

KUWAIT - SAUDI ARABIA RELATIONS (1981 to 1995)

*Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the award of the Degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

SANDHYA RAI RATHORE

CENTRE FOR WEST ASIAN STUDIES
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110 067

1996



जवाहरलाल नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI - 110067

CERTIFICATE

Certified that the dissertation entitled

KUWAIT - SAUDI ARABIA RELATIONS : 1981 TO 1995

Submitted by

SANDHYA RAI RATHORE

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

has not been previously submitted for any other degree of this university or any other university to the best of our knowledge . This dissertation is her original Work and may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Dr. G. PANT

**CHAIRPERSON
CWAAS/SIS
JULY , 1996.**

DR. A. K. PASHA

SUPERVISOR

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Before embarking on the subject, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have contributed towards the completion of this dissertation.

At the outset, I wish to thank my guide Professor. **A.K. Pasha** for providing the initial impetus and for his invaluable suggestions and guidance he gave, at all stages, till I completed my dissertation. I am also very grateful to Professor. **K.R.Singh**, Professor. **Gulshan Dietl** and Professor **Girijesh Pant** for their encouragement and support. I would be failing in my duty if I forget to thank the **Centre for Research and Studies on Kuwait**(in Kuwait), for providing me with very basic books on Kuwait. I am highly indebted to Professor. **Saif Abbas Abdullah Tohrab**, Professor. **Abdul Reda Ali Assiri** and Professor. **Hassan Abdullah Johar**, all from the Kuwait University for sparing their invaluable time for fruitful discussions we had in Kuwait and also for providing access to their library. Last but not the least, thanks are also due to the **Kuwait Embassy** in Delhi for providing useful information.

SANDHYA RAI RATHORE

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER II: ORIGIN OF THE STATES.

CHAPTER III: INTERNAL FACTOR'S INFLUENCING RELATIONS

(A) DEMOCRATIC CHANGES

(B) ROLE OF MEDIA

CHAPTER IV: EXTERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING RELATIONS

(A) SECURITY

(B) RELATION WITH ISREAL

(C) RELATION WITH IRAN

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Kuwait and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia though monarchies, are unique countries in the gulf region which have widely divergent approaches towards democracy and political participation. They are also unique in the sense that although the tribes across the region follow the same religion, similar language and culture, they still have a divergent political policies and different attitude towards neighbouring states. In Kuwait, the Al-Sabaha's of Bani Utub clan became the rulers as early as in 1756 and in the later part of 19th century they accepted British protectorate over their territory. Whereas in Saudi Arabia it was basically the combination of religion and politics in 1740s to gain control over the region. It took over two centuries for the Al-Saud rulers to consolidate the opposition in the desert Kingdom. It must also be emphasised that Saudi Arabia had never been under any foreign domination. This contrast between two states has played very crucial role in determining the future of these states.

Geographically, Kuwait is very small when compared to a large Saudi Kingdom. Its total area is only 17,818 sq.km. in contrast to 2,150,000 sq.km. of Saudi Arabia. Unifying this vast area under one ruler had been a formidable task. On the other hand there were no such problems for the Al-Sabah rulers. They were the chosen ones by the tribal chiefs to lead them and protect them from the neighbouring tribes. Thus acquiring power within the territory was relative easy for the Al-Sabah's. People of both the states accept the Al-Sabah's and Al-Saud's as their rulers. It is not only due to their historical role in state formation but also due to the important part played by them in bringing economic prosperity to their countries after the discovery of oil in 1930s. Revenues from oil were crucial factor in bringing transformation to the desert

region. The rulers indulged themselves in taking utmost care of their subjects at least in economic matters. They evolved a welfare state system in which free education, free health services, housing, employment, financial support were provided to the citizens. One reason for doing so was to lift the economy and to share the profits, accruing from oil, among the citizens. The other was to gain loyalty of the citizens to maintain legitimacy over the state.

This paper mainly tries to bring out the relation between these two states when internal factors such as democracy, role of media are discussed and when external factors like security, Iran and Israel are analysed.

In the second chapter an attempt has been made to look into the historical background of both the states. The main focus of attention has been on tracing their origin and analysing how it has affected the state formation. Both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia even though having the same tribal base in the 18th century, being influenced by similar external powers like the Ottomans, still by early twentieth century had distinct political setup.

