadists) affiliated with underground movements decked out with a myriad of names and signs.[7] The remainder are mostly uncompromising Islamist extremists driven by an irrational and unearthly confessional allegiance that allows no place for dialogue or a political settlement with the current Syrian government or any other Arab regime.

Many documents from Western governments (including Denmark, Holland, the United Kingdom, France, Sweden, Norway, the US, Australia, Canada, Spain and others) point to the increasing number of foreign fighters (their citizens) who smuggled through Turkey, and other countries, to participate in the battle over Syria and Iraq. Their guidelines are part of some hidden agenda and plans nursed and sponsored by masterminds outside Syria.[8] Ironically, however, footage and video reports show that most (if not all) of these insurgents and well-armed young rebels, including the Islamist factions, have evacuated their injured across the borders to Turkish, Lebanese, Jordanian and Israeli hospitals.[9] They even share and exchange field information with various international and regional military intelligence agencies and receive financial and military support from Arab and foreign financiers and the puppeteers of a grand plan against the Syrian government called "Friends of Syria."[10] With waves of merciless violence being car-

ried out by both rebels and Syrian armed forces across almost all of Syrian territory, the prospects of an Arab Spring blooming in the country are few. In other Arab states like Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen, which experienced varying degrees of violence and succeeded in toppling their political regimes, the situation is no better. In fact, it has grown worse: less secure and more fragmented. Still, when compared with those Arab countries swept away by the winds of change of the blood-stained and tarnished Arab Spring, Syria tells a different story. For over three years, the country has stood out from the collapsing Arab countries of the Middle East: bleeding gravely, but still miraculously composed and intact. Why, then, are Syria and its government resistant to the "constructive chaos" intended for the Arab world?[11]

Ibrahim A. El-Hussari

In the first place, we must remember that the war on and over Syria is a war for a new Middle East, as envisioned by former US secretary of state Condoleezza Rice. Here Syria's role as a major sponsor of Arab liberation movements for decades is crucial; its practical support of the PLO and more recently Hezbollah in Lebanon has always been a thorn in the side of Israel and its supporters in the West. Syria's geo-political location, in the midst of three rising regional hegemonic powers (in Iran, Turkey and Israel), creates temptation enough for subduing it—by hook or by crook. Jewish lobbyists in Europe and North America have been working hard on this project: Syria must be brought to its knees. This is one explanation for the regional and global interventions in Syria from day one of the Syrian popular uprising though their declared pretext was the cause of freedom and democracy. Still, Syrian armed forces have withstood these interventions, and the state and its institutions seem to have won most rounds, albeit at a heavy cost. Secondly, the Syrian president's early response to constitutional change has been a strong move towards pluralism and multi-partisan political life.[12] While other Arab regimes in Tunisia, Libya, Yemen, Bahrain and Egypt overlooked the popular and legitimate demands of their people, Bashar al-Assad took a step in the right direction. Thirdly, Syria has stayed composed, maintaining the day-to-day operations and services of its state institutions and, above all, the unity of its armed forces and security police. This is why the country has remained intact and unified despite heavy losses of life and property and its shrinking control over important and oil-rich provinces such as al-Riqqa and Deir al-Zour. Fourthly, Syria's unified body politic and the strong nation-

alistic spirit of its people (including the country's internal opposition) have kept the state apparatus operating at home and abroad; only a handful of high-ranking officials have resigned from their jobs and joined opposition factions to be heard of no more. Fifthly, the Syrian leadership and its regional and international alliances have lent weight to national steadfastness in the face of regional and global sanctions and threats, local violence and foreign military intervention—to name only some of the fronts. And finally, we may consider the practical reconciliation measures taken by Syria to grant pardon to fugitives and defectors as well as civilians who took up arms and fought against the government. All these are part of the national story of Syria's defensive efforts to squash and foil the plan to restructure and redraw the map of the Middle East.

Against the odds, the fate of an indivisible Syria remains the concern of its entire population. This is as true for the Syrian elites as it is for common citizens and ethnic minorities, all of whom see Syria as their first and last homeland. Even those citizens who have been displaced and left homeless inside Syria, across state borders and in other parts of the world have spoken out unfalteringly against the partitioning of their homeland. On the level of popular Arab consciousness and pan-Arab nationalist movements, it is believed that Syria's unity and the national aspirations it endorses and upholds are the main concerns. Although the Syrian regime has its own failings, which are too numerous to name, it is Syria, the state, its history, location and role which are being targeted in a plan pre-meditated, tailored and orchestrated by enemies of the Arab world.[13] These opponents have hijacked the Arab Spring in Syria and twisted its goal for other purposes. The strategic visions of globally influential countries with fast-growing economies such as the BRICS and their strong political position in support of Syria and their own geopolitical interests, add another dimension to the seemingly endless armed conflict in Syria. As it is, the complications of the situation look set to spill over to the countries neighbouring Syria. From there, they could spread to those faraway states from which thousands of insurgents have come to fight the Syrian army and destroy community life, power and water facilities, factories and air defence bases and above all steal the people's grain and wheat silos. Those foreign fighters will eventually leave Syria and return home, this time as skilled and professional militants in the art of warfare, posing a grave threat to the national security of their countries of origin and residence.

134

Genesis of the 2011 Arab Popular Uprising

That the 2011 Arab popular uprising erupted in several Arab countries almost simultaneously was not a matter of chance. The genesis of this collective national consciousness goes back to the early years of modern Arab history at the start of the twentieth century. It all begins in mid-World War I when Sharif Hussein led the great Arab Revolt against four hundred years (1516-1918) of Ottoman military occupation of most of the Asian part of the Arab world.[14] Duped by British colonialists into serving as a Trojan horse, Hussein's troops launched armed attacks on Ottoman forces from within the empire while British forces planned an onslaught from without. When Turkey lost the war and shrank back into its own national borders, thus surrendering all the Arab territories it had occupied for centuries, the Arab Revolt came to an abrupt end. The Arab tribal leaders who outlasted the revolution had been expecting their victorious allies in Europe to confer part of the war dividends on them. Instead, the Arab world was divided up between Great Britain and France.[15] The direct result of the war of independence, then, was the collapse of the dream of Arab unity and the mingling of a sense of defeat and discomfort with the collective Arab consciousness of freedom. Instead of long-awaited unity, the Arab League was established (at Britain's recommendation) by six founding Arab states in Cairo, Egypt, in 1945; this was done with Anglo-French approval since most of the Arab world remained under British and French colonial rule. Ironically enough, instead of coming true, the dream of Arab unity was shattered, and in its place there mushroomed banana republics, protectorates, emirates and sultanates, each hoisting up its own national flag, singing its own national anthem and sanctifying its own borders under the patronage of declared or undeclared Western protection and hegemony, a legacy handed down by Anglo-French colonialists but sincerely observed by self-appointed Arab leaders and their successors. The result was the loss of Palestine under the Balfour Declaration against which the Arab masses of Palestine took the first step towards resisting neo-colonial policies.[16]

Ever since the transformation of Palestine into a Jewish settlers' state in 1948, the central Arab cause has been foiled. So many military coups have been attempted across the Arab world, all bearing the false fragrance and pollen of a "Spring" but yielding no fruit. Most of these coups have occurred in Egypt, Syria and Iraq, whose leaders rose to power on the pretext of maintaining and consolidating national independence and liberating Palestine as the crucial Arab goal. It was

135

believed these leaders would pose a threat to the new-born state of Israel inside Palestine. Ironically, the deadly consequence of their corrupt military rule was the loss of more Arab territories along with all of Palestine in the Six-Day War (1967) between Israel and at least three Arab regimes surrounding the Jewish state. Ordinary citizens of the Arab world condemned that defeat right away and supported the birth of the Palestinian resistance movement in the wake of that great loss. However, with Palestine remaining a dream unfulfilled for more than 60 years, the Arab public has gradually soured against these regimes; it is ready to condemn their leaders as dictators and support any prospect of change to the tired political scene and its disordered power relations. Against this background, we meet the long-awaited wave of change that overtook the Arab world at the outset of 2011.

The Turning Point

The suicide of the young Tunisian vendor Mohammed el-Bu'azizi and its aftermath unleashed a series of popular uprisings across Arab states.[17] For a relatively short time, protesters took to the streets first in Tunisia (December 2010) and then in Egypt (January 2011). They occupied public squares, shouting their support for freedom, justice and dignity while condemning the corruption and decay of the respective political regimes, which had allegedly whittled away state institutions, ballooned unemployment rates and caused mass poverty. Thanks to social media networks, the reverberations across other Arab states were astonishingly compelling: the unprecedented violent clashes between angry masses and riot police were videotaped and screened round-the-clock to the whole world. Surprisingly, the regimes in both Tunisia and Egypt collapsed soon after and their presidents were forced to step down in clearly worded resignations and disappear from the political scene for good.

In the case of Libya, the situation was devastating and tragic due to the heavy death toll and large-scale urban destruction caused, in large part, by the direct military intervention of NATO air and navy forces under UN Security Council Resolution 1973. Interestingly, it was the UN vetoes of Russia and China at the same Security Council meeting which averted a replay of the Libyan scenario in Syria. From here on, controversy surrounded not only Syria but also the fate of the blood-

stained "Arab Spring." The world divided gradually over the connotations of that term – coined by the Western media to describe a new era of political life in the Arab world – that was unlikely to bloom in Syria since it has not blossomed in any of the Arab countries swept up in these events.

Ibrahim A. El-Hussari

Syria, which has sustained unspeakable war damage in all private and public sectors and a heavy loss of life for over three years, must be read, thus, as crossroads story about the conflict between strategic regional and global geopolitical interests. There is a seeming convergence in most political and military analyses of the Syrian situation published in the international media over the last three years.[18]

The Syrian Version of the Arab Spring

The Arab Spring caught most rulers of the Arab countries unaware. Sensing the power of this sweeping change to undermine the existing Arab order, each one of these states viewed that Spring as an unwanted process. This explains the various narratives that emerged in this context. The ones framing the Syrian version of the Arab Spring are heavily loaded. Each of these stories is purpose-built to serve some agenda whether locally, regionally or globally. Islamist factions, each with a different vision and transcript, share a commitment to violence and armed struggle against the existing Syrian regime embodied in the person of President Bashar al-Assad. This accounts for their resolve to unseat the regime and bring about a new order based on their unilateral interpretation of Islamic thinking, no matter the cost. Such nihilism would never allow for a constructive dialogue with diverse others to occur and bear fruit. For those Islamist factions, it is an existential imperative that half-measures cannot be tolerated and defeat must not be conceded. On the other hand, the official Syrian narrative describes the whole situation as a premeditated act of aggression set in motion by a regional and global conspiracy against Syrian national sovereignty and independence as well as a direct intervention in its national and domestic affairs. Yet, Syria has not dismissed the possibility of reaching a political agreement even with armed rebels.

Since the outbreak of anti-government events in March 2011, the Syrian government has called on all political parties and key figures inside and outside Syria to join the negotiating table to start a national

dialogue and broker a peaceful settlement over the country's future. The responses from fragmented opposition factions to that call have been conditional: Assad must step down first. Even talks in Geneva, sponsored by the UN, Russia and the US, were a fiasco because of the conflicting agendas (in some cases hidden) which the different parties maintain and have gone to the war for. Standing on either extreme of the political spectrum, the Syrian government and the opposition seem to be in a deadlock so long as the military solution does not decisively favour either one of them. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Amidst heavy losses of life and property across the country, the Syrian government's position is based on the lessons learnt from the experiences of other Arab countries into which the Arab Spring has brought chaos, disorder and tragedy [19]What, then, makes that Spring so controversial and its national objectives so mystified?

It seems that Syria has realised that the Arab Spring has been hijacked and overridden by both regional and global powers. Based on this assumption, it is highly unlikely that this Spring can bring a significant change to the political life of the countries where it has been active. The hijackers have distorted its legitimate objectives and gradually created a mood of frustration among the masses of the Arab world. The Arab Spring has failed to bring democratic reforms to any of the countries overtaken by popular rallies demanding an immediate change of the political regime and the ousting of the ruling party. In other words, it has failed to bloom in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen. Its biggest failure, however, has been in Syria. There it has descended into the alternative of a military solution aiming to bring faster changes to the political scene. Meanwhile the situation has worsened and grown more tragic: millions of Syrian civilians are now displaced (inside and outside Syrian national territory), jobless and at the mercy of volatile security conditions and warfare developments. A large number of Syrian refugees who crossed the borders into host countries such as Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon are living in bleak makeshift shelters and tents where UNHCR and other regional and global humanitarian organisations operate pending fundraising campaigns and available resources. This version of the Arab Spring as seen through the lens of Syrian officials, seems to be grounded in realism. The expansion of military action – accompanied by the violence and brutality of militants of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) against anyone who fails to abide

by their strict belief system in Syria, Iraq and perhaps beyond – is solid enough proof of the deteriorating situation in the name of the Arab Spring. Horrific acts perpetrated by militants against Syrian civilians and soldiers across so much of the country have been broadcast on networks for the sake of intimidation and propaganda. Syrian children in rebel-held areas have been mobilised and brainwashed to join the on-going war in Syria as "fuel" or "martyrs."

However, Syria has also shown the other side of the coin. As a result of a dialogue initiated by the internal National Consultative Ad-Hoc Committee, which took place inside Syria in 2012, the Syrian national constitution was modified significantly. The changes touched on issues including multi-party and pluralistic political life, presidential elections, the cancellation of Article 8 (which appointed the Ba'ath Arab Party the leader of the state and the nation), the recognition of the Kurds and other ethnic/cultural minorities within the Syrian population and many other positive points which would have remained unthinkable had there been no mass uprising demanding change. During the most recent multi-party presidential election in Syria on 03 June 2014, many Syrian citizens who had been banned in their host countries (Kuwait, UAE, Saudi Arabia, France, the UK, US, Canada and others) from exercising their right to vote at their own embassies, headed home to exercise this constitutional privilege in support of the state and the rule of law. The voter turnout inside Syria and all its neighbours, except for Turkey, was unprecedented. The proportion of the population that participated in the presidential election reached 77.8%, a percentage which exceeds comparable figures for the US and France.

The Larger Arab Scene

The larger context of the Arab Spring is rather sad and frustrating. What started as a gleaming hope of real change in some parts of the Arab world soon dimmed and vanished. Thanks to daily mass rallies and other hidden forces operating inside and outside the Arab world, some political regimes began to collapse under the pressure on the streets and the inability of local governments to contain these no-compromise situations. Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen each crumbled, but their rapid collapse has, to date, produced no better system of governance or tangible change on any level including domestic security and

civil services. In Tunisia, even the "moderate" Islamist an-Nahda Party, which won a general election and ran the state for almost two years running, was an exclusionary party. The result has been the country's volatile situation entailing a change of government and national dialogue among Tunisia's key constituencies. The most recent development in Tunisian politics has been the forming of a new transitional cabinet run by an independent politician whose job it is to organise general elections for a new national parliament. In Yemen, the situation is no better after the interim transfer of the presidential office. Armed struggle and domestic violence (often in the shape of terrorist attacks) have only worsened the lives of the Yemeni people, and the dialogue is still unripe among local forces in the country. Ironically, the unified Yemen has finally opted for a six-province, federal state, however the death toll across the country has not subsided, due to endless rounds of shooting and violence at the hands of the Yemeni army and Yemeni militiamen including al-Qa'eda rebels.

In Libya, the state has practically undergone an official partitioning process recalling the situation during the Italian colonial period before national independence and the unification of the three Libyan provinces under King Idris es-Sanussi in 1951.[20] Most recently, Libya has seen unprecedented armed violence erupt across the entire country – with Tripoli, Ben Ghazi and Sabha hardest hit – in fighting between the newly-built but fragile state army and Islamist militia supported by armed-to-the-teeth tribal factions. This open-ended battle threatens to produce more tragic consequences as the belligerents pay little heed to half-measures or the prospect of rational compromises.