The third and fourth chapters throw light on internal and external factors which have brought forward main differences among the two states relationship. While dealing with internal factors such as democratic movement and the role of press, the main differences between them have been highlighted. Kuwait is seen as a democratically more vibrant state than Saudi Arabia. After the Gulf War (1990-1991), the demand for increased people's participation for running the state machinery intensified in Saudi Arabia. The main focus of attention has been on what are the demands of the citizens and how the ruling family is coping with these demands.

With respect to external factors, the main area of focus has been on studying the attitude of both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia with countries like Iran and Israel. The main reason for choosing

these countries is that, Iran has historically played an important role in the region and in future it has all the inputs which would make it a powerful state. Concerning Isreal, the importance is attached due to it's conflict with the Arab states. Even though in the past years hope of better relations between them has risen, but still the peace process is incomplete. In addition the religious differances could continue to separate the Arabs and the Jews. With respect to the question of security it has been seen over the years that the two states have maintained defence aggrements with most of the European countries along with U.S.A & Russia.

ORIGIN OF THE STATES

ORIGIN OF TWO COUNTRIES.

The origin of any state in the world history has played a very important role in determining its future course. It is like the birth of a child whose future depends to a certain extent on his social and religious background. Similarly when a state is formed, it is influenced by its surrounding geography, society, economy and religious beliefs. Thus a new state adopts the already existing social and economic norms, at times, altering them, to fit into its own perception of a statehood. These alterations can either be in favour of individuals, or against their existing activities. When a state where the founder does not want to go against the public interest he is accepted by the people, whereas in the other, the general public starts revolting against the founder, demanding changes.

GENESIS OF THE STATE OF KUWAIT

The genesis of the State of Kuwait, can be traced to 1710. Severe drought hit the Arabian hinterland which led to the migration of Bani Utub tribe (offshoot of Anaiza) to the northern shores of gulf near Basra. The tribe enjoyed independence from the very commencement, and developed trading facilities. The main community affairs were divided amongst three leading families. Al-Sabah's were responsible for state affairs ; Al-Khalifas managed local commerce ; Al-Jalahimas controlled maritime activities. In 1752 , the Al-Sabahs consolidated power and in 1756 Shaikh Sabah -I became the first ruler of Kuwait. The Ottoman turks honoured the Al-Sabahs as their officials and considered it as part of Basra villayat , although Sabah - I had negotiated with Ottomans for independence of his territory.

In 1775 , Basra was occupied by Persia which lead to the increase in British influence in the region. Soon an office of the East India Company was opened in Kuwait which totally undermined the Ottoman authority in the region. The location of Kuwait (due to trade) made it, the bone of contention, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries among Germany, Great Britain , Russia and Turkey. Besides these, it had to face threats from its neighbouring Arab tribes, as well. In 1783, 1794 and 1796 unsuccessful attacks were made by Banu Kaab and the Ibn Saud tribes.

Over Kuwait , the Ottoman had maintained a quasi-sovereignty in the eighteenth century. The Ottomans had placed an envoy in Kuwait so as to lessen the impact of Wahhabism and strengthen its ties with the Sheikhdom. Later when Shaikh Abdullah II Al-Sabah (1866-92) strengthened Kuwait's ties with Constantinople it was very upsetting to the British who were already alarmed by the German plans of extending the Berlin - Baghdad railway up to Kuwait. The Ottomans had tried all the means at their disposal , to keep Kuwait under their control. It made Sheikh Abdullah II the governor of a sub-province, and made Kuwait, a part of the important Basra vilayat along with giving power to run its own internal affairs . Two factions, soon appeared in Kuwait, one was the pro-British lead by Sheikh Mubarak which wanted administrative independence of Kuwait and the other supported the pro-Ottoman stand for the formal integration of Kuwait with Iraq . The Kuwait's policy concerning Ottoman Suzerainty in short can be said as "ignore the claim on most occasions to deny it on others and to tolerate it when danger threatened from another quarter."

Sheikh Mubarak , taking advantage of the situation, with the British aid, came to power in 1897. Ottoman Sultan fearing secession, declared him Quimmaqam. But Mubarak in turn feared a military take over by Ottomans appealed to the British to guard the Kuwaiti shoreline and

later signed a secret treaty with the British , in 1899. He stated in the treaty that “ He does hereby pledge and bind himself, his heirs and successors not to receive the Agent or Representative of any power at Kuwaiti territory, without the previous sanction of the British government;” -

GENESIS OF SAUDI ARABIA

The genesis of Saudi Arabia could be traced from mid eighteenth century approximately around 1744 , when an agreement was concluded between Mohammad Ibn Saud (ruler of Ad- Diriyah) and Mohammad Ibn Wahhab (the founder of Wahhabism),to bring the Arabs of the peninsula ,back to Quran and Sharia.

This success prompted the Ottoman Sultan, who ordered his Viceroy in Egypt Mohammad Ali to put an end to this Saudi-Wahhabi challenge. The Ottomans who at this time had control over major parts of central and peninsular Arabia, in order to regain their control,launched a military campaign (1812 to 1818) and captured Riyadh .

Throughout the nineteenth century the successors of Ibn Saud, continued to consolidate their power despite facing difficulties. In 1871, Mohammad Ibn Rashid (tribal leader of the Shammar) signed a treaty with Turkey and captured Al Hasa. Within twenty years,he captured Najd and maintained control over its capital, Riyadh. Abdul Rahman, the ruler, left the city with his family initially for Bahrain and then to Kuwait (1893).

Abdul Rahman's son,Abdal-Aziz, thirteen at that time, was greatly influenced by cosmopolitan environment of Kuwait. Mubarak treated Ibn Saud as a son and invited him often to his house, teaching him politics and discussing world affairs. Thus Ibn Saud was surrounded by new

ideas, new people, novel customs and thoughts, many of which were unknown and forbidden in Riyadh.

Kuwait, during this time was known as "Marseilles" of the Persian Gulf, as it lay on a common trade route from the north to the gulf, towards India. Merchants from all over the region i.e. from Bombay, Tehran, Aleppo, Damascus, and even Europe came to Kuwait. This openness gave a new outlook to Ibn Saud, of the surrounding countries. In Najd he was only acquainted with the Wahhabi line of learning. Mubarak said that "Ibn Saud caught a glimpse of international politics and intrigue on a far larger and more complex scale than that of the inter-tribal rivalries to which he had previously been exposed."

Like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait also had to overcome the Ottomans. Mubarak disapproved of the title of Governor which was granted to his predecessors. His emergence to power in 1896 was mainly conditioned by the pro-Ottoman stand of previous ruler Muhammad al-Sabah. Mubarak was alarmed by the growing degree of Ottoman control over the region. In 1897 Ottoman's were alarmed at the rise of Mubarak and appointed him as the Qaimmaqan of Kuwait and recognized him as the successor of Muhammad al-Sabah. The whole situation took a deep turn when Kuwait fearing Ottoman intentions, approached the British and signed a secret treaty in 1899. The following were the additional reasons for Mubarak to sign the treaty.

The Russians, who had been looking for a warm water port in the Peninsula, tried to obtain from the Ottomans, approval to build a railroad from Tripoli (Lebanon) to Kuwait. Whereas, the Germans, were also interested in building a railroad from Berlin to Baghdad with its terminus in Kuwait. This move was against the British interest, who did not want any other European power to maintain hold in the Gulf, as it wanted to remain the sole power in the region.

In this way Kuwait saved itself from the Ottoman Sugernnity,over its territory.

Things were not so easy for the Saudi's on the other hand. Since 1893 , they were in exile in Kuwait. To win back Riyadh, was the main task in front of the young Abdal-Aziz. Being in Kuwait ,he came to know the actual desires of the Ottoman Porte. The Ottoman's attempted to encourage the Saudi's to re-occupy Riyadh with their support as they felt eliminating the Saudi's from central Arabia was not in their interest. Moreover it felt that Saudis were ideal instrument for checking the hegimony of Ibn Rashid. Ibn Saud had also approached the British,for help against the Rashids,but the British did not show any interest.

The things took a different turn when Sheikh Mubarak tried to mend his relations with the porte. In November 1900,he went to Basra on the request of the Ottomans. The Ottomans conferred on him the title of, the order of Mejdieh (glory), and Sheikh Mubarak ,in return, promised to abstain from relations with foreign powers. Relations with Ottomans,soon deteriorated as the Saudi- Kuwait forces in February 1901,launched an attack on the Ibn Rashid in the battle of Sarif. The Saudi-Kuwait forces were defeated and the Ottomans, taking advantage of the situation, asked Sheikh Mubarak to accept military garrison at Kuwait and to surrender his independence. Kuwait immediately approched Britain,and requested it to assume permanent protectorate over Kuwait.