Nor is the situation ideal in Egypt. After the popular uprising of 25 January 2011 that excised (then) President Hosni Mubarak and his regime, the Muslim Brotherhood organisation rose to power and Mohammed Morsi was elected president of the republic. During his brief term in office, almost everything went wrong: corruption, sectarian violence, crime, rape, insurgency, more mass protests and opposition rallies and above all poor "Islamist" administration of the collapsed and indebted state, which found itself on the verge of bankruptcy. Morsi's government was also a poor achiever at the level of foreign policy. He was himself behind the expulsion of Syria as a member of the Arab League, and he severed diplomatic relations with Syria in a public speech while keeping an ambassador in Tel Aviv.[21] The Egyptian made

a show of waving the flag of the Syrian opposition, which was designed during the time of French colonial rule (1918-1943). Since Morsi's jailing by Egypt's new transitional government on 30 June 2013, and the election, inauguration and swearing in of a new president, Abdel-Fattah el-Sisi, on 08 June 2014, Egypt has been recovering from two years of economic stagnation. The recovery is still under way despite the stronghold of the new president and the generous grant ($5.8 billion USD) offered by Saudi Arabia on the eve of the presidential election to stabilise Egyptian economy and bolster el-Sisi's position. The US, likewise, resumed aid to Egypt following a state visit to Cairo by US Secretary of State John Kerry in June. At best, Egypt is undergoing a transitional period during which the declared war on terrorists in the Sinai Peninsula and other Egyptian provinces will continue.

Ibrahim A. El-Hussari

Repercussions of the Syrian Arab Spring

The Arab Spring has certainly aggravated security concerns across the region and made life unbearable for much of the populations facing it. This is as true in Lebanon as it is in Iraq and Jordan and may even extend beyond these states. What repercussions could the Syrian version of the Arab Spring possibly have as it spills-over into Syria's neighbouring states? In fact, a critical turn in Syrian-Lebanese historic relations rests on the consequences of the war in and on Syria. So far, this maddening war has resulted in large-scale damage to infrastructure facilities, immeasurable destruction of large cities and towns across Syria as well as major losses of life (around 160,000 are dead) and mass displacement (affecting around four million) inside and outside the country,[22] not to mention devastation to the economy, finances, quality of life and civic services for Syria's population of 23 million. As the spill-over from Syria into Lebanon and vice versa is inevitable for a number of reasons, the socio-political and security situation in Lebanon is not much better than that in Syria. A great number of radicals from Lebanese political and religious parties have been directly or indirectly involved in the rounds of fighting in Syria, either as supporters of the Syrian state or its opponents.[23] Currently the situations of the two countries are to a large degree inextricably connected and entwined so that any answer to the Syrian conflict, whether political or military, will help to bring about some solution to Lebanon's unstable domestic

situation. It is highly likely that Syria will always be a major player in the Middle East, and Lebanon is just a pawn in a game of regional and international powers. The recent history of the two countries strongly supports this hypothesis.[24] On the human level, the number of the displaced Syrians in Lebanon has become a grave problem in terms of providing shelter, water resources, hygiene, schooling, security to the population. Lebanon has failed to set up refugee camps for the majority of displaced Syrians, who have found rented accommodation among Lebanese civilians in many places across the country and particularly along Syrian-Lebanese borders. It has been a huge struggle for the Lebanese government to provide for the scattered Syrian refugee population, guarantee their safety and oversee basic daily essential services. For Lebanon to cope with this problem, it needs to do much more than it can afford. Even UNHCR services and foreign aid in this area are not enough to ease the situation, which seems irresolvable in the short-term. Additionally, Lebanon has taken in armed fugitives and insurgents who are fleeing the Syrian battlefields and taking shelter in Lebanese cities, towns and the countryside. No guarantee has ever been provided by the UN or major powers (including Lebanon's surrogate mother, France) to protect Lebanese cities from potential acts of disruption. To the extent, then, that Lebanon has been suffering the repercussions of the Syrian crisis, the Lebanese people themselves are divided over the Arab Spring in Syria.

In Iraq, the security situation is even worse than that in Lebanon. The spill-over of the Syrian armed conflict into Iraqi national territory has become a real threat, not only for the region but also for the world at large. Thousands of radicals and insurgents have crossed the borders at many points from Syria into Iraq and vice versa; they established the first Islamist principality, the Islamic Imarah in Iraq, and then transformed this into ISIS.[25] ISIS is now a significant danger to both Syria and Iraq: it has recently expanded over large parts of both national territories and even reached the crossing between Iraq and Jordan in Iraq's Anbar province. A sketch drawn and posted on the ISIS website (22 June 2014) shows arrows of a potential attack in two directions: one into Jordan, the other into Saudi Arabia. If ISIS expands further into Iraqi territory, the next battle will be over Baghdad. Hence, we see the strong reaction to ISIS hegemonic power over three Iraqi provinces, including Mosul, the second largest city in the country and

the oil pipelines between Iraq and Turkey. The danger is only com-
pounded by ISIS control of two Syrian provinces, including Riqqa and
most of Syria's oil fields in the eastern provinces bordering Iraq.

With ISIS now occupying large parts of Syria and Iraq and hovering
at the borders with Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the threat to the stabil-
ity of the whole region is already grave. ISIS has practically removed
the "sanctified" borders drawn up under the Sykes-Picot partitioning
plan for the Asian part of the Ottoman Sultanate in 1916. Official state-
ments from the foreign offices of many countries, among them major
regional and global powers, warn of the threat ISIS poses to global sta-
bility.[26] Due to the latest transformation of the geopolitical scene in
the Middle East, ISIS has been designated as a terrorist organisation by
world powers, the UN Security Council, Saudi Arabia and the United
Arab Emirates.

Ramifications beyond the Arab World

The threat of terrorism has become a stark, undeniable reality. This
refers especially to the horrific acts instigated or carried out by Isla-
mist jihadists such as al-Qa'eda, ISIS and many other militant factions
who have used brute force in the name of Islam in Syria, Iraq, Tuni-
sia, Yemen and Egypt. Car bombs, mines, hand grenades, mortar shells
and other explosives have already killed scores of innocent civilians in
those Arab countries and recently also in Lebanon and it is highly like-
ly that such terrorist acts cross the borders into Europe and America. A
glance at the statistics on extremists travelling from the West to Syria
and Iraq shows the numbers of these militants in the two countries to
be quite shocking. British PM David Cameron put the figure at 500 (of
whom 30 have died in Syria alone) when discussing the threat that UK
nationals now fighting in the Syrian conflict could soon head home;
Australian PM Tony Abbott has said that there are 120 Australian insur-
gents active in Syria; French Prime Minister Manuel Valls and Foreign
Minister Laurent Fabius claim that 800 French citizens have joined
the fighting in Syria and probably in Iraq, and some 30 of them have
lost their lives. Valls told BFM TV, 'We have to ensure the surveillance of
hundreds and hundreds of French and European individuals who are
today fighting in Syria.'[27] US Secretary of State John Kerry has echoed
this call and warned of the spread of ISIS, which his administration

143

sees as a threat to the international community. At his most recent (June 2014) press conferences in Cairo and Baghdad, he reiterated the discovery of ISIS terror and the danger it poses to the world. All these high-ranking Western officials who previously campaigned in aid of armed rebels in Syria appear to have become Islamophobic now that there are Islamist militants finding their ways back home and harbouring plans to create unrest and disorder in their countries of residence. It is worth asking who precisely created these Islamist extremists and sent them to Afghanistan in the early 1980s to launch a guerrilla war against the Soviet "occupation" there.[28]

There is a degree of double-standards applied as many Western leaders appear proud of the support lent to the insurgents in Syria and then decry the threat the same or similar extremists pose in Iraq. For them, the rebels in Syria are freedom fighters while those in Iraq are terrorists. Sample video tapes recently circulated show young Europeans heading off to fight in the region, preaching about a holy war against all non-Muslims and naming 'the West' as one of the targets. The West is, in short, quite aware that terrorism is often identified as a transnational or transcontinental threat. It cannot be reduced to some ethnic group or identity in a specific geographic location. This is why there is a need for security coordination among nations and communities when combating terrorism—a step that is urgently called for before it is too late. If, however, the West expects the insurgents that it provides with arms, health care and logistical aid to return home as tamed and disciplined "good boys," then it is deluding itself either through miscalculation or underestimation.

Concluding Remarks

The Syrian version of the Arab Spring is incompatible with other local and global versions. The Syrian version shows that Syria's political leadership is rather rational and more flexible than the governments of other countries swept up in the Spring. The flights of the presidents of both Tunisia and Egypt, either out of cowardice or in an effort to avoid bloodshed on the streets and in public squares, could not halt those countries' acceleration towards chaos and instability. Nor could the rise to power of Islamists in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya resolve the deteriorating socio-economic situations of those countries. Islamist

militants appeared in these countries due to the vacuum created after the collapse of the security apparatus there. These states' situations remain unstable despite the ousting or distancing of Islamists from office, including through the dissolution of elected councils, whether consultative or representative. In Syria, the situation is bloodier since the war is fiercer and more merciless. However, the state survives through its institutions and armed forces. In areas where there are no armed rebels, life proceeds smoothly: the everyday activities of both government and citizens go on undisrupted as if there were no violence in the country. Recently 16 million Syrians were called on to cast their votes for a new president. The number who took part in that election process totalled 11 million. This is a sign that the Syrian people are gaining awareness of their national cause even in the midst of war, destruction and external intervention. For most of the Syrian population, the state and its institutions must come first. An honest reading of the Syrian version of the Arab Spring would allow us to take a long breath before heaving a sigh of relief.

Ibrahim A. El-Hussari

∾

IBRAHIM A. EL-HUSSARI is affiliated to the Department of Cultural Studies at the Lebanese American University and may be reached at: *ihousari@lau.edu.lb*

Notes

1   See Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1902), *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, translated by J. Sibree, London: George Bell and Sons.
2   The tragic case of Mohammed el-Bu'azizi, a young Tunisian university graduate working as a vendor, who set himself alight in protest after a personal conflict with a policewoman, was what sparked the movement against the police state of Tunisia. Large, angry, crowds of young people rallied and occupied the public squares in Tunis and other large cities, posing a real threat to the then ruling party.
3   The popular uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt were unexpectedly record-breaking, bringing about the dramatic downfall of the presidents of both countries. It took just 28 days (18 December 2010-14 January 2011) for Tunisia's "Jasmine Revolution" to force President Zein el-Abedine Bin-Ali to stand down and flee incognito to Saudi Arabia for political asylum. Even more strikingly, it took ten days less than that (25 January-11 February

2011) for the Egyptian revolutionaries to oust President Mohammed Husni Mubarak.

4   The contagion s reached other Arab countries, namely Libya, Yemen, Bahrain, Oman, Saudi Arabia and Syria, all of which appeared at the time to be politically stable and secure. Although the Arab regimes in question were also greatly afflicted by challenged governance, they did not follow the same pattern of collapse. In Oman and Saudi Arabia, the governments managed the situation by lavishing funds on the underprivileged to suppress and contain the angry masses. In Yemen, political power was transferred from within the establishment thanks to the intervention of the Gulf Cooperative Council (GCC). In Bahrain, the royal regime was backed by direct military intervention from GCC Peninsula Shield troops. It was only in Libya that the confrontation between the regime and the rebels took a startling turn. The one-man Libyan regime was toppled and the "invincible" leader eventually shot dead and left unburied.

5   At the request of the Arab League, the UN Security Council was convened on 17 March 2011 to discuss the Libyan conflict. The Council issued Resolution 1973 (with 10 in favour, five abstaining) which established a no-fly zone over Libya, applied an arms and trade embargo, froze government assets and called on member states to comply and cooperate among themselves to effect the resolution. The military intervention of NATO troops (both naval and air force), combined with Arab GCC's financing and arming of rebels, was central to this move to use the United Nations flag to change the Libyan regime by force. See also 'UN Security Council Resolution 1973 (2011) on Libya – Full Text' (2011), *The Guardian,* <www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/17/un-security-council-resolution> (accessed 15 August 2014).

6   Over 2011 and 2012, the Arab League held a series of sessions in Cairo and took crucial decisions and measures against the Syrian government. These ranged from ousting Syria from the League (of which it was a founding member) to facilitating all means, including arms and logistical support, to serve rebels who had by then chosen to use force to topple the Syrian government.

7   Al-Qaeda is only one of those militant factions. Others go by names such as Ahrar al-Sham, al-Tawheed, Suqoor al-Sham, Ansar al-Sham, al-Islam Brigades, al-Farouq Battalions and Fajr al-Islam Battalions, to name a few. All of these groups have been fighting to oust al-Assad and establish an Islamic/Islamist state in Syria and, according to some, beyond.

8   Western media and state officials have reported that the involvement of European and American citizens in the Syrian conflict far exceeds the presence of similar insurgents in Afghanistan and Iraq. In a recent statement (03 June 2014), French PM Manuel Valls claimed almost a thousand French citizens had been fighting in Syria, including 30 reported dead in the conflict. Obama himself denounced a suicide bombing by a US citizen from Florida under the alias Abu-Huraira. The American drove a booby-trapped vehicle which he detonated in a public place on the outskirts of Idlib, Syria in May 2014.

9   Turkey and Israel, in particular, have been major players in the current Syrian situation by providing the rebels with open corridors into Syrian territory as well as medical, intelligence and logistical services. International and local television channels have screened long reports about those services.

10 The "Friends of Syria" describes the governments of 84 countries (now reduced to 11 for unknown reasons) who support the multi-national rebels fighting Syrian armed forces, albeit based on different political and religious agenda. They hold periodic meetings around the world to voice their 'unfaltering' position of support for the rebels on all levels. They were also behind the talks held in Geneva in 2013 and 2014 seeking a political solution to the Syrian armed conflict.

11 Following former US secretary of state Condoleezza Rice's phrase 'the birth pangs of a new Middle East' (said during the Israeli war against Lebanon in July 2006), US neo-conservative foreign policy makers understand "constructive chaos" as the bloodshed required in order to bring about a new order.

12 See two key speeches in which al-Assad addresses the Syrian conflict, delivered and transmitted live from Damascus (one from the Opera House in 2011 and the other from the People's Assembly in 2012), they propose national dialogue with the opposition and a political solution to the conflict. They also call for the drafting of a new constitution pending a national referendum and the forming of a new state government whose aims are reconciliation and the reconstruction of war-damaged facilities and residential areas in cities and the countryside. See Bashar al Assad (2013) 'The West has Brought Terrorists to Syria: President Bashar Al Assad's Historic Speech. Full Transcript,' Centre for Research on Globalization, 07 January, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-west-has-brought-terrorists-to-syria> and <http://www.trcb.com/al-assad-delivers-speech-at-peoples-assembly-48754.htm>. (accessed 01 October 2014).

13 See the Anglo-French Sykes-Picot plan for the partitioning of the Asian territories of the Ottoman Empire during World War I, the Balfour Declaration and the latest geo-strategic plan developed by the US, the UK and Israel for a 'new Middle East.' See also this commentary on the redrawn map of the Middle East; it argues that some countries will disappear, others will gain or lose territory and still others will remain unchanged: 'Plans for Redrawing the Middle East: The Project for a New Middle East', Pakistan Defense website (forum thread posting), <http://www.defence.pk/threads/plans-for-redrawing-the-map-of-the-middle-east/the-project-for-a-new-middle-east>

14 Sharif Hussein was the custodian of the Muslim holy sanctum of Mecca as well as the leader of the great Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Empire in 1916. The revolt for Arab unity and freedom was coordinated with the United Kingdom.

15 For details of the division, see the Sykes-Picot plan partitioning plan for the Asian Ottoman Empire (1916) concluded between the governments of France and the United Kingdom.

16 This was a letter sent by Arthur James Balfour, the UK foreign secretary during World War I, to Baron Lionel Walter Rothschild, a leader of the UK Jewish community. It declared the sympathies of his Majesty (King George V)'s government with aspirations to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. See also Leonard Stein (1961), *The Balfour Declaration*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

17 El-Bu'azizi's suicide in Sidi Bu-Zeid, central Tunisia was the catalyst for not only a series of uprisings across the country but also the flight of then president Bin Ali and the disintegration of his political regime.

18 The most recent version was conveyed by US President Barack Obama in an interview that aired on US television network CBS on 06 June 2014: 'I think this notion that somehow there was this ready-made moderate Syrian force [armed opposition] that was able to defeat [Syrian President Bashar] Assad is simply not true … it's a fantasy.'

19 Reference is made here to the current unstable situations in Libya, Yemen, Egypt and Tunisia and even to earlier bitter experiences in Iraq. In 2003, Bremer, Iraq's American governor, dissolved the Iraqi national army, thus allowing insurgents to fill the vacuum and cause unspeakable damage to the Iraqi people and Iraqi statehood.