The Rashidis

The Rashidis had built a great state during the twenty five years rule of Muhammad IbnRashid ,who had destroyed the second Saudi state in 1871. He died,in 1897 and his successors proved weak,which led to the disintegration of the empire founded by him. Sheikh Mubarak wanted

to exploit the new situation as Rashidis had always wanted to control central Arabia and Kuwait. Sheikh Mubarak had always felt that Kuwait was the strongest, when central Arabia was not dominated by a single power. The re-establishment of Saudi power in Riyadh was looked upon by Sheikh Mubarak, to maintain the balance of power in the region which led to the battle of Sarif. Eventhough the joint Kuwait-Saudi forces were defeated ,but it laid the foundation of the third Saudi State under the leadership of capable Ibn Saud. Ibn Saud was made the succesor to his father in 1902, at the young age of twenty-one, when he proved his capabilities by overpowering a Rashid garrison and capturing Riyadh in December 1901.

Ibn Saud

Ibn Saud's quest for power began from 1901 till 1906, when he was finally able to break the back of Rashids and Ottomans in Najd. This was the final blow to the Rashids in Najd and the beginning of rule of Ibn Saud. King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud was a genius, since he knew exactly, how to use wahhabism into a force which could help him in creating a kingdom. In 1912, he developed wahhabism into a program, which transformed nomadic beduin, into a settled farmer ,and farmers into soldiers. These devotees turned farmers called themselves 'IKIHWAN' meaning brethern. They were used to sub-ordinate tribal affiliations into religious affiliation. In 1913 ,Al-Hasa was the first region to be conquered by IKHWAN forces. By 1916, many tribes had been converted into this Political- military force enabling Ibn Saud to consolidate his rule over Najd and Al-Hasa.

The British reaction to Ibn Saud's growing power was not very hostile, even though he had come into the sphere of British gulf politics. That is because, it was more concerned at this time, about the direction of Ottomans German relations . Ibn Saud was informed, that "as long

as he did not disturb the peace in the gulf area . His majesty's Government would continue to maintain friendly relations with him." The British wanted Ibn Saud not to take any further independent actions. But with the outbreak of First World War, Turkey supported Germany and Britain ,in 1915 signed a same protectorate treaty with Saudi Arabia. Ibn Saud agreed to be guided by Britain, if the need arose . Soon Britain recognised him as the sole ruler of Najd and Al-Hasa thus consolidating his position.

Ibn Saud, next looked upon Asir and Hijaz. Hijaz is on the western side of the peninsula. It was a very prosperous province as it had holy cities which formed an important part of the land trade route to Asia and India. The Ottomans had placed their governor in Hijaz by the name of Sharif Hussein Ibn Ali of the Hashimi House .

With the end of first world war the British interest in Hijaz increased as it wanted to safeguard the holy cities in order to maintain pilgrimage traffic from British India . In the beginning the British government tried to use only diplomatic means to get control of Hijaz . But matters became worst when Hussain unilaterally assumed the title of Caliph . This lead to uproar in the muslims and the wahhabis who forcibly took over Taif(near Mecca) . This ultimately lead to the fall of Hijaz in 1925 . Asir was annexed in the next year without much difficulty. Thus it took around of twenty five years for Ibn Saud to consolidate his control over Arabia and in 1932, he founded the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia .

DIFFERENCES IN STATE FORMATION .

Both the states as seen earlier have had very different origin. Even though they had emerged from similar topography, the ultimate strategy adopted by its founders was not similar .In