20 In the unstable and deteriorating conditions in Libya after the killing of Colonel Muammar el-Qaddafi on 20 October 2011 and collapse of his regime, the Libyan provinces of Barqa and Fezzan declared their autonomy within state territory. Neither one attempted to negotiate legal terms for a possible federation, which could have been an optimal solution. Their actions were prompted by the frequent assassinations of key local military, judiciary and civilians. More recently, an ex-general in the dissolved Libyan army has taken charge of a military unit in a move to correct Libyan rebels who are seen as having prioritised their own interests over those of the state.

21 A letter from Morsi to Israeli leader Shimon Peres was read at an official reception to honour the Egyptian ambassador on his return to Tel Aviv. In it, the ex-president of Egypt addressed the Israeli as 'my great friend,' a phrase that rankled Muslims, who maintain that their sanctum in Jerusalem continues to be occupied and desecrated by Israeli soldiers.

22 According to recent records (May 2014) of the Lebanese Ministry of Interior as well as UNHCR data, the number of displaced Syrian civilians in Lebanon so far amounts to one-third of the Lebanese population, that is 1 382 134 people.

23 Hezbollah, the Lebanese Islamic resistance party, has been directly involved in the Syrian domestic armed conflict as have other Islamic (non-Shiite) militants, albeit in disguise.

24 Since Lebanon became independent in 1943, it experienced two rounds of bloody civil strife and domestic unrest (in 1958 and 1975), the longest and most devastating of which was the 1975-1990 civil war. In both cases, Syria contributed greatly to restoring Lebanon's stability as an influential stakeholder. If the situation in Syria remains explosive, Lebanon may descend into a third round of civic conflict. Such an outcome is already being

fomented by local puppet groups fueling sectarian hatred.

25 Islamic Imarah in Iraq (al-Imarah al-Islamieh fil-Iraq) is an offshoot of the al-Qa'eda organisation. After the Arab Spring erupted in the region, a group of al-Qa'eda militants moved to northern and western Iraq under the leadership of Abu-Bakr el-Baghdadi. This emir established his emirate in Iraq under the name al-Imarah al-Islamieh fil-Iraq in 2012. A year and a half later, it was renamed ad-Dawlah al-Islamieh fil-Iraq wa-Bilad el-Sham or the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Abu-Bakr al-Baghdadi continues to sit at its head and 55000 armed loyalists operate in Syria and Iraq under his command.

26 Speaking at two press conferences – in Cairo and then in Baghdad – on 23 June 2014, John Kerry declared ISIS to be a major threat to the world. His comments were made in the presence of Egyptian Foreign Minister Sameh Shoukri and then Iraqi Foreign Minister Hoshyar Zebari. See also the joint statement released at a London meeting on 20 June 2014 between UK Prime Minister David Cameron and NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen. The two condemned ISIS and terrorist groups operating in Iraq. These views were endorsed by other high-ranking officials in Europe and North America.

27 See <www.english.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx> (accessed 10 September 2014).

28 These developments bring to mind a common literary theme explored in works like Mary Shelley's Frankenstein: evil destroys evil.

Diplomatic Relations between the Philippines and Eastern European Socialist Bloc under President Ferdinand E. Marcos, 1965-1986

Archie B. Resos

Diplomatic communiques between the Philippines and the Eastern European Socialist bloc (EESB) found in the Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of the Philippines reveals a compendium of original data significant in tracing the inception of diplomatic relations between the Philippines and the EESB i.e. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia. This is a pioneering work about the beginning of diplomatic relations between the Philippines and the Eastern European Socialist Bloc under the administration of President Ferdinand E. Marcos (1965 to 1986) including the establishment of formal diplomatic ties, signing of trade, cultural, scientific and visa agreement, economic implications of trade and tourism and the strengthening of cultural relations.

Scan this article
onto your
mobile device

Formal Diplomatic Relations between the Philippines and the EESB

The EESB did not have any official relations with the Philippines until after World War II. The Iron Curtain in Europe limited Philippine re-

lations with European countries, so that the Philippines focused only on relations with Western Europe.[1] From President Manuel Roxas to President Diosdado Macapagal, the idea of opening formal diplomatic relations with Communist countries was practically non-existent. This included to the EESB.[2]

In 1965, under Ferdinand E. Marcos' presidency, the general opinion of the people in the diplomatic and business sectors was for establishing diplomatic relations with the Socialist countries. This included the USSR and the EESB. The People's Republic of China was exempted at that time because of suspicion that it was a potential threat as it is geographically nearest to the Philippines. At the same time, the Philippine military knew that the People's Republic of China had direct links with the insurgency movement in the country, which included the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army. On the other hand, the USSR and other Socialist countries in Eastern Europe were too far to be of any direct or immediate threat to its national security.[3]

Several Philippine missions were sent to the USSR and EESB in 1967 and 1968. The findings showed that the opening of diplomatic linkage with Communist countries would be beneficial for the Republic of the Philippines. For a time, the government was indifferent to these suggestions. But even if the government remained uninterested, public discussions regarding Philippine foreign relations, especially in the media, showed a trend toward softening of the hardline policy against the USSR and other Communist countries.[4]

Key government officials lambasted the possible opening of diplomatic relations with Communist countries. A proposed meeting between the Filipino and Soviet diplomats during an annual Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ECAFE) meeting in Bangkok in 1967 was attacked by Congressman Salipada Pendatun (Liberal Party, Cotabato) as evidence of Philippine foreign policy's notorious instability.[5] In the Senate chamber, protests were also pronounced. In 1968, when President Marcos suggested that the Philippines learn to co-exist with Communist China, Senator Sergio Osmeña, Jr of the Liberal Party, challenged him, claiming that peaceful co-existence was impossible and urged closer ties with the U.S.[6] Furthermore, in December 1970, Senate President Gil Puyat, Nacionalista, organized a bi-partisan caucus of senators who warned Marcos against establishing trade

and cultural relations without serious study and consultations with all constitutional and legal bodies.[7]

Be that as it may, Marcos, as the Chief Diplomat, considered the international and local realities that necessitated the opening of diplomatic relations with Communist nations. The initial concrete step which Marcos took to prepare for accord with the USSR was the establishment of diplomatic relations with smaller Socialist countries in Eastern Europe, selectively without fanfare.[8]

Marcos sent Executive Secretary Alejandro Melchor on a secret mission to the USSR in October 1970. On his return to the Philippines, Melchor suggested to Marcos that:

> Considering the chronic need of the Philippines for technical assistance and capital, it is advantageous to establish relations with the USSR in the shortest possible time . . . As a strategy, developing relations first with the smaller Eastern European Socialist states – i.e. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and East Germany – on an experimental basis, then reach up to Moscow if the experiment is found beneficial.[9]

Secretary of Foreign Affairs Carlos P. Romulo recommended the establishment of preliminary contacts with Socialist countries, particularly Romania and Yugoslavia, first. The advantages cited in the Romulo report included: the diversification of export markets for Philippine products; importations, at reasonable terms, of capital goods from Socialist countries; and enhancements of an independent Philippine foreign policy.[10]

A Flurry of Diplomatic Activities

While the introduction provided a brief overview of the context that drove the Philippines to engage with Eastern Europe, this section densely approaches each of the main milestones in the normalisation of diplomatic relations between the Philippines and members of the Soviet bloc in Central and Eastern Europe.

The Foreign Policy Council chaired by Marcos immediately adopted the Romulo Report to establish diplomatic ties with Romania and Yugoslavia as a stepping stone to opening relations with others in the EESB. Following the decision, on 12 January 1972 the Department of Foreign Affairs instructed the Permanent Representatives to the UN,

Ambassador Narciso G. Reyes, to make contacts with his Romanian and Yugoslav counterparts regarding the establishment of diplomatic ties.[11] The charting of a new diplomatic direction toward relations with socialist countries was mentioned by Marcos in his seventh State of the Nation Address on 24 January 1972 with:

Archie B. Resos

> The Philippines took the fateful steps of opening diplomatic relations with two Socialist countries of Eastern Europe, namely, Romania and Yugoslavia. Depending upon the success of these initiatives – and there is no reason to doubt their success – we will study the possibility of relations with other Socialist countries of Europe as part of the widening web of intercourse with friendly countries. The opening of relations with Yugoslavia and Romania should be regarded therefore only as a first step in a worldwide rapprochement with Socialist countries.[12]

Marcos deferred the signing of diplomatic accord with the USSR and the People's Republic of China (PRC). He opened diplomatic relations with Romania as a testing ground on 28 February 1972, and with Yugoslavia on 01 March 1972. This was done through an exchange of letters from Manila. Ambassador Luis Moreno Salcedo was designated the Philippine non-resident envoy to these two countries.[13] In turn, Romania appointed its ambassador to Japan, Nicolae Finantu, as non-resident envoy to the Philippines, while Yugoslavia designated its ambassador to Japan, Josef Smole, as a non-resident envoy to our country.[14]

Diplomatic relations with Romania bore fruit and in 1974, Ambassador Pacifico A. Castro presented in Bucharest, Romania – under the World Population Conference – the contents of the Philippine Policy Statement. Also, in the same year, Foreign Minister Carlos P. Romulo arrived in Romania for an official visit from 04 to 06 September. In 1975, and Leticia Ramos-Shahani presented her credentials as Philippine Ambassador to Romania. To further strengthen bilateral relations, on 09 to 13 April 1975, President Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania paid a state visit to the Philippines, which was the occasion for signing seven agreements on such varied subjects as trade, cultural matters, economic and technical cooperation, commercial exchanges, economic representation in Bucharest and Manila and the extension of visa facilities.[15] The Romanian delegation included President Nicolae Ceaucescu, First Lady Elena Ceausescu, Vice Prime Minister Georghe

Oprea, Minister of Foreign Affairs George Macovescu, and Minister of Health Radu Paun.

Likewise, Yugoslavia's diplomatic relations with the Philippines was prolific after the signing of diplomatic relations on 01 March 1972. On 06 June 1976, Yugoslav Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Lazar Majsov, who was later to become President of the UN General Assembly, visited Manila.[16] From 28 June until 02 July 1979 Vice President Hadilj Hodza of the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia paid a state visit, resulting in the signing of a joint statement with Marcos which agreed that:

> The only sound basis for maintaining international and regional peace and stability is the firm adherence by all states, in precept and practice to the principles consecrated in the Charters of the United Nations such as respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of states, non-interference in the internal affairs of the states, renunciation of force or threat of the use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, equality and mutual benefit. Both countries stressed their support of the right of every nation to choose freely its political, economic and social system and to pursue the mode of development it deems best for its own people without outside interference.[17]

As a gesture of diplomatic respect, on 07 May 1980, Ambassador Leon Ma Guerrero represented Marcos at the funeral rites of Yugoslavian President Josip Broz Tito.

Following the signing of diplomatic accords with Romania and Yugoslavia came Marcos' instructions to Romulo to establish diplomatic ties with four EESB states: Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic (GDR). To help contain the Communist and separatist insurgencies, in 1973, President Marcos opened diplomatic and trade relations with member states of the EESB with East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria.[18] The logic was that if the Philippines were seen as reaching out to the international socialist bloc, reasons for insurgency at home would be reduced. Or, at the very least, some backchannels for a negotiated settlement might be explored.

On 21 September 1973, the Philippines and the GDR established formal diplomatic relations, and exchanges were immediately carried out.[19] On 02 September 1977, Ambassador Leticia Ramos-Shahani

submitted her credentials to President Erich Honecker, and on 08 June 1978, Ambassador Eberhard Feisher submitted his credentials to President Marcos. Honecker officially visited the Philippines from 06-08 December 1977 and he was very warmly received by Marcos in Malacañang Palace. A joint statement was issued declaring that:

> The relations between the two countries shall be based on the following principles: respect for each other's independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; non-recourse to force or the threat of force in the conduct of their relations with each other; non-interference in each other's internal affairs; peaceful settlement of disputes; and respect for the principles of equality of states.[20]

Furthermore, President Marcos and President Honecker affirmed:

> the full support of the peoples of Southeast Asia in their endeavour to live in an atmosphere of peace, independence, and good neighbourly cooperation. All steps serving this objective accord with the effort to implement global détente and strengthen international security.[21]

The Polish People's Republic and the Republic of the Philippines established diplomatic relations on 22 September 1973. Foreign Affairs Secretary Romulo and Polish Foreign Minister Stefan Olszowski signed a letter of agreement at the office of the Philippine Mission to the UN in New York. In November 1974, a Polish trade mission led by Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade Tadeusz Zylkowski arrived in Manila for possible trading partnership. On 22 January 1975, Ambassador Zdzislaw Regulaski presented his diplomatic credentials to Marcos, while Ambassador Rogelio de la Rosa submitted his diplomatic credentials to Chairman Stanislaw Kania. Exchanges in various fields were actively carried out. From 01 until 03 August 1980 Philippine Deputy Foreign Minister Jose Ingles met with his counterpart, Polish Vice Foreign Minister Eugeniuz Kulaga. Both of them attended the Third Armand Hammer Conference which produced the Warsaw Declaration on Peace and Human Rights.[22]

The next goal was the Hungarian People's Republic and on 28 September 1973, the Philippine government directed Secretary Romulo to forge diplomatic ties with Hungary led by Foreign Minister Janos Peter. The diplomatic agreement was signed in the Philippine Mission office in New York. Erni Horvath was assigned as non-resident ambassador

in Manila, while Leticia Ramos-Shahani became his counterpart in Budapest. Romulo went to Budapest on an official visit from October 30 to November 2, 1974. The first high-profile Hungarian government official to visit Manila was Deputy Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Pal Racz.[23] From November to December 1978, a Hungarian Exposition was held at the Philippine Centre for International Trade and Exposition in Manila. In April the following year, a seminar on Hungarian pharmaceutical industry and medicine research was conducted at the Philippine International Convention Centre.

Then, on 05 October 1973, the Philippines signed an agreement with Czechoslovakia for formal diplomatic relations. Secretary Romulo signed the formal accord with Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek at the Philippine Mission office in New York.[24] To strengthen bilateral relations between the two countries, Romulo made an official visit to Prague between 02 and 03 September 1974. Karel Houska of Czechoslovakia presented his credentials on 28 June 1977, while Rolando Garcia of the Philippines did the same in 1978. The Foreign Affairs Minister of Czechoslovakia visited the Philippines from 13 until 17 July 1979. The official visit forged an executive programme for cultural and educational cooperation and expansion of bilateral trade between the Philippines and Czechoslovakia.

A month after the diplomatic accord with Czechoslovakia, the Philippines signed a joint communique with the People's Republic of Bulgaria on 16 November 1973. Signing in behalf of the Philippines was Romulo, while his Bulgarian counterpart was Deputy Foreign Minister Guero Grozev. The joint communique was signed in the Philippine Mission office in New York. From 23 until 30 October 1974, Romulo paid an official visit to Sofia. Rumen Serbezov submitted his credentials as Ambassador of Bulgaria on 20 March 1975, while Rogelio de la Rosa did the same as Philippine Ambassador on 23 May 1975. Hristo Hristov, Bulgarian Minister of Foreign Trade, attended the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD V) held in Manila. From 13-17 July 1979 Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek was in Manila on an official visit.[25]

Trade, Cultural, Scientific and Visa Agreements

As early as 1968, the vision of fostering diplomatic ties with Socialist countries was already lingering in the minds of various sectors of Phil-

ippine society and Marcos viewed such a move as a means to opening of new markets for Philippine products, especially since the Philippines wanted to expand its trade relations to strengthen its economy. Fervent nationalists argued that diversification was needed to end the unfavourable dependency relationship between the Philippines and the US.[26]

Archie B. Resos

It is noteworthy that during the latter part of the 1960s, the Philippines considered the Republic of China (Taiwan) as an independent nation with whom a lucrative trading partnership could exist. The EESB should then be a more appropriate choice for trading partnership at that juncture than the PRC – if the choice had to be made – since the USSR and its bloc were not as opposed to Philippine relations to Taipei as Beijing was (and remains). Hence, the Philippines would not have had to choose between Taiwan and the PRC and could remain on good terms with all its trading partners.

The forging of diplomatic relations with Socialist countries began in earnest in 1972 when Marcos ordered the Department of Foreign Affairs to coordinate with their Romanian and Yugoslavian counterparts. In 1973, the normalisation of relations was made with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Poland.

Marcos propounded a "New Diplomacy" when he said:

> We have continued our efforts to establish mutually beneficial relations with the Socialist world. We now maintain diplomatic relations with almost all countries of Eastern Europe – East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Romania. Such relations have already begun to positively affect our domestic situation in terms of diversification of the markets for our products as well as of the sources of finished goods needed by our burgeoning economic development efforts.[27]

Bulgaria

Bulgaria inked a trade agreement with the Philippines on 02 May 1975. The trade agreement was signed by Philippine Minister of Trade Troadio Quiazon Jr. and Bulgarian Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Tzvetan Borisov Petkov. To strengthen direct trade and economic relations, the two countries agreed to develop and promote trade and economic relations within the framework of the agreement and of the

laws and regulations of their respective countries.[28] The exchange of goods would be carried out based on the prevailing world market prices with authorised Philippine import and export enterprises and Bulgarian foreign trade organisations. In the agreement, Bulgaria's list of possible exports included machinery, metal products, building materials, household appliances, chemicals and fertilisers.[29] The other hand, Philippines' list included copper concentrates, coconut oil, abaca, rubber, textiles, and handicraft.[30]

A cultural agreement was signed between the two countries on 09 June 1978. The Philippines and Bulgaria had the common desire to promote and develop cultural relations among their respective peoples. A better understanding of each other's cultures was made possible through the exchange of books and periodicals, non-commercial cinematographic films, arts and cultural exhibitions, exchange professors, scholarships, physical education and sports.[31] An accord on economic and technical cooperation was signed by Philippine Minister of Trade Troadio Quiazon Jr. and Bulgarian Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Spas Georgiev on 10 May 1979. To promote economic and technical cooperation, both governments agreed to undertake feasibility studies, research and designs, and delivery and installation of plants, machinery, and equipment as well as provide technical assistance.[32]

Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia established trade relations with the Philippines on 09 March 1977 with the signing of a trade agreement between Minister Troadio Quiazon Jr. and Minister of Foreign Trade Andrej Barcak. To strengthen Philippine-Czechoslovak trading ties, direct economic relation between the two countries was established on equitable and beneficial bases. The Philippines and Czechoslovakia were to promote and develop their trade and economic relations in accordance with the laws, rules and regulations effective in either country.[33] Exchanges of goods between the two countries would be affected based on the list of goods mentioned in the agreement. The goods for export from the Philippines included coconut oil, logs, Portland cement, coffee, tropical fruits, tobacco, copper, nickel, lead, and chrome.[34] On the other hand, goods for export from the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic included textile, electrical and industrial machinery, metal and wood-

working machine tools, construction and road building machinery, and scientific and laboratory equipment.[35]

On 08 October 1974, the Philippines and Czechoslovakia forged a cultural agreement. The agreement was signed by Romulo and Chnoupek. Both countries agreed to promote cultural collaboration on the basis of mutual respect for their sovereignty and in conformity with the laws and regulations in force in each country. Both countries were encouraged to promote better understanding of each other's customs through an exchange of books and periodicals dealing with science, art and education; non-commercial cinematographic films and recordings; art and other cultural exhibitions; exchange professors and scholars, concerts and other performances, and scholarships.[36] To strengthen Philippine-Czechoslovak bilateral relations, an Executive Programme of Cultural and Educational Cooperation was signed on 17 July 1979, 22 October 1981 and 02 August 1985. The Programme aimed to finance the studies of two exchange scholars at post graduate level from both the Philippines and Czechoslovakia.[37] Experts from each country in music, the graphic arts, literature, theatrical art, museology, care of historical monuments, protection of nature and adult education would also be exchanged.[38]

The Philippines and Czechoslovakia also signed an agreement on 01 June 1983 for the promotion and development of scientific and technical cooperation. It included the provision of scientists, experts and technicians, equipment, instruments, accessories, and organisation of theoretical and practical training programmes.[39]

The German Democratic Republic

The German Democratic Republic and the Republic of the Philippines signed a trade agreement through Acting Foreign Minister Jose D. Ingles of the Philippines and Minister of Foreign Affairs Oskar Fisher of East Germany on 07 December 1977. Under the agreement each country granted the other the most-favoured-nation-treatment with respect to the levy of customs duties, taxes and similar charges, and the application of rules and formalities governing customs clearance, as well as the issuance of export and import licenses.[40]

The trade agreement indicated the products for export of the Philippines as coconut oil and other coconut products, coffee, tobacco leaf,

animal feed materials, plywood, pineapple, abaca fibre, and copper.[41] Likewise, the products for export by the GDR included machinery, scientific and laboratory equipment, diesel generating sets, ships, capital goods, electronic products, fertilisers, and pharmaceutical products.[42] A cultural agreement between the two countries was signed on 06 July 1983. Under this agreement, the Philippines and the GDR agreed to promote friendly cooperation in the fields of culture, art, education, and sports on the basis of mutual respect for their sovereignty, equality and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, in conformity with the laws and regulations in each country, bearing in mind the interests of their respective peoples.[43]

Hungary

Next in establishing a trade agreement with the Philippines was the Hungarian People's Republic. On 14 October 1976, Minister Quiazon and Hungarian Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade Sandor Udvardi agreed that both countries shall promote the development of trade and economic relations in accordance with the laws, rules and regulations effective in each country, and within the framework of their respective participation in the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade.[44]

On 15 July 1976, a cultural agreement was forged between Secretary Carlos P. Romulo and Ambassador Ernd Horvath. It provided for exchanges of books, periodicals, recordings for television, radio broadcasting programs, artworks, professors, theatrical, and musical performances, as well as for scholarship grants.[45] In the same way, a pact on scientific and technical cooperation was signed by the Philippine Deputy Foreign Minister Manuel Collantes and Hungarian Foreign Minister Fuja Frigyes on 22 February 1980. This agreement encouraged the Philippines and Hungary to promote and develop scientific and technical cooperation in the fields in which the two countries were interested on the basis of the principle of mutual advantage. The scientific and technical cooperation consisted of exchange of experts and technicians for study, grant of fellowships, provision of scientific data, exchange of delegations for short visits and joint technical studies in industry and agriculture.[46] In addition to these agreements, an exchange of notes regarding the holders of diplomatic and service or official passports of the Philippines and Hungary was signed in Budapest on 07 July 1994.[47]

Poland

Of all the countries belonging to the EESB, Poland was the only one to forge a full diplomatic and trading relationship with the Philippines. On 12 February 1976, the Philippine government represented by Minister of Trade Troadio T. Quiazon Jr and the government of the Polish People's Republic represented by Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade Tadeusz Zylkowski signed a trade accord. The agreement provided that both countries accord to each other the most-favoured-nation treatment with regard to custom duties and charges of any kind, rules and formalities connected with customs clearances and internal taxes on imported and exported goods, and the issuance of import and export licenses.[48]

*Archie B.
Resos*

Romania

Romania entered into a trade partnership with the Philippines on 13 April 1975 with Marcos and Ceausescu signing on behalf of their respective countries. The two countries agreed to promote the expansion of trade and economic relations with regard to their respective international rights and duties, taking into account the importance of more favourable conditions of access for their national products to each other's market.[49] The list of Romanian products for export to the Philippines included electric motors, transformers, generators, oil drilling equipment, irrigation equipment, food industry equipment, and compressors.[50] Among the Philippine products listed for export to Romania were processed food products, shrimps, prawns, fresh fruits, fish, canned tuna, pineapple juice, beer, rum, and tobacco.[51] A Memorandum of Agreement between the Department of Science and Technology of the Philippines and the Mining Research and Technology of Romania on cooperation in science and technology undertakings was also signed in Manila on 22 August 1994.[52] In the same manner, an agreement relating to the waiver of visa requirements for holders of ordinary passports and abolition of visa fees in certain cases was signed in Manila on 12 April 1975.[53]

Yugoslavia

Finally, Yugoslavia entered into a trade agreement with the Philippines when Minister of Trade and Industry Roberto Ongpin signed a trade

accord with the Federal Secretary for Foreign Trade Milenko Bojanic on 07 June 1983 in Belgrade. This agreement directed the Philippines and Yugoslavia to promote direct trade and economic relations, and espouse the expansion of bilateral trade within the framework of the laws and regulations effective in their respective countries.[54]

A cultural agreement was likewise made between the Philippines and Yugoslavia on 14 September 1977 with the purpose of improving cultural ties through an exchange of books, films and artworks, as well as through cultural exhibitions, scholarship grants and sports.[55] On 30 August 1982, a pact on scientific and technical cooperation was forged between the Philippines and Yugoslavia, Romulo and Miodrag Trajkovic signed for their countries. The treaty provided for an exchange of experts and professors, scholarship grants, aid in the preparation of feasibility studies, the training of technical staff, exchange of documentation, and other related forms of cooperation.[56] On 09 March 1973, an exchange of notes for the abolition of non-immigrant visa requirements for the citizens of the Philippines and Yugoslavia was signed in Manila.[57]

As the above section demonstrated through the deployment of empirical data, the 1970's was a decade of intense start-ups in the relationship between the Philippines and an assortment of East European countries situated in the Socialist bloc. The next section seeks to show some of the implications of the momentum created over the course of that decade.

Economic Implications in Trade and Tourism

The Philippines' forging of diplomatic and trading relationships with the EESB was a milestone in the country's search for a market for its products. The opening of the diplomatic and trade relations with the Eastern European countries bolstered efforts to establish diplomatic ties with the USSR and, by extension, the PRC. The foreign policy of Marcos proved effective in dealing with smaller Eastern European countries first. It took the form of an active search for new friends and markets among the Socialist countries in Eastern Europe.[58]

In terms of bilateral relations, Marcos' Administration sought to mobilise the Philippines' diplomatic posts among the EESB for the promotion of trade and tourism. In fact, *Trade Promotion Units* were created in each of these posts headed by a Philippine ambassador or consul

general.[59] This proved to be an effective diplomatic move. According to Deputy Foreign Minister Manuel Collantes:

> The trade promotion units later assumed expanded roles such as encouraging investment and tourism in the country and sourcing out placement for our skilled manpower . . . with this setup, our officers became more responsive to national development programmes.[60]

Tables 1 to 3 present the development of the Philippine trade with Eastern Europe from 1971 to 1975.

Table 1. Trends in Philippine-EESB Trade from 1971 to 1975 (in US dollars)

	Imports from the EESB				
	1971	*1972*	*1973*	*1974*	*1975*
Bulgaria	x	x	x	28,742	28,765
Czechoslovakia	x	88,888	75,507	777,645	1,047,161
East Germany	x	x	x	2,235	6,605
Hungary	x	1,123	37,177	29,395	61,169
Poland	x	x	113,868	4,209,522	71,978
Romania	x	x	333,220	519,095	4,601,514
Yugoslavia	x	8,176	60,481	9,622,945	4,726,822

	Exports to the EESB				
	1971	*1972*	*1973*	*1974*	*1975*
Bulgaria	x	x	2,720	x	18,417
Czechoslovakia	x	x	x	100	x

East Germany	x	x	x	x	x
Hungary	x	x	x	x	x
Poland	x	x	x	x	118,430
Romania	x	x	x	x	15,738
Yugoslavia	105,000	x	49,287	116,766	380,741

	Total Trade				
	1971	*1972*	*1973*	*1974*	*1975*
Bulgaria	x	x	2,720	28,742	47,182
Czechoslovakia	x	88,888	76,507	777,715	1,047,161
East Germany	x	x	x	2,235	6,605
Hungary	x	1,123	37,177	29,395	61,169
Poland	x	x	113,868	4,209,522	190,408
Romania	x	x	333,220	519,095	4,617,252
Yugoslavia	105,000	8,176	109,768	9,739,711	5,107,563

	Balance of Trade				
	1971	*1972*	*1973*	*1974*	*1975*
Bulgaria	x	x	2,720+	28,742-	10,348-
Czechoslovakia	x	88,999-	76,507-	777,545-	1,047161-

East Germany	x	x	x	2,235-	6,605-
Hungary	x	1,123-	37,177-	29,395-	61,169-
Poland	x	x	113,868-	4,209,522-	46,452+
Romania	x	x	333,220-	519,095-	4,585,776-
Yugoslavia	105,000+	8,176-	11,194-	9,506,179-	4,346,081-

Source: Collated from the Central Bank Statistical Bulletin and Philippine Statistical
Yearbook 1975, 1976, 1984, 1985 and 1986.

Table 2.
Trends in Phil-
ippine-EESB
Trade from
1976 to 1979
(in US dollars)

	Imports from the EESB			
	1976	*1977*	*1978*	*1979*
Romania	6,024,000	1,518,000	237,000	14,282,000
Others	4,494,000	2,348,000	5,506,000	9,604,000

	Exports to the EESB			
	1976	*1977*	*1978*	*1979*
Romania	13,656,000	5,882,000	x	7,711,000
Others	5,631,000	5,797,000	1,805,000	1,264,000

	Total Trade			
	1976	*1977*	*1978*	*1979*
Romania	19,680,000	7,400,000	237,000	21,993,000
Others	10,125,000	8,145,000	7,311,000	10,868,000

	Balance of Trade			
	1976	*1977*	*1978*	*1979*
Romania	7,632,000+	4,364,000+	237,000-	6,571,000-
Others	1,137,000+	3,449,000+	3,701,000-	8,340,000-

Source: Collated from the Central Bank Statistical Bulletin and Philippine Statistical Yearbook 1975, 1976, 1984, 1985 and 1986.

Table 3.
Trends in Phil-
ippine-EESB
Trade from
1980 to 1984
(in US dollars)

	Imports from the EESB				
	1980	*1981*	*1982*	*1983*	*1984*
Bulgaria	1,147,648	1,337,123	2,257,630	3,579,155	304
Czecho-slovakia	2,953,996	2,254,892	3,126,216	4,921,815	1,472,243
East Germany	4,521,088	5,184,602	2,180,384	2,689,528	432,877
Hungary	150,629	657,775	629,976	229,923	85,483

Poland	5,496,907	2,012,549	1,771,454	1,427,469	1,438,772
Romania	2,036,871	2,479,072	4,810,336	1,725,405	3,534,490
Yugoslavia	54,244	284,805	227,444	2,149,531	443,618

	Exports to the EESB				
	1980	*1981*	*1982*	*1983*	*1984*
Bulgaria	x	82,467	733,555	2,415,763	167
Czecho-slovakia	x	219,957	497,005	54,182	45,480
East Germany	4,743,284	299,437	x	488,816	87,553
Hungary	15,750	226,682	2,892,889	1,145,721	127,546
Poland	3,695,230	375,718	535,872	570,498	418,771
Romania	4,175,650	5,938	50,000	x	100
Yugoslavia	4,203,792	3,828,866	380,507	43,403	12,181

	Total Trade				
	1980	*1981*	*1982*	*1983*	*1984*
Bulgaria	1,147,648	1,419,590	2,991,185	5,994,918	471
Czechoslovakia	2,953,996	2,474,849	3,623,221	4,975,997	1,517,723
East Germany	9,264,372	5,484,039	2,1880,384	3,178,344	520,430
Hungary	166,379	884,457	3,522,865	1,375,644	213,029

167

Poland	9,192,137	2,388,267	2,307,326	1,997,967	1,857,542
Romania	6,212,521	2,485,010	4,860,336	1,725,405	3,534,590
Yugoslavia	4,258,036	4,113,671	607,951	2,192,934	455,799

	Balance of Trade				
	1980	*1981*	*1982*	*1983*	*1984*
Bulgaria	1,147,648-	1,254,656-	1,524,075-	1,163,392-	137-
Czechoslovakia	2,953,996-	2,034,935-	2,692,211-	4,867,633-	1,426,763-
East Germany	222,196+	4,885,165-	2,180,384-	2,200,712-	345,324-
Hungary	134,879-	431,093-	2,262,913+	915,798+	42,063+
Poland	1,801,677-	1,636,831-	1,235,582-	856,971-	1,020,000-
Romania	2,138,779+	2,473,134-	4,760,336-	1,725,405-	3,534,390-
Yugoslavia	4,149,548+	3,544,061+	153,063+	2,106,128-	431,437-

Source: Collated from the Central Bank Statistical Bulletin and Philippine Statistical Yearbook 1975, 1976, 1984, 1985 and 1986.

From the opening of trade relations in 1972 and 1973, the Philippines gradually increased its import of Eastern European products – particularly machinery and equipment – however, the balance of trade was favourable to the EESB. Yet, between 1976 and 1977 there was a shift and the balance of trade favoured the Philippines as compared to Romania and other Socialist states. It is noteworthy that from 1980 to 1984, total trade increased substantially between the Philippines and the EESB. With the exception of Hungary and Yugoslavia, the Philippines had a negative trade balance with other Socialist countries. The Eastern

European countries exported tractors, machinery, equipment and other industrial products to our country, while we exported coconut oil, minerals and other agricultural products.