Kuwait, its founder Al -Sabah was actually chosen by the tribal chiefs and its people to become their leader . The only qualifications required were strength and loyalty to the tribe . Kuwait by mid eighteenth century had become an important trading center . Basically for traders coming from north and Europe, going towards India and southern Asia. Thus there was constant fear of being occupied by some big power either Russians, French, British, Ottomans or Germans. Giving power in the hands of the most capable man was looked upon by the Kuwaitis as the best means to safeguard themselves. In Saudi Arabia on the other hand it was basically faith in Islam which had helped King Abdul Aziz to lay the foundation of his kingdom . Wahhabism was the main tool used to bring the whole peninsula under one control . Muhammad Ibn Saud the founder of Ist Saudi state was the ruler of Ad - Diriyah a small town in Najd province . He knew that in order to control the vast peninsula he had to adopt a very rigid policy . In wahhabism he found the answer to his quest . He concluded an agreement with its founder Muhammed Ibn Wahhab(1744) who preached the revival of Islam and wanted to bring back the old beliefs and practices. Thus they both found each other to accomplish their goals, one wanted some means to gain power and the other wanted some power behind it, to preach its philosophy. The combination was very good and soon they were successful in gaining control over full of Najd.

Similarly in 1901 , Ibn Saud the founder of third or last state in Saudi Arabia again used this Wahhabism to get control of the region from the Al-Reshidis and Hussein's who had driven the Saud's out of Arabia in 1891. Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud's genius lay in using religious fundamentalism as a state building and state expanding instrument. As consolidation of empire began, he was sure of one thing that it is very important to maintain loyalty for creating political stability in the conquered territories. For this, he planned a two step program. First,

he sent Wahhabi preachers in all the directions to meet various tribes and to teach them the essence of Islam. He also encouraged them to engage themselves in agricultural activities. Second, after encouraging the bedouins to take up agriculture, he tried to settle them in these agricultural settlements which were established according to the Wahhabi teachings. These tribesmen were called as IKHWAN, a political military force which by 1916 had become a major tool to gain control over Hasa Hijaz.

The Sabhas, unlike the Saudis do not call themselves as Kings and Princes. That is because as said earlier, the first was chosen in a tribal Majlis for his skill as an administrator and negotiator. His successors ever since have taken care not to assume any royal titles. All the powers like in Saudi Arabia are concentrated in the hands of the ruler. The succession was not transferred from father to son but was determined by the clan in earlier days and now it is based on the successors of Jabir and Ahmed.

Whereas in Saudi Arabia the succession was based up till 1902, from father to son and after 1954 it is basically the sons of King Abdul Aziz, who become the successors. One of the problems that was common to both the states was the Ottoman claims of control over them. In 1860 itself, Sabah - I tried to negotiate with the Ottoman governor at Basra, for independence of his territory. Not much success was achieved in this and in 1871, Kuwait was made the part of Basra, changing it from Al Hasa. In Assiri's book, it has been said, that, "up to the reign of Mubarak, Kuwaiti Sheikhs paid an annual tribute of 40 bags of rice and 400 Frasilah of dates", and received from their suzerain "every year a dress of honour". Sheikh Mubarak was against the policy of supporting and accepting the suzerainty of Ottomans. When he feared the threat of Ottoman occupation he approached the British, and signed the protection agreement in 1899. This treaty was abrogated only in 1961 at the time of Kuwait's independence.

In Saudi Arabia also, the Ottomans maintained suzerainty over the east and west coast (Haram and Hijaz). The creation of a state was much difficult a task for the Saudi rulers as there were a number of internal as well as external problems. Internally, it was weak, as there were number of tribes who had to be fought at times for winning their territories. Externally, there was constant fear of Egyptian and Ottoman invasion in the early period of its history, and later, it were the Al-Rashidis and Husseins. But one of the failures of Saudi State had been that they could not get British support to overcome the Egyptian and Ottoman invaders. All the while Saudis pursued an anti-British policy along the gulf coast. Although the British were approached wherever the fear was immense, but Britain being sure of Saudi feelings used diplomacy as the means to bring peace between the conflicting sides, if asked to do so by Saudi rulers. During the First World War, Britain changed its attitude towards Ibn Saud. Turkey sided the Germans in the war. This alliance was looked upon by Britain, with fear. It thus, wanted to have good relations with the Saudi state, only as a means to gain support in the war. Ibn Saud, by now, had control over most of the peninsula and the British government reacted by saying, that, "we cannot touch him. It is essential to carry him with us in any settlement of Arabian affairs that may be proposed." This had led to the 1915 treaty signed between the two parties for creating a semi protectorate over Saudi Arabia. Ibn Saud agreed to be guided by British advice only if it was in his interest. And for this he had to pay an annual subsidy of Pound Sterling 60,000. The British promised military assistance whenever the need arose. By 1925 Ibn Saud had conquered the whole of Arabian peninsula, the British lost no time in concluding a new treaty of Jiddah with him. Ibn Saud under the terms of this treaty was recognised as the complete and absolute independent ruler of the Kingdom. This agreement was a bit unusual and very different from the one concluded by Britain with most of the other Gulf states, since the treaty indicated equal status between the two states only in mutual respect.