Philippine exports to the EESB, from 1972 to 1982, is shown in Table 4.

Products	Romania	Yugoslavia	G.D.R.	Poland	Bulgaria	Czech.	Hungary	Total
Primary								
Copper	10,262,200	16,442,800	299,400	x	x	x	x	27,004,400
Sawlogs, Venfer Logs	x	x	x	x	236,400	x	x	236,400
Chromium	x	1,200,600	x	x	5,500	x	x	1,206,100
Abaca	312,000	129,000	x	554,400	x	x	x	995,400
Gold	1,004,100	1,856,000	x	x	118,700	219,900	67,600	3,266,300
Buntal Fiber	x	x	800	x	x	x	x	800
Vegetable	x	200	x	x	x	x	37,600	37,800
Tobacco	x	x	x	x	x	3,200	x	3,200
Centrifugal Sugar	25,682,000	x	4,743,200	1,271,500	x	x	x	31,696,700
Copra	x	x	3,049,600	x	x	x	15,700	3,065,300
Coconut oil, crude	x	x	x	371,700	314,200	669,400	x	1,355,300
Non-coniferous wood	x	1,606,000	4,789,300	x	x	x	x	6,395,300
Fruits and Vegetables	x	x	700	10,800	x	x	430,000	441,500

Semi-Manufactured							
Abaca Rope	x	x	x	56,100	347,500	x	69,500	473,100
Veneer Sheets	x	x	x	55,300	348,200	x	x	348,200
Silver	4,413,200	4,424,400	x	x	x	123,100	x	8,960,700
Chlorites Hypochlo-rites	x	x	x	123,800	321,700	x	x	445,500
Ferro-Manganese	2,614,400	12,100	178,300	x	x	38,600	x	2,843,400
Manufactured								
Desiccated Coconut	x	1,378,300	722,400	593,500	231,400	961,100	x	3,886,700
Refined Petroleum	114,100	318,500	x	367,100	132,600	x	129,500	1,061,800
Petrol. Prod. For Int'l	1,228,200	x	x	739,800	x	x	x	1,968,000
Household Wood	x	158,100	x	x	161,300	x	x	319,400
Films	x	x	237,200	455,800	x	x		693,000
Basket Work	x	x	8,900	x	x	x	x	8,900
Samples	x	x	x	x		1,300	11,612	12,192
Articles	x	x	x	500	23,600	x	x	24,100
Personal Effects	13,700	1,200	x	4,500	13,500	700	x	33,600
Replace-ments	x	x	x	59,100	x	x	x	59,100
Dresses	7,900	6,300	2,647,300	x	x	186,400	x	2,847,900
Coffee	x	x	1,021,900	x	x	123,100	x	1,145,000
Total Export	*45,651,800*	*27,533,500*	*17,699,000*	*4,664,900*	*2,254,600*	*2,326,800*	*761,512*	*100,892,112*

Source: Central Bank Statistics, Annual Report for the year 1982.

Primary, semi-manufactured, and manufactured products were the main export of the Philippines to the EESB from 1972 to 1982. The top ten export of the Philippines to the EESB include centrifugal sugar, copper, silver, non-coniferous wood, desiccated coconut, gold, copra, dresses, ferro-manganese, and petroleum products for international delivery. Other substantial export of the Philippines include coconut oil, chromium, coffee, refined petroleum product, abaca, cinematograph films, chlorites, cordage, fruits and vegetables and others.

*Archie B.
Resos*

Romania remains the Philippines top export destination with $45,651,800. Other export destinations in Eastern Europe were Yugoslavia, $27,533,500; German Democratic Republic, $17,699,000; Poland, $4,664,900; Czechoslovakia, $2,325,800; Bulgaria, $2,254,600 and Hungary, $761,512. The total export of the Philippines to the EESB was $100,892,112.

Tourism gained significantly for the Philippines. Table 5 shows the distribution of visitors from Eastern Europe.

*Table 5.
Eastern Europe Distribution of Foreign Visitor Arrivals by Country of Residence and Mode of Travel*

	1980			1981			1982			1983		
	Air	Sea	*Tot.*	Air	Sea	*Tot.*	Air	Sea	*Tot.*	Air	Sea	*Tot.*
Poland	179	0	*179*	116	1	*117*	70	0	*70*	76	1	*77*
Yugoslavia	493	19	*512*	220	7	*227*	407	14	*421*	309	2	*311*

	1984			1985			1986			1987		
	Air	Sea	*Tot.*	Air	Sea	*Tot.*	Air	Sea	*Tot.*	Air	Sea	*Tot.*
Poland	69	18	*87*	50	3	*53*	76	0	*76*	86	82	*168*
Yugoslavia	167	23	*190*	153	1	*154*	260	95	*355*	160	39	*199*

Source: Culled from the Distribution of Foreign Visitor Arrivals by Country of Residence and Mode of Travel, Planning Service Division, Ministry of Tourism.

Of the Eastern European visitors, those from Poland and Yugoslavia increased in number from 1980 to 1987. No record was available in the Department of Tourism on visitors from the other Eastern European countries. Indeed, the opening of diplomatic relations with socialist countries opened windows of opportunities for the Philippines. Trade, tourism, cultural, and scientific and technical cooperation were promoted vigorously.

Strengthening Cultural Relations between the Philippines and the EESB

Cultural exchanges proliferated between the Philippines and the states of the EESB. Since the signing of diplomatic agreements in the 1970's, various cultural performances were staged in the Philippines by Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Poland, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. Romania sent its finest violinists, Petru Csaba – the first Romanian concert artist to set foot on Philippine soil on 12 December 1977 – and Lenuta Ciulei on 06 December 1982.[61] Romanian conductors, Ilarion Ionesu-Galati and Christian Brancussi, visited the country on 10 November 1980 and 30 April 1984, respectively. Romanian opera singers performed in the CCP Main Theatre, among them, Dan Iordachescu on 19 November 1979, Nelly Miricioiu on 29 September 1980, Luminita Dumitrescu on 10 September 1981, Mihaela Agachi on 16 February 1982, and Eleonora Enachescu on 07 November 1983.[62]

Hungary participated in the cultural exchange with the performance of the Hungarian State Folk Ensemble under the direction of Zoltan Vereb on 03 September 1977.[63] Hungarian musicians also performed in the country like pianists Bela Siki in 1978, 1981 and 1983 and Gyorgy Sandor on 19 June 1981. The greatest Hungarian conductor, Gyorgy Gulyas also performed on 25 April 1982. Czechoslovak musicians Bozena Steinerova, a pianist, staged a performance on 16 October 1979 and Vladimir Mikulka, guitarist performed on 20 March 1982. Slovak Folklore Artistic Ensemble, compose of five Czechoslovak musicians namely, Jan Berky-Mrenica, Ondrej Kurucz, Bertok Alexander, Alojz Rigo and Juraj Helcmanovsky rendered their local music to Filipino audiences on 18 October 1982. The Zilina Black Theater, the first professional puppet theatre in Czechoslovakia entertained Filipino audiences on 01 February 1986.[64] The GDR also had their share of cultural performances in the Philippines. Horst Forster, the country's leading conductor, visited the Philippines on 19 November 1979 and Werner Taube, soloist cellist, performed on 24 September 1980.[65] And, a top pianist from Poland rendered outstanding performances. Ruth Slenczynska, known as 'the First Lady of the Piano,' was in Manila on 05 March 1980. Mona Golabek, who won the Chopin International Competition in Warsaw in 1970, performed in the Philippines on 06 June 1981.[66] Pawel Checinski, another Polish pianist rendered a performance on 05 March 1982 at the Cultural Centre of the Philippines.

Bulgaria also made its presence felt in the Philippines by staging a performance of Youlia Radounova, a dramatic soprano on 18 September 1981. To expose the Filipinos to local music and dance performances, the Pirin Folk and Dance State Company (Blagoevgrad), a music and dance cultural group performed on 04 October 1981 at the Cultural Centre of the Philippines.[67] Suzanna Eugeni Klintcharova, a harpist, came to the Philippines on 20 February 1984 and again on 01 December 1985. Yugoslavia sent its finest ballet dancer, Dinko Bogdanic, member of the Ballet Theatre Company of Zagreb, on 19 March 1982.

During the 1970's and 1980's, Filipino cultural performers were also sent to various countries in the EESB. Among these Filipino performers were the Ballet Philippines founded by Alice Reyes in 1969, Bayanihan Philippine Dance Company, Dance Concert Company founded by Eric Cruz in 1973, Filipinesca Dance Company founded by Leonor Orosa-Goquinco in 1958, and the Hariraya Ballet Company. In 1983, Toni Lopez Gonzales, a Filipino choreographer and dancer became a semi-finalist in the 11th International Ballet Competition in Bulgaria.

Given the above activities that followed from the diplomatic overtures in the 1970's it is clear that there was a convergence of interests between the Philippines and the EESB states to engage in regions beyond their traditional spheres. The spate of activities must also be understood in the context of a general return to Cold War thinking in both Moscow and Washington as détente fell apart in 1979 with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Perhaps it was due to such confusing times, or that the Helsinki Final Act (1975) created the impetus for dialogues and budding civil societies in and among the EESB, that there was space for the creation and warming of relations between the Philippines and the EESB in the 1970's and 1980's. But even this is part guess and part reflection.

Conclusion

As early as 1972, the Philippines had been contacting Romanian and Yugoslav representatives in the UN for possible diplomatic ties. Prior to the opening of formal ties with the USSR and the PRC, Marcos wanted to test the waters. An exchange of letters was initiated to open diplomatic ties with Romania and Yugoslavia. The result was favourable and trade and cultural relations were formed between the Philippines and these countries. In 1973, other nations belonging to EESB followed suit,

173

the Philippines initiating the move to have official diplomatic relations. The German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria inked official agreements with the Republic of the Philippines in 1973.

Trade relations increased tremendously from 1971 to 1984. However, the balance of trade was favourable to the EESB. This was primarily because these countries exported machinery, tractors, heavy capital equipment and industrial products, while Philippine exports consisted mostly of raw minerals and agricultural products. Tourism would not be substantial affected; Polish and Yugoslavian tourists were the only ones mentioned in the Department of Tourism records. In terms of cultural relations, exchanges of books, periodicals, non-commercial cinematographic films, arts, cultural exhibitions, professors, scholarships, physical education and sports provided greater awareness and understanding of the varied cultures of the Philippines and EESB. Scientific and technological exchanges exposed Philippine scientists and technicians to scientific and technological advances in the various Eastern European states.

All told, Marcos' policy of opening diplomatic ties with Socialist countries enhanced the economic and socio-cultural aspects of Philippine national life. This was done in a flexible, pragmatic and development-oriented manner. Among Filipino presidents, no one dared and succeeded in forging diplomatic ties with Communist countries except Marcos. Indeed, Marcos steered Philippine foreign policy from its traditional thrust to one of pragmatism in the face of the realities of the time. He accomplished this by inking diplomatic agreements with EESB: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia. In other words, Marcos' diplomatic coup helped recast the Philippines national direction into the future.

૰

ARCHIE B. RESOS is affiliated to the History Department, Faculty of Arts and Letters at the University of Santo Tomas, in España, Manila Philippines. He may be reached at: *archieresos@yahoo.com*

Notes

1   Alma Ocampo-Salvador (1998), 'Philippine-European Relations,' in Aileen San Pablo-Baviera and Lydia N. Yu-Jose (1998), *Philippine External Relations: A Centennial Vista*, Pasay City: Foreign Service Institute, p. 496.

2   As defined, Eastern Europe consists of seven states: Poland, the largest in every way; Czechoslovakia and Hungary, both land-locked; Romania and Bulgaria, facing the Black Sea; and Yugoslavia and Albania, political mavericks that possessed Adriatic coastlines. These countries form the fifth and easternmost regional unit of Europe, whose eastern boundary also forms the eastern limit of the European geographical realm. This is Europe at its most continental, most agrarian, and most static.

3   F. Landa Joacano (1988), *Philippine-USSR Relations: A Study in Foreign Policy Development*, Manila: NDCP Foundation, p. 53.

4   Ibid.

5   *Manila Times*, February 11, 1967, p.11.

6   *Manila Chronicle*, November 23, 1968, p.6

7   Amelito R. Mutuc (1971), "The Issue of RP-Russia Relations" *Weekly Nation*, Volume 6, Number 20, p. 3.

8   F. Landa Jocano (1988), *Philippine-USSR Relations: A Study in Foreign Policy Development*, Manila: NDCP Foundation, p. 97.

9   *Manila Times*, October 27, 1970, p. 2.

10 Pacifico A. Castro (1985), *Diplomatic Agenda of Philippine Presidents 1946-1985*, Manila: Foreign Service Institute, p. 188.

11 Ibid. 195.

12 Ferdinand E. Marcos. "Strength through Crisis, Growth in Freedom" State-of-the-Nation Address on January 24, 1972 taken from www.gov.ph/1972/01/24/ferdiand-e-marcos-seventh-state-of-the-nation-address-january-24-1972/

13 F. Landa Jocano (1988), Philippine-USSR Relations: A Study in Foreign Policy Development, Manila: NDCP Foundation, p. 99.

14 *Philippine Diplomacy: Chronology and Documents, 1972-1981* (1981), Manila, Philippines: Foreign Service Institute, pp. 200 and 287.

15 Jose D. Ingles (1982), *Philippine Foreign Policy*, Manila: Lyceum Press, Inc., p. 75.

16 Ibid.

17 Basic Document. Joint Statement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia (Signed, 2 July 1979).

18 Cecilio T. Arillo, (2012), *Imelda: Mothering and her Poetic and Creative Ideas in a Troubled World,* Makati City: IAME, p. 20.

19 Benjamin B. Domingo (1983), *Marcos Diplomacy: Guide to Philippine Bilateral Relations*, Manila: Foreign Service Institute, p. 387.

20 Basic Document. Joint Statement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and Government of the German Democratic Republic (Signed 7 December 1977).

21 Ibid.

22 Jose D. Ingles (1982), Philippine Foreign Policy, Manila: Lyceum Press, Inc., p. 74.

23 Philippine Diplomacy: Chronology and Documents, 1972-1981 (1981), Manila, Philippines: Foreign Service Institute, p.99.

24 Pacifico A. Castro (1985), *Diplomatic Agenda of Philippine Presidents 1946-1985*, Manila: Foreign Service Institute, p. 214.

25 Jose D. Ingles (1982), Philippine Foreign Policy, Manila: Lyceum Press, Inc., p. 72.

26 Richard John Kessler Jr. (1985), *Development Diplomacy: The Making of Philippine Foreign Policy under Ferdinand E. Marcos*, United States of America: The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, p. 258.

27 Ferdinand E. Marcos, (2007) "New Diplomacy" in Benjamin B. Domingo (2007) *Marcos Foreign Policy* (Manila: Marcos Presidential Center, Inc., p. 193.

28 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria (Signed, 2 May 1975).

29 Ibid. 6-7.

30 Ibid. 7-8.

31 Basic Document. Cultural Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria (Signed, 9 June 1978).

32 Basic Document. Agreement on Economic and Technical Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria (Signed, 10 May 1979).

33 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (Signed, 9 March 1977).

34 Ibid. 5-6.

35 Ibid. 6.

36 Basic Document. Cultural Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (Signed, 8 October 1974).

37 Basic Document. Executive Program of Cultural and Educational Cooperation between the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the Government of the Republic of the Philippines for the Years 1982-1983 and 1983-1984 (Signed, 8 October 1974).

38 Ibid. 2.

39 Basic Document. Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (Signed, 1 June 1983).

40 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the German Democratic Republic (Signed, 6 July 1983).

41 Ibid. 5.

42 Ibid. 6.

43 Basic Document. Agreement on Cultural Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the German Democratic Republic (Signed 6 July 1983).

44 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic (Signed, 14 October 1976).

45 Ibid. 2.

46 Basic Document. Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic (Signed, 22 February 1980).

47 J. Eduardo Malaya et al. (2012), *Philippine Treaties Index: 1946-2010*, Pasay City: Foreign Service Institute, p. 71.

48 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Polish People's Republic (Signed, 12 February 1976).

49 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania (Signed, 13 April 1975).

50 Ibid. 6-7.

51 Ibid. 7.

52 J. Eduardo Malaya et al. (2012), Philippine Treaties Index: 1946-2010, Pasay City: Foreign Service Institute, p. 117.

53 Ibid.

54 Basic Document. Trade Agreement between the Federal Executive Council of the Assembly of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (Signed, 7 June 1983).

55 Basic Document. Cultural Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Signed 14 September 1977).

56 Basic Document. Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Signed, 30 August 1982).

57 J. Eduardo Malaya et al. (2012), Philippine Treaties Index: 1946-2010, Pasay City: Foreign Service Institute, p. 156.

58 Benjamin B. Domingo (1993), *The Re-making of Filipino Foreign Policy,* Quezon City: Asian Center, University of the Philippines, p. 95.

59 Bonifacio S. Salamanca (1995), *Towards a Diplomatic History of the Philippines*, Quezon City: UP Press Printery, p. 175.

60 Manuel Collantes. (1983), "The Frontiers of Philippine Diplomacy" Speech before the Rotary Club of Lucena City, April 27, 1983 in *Philippine Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, I:3, pp. 46-47.

61 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "Petru Csaba, Violin Soloist" December 12, 1977 and "Lenuta Ciulei," December 6,

1982.

62 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "Romanian Opera Singers in the Philippines from 1979 to 1983."

63 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "The Hungarian State Folk Ensemble in its Philippine Debut." September 3, 1977.

64 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "Zilina Black Theatre." February 1, 1986.

65 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "Horst Forster, Great Conductor" November 19, 1979 and Werner Taube, Soloist Cellist" September 24, 1980.

66 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "Mona Golabek, Pianist" June 6, 1981.

67 Performance Program of the Cultural Center of the Philippines, "The Pirin Folk and Dance State Company" (Blagoevgrad) October 4, 1981.

The Business of Private Security in Europe

The Case of Bulgaria

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

This work offers readers' information related to the infusion of private businesses into the area of private security in one of the EU's "new" member states: Bulgaria. The materials and analysis offered in this text attempts to act and an inspirational probe that goes beyond publicly accessible documents prepared by some international private security associations so that a clearer picture of the sectors' impact on security may be gleaned. Additionally, this work offers an analytic contribution to the privatisation of security.

Keywords: Bulgaria, security system, private security companies, privatisation of security

Introduction

This work offers readers' information related to the infusion of private businesses into the area of private security in one of the EU's "new" member states: Bulgaria. The materials and analysis offered in this text attempts to act and an inspirational probe that goes beyond publicly accessible documents prepared by some international private security associations so that a clearer picture of the sectors' impact on security may be gleaned. Additionally, this work offers an analytic contribution to the privatisation of security. In order to make sense of such a relationship and some practical implications, this work proceeds as follows. First, it highlights the specific organisation of security apparatuses in Bulgaria. This section is heavily reliant on empirical information and assists in showing the distribution of responsibilities in the coun-

Scan this article onto your mobile device

179

try. This is closely followed by a section that details general statistics and trends regarding crime in Bulgaria; providing an important contextualisation to the preceding section and the rest of the work. Once crime and security organisations have been accounted for, this work then turns to establishing an appropriate framework for understanding the manner in which business has engaged in the security sector in Bulgaria. This section identifies the main phases of such engagements and deploys adequate case work to support the main arguments raised. This work then concludes with proposals Bulgaria could undertake to both improve its security situation and increase the transparency of the actors.

The Security Community in Bulgaria

Since January 2009, the main internal security authority in Bulgaria has been the Ministry for Public Order and Security (MPOS), which controls the following national services: the National Police Service, the Gendarmerie, the National Security Service (counter-intelligence); the Border Police Service and the National Service for Combating Organised Crime and Conducting Special Operations.[1] Each of these services is responsible for specific tasks, though these may overlap.

The National Police Service (NPS), is responsible for combating general crime and maintaining public order in the broadest sense of the term.[2] This service excludes more serious criminal behaviours, which tend to fall under the mandate of the National Service for Combating Organised Crime (NSCOC).[3] The Gendarmerie is a special police force that functions as an "intermediary" between the military and the police force. Its territorial operation is not specified and it is therefore active in both towns and rural regions. The National Security Service (NSS) represents the counter-intelligence branch of security.[4] The main task of the Border Police Service (BPS) is to protect state borders from illegal crossings of people and the smuggling of illicit goods. The Service employs around 12000 staff members.

The number of employees in the police and security forces in Bulgaria is not officially published though it is estimated that between 25000 to 29000 people in service are currently working for the NPS alone. Another 30000 people[5] are employed directly in the MPOS. In other words, the MPOS fields around 60000 employees. At the same

time, there is a blurring of responsibilities between the military and police forces since the former may be called up to perform tasks typically assigned to the latter. Since the country's accession to NATO, its armed forces have been going through an extensive reform which aims to achieve full compatibility with the national armies of allies by around 2015.[6] The target number of the military personnel resources for 2014 is 27 000[7] soldiers (land forces, air force, the navy and Joint Forces Command). Another 18 000 to 20 000 officers are in the National Guard, and around 280 000 are reserve officers.[8] In relation to the role of private security services it should be noted that some high-ranking military officials think it worthwhile to engage private security agencies in guarding military facilities, thus replacing soldiers in such positions. General Ivan Dobrev, Chief of Infantry – noted for his efforts to reduce the number of women in the army[9] – said that 'activity not related to training and education is a waste of time for the soldiers.' This is especially true of guarding military facilities and General Dobrev adds that

> The soldier's salary is about 700 levs, and yet instead of improving their qualifications they waste their potential for something we could get for 400 levs monthly if security agencies were engaged to do the job.[10]

Another specialised authority that poses powers of investigation is the National Investigation Service which is subordinate to the Ministry of Justice. It specialises in serious crime not dealt with by the National Service for Combating Organised Crime. Its powers can be compared to those of the Czech Republic's Criminal Police and Investigations Service, which collects documents and evidence for the main judicial proceedings. Following the adoption of the new Criminal Law, this Service went through a reform in 2005 which deprived it of some of its powers and transferred them to the National Police Service.[11]

Municipal Police in Bulgaria was probably established only in Sofia.[12] This was at the turn of 2010 and 2011. This force employs some 110 people, of which 75 are guards. So far, the officers' duties are defined mainly in the area of inspection and penalties for improper parking, combating illicit business (stalls, vendors) and penalising unpaid advertising areas. However, Sofia City Hall has expressly stated that establishing the Municipal Police in no way means contract termination with the private security agency Egida (which guards buildings and city

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

areas – such as offices of state authorities, schools and kindergartens, cemeteries, social care and social aid institutions, orphanages, parks, subways etc.).[13] Understanding the manner these organs function must be measured against the levels and types of crime in Bulgaria.

Crime in Bulgaria

The criminal activity in Bulgaria has become a relatively delicate problem, and a growing political issue.[14] This was a main reason why the Centre for the Study of Democracy decided – with a significant contribution of the US Department of Justice – to produce an extensive report on the criminal situation and trends in Bulgaria.[15] According to the report, crime in Bulgaria increased three to four times in the early 1990's and some types of criminal activity saw growth at up to 10 times previous rates. Between 1990 and 2005 at least one member of *every* Bulgarian family fell victim to crime.

At the beginning of the 21st century (also in the context of European Union accession efforts and with assistance of foreign counterparts) measures were developed in the country to end an incredible crime wave. This, indeed, brought results and the crime incidence has since dropped. According to the European Statistical Office[16] around 200000 crimes were committed in Bulgaria in 1995, and "only" 136000 crimes were reported in 2006.[17] This can be explained by a few mutually non-exclusive factors: a general decline in Bulgaria's population, the fact that young men – the demographic group attributed to the majority of crimes – are leaving Bulgaria for opportunities in other parts of the EU, a comprehensive decline in unemployment coupled with more effective policing.

While on the surface, this reflects a positive trend, it must be measured against the claim that only some 53% of all committed crime is actually reported in Bulgaria. However, there is a significant difference in some particular types of crime: during a 2003 survey 78000 respondents declared themselves victims of a particular crime, while only 11090 cases of that same crime were recorded in the official statistics. The reason for this is that confidence in the police force in Bulgaria is not at such a level to make people report the same proportion of crimes as is usual in the majority of "older" European Union Member States.[18]

Now that a general contextualisation of security and criminality has been presented, this work turns to its main arguments which expose the connection between private business and private security in Bulgaria.

The Current Framework of Business in Private Security

The regulatory framework for private security services in Bulgaria is described in idealised terms—at least on paper.[19] Some norms were even transposed, with only minor changes, from the legislation of some Nordic European countries. To a greater or lesser extent this also applies to the following norms, the:[20]

1. Act on Private Business in the Area of Guarding Services (24 February 2004),[21]
2. Regulation on the Rules for Training the Private Security Personnel (4 December 2006),[22]
3. Decree No. 69 on the Conditions and Rules for Psychological Fitness Necessary for Handling Guns and Ammunition as of 19 May 2000,
4. Act on Inspection of Explosive Substances, Weapons and Ammunition, as Amended (last Amendment 2003, SG 71/12),[23]
5. Decree to Implement the Act on Inspection of Explosive Substances, Weapons and Ammunition, as Amended (last amendment from 2004, SG. 12/13),
6. Decree No. 1-121 on the Requirements to Ensure Security in Transporting Valuables as of 24 June 2004, SG 63/2004),
7. Other Norms (Commercial Law, Labour Code etc).

The institution responsible for creating the regulatory framework defining the rules and conditions for private security business in Bulgaria is the Ministry for Public Order and Security[24] and the National Police Service and its local police units. This is significant since it produces the clear jurisdiction of public services over private. As a result, Bulgaria's national authorities have done much to clearly regulate the area of private security. Consider, for instance, the following regulated areas related to the business in private security: 1. protection of people (physical security), 2. protection of the property of natural and legal persons, 3. event management services, 4. guarding and transport of

cash and other valuables, 5. Technical aspects of ensuring security (distribution and management of security systems).

Yet, just because a particular entity is interested in entering the private security market and has the capital to do so, does not entitle it to do so. Instead there are a series of requirements – typical of any business sector – the differ in relation to whether an individual or corporate body is seeking access. For instance, corporate bodies must first be registered in national Commercial Register and retain a valid licence for running a business in private security (issued for an indefinite period). In contrast, for natural persons trying to enter the market in Bulgaria must be: at least 18 years of age, a citizen of an EU member, retain permanent residence in Bulgaria, have completed at least elementary education (secondary education in case of management members), gleaned a satisfactory result in the compulsory psychological examination and keep no criminal records, re: no criminal prosecution is currently pursued against the person for intentional crime.

Other "special requirements" including the wearing of uniforms and carrying of adequate identification cards are compulsory. With its design, colour or accessories, however, the apparel must not resemble the uniforms that are used by state security forces. Identification cards that are worn on duty show affiliation to the particular agency.

Considering the use of firearms, private security employees are allowed to carry these (though not automatic weapons) and, in practice, it is very common that they are armed. Having a gun licence (which is issued to individuals) is compulsory. The relevant security agency must report to the local police station the number of its employees who carry a firearm. It is estimated that among the 130000 people working in the private security sector (see below) are around 90000 registered firearm holders. The tactical use of dogs, and, for example horses, by private security companies is strictly forbidden.

Even though the sector is highly regulated, private security staff in Bulgaria are entitled to the following powers:

1. To carry out body searches and the power to seize property that is carried away without authorisation,
2. The power to detain a person inside a guarded area or facility if such a person has committed a crime within that area, or if the person's conduct threatens the life, health or property of people who are present in the area or it causes damage to the property found in that area,

3. The power to detain a person whose conduct threatens the life, health or property of a guarded physical person. Any such detained person must be immediately referred to the law enforcement authorities.

A widespread phenomenon in Bulgaria is the involvement of private security companies in providing services to the public sector authorities (including the guarding of central public administration bodies, embassies, military facilities and border crossings). Critics of this condition say that private agencies are awarded contracts for guarding public facilities without being required to sufficiently train their staff. Also, that employees of these agencies do not enjoy the status of a public official and if attacked, the attack will be penalised as if aimed at any other citizen ("ordinary person"), regardless of how important the building or area guarded by this employee is, remains problematic.

Private security workers in Bulgaria are required to undergo a minimum and initial (immediately after the employee starts working with the agency) training of 40 hours (6 days). Other specialised training – probably also compulsory – is attended by security staff according to the type of activity performed or the risk expected with that activity (a minimum of 18 to 20 hours every year). During the first month of employment the newly recruited worker is under the "patronage" of a senior and a more experienced colleague (mentor). The rules for the compulsory pilot training are set by the Ministry for Public Order and Security and are approved by the Police Force management. Private security agencies may also provide training via its own resources or via external trainers. After completion of the training the security worker receives a certificate of professional qualification.

The number of companies in the market reported in 2010 by Confederation of European Security Services (CoESS)[25] was 1131 (more or less steady figures for the last couple of years – 2004: 1159 companies, 2007: 1112 companies; 2008: 1029 companies). From the total number, around 50 companies provide (as part of their regular activities) event management services (maintaining public order during events involving a larger number of people) and around 400 companies provide services of a "technical nature" (which mainly includes distribution, maintenance and operation of camera and alarm systems). The vast majority of them are companies with no international background. More frequent are small firms with less than 200 or less than 100 employees. The largest companies employ no more than 3000 people.

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

185

The confirmed turnover in the sector amounts to around 550 million levs (2 levs = 1 euro) in 2007.[26]

As for the number of people working in the sector, there are two views on this issue: according to one there are around 56500 people[27] in Bulgaria who work in private security (based on Coess, this was 56486 people in December 2010, 58700 people in 2007 – of which 2100 were management members, and 42733 people in 2004). According to the second view, however, we should speak of more than 130000 people because another 70000 (est) employees work as "in-house guards" in many enterprises. This would mean that an incredible 9% of the country's male population (of working age) is employed in the non-state security sector. The annual fluctuation rate in the sector ranges from 40% to 70% and the "average" sector worker is a male of around 40 years of age or a woman of around 30 years of age. However, women only represent 2% (est) of the staff employed by agencies. Most employees of these agencies have secondary education (including the apprenticeship schools). As for the equal opportunities principle, this aspect is covered by the Act on Protection against Discrimination from 2004.

As far as salaries are concerned, the average wage in the sector (guards) reported at the end of 2008 ranged between 320 to 350 levs per month. However, there may be gaping differences between individuals. While some guards (at least officially) earn only the minimum wage (220 levs per month, or 1.4 levs per hour), others earn 600 levs monthly. Employees involved in transporting valuables or installation of security systems can earn up to 800 levs. The maximum working hours in 2008 were set to be the maximum of 12 hours a day, which is no more than 48 hours a week (alternation of the "short" and "long" weeks – which is 40 and 56 hours respectively – is acceptable when working on shifts), 192 hours a month or 2 304 hours a year. The minimum annual leave is probably not determined. Overnight work or work over weekends and public holidays should not exceed 35 hours a week.

While not central to the main arguments of this work, these figures assist in providing the overall situation facing security services in Bulgaria and provide insights – naturally – into some of the embedded problems. While these are comprehensively dealt with in the subsequent sections, it is prudent to first trace the full spectrum of private security in the country.

Private Security Services in Bulgaria: Milestones

The development of Bulgaria's private security sector was part reactive and part proactive and very dramatic[28] in the period 1990 until 2006 several factors contributed to it.[29] The most important are listed as: First, the inability of state institutions to build and reinforce the rule of law and set clear borders for business as well as to ensure an acceptable and the highest possible level of safety to the public. Second, many Bulgarian people lacked trust in the impartiality, or at least effective functioning of the judiciary (especially with regard slow and often biased courts) which only added to the public demand for security-related diffusions of power. Third, there was considerable pressure stemming from unemployed security professionals – during the reported period between 1988 and 2001, for example, the Bulgarian army was reduced from between 104000 and 150000 members to about 40000 – coupled with the dissolution and major transformation of the intelligence sector (by estimate, 30000 members of the regime's intelligence platforms – mainly the State Security – were also made redundant). Fourth, at the same time the role of the "grey economy" cannot be ignored. It is estimated that during some periods over the past 20 years the grey economy represented nearly 40% of Bulgaria's total GDP. For those conducting business on the edge of the law tend not to use police and other national authorities to resolve disputes and seek protection but are more likely try to engage in (partnership with?) private security services.