This was an important step forward, which clearly distinguished the Kuwaiti political system from that of Saudi political system. Kuwait even though more politically advanced and more liberal in the early twentieth century failed to create such a treaty with Britain. Whereas Saudi Arabia having not much of political advancement was able to carve out a treaty, by which, its ruler were recognised as independent, and state free from any foreign control. One of the reasons could be the size of the Kingdom stretching from Persian Gulf in the East, to Red Sea in the West. This vastness could be the main factor which made the British fearful as there are a number of Beduin tribes stretched across the desert kingdom. Whereas in the case of Kuwait, it is very small in size where tribal conflicts are not a major problem.

RELATIONS AFTER 1932

In order to understand better, how the Kuwaiti -Saudi relations emerged after 1932 it is important to know the developments which had taken place over the past decade.

Ibn Saud had created the Ikhwan force to control the Bedu tribes of the peninsula. These tribes then took up the task to spread Wahhabism either by peace or by force, if the need arose. In 1916, Ibn Saud issued a famous edict by which he asked all the Beduin tribes to join the Ikhwan, under the fear of foreign attack. But, it was opposed by the Ajman tribe, based in Al-Hasa. Earlier in 1915, the Ajman forces besieged the Saudis in the Najd province.

At this time Sheikh Mubarak came to the rescue of Ibn Saud as he had always supported him as the rightful ruler of Najd. The Kuwaitis inflicted defeat on the Ajman, Ibn Saud personally took upon the challenge to teach Ajman a lesson. Ajman fearing Saudi attack, appealed to Sheikh Salim, son of Sheikh Mubarak. Sheikh Salim was sent by Sheikh Mubarak to protect Ibn

Sauds claims . But the situation took a deep turn the Ajmans wanted the Kuwaitis to provide them asylum.

Sheikh Salim, who was still on the way to Kuwait, agreed. Tension arose between Ibn Saud and Kuwait for the first time. At this time when Sheikh Mubarak was most needed, was already dead. He was followed by his son Jabir who pushed the Ajman Out of Kuwait into Safwan (Ruled by Sheikh of Zubair). Within a year he also died, succeeded by Salim in 1917. Ibn Saud considered him as an enemy for he had given shelter to the Ajman. So now Ibn Saud in order to take revenge, tried to influence the Awazim, a Kuwaiti tribe to become Ikhwan & settled down in Najd province. Sheikh Salim in return brought back the Ajman and made them his subjects. Later Awazim were returned to Kuwait but most Ajmans preferred to stay in Kuwait.

Things were not easy for Shaikh Salim. In 1918, the British imposed a naval blockade on Kuwait as it felt that supplies were reaching Turkey through Kuwaiti the route. Salim felt that Ibn Saud was behind it, due to estranged relations between the Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

By the end of the decade the matters had become quite complicated in which boundary question became the main issue. There had been two important battles. The first was battle of Hamdh, where the Ikhwan wiped out the Kuwaiti army. The second was the battle of Jahra. This battle has been of quite importance, wherein the Kuwaitis defeated the large Ikhwan garrison. The crucial outcome of this battle was the Uqair conference where the actual demarcation of the boundary between the two countries took place in 1922.

At the conference, which was chaired by Britain, about two-thirds of Kuwait's territory was granted to Saudi Arabia to compensate the Saudis for their territorial losses to Iraq. Iraqi boundary

was also demarcated at this conference, those bordering Saudi Arabia & Kuwait. The British tried to pacify the angry Sheikh Ahmad Al Jabir, by saying that, "had Kuwait not conceded the territory, Ibn Saud would certainly have soon picked a quarrel and taken as much, if not more, by force of arms."