With this in mind, there are four main stages of Bulgaria's private security sector from 1990 until our own times.

Period 1, 1990-1994: At this point, in principle private enterprise was entering a totally unregulated environment and private security fell into the domain of criminal and semi-criminal groups that engaged more in racketeering than in ensuring safety.[30] At this time, companies such as Daga Security, IPON-1, SOT 161, Scorpio, Atlas, and Pireli were established—they still exist today. Companies such as VIS-1, Club 777, TIM and Apolo Balkan were blamed for using drastic methods of violence and intimidation to appease their paymasters.[31]

Period 2, 1994-1998: At this point, the first signs of an emerging legislative framework to regulate private security in Bulgaria (license introduction) emerged.[32] Some agencies (that would have hardly met

the conditions for obtaining a licence – mainly because most of their management had criminal records and found it undesirable to register via a "straw man" – came to the conclusion that, to achieve their goals, they would do better if they transformed into "consultancies" or "insurance" companies. This should not be taken to mean that they would surrender their methods of pressuring would-be customers to purchase their services—methods nothing short of blackmail and racketeering. For example, the security agency VIS-1 transformed into an "insurance company" VIS-2 (later operating under the names Planeta and Jupiter), the agency Club 777 turned into company Sila ("Force"). At this time, stickers with logos of a particular agency or insurance company became widely used. Buildings with labels on them (not only of companies, but also houses, apartments, cars, and bus stations of private carriers) that were guarded or "insured"[33] by a specific agency were sometimes perceived as the "zones of influence" of that particular agency (or the criminal or pressure group directly associated with it).

Period 3, 1998-2000: This is the phase of "setting up holdings." The market was dominated by a group of corporate bodies (controlled by similar or identical physical persons) that were engaged in a wider spectrum of activities, from more or less legal ones (providing "protection," facility management services, cleaning or catering services, transportation, insurance services, etc) through to controversial activities or business on the edge of the law.[34] It is typical of this stage for the private security market in Bulgaria to be saturated (or even over-saturated) and, in fact, divided. Many agencies at this point sought ways to diversify their portfolios, which meant expanding outside this sector. Reportedly it was common to – either directly or via subsidiaries – control some of the profitable firms to which they originally provided the guarding services. Instead of acting as a protector, paradoxically, such security agencies became a threat for the guarded company. Some security agencies were financially so strong that they buy up the shares of individual businesses and through supervisory boards (forcing out other shareholders by fair means or foul) they gain control over companies with which they have not been in any business relationship before. It was at this time that the country began (with Romania) seeking to join the EU and NATO, which became the driving force for a number of changes. For instance, At the beginning of 1999, law courts began handing out a lot more sentences (deciding also the cases connected with the unfair practices of private security agencies).

Abusing the model of "insurance firms" was made complicated by the Insurance Act of 16 July 1998 (which required all firms in this area to re-register and which contributed to the dissolution of the most dubious firms as well as to certain consolidation in this area). Directly applicable to private security agencies were the Decrees of February 1999 (No. 39) and June 2000 (No. 79) regulating the conditions for running a business in private security, which imposed stricter rules for setting up and operating these types of agencies.

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

Phase 4, post-2001: This, the supposed consolidation of the situation[35] was assisted greatly by the slow arrival of multinational groups (Securitas and others). People's confidence in at least some security agencies increased. Pessimists however, think that the consolidation of the environment was caused by tightened relations between semi-criminal groups and public officials. Corruption, rather than violence, seems to better suit the purpose of achieving goals. It is no longer necessary to laboriously blackmail hundreds of businessmen; manipulated government contracts bring higher and safer benefits (guarding the power stations, barracks, sea ports, border crossings, etc). It is also prudent to mention the ephemeral efforts of some private firms to win contracts for maintaining order at football stadiums (which is normally the responsibility of police forces that are apparently paid for their presence by event promoters). Company SOT 161, which tried to get a contract in May 2006 by dumping prices, was a complete failure. Its employees were unable to mitigate an incident that had burst out among hundreds of fans and eventually the police still had to be called.[36] As far as the key legislation currently applicable (the Act on Private Business in the Area of Guarding Services from 2004) is concerned, it introduced – among other things – the following changes:[37]

1. Employees of the agencies must go through at least a basic six-day training programme,
2. Licences that are issued to agencies are not limited in time (the arguments used at this point are that while in the past licences were issued for 3 years and police officers had time for nothing else but constantly handling the bureaucratic issues connected with repeated licence renewals, today they reportedly have more time for more consistent inspections on the spot),
3. It expressly says that private security agencies must not use automatic guns throughout their performance,
4. Supervision and sanctions are now purely the responsibility of the

police or the Ministry for Public Order and Security (municipalities and the Parliament or other central government bodies no longer play a role in this – as compared to the past).

An interesting comparison can be drawn from two UNICRI researches[38] that were carried out in Bulgaria (with special focus on Sofia agglomeration) between 2000 and 2005.[39]

That same research in 2005 identified the reasons why companies hire private security agencies for their safety:

Despite the clear steps taken towards regulating the private security market, several negative dimensions can be seen in the case of Bulgaria.

A Critical View of Private Security in Bulgaria

The key weaknesses in the sector of private security in Bulgaria can be described as intersection of several negative factors. First, the sector originated spontaneously, without previous examples of proper regulation (best practices from countries abroad with longer and less interrupted democratic tradition). Second, as gathered, the sector is extremely oversaturated. As a rule there is also, thirdly, a low level of social assurances for employees of private security agencies, as well as fourth, the absence of clear rules for occupational health and safety. Fifth, the situation is even more complicated because of the "grey economy" in Bulgaria. A company that runs a business without a licence, fails to comply with the occupational health and safety regulations, fails to pay taxes and social insurance for its staff (etc) is unlikely to contact the state police in case of any troubles, but will rather choose a private security agency, no matter how dubious. Sixth, regulation requires inspections, but there is often no money to compensate overtime work of supervisors (often local police officers). This – among other things – opens up space for corruption. Seventh, many agencies are at the same time controlled by former police officers who make use of their above standard (and mutually beneficial) relations with colleagues still in service, which can lead to many conflicts of interests.

What is also striking are the links of many top government and local officials as well as political representatives to specific agencies (political-police-judicial-security brotherhoods). Agencies with politicians in their back-pockets are reportedly exerting pressure on public officials to make them stop hindering contracts that are not advantageous for

the state or they try to stop police officers from investigating particular cases that might damage their benefactors or patrons. For example, the former Deputy Minister of the Interior Kamen Penkov, owner of the company Scorpio and a man associated with the Socialist Party, reportedly helped gain lucrative contracts for his company in June 2006 to provide services for the National Customs Agency. Parliament Member Ivan Palćev (board member in Khan Krum agency, today Security BG) allegedly stood behind the awarding of the contract for guarding the nuclear power station in Kozlodui.[40]

It is clear that the private sector in security needs improvement. The following section provides a few recommendations to that end.

Recommendations for Improving the Private Security Sector in Bulgaria

The most often noted recommendations to improve the situation in Bulgaria are:

1. Ensure adequate funding for supervision over private security agencies: One possible approach is to finance the licensing from collected fines or through introducing other administrative penalties. Another option would be to broaden the spectrum of institutions assigned to supervise agencies. Ideally, the private firms themselves would voluntarily contribute to the financing of such supervision.

2. Reinforce a greater role of local/community councils as a supplementary platform to assist the police decision making (concerning both licence issuing and the monitoring).

3. Ensure stricter regulation of security services that are operated by companies with their own resources (in-house security). Bearing in mind that the number of these employees in Bulgaria is higher than the number of licensed personnel of security agencies, it is necessary that these in-house security workers are subject to the same regulation (in terms of the training, powers, etc.). The same is true for a stricter regulation of persons with a criminal history (restrict the possibilities for these people to work in private security agencies). Together with this are proposals suggesting that stricter penal sanctions are applied if a crime is committed by a person employed in a private security agency. It is also necessary

to enable the public to complain about the behaviour of people employed by private security agencies (for example, via local town councils).

4. Increase the responsibility of private agencies for the behaviour of their staff.[41] This compliments efforts to suppress the practice of using their own firearms by the employees of agencies.

5. Increase the criteria for the companies guarding state facilities. In performing the tasks connected with guarding the state's critical infrastructure facilities (ports, power stations, military facilities), employees from the potential agencies hired for this job are not required to go through any specialised training, nor is there a

	Proportion of firms addressed with a request for protection	Proportion of reported racketeering cases	Main reasons for not reporting racketeering
2000	7,3 %	7,9 %	Fears of revenge from blackmailers (63.3%)
2005	1,3 %	22,0 %	The police won't solve the problem anyway (31%); this problem does not fall within the police responsibilities (sic, also 31%); fears of revenge from blackmailers ("only" 21%)

higher responsibility of the agency for possible faults (and if there is, then at a price exceeding the costs for hiring specialised police or military staff).

Fear of crime	Other firms in my field have hired one	It wasn't necessary but the service is cheap and available	Our firm has become a victim of crime
66%	23%	17%	17%

Police fails to ensure security at sufficient level	To protect our firm against its competitors	Our firm was forced to do so by the agency	Other reasons
14%	6%	6%	3%

6. Adopt measures to prevent conflicts of interest to be used as a special anti-corruption tool (cases in which a person in public office awards a contract to a company affiliated with or even owned by that person).

While these only touch on some of the things that could be undertaken to provide a greater level of regulation, and with it real security, for Bulgaria, its citizens and the wider European community. These are certainly not enough to change – overnight – the practises that have plagued Bulgaria since the end of the Cold War, but they will help in ensuring that Bulgaria finds its legitimate place in the EU, not only as a member (which it became in 2007), but as a responsible member. This is why it is important to understand the full impact of individual transformations within Bulgaria. The following section illustrates the main points of this article via a biography of Boyko Borisov.

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

Boyko Borisov: A Biography

Borisov was born (1959) in the town of Bankya which is now part of Sofia.[42] His family was seen as being 'ideologically unreliable' and, as a result, his dream of becoming a Police Academy student was dashed. He had content himself with the University of Fire Prevention where he later lectured. He proved himself and therefore was accepted as a member of the Communist Party. In the 1980's he took part in pressure operations against the country's Turkish minority.[43] He was also engaged in wrestling, achieved a black belt in karate, and became the national trainer, and an international referee. The combination of experience from sport and the security forces eventually led Borisov to start his own business. In 1991 he founded a security company IPON-1 which specialised in VIP bodyguarding services.[44] Apart from that he ran a company Budoinvest that was engaged in international trade and martial arts training. At this time, Borisov allegedly acted as a collector of ransom money and was nicknamed "Mutra" (in loose translation a "Mug" or "Visage").

In 1997, Borisov's mistress – Cvetelina Borislavova – fell victim to a car bomb attack. She survived, but was seriously injured. Today, Borislavova works in the management of CIBank, which, arguably, played a role in siphoning profits out of Icelandic banks (which for some time operated on the principle of the pyramid fraud scheme but later went bankrupt). Borislavova's business partner was Iceland's first billion-

aire, Björgólfur Thor Björgólfsson, who between 2002 and 2008 held the decisive share pack of Landsbanki and Straumur banks (until they faced bankruptcy).[45]

During the 1990's, Borisov worked as a bodyguard for the last Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Todor Zhivkov, and for the former Tzar Simeon II. When Tzar Simeon II won the parliamentary elections in 2001, following a campaign full of unrealistic promises, he appointed Borisov State Secretary at the Ministry for Internal Affairs where he was responsible, among other things, for commanding the police force. Borisov was then promoted several times until he achieved the rank of General.

In 2005, he stood as a candidate in parliamentary elections for the Party of Simeon II (Narodno dviženije Simeon Vtory, NDSV). He was elected in two districts (Blagoevgrad and Plovdiv). However, he did not accept the mandate and continued to work within the Ministry. Shortly thereafter, he broke away from the former Minister and left public service. In that same year, mayoral elections were held in Sofia in which Borisov won as an independent candidate. He gained political merits through his vigorous fight against corruption, theatrically dismissing from public functions anyone under even the slightest suspicion.[46] Then, in 2006, Borisov founded a political party called Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria (its abbreviation in Bulgarian is GERB, which means a "shield" or "coat of arms"). Formally Borisov does not lead the party; however his face brings success to it. Although the Party defines itself as centre-right-liberal, these notions are only empty words (not only) in the Balkans. Voters are more likely to respond to familiar faces or to catchy political slogans. In the case of the GERB Party, this was mainly Borisov's face and his platitudes about fighting corruption and "mafia practices."

In 2007, Borisov was confronted with the US Congress report (US Congressional Quarterly, Homeland Security). The report says, among other things, that at least between the years 2001 and 2005 during in which Borisov acted as the State Secretary of the Minister of the Interior, he was connected to influential mafia members (for example, Rumen "Pasha" Nikolov and Mladen "Madžo" Mihalev). His name was also put in connection with several dozens of unresolved assassinations. In spring 2009, the "cocaine king" Sreten Jociš, nicknamed Joca Amsterodam, testified against Borisov in Belgrade. He said that, at the turn of the century when he had been living in Bulgaria, Borisov and

Nikolaj Gigov, owner of the Locomotive football club and an arms dealer, were his closest associates.

Borisov, dismissed such attacks and explained that they were merely the 'revenge of his political enemies,' and voters responded positively. In June 2009, GERB won 5 out of 17 seats in the European Parliament to represent Bulgaria and a month later the Party – under the flag of the 'resolute fight against mafia and corruption' – dominated the one-chamber Parliament and won 116 out of 240 seats.[47] This resulted in a single-colour Government, in which GERB is supported from outside by the centre-right "Blue Coalition" and the individual members from other parties.

A turn in Borisov's career came with the public protest against high energy prices and against perspective of limiting subsidies for agriculture which culminated in February 2013. Borisov initially pledged 'tough methods against foreign energy companies' (including Czech energy plants), but then he reassessed the situation and gave space for early elections. Those were won in May 2013 again by GERB, but the government was set up with coalition of socialists and Movement for Rights and Freedoms (defending among other interests of Muslims), which governs until this day.

Conclusion

To summarise the situation in Bulgaria, vis-à-vis the budding private security sector, it is a country whose socio-economic indicators are the least encouraging in the EU and this is partially connected to the oversised security community. Even though there has been a general downsizing of the public security sector, many of those made redundant found employment in private security firms. At the same time, it should be noted that the legiaslative-organisational framework for the functioning of the sector formally meets international standards. In practice however, many firms operate as legislatively uncontrolled linked to various influential clandestine groups. Similar to in the Czech Rupbilic, in Bulgaria at least one of the well-known eneterpreneurs, in the framework of this sector, has made an effort to setp into higher political ranks. Borisov, in the leadership position of a populist forum was able to win the seat of Mayor of Sofia and then Prime Minister, which he occupied from July 2009 until March 2013. Despite many criticisms of his unclear political as well as criminal past he holds high

level of popularity and continues his career. It is not only in Bulgaria where the civil society is more interested in the cover rather than the content of political programme of political parties. However, for the research work conducted here, it is a pressing European issue that Bulgaria adopt the recommendations proposed above since it is not only an important part of the EU's external border-zone and set to join the Schengen system but it is also an integral part of the Black Sea area. Hence, leaving the regulation of the flow of goods, people and ideas from conflict-ridden Ukraine, Russia and Turkey in the hands of private Bulgarian security firms may have negative short, medium and long-term consequences.

∽

OLDŘICH KRULÍK is affiliated to the Department of Crisis Management at the Police Academy of the Czech Republic in Prague and may be reached at: *krulik@polac.cz*

ZUZANA KRULÍKOVÁ is affiliated to Tri Services and may be reached at: *z.krulikova@triservices.cz.*

Notes

1   Министерство на вътрешните работи. Available at: <http://www.mvr.bg> (accessed 3 October 2010).
2   The average wage of the National Police Service officers is expected to be around 500 euros per month. Bohman, M.; Krulík, O. *Policejní sbory v zemích Evropské unie: Inspirace pro Českou republiku* [Police Forces in European Union Countries: Inspiraton for the Czech Republic]. Praha: Ministerstvo vnitra České republiky, 2009.
3   Interpol: European Police and Judicial Systems: Bulgaria. Available at: <http://www.interpol.int/public/region/europe/pjsystems/bulgaria.asp> (accessed 12 November 2011).
4   The country's other intelligence agencies are the National Intelligence Ser-

vice (sometimes also called the **Bulgarian Foreign Intelligence Service,** the intelligence service which falls under the budget chapter of the Ministry of Defence) and the Defence Information Service (military counter-intelligence). National Intelligence Service. Available at: <http://www.nrs.bg/> (accessed 9 May 2012). Bulgaria Security Services and Selected Government Offices. Available at: <http://www.eyespymag.com/intel-bulgaria.htm> (accessed 9 May 2012). 'Bulgaria: The Counter-Terrorism Coordination Centre (CTCC) of the State Agency for National Security (SANS),' in *Fusion Centres throughout Europe: All-Source Threat Assesments in the Fight against Terrorism*, ed. Rapaille, G.; van Laethem, W. Antwerp; Oxford; Portland: Belgian Standing Committee; Intersentia, 2010, 19-32.

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

5 The documents of The Confederation of European Security Services (CoESS) report the number of around 47 000 officers in 2008. This is probably a sum of the two figures mentioned.

6 It should be also noted that for quite a long time after the political change the local police and security forces held a military status (the People's Militia and the internal security unit of the Red Berets) and it was only under pressure from the EU that they turned civilian. See Das, D., K.; Palmitto, M., J. *World Police Encyklopedia*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group; LLC, 2006, 136.

7 As of 2011, it is around 34 000 soldiers, of which around 600 serve in Afghanistan (between 2003 and 2008 a contingent of 485 soldiers was relocated to Iraq).

8 Министерство на вътрешните работи. Available at: <http://www.mvr.bg/> (accessed 3 October 2010).

9 It must be noted, however, that of all NATO members Bulgaria has probably the highest number of women working in the army around 12.7 %, of which 1200 are assigned as combat troops.

10 Iliev, N. 'General Wants Private Security Contractors to Guard Military Bases.' Feral Jundi, 12 November 2009. Available at: <http://feraljundi.com/1137/bulgaria-general-wants-private-security-contractors-to-guard-military-bases/> (accessed 9 May 2012).

11 Law Enforcemen in Bulgaria. Available at: <http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/law_enforcement_in_bulgaria> (accessed 12 November 2011).

12 'Bulgaria's Sofia Launches Municipal Police". *Novinite – Society*, 3 January 2011. Available at: <http://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=123751> (accessed 11 November 2011). Nikolova, A. "Municipal Police Department Will be Launched in Sofia". *Sofia Echo*, 22 November 2010. Available at: <http://sofiaecho.com/2010/11/22/997551_municipal-police-department-will-be-launched-in-sofia, (accessed 11 November 2011).

13 **'Егида-София' ЕАД:** общинска охранителна фирма. Available at: <http://www.egida-sofia.com/> (accessed 13 November 2011). EGIDA – Sofia J. S. C.: Municipal Security Company. Available at: <http://www.securitybg.com/egida/data.php?id=2001> (accessed 13 November 2011).

14 Das, D., K.; Palmitto, M., J. *World Police Encyklopedia*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group; LLC, 2006, 135-136.

15 Bezlov, T.; Gounev, P. *Crime Trends in Bulgaria: Police Statistics and Victimization Survey.* Sofia: CSD 2005.

16 Crime and Criminal Justice Database. Available at: <http://epp.eurostat. ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/crime/data/database>   (accessed 9 May 2012).

17 Bezlov and Gounev say that according to their research, in 2001 nearly 600000 crimes were committed in Bulgaria and 300000 crimes in 2004.

18 Nation Master: Bulgaria Crime. Available at: <http://www.nationmaster. com/country/bu-bulgaria/cri-crime> (accessed 12 November 2011).

19 Much of the information for this section is based on: Private Security in Europe: CoESS (Confederation of European Security Services) Facts and Figures 2008, available at: <http://www.coess.org/pdf/coess_facts_figures_2008.pdf> (accessed 28 November 2011) and Private Security in Europe: CoESS (Confederation of European Security Services) Statistics. Available at: <http://www.coess.org/stats.htm> (accessed 28 November 2011).

20 Private Military and Security Services (PMSCs) Regulation Database: Bulgaria. Available at: <http://www.privatesecurityregulation.net/countries/ results/taxonomy%3a238.32> (accessed 13 November 2011).

21 Law of 24 February 2004 on Private Guarding Activity. Available at: <http:// www.privatesecurityregulation.net/files/bulgaria_2004_law_private_security.pdf> (accessed 13 November 2011).

22 Regulation of 4 December 2006 on Training Requirements for Security Guards. Available at: <http://www.privatesecurityregulation.net/files/ bulgaria_2006_regulation_qualification_securityguard.pdf> (accessed 12 November 2011).

23 1998 Law on the Control of Weapons and Explosives. Available at: <http:// www.privatesecurityregulation.net/files/bulgaria_1998_law_guns_explosives.pdf> (accessed 13 November 2011).

24 Yet according to some opinions, the Ministry is in conflict of interest – not only it regulates the sector but it itself hires some   private agencies to perform specific tasks for the state.

25 CoESS (Confederation of European Security Services). Available at: <http:// www.coess.org> (accessed 8 May 2012).

26 Reduction to around 346 million levs was envisaged for 2008.

27 And reportedly a number of other people 'without a licence.'

28 Jäger, T.; Kümmel, G. *Private Military and Security Companies*, 203-205. Available at: <http://www.tcij.org/training- material/private-security-sector> (accessed 12 November 2011). Bulgaria's Private Security Industry. Genéve: Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), 2006. Available at: <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/digital-library/publications/detail/?ots591=0c54e3b3-1e9c-be1e-2c24a6a8c7060233&lng=en&id=96902> (accessed 12 November 2011). Page, M.; Rynn, S.; Taylor, Z.; Wood, D. *SALW and Private Security Companies in South Eastern Europe: A Cause or Effect of Insecurity?* Belgrade: SEESAC, 2005. Frye, T.; Zhuravskaya, E., "Rackets, Regulation and the Rule of Law". *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organisation.* 2000, vol. 16, II (October), 478–502. Dimitrov, M.; Stanchev, K., *A Law on Private Collection Judges should be Approved Before the Elections.* Insti-

tute for Market Economy. February 2005. Available at: <http://ime-bg.org/
pr_bg/213-3.htm> (accessed 12 November 2011). Frye, F. 'Private Protection
in Russia and Poland.' *American Journal of Political Science*, 2002, July, 'The
Wrestlers Remain in the Insurance Business.' *Capital Weekly*, 24 October
1998. Informal Economy in Bulgaria: Center for the Study of Democracy.
Available at: <http://www.csd.bg/?id=118> (accessed 13 November 2011).

29 Some authors approach three models of the transformation of security
systems in post-socialist countries in East and Southeast Europe: 1. the
Post-Yugoslav model: Security forces have not been reduced (and if so, the
reduction was slow and often occurred only at the beginning of the 21st
century) because their members found their place in the armed conflicts
that were going on in this region (Krajina, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Koso-
vo); 2. the model from Romania and Hungary: The downsizing of the forc-
es was done at once, very quickly and in a relatively drastic manner, but the
state has remained strong and capable to quickly introduce regulation in
the area of providing services in private security. 3. The model from Bul-
garia, Ukraine, Russia and Albania—massive transfer of redundant security
officers (but also athletes) into the already established or newly emerging
criminal structures that often do business in private security (where, for a
couple of years, there is no legal or other effective regulation). See Handel-
man, S. *Comrade Criminal: Russia`s New Mafiya.* New Haven: Yale Univer-
sity Press, 1997.

30 Hajdinjak, M. *Partners in Crime: The Risks of Symbiosis between the Secu-
rity Sector and Organised Crime in Southeast Europe*. Sofia: Center for the
Study of Democracy, 2004, 20–22. Volkov, V. *Violent Entrepreneurs: The Use
of Force in the Making of Russian Capitalism*. Ithaca; London: Cornell Uni-
versity Press, 2002.

31 UNHCR: Bulgaria: Information on a Private Protection Firm Called Club
777. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/publisher,irbc,,bgr,3ae-
6ab7d88,0.html> (accessed 13 November 2011).

32 In 1993, a legislative change was adopted that introduced a new provision
(No. 43) into the Act on National Police generally stating that private se-
curity services must be registered by police stations (i. e. that the police
forces should be informed of the existence of private agencies). This
issue is further discussed in the "Decree on issuing licences for guarding
locations and   private physical and corporate bodies" as of March 1994.

33 The car "insurance" provided by a specific agency often involved that if
the particular car was stolen, the injured was compensated with another
comparable – but also stolen – car.

34 This period was characterised, among other things, by at least partial in-
troduction of standard regulation (in other European countries   already
common for quite a long time) applicable to handling firearms, collection
of taxes in freight transport, trade in precious metals.

35 In August 2001, police inspections were held in 847 companies and in more
than 3 400 areas where the staff of these companies   was   assigned   to
work. 'Dozen cases of misconduct' were found and 69 reprimands were
given.

36 'How the Police Came Back to the Stadium.' *Dnevnik Daily*, 31 May 2006.

37 The Act (and its provisions) was also supported by some companies that had been calling themselves for clearer rules for their business.

38 United Nations Interregional Institute on Crime and Justice, UNICRI. International Crime Victims Survey. Available at: <http://rechten.uvt.nl/icvs/> (accessed 12 November 2011).

39 Other findings from 2000 are as follows: 8 out of 12 companies stated that they pay for security services on a regular basis. Another 60% said that they pay for these services on a random basis, a few times a year. The most frequent victims of blackmailers are companies with less than 10 employees. Larger companies with over 100 employees reportedly experienced racketeering only exceptionally. In 2005, only 7% of racketeers were labelled as people somehow connected with private security agencies. The majority of them were denoted as "other criminals" (33%) and competitors (26%).

40 "Bulhaři a Rumuni se upínají k roku 2007 jako datu vstupu do unie". *Hospodářské noviny*, 17 December 2002.

41 A bizarre case happened in November 2005 in the region of Gabra near Sofia. Local residents protesting against a plan to establish a dump site in an abandoned mine were confronted by around 50 employees from various private security agencies. Ten demonstrators were injured; police officers found out that thirteen of the agency workers had criminal records. The owner of the abandoned mine insisted that he had not hired the agency staff. The employees later testified that they had "happened to pass by" and merely got involved on their own initiative. None of the agencies was thus held responsible.

42 "Batman od Černého moře". *Týden*, 20 July 2009. "Bulhaři zúčtovali s vládou a vsadili na Batmana". *iHNed.cz*, 7 July 2009.   Sokol, P. "Generál Borisov: nebude se krást." *Reflex*, 13 August 2009.

43 In the eyes of Turks, however, this won no popularity for him. The Kardzali region with prevailing Turkish population (Pomac Turks) is one of the few regions of the country in which the GERB party does not enjoy strong voter support.

44 Agency IPON-1 – and Borisov himself as a private person – is the only Bulgaria's full member of International Association of Personal Protection Agents, IAPPA, certificate IAPPA C-002. IPON. Available at: <http://www.security-bg.com/ipon/english.htm> (accessed 13 November 2011).

45 'Who Is Who: Bulgaria's New Prime Minister Boyko Borisov.' *Novinite*, 21 July 2009. Available at: <http://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=105996> (accessed 13 November 2011).

46 Some blame Borisov for the fact that, when he was the mayor of Sofia, he not only continued to formally manage the company IPON-1   but   also awarded it with lucrative or significantly overpriced contracts to guard the municipal property.

47 The ruling Socialists (Communists, in fact), that had been so popular so far, failed in the public eyes. People reproached the party with its feeble fight against rampant organised crime, the omnipresent corruption and abuse of power, but also for the country losing the opportunity to benefit from between 500 to 800 million Euros from EU

financial assistance. The majority of Bulgaria's population also had the unrealistic idea that, following the country's accession, their standard of living would quickly approach the Western European level. But the miracle did not happen and this was one of the reasons why so many people got fixated on Borisov's image of the "tough guy" (also called the "general" or "Batman"). In January 2009, the Parliament was even sieged by a thousand protesters demanding the resignation of the socialist Government. "Bulharsko: policie se střetla s demonstranty." *Hospodářské noviny*, 15 January 2009.

Oldřich Krulík and Zuzana Krulíková

Book Reviews

Colin McInnes and Kelley Lee, *Global Health and International Relations*, Cambridge: Polity Press 2012, ISBN: 9780745649467

Global Health and International Relations

Reviewed by Emel Elif Tugdar (West Virginia University)

Health is traditionally perceived as a domestic issue in politics. With the globalisation and increasing interdependence of states, health has become an important foreign policy and diplomatic concern that has implications for security, economics and international development. In recent years, the world has witnessed an increasing interaction between international relations and health due to the reasons such as involvement of intergovernmental organisations, impact of the transnational epidemics, and the problem of access to drug treatment for poor populations as part of human rights. Thus, because of its social and economic effects as well as its geopolitical and security implications, health has become a major factor in international relations. The recognition of health as an important issue in global politics requires greater policy coherence both domestically and internationally.

Global Health and International Relations by McInnes and Lee mainly argues that achieving this coherence requires better understanding of the relation between health and International Relations. It examines the topic of health from an International Relations perspective as opposed to the majority of related works on health, which have treated the issue as part of domestic politics and public policy. Thus, the authors of the book fill a gap in literature with their research by exploring not only the issue of health, but also the importance of its place in International Relations. They question whether the emergence of health onto the agenda of International Relations serves for any purpose from a social constructivist perspective (p. 24).

It is possible to divide the book into six sections based on specific thematics, with Chapter One acting as an introduction to the global health issue with a broad discussion of the topic. Chapter Two is where the authors explain the emergence of health as an agenda in International Relations. Chapter Three is an illustration of the health issue as part of foreign policy and the importance of global health diplomacy. Chapter 4 focuses on the global health from an International Political Economy perspective. Chapter Five examines the global health governance as a concept and discusses its pros and cons whereas the Sixth Chapter primarily focuses on the security dimension of the health issue in International Relations. The conclusion chapter offers a summary, comparison and evaluation of the analysis made.

McInnes and Lee question why the health as a subject could not have been incorporated into the discipline of International Relations by claiming that health has been ignored by the discipline. By taking a social constructivist stand, McInnes and Lee suggest that health was ignored because the interests of the states were not created in a way that would allow them to engage with this question (p. 30). The health issue has traditionally been left as a competence of the states that could not be interfered by the others. However, globalisation had impacted the perception of health as well and explaining the globalisation of the issue requires taking a step away from traditional rationalist theories and taking a more reflectivist position. The authors argue that the relationship between global health and International Relations is not a natural response of the states to an evolving circumstance, but the relationship itself is something that has been constructed in a particular way, resulting in an emphasis on certain issues rather than others. Thus, according to McInnes and Lee, a useful question would be "why" instead of "what" (p. 159).

The framing of the health issue can be in the form of political economy, security or foreign policy. These frameworks comprise set of values that shape the articulation of ideas, interests and institutions and even the definition of global health. Consequently, these frameworks construct the attitude of the states towards the global health and explain the relationship between health and International Relations.

Much of the book is devoted to assisting readers understand these frameworks. However, the difference between the concept of global health and international health is not defined properly. The authors

refuse to use the term "international health" unlike previous works in literature, but ignore the fact that the readers may not get the difference. Relatedly, the improper identification of the "frameworks" creates a theoretical obstacle for the analysis. Why political economy, security and foreign policy are used as frameworks that construct the idea of global health is not explained thoroughly. Thus, a better analysis would be discussing whether other frameworks such as gender and development could be included for a better analysis.

Another theoretical shortcoming is the lack of discussion about the reason of focusing solely on social constructivism. What are the advantages of looking from a reflectivist perspective compared to other theories of IR? Although, the authors keep away from rationalist explanations, they still focus on the individual Western states and their behaviours on health issues.

The discussion of global health governance in the Chapter Five may not satisfy the reader as it fails to explain the place of developing and underdeveloped countries in the global governance. Furthermore, there is lack of discussion about to what extent the global governance of health can be effective and how. Thus, global governance of health is presented as the Western governance of health in the book in which neither the place of non-Western states nor its effectiveness is clear.

Despite these shortcomings, the Global Health and International Relations is a significant contribution to the literature on health and International Relations. McInnes and Lee fill a gap in the literature by presenting the issue from a social constructivist perspective. The analysis illustrates how the normative frameworks construct the issue of health in IR as well. Despite the traditional rationalist perspectives, the book shows that these frameworks construct the attitude of the states towards the health and explain the place of health in International Relations.