In the 1920s tension grew between Kuwait & Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia at that time did not have any port, of value, along its coast as it basically relied on those of Kuwait and Bahrain. Ibn Saud looked upon Kuwait to establish his own custom house as he felt that it would be difficult to collect custom duties along the desert border between the two states. Sheikh Ahmed, in return, refused Ibn Saud's request, of granting duty free transit to Saudi goods passing through Kuwaiti territory. This action of Sheikh Ahmad angered Ibn Saud and he retaliated by imposing an economic embargo on Kuwait. The result of this was extremely disastrous for Kuwait, as it led to the collapse of the pearling industry which was the main source of income and main commodity of trade. This situation continued throughout the 1920s. Only in the 1930s some important developments in Saudi attitude towards Kuwait and Bahrain. Firstly, the Iraqi claims on Kuwait and Iranian claims on Bahrain became more clearer. Secondly, there was discovery of oil in almost all the countries of the Peninsula. Thirdly, the 1939 reform movement in Kuwait.

During the reign of Sheikh Ahmad Al Jabir in Kuwait, Ibn Saud had to face waves of anarchy and revolt from the Ikhwan. After the campaign against Hejaz in 1925, the differences between the Ikhwan and the king became wider. The Ikhwan were basically Bedu who lived on raiding & plunder. They wished to remain free and independent of all, but tribal authority. Whereas Ibn Saud was a shrewd politician. He was looking at creating world wide prestige and wanted to show that he was effective in creating a central administration, wherein he imposed law and order on the tribes. It was a difficult task for Ibn Saud but with the help of British agents

and Sheikh Ahmad of Kuwait he was able to suppress the Ikhwan by 1930.

By 1932, the Saudi state had tackled some of its internal and external problems. The matters like boundary question, internal tribal conflicts had all be settled before time. Thus Ibn Saud was fully in command to finally create a state. This state has been called the third one ,since the origin of Saudi Arabia in 1744 in the Najd province. The first state lasted for almost a hundred years. It had to face the Ottomans and Egyptians under Mohammad Ali.

The second state began in 1843 under Turki Al Saud who succeeded in uniting the Najd . But after the death of his son in 1865 internal strife among the Al Saud began. This ultimately lead to the rise in power of Al Rashids ,as the Saudis control on Najd diminished due to their fights for succession. Ibn Saud felt secure by 1932,of his control over Hejaz., Najd, Al Hasa, Asir to proclaim his territory as kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

In 1934, Abdul Aziz al AlSaud proclaimed himself king of Saudi Arabia thus introducing the concept of monarchy into a formely tribal structure. The immediate task was the creation of administratve machinery,which the Saudis were not as familiar with as the Kuwaiti rulers, were. Inspite of this he formulated the best policy for his kingdom. He Knew very clearly that it would be difficult to keep Hijaz under his control. Hijaz was more politically aware and more modern than rest of the provinces. So, Ibn Saud encouraged the policy of decentralisation in administration. For this reason,he divided the whole Empire into Viceroyalties,Governates and the Amirates. To be headed by a member of the royal family,accountable to king.

The majlis movement of 1938 in Kuwait helped in changing Saudi attitude towards Kuwait. The relations between the two had reached the lowest by the beginning of 1930s. He changed his attitude towards Kuwait by saying that both belonged to the same original Anaiza tribe.Ibn

Saud saw in Kuwait, that, its ruler has been challenged by a group of his own subjects - a challenge which Ibn Saud was strongly against. He also felt that he had by now outgrown his former dependence on Kuwait and that it acknowledged his superior rank. This led to his state visit to Kuwait, the first, since becoming king. The earlier Saudi trade embargo was officially over, and was replaced by a trade agreement between the two states. The oil wealth which came after 1930s made the Gulf states strong and recognised in the international politics.

Thus during the reign of Ibn Saud Saudi Arabia had become a unified and powerful state. Oil brought in immense wealth and along with it concessions were granted to Americans for exploring and drilling oil. Saudi Arabia became the second country in the Gulf, after Bahrain, to have signed deals with Americans for the exploration of oil. In this way Kuwait and Saudi Arabia differed as Kuwait had signed concessions with the British and not the Americans. After creating a place for Saudi Arabia in the world economic scene, Ibn Saud died in 1953. King Saud succeeded him and continued his father's tradition of personal rule. However, he was much more extravagant and inexperienced in the art of statecraft.

In 1954 when Gamal Abdul Nasser turned to power in Egypt, he put forward his policy of Arab nationalism and unity among the Arab Muslim states. He indirectly attacked the monarchies of the Gulf region for cultivating close relations with Britain and other European countries. King Saud felt that this policy of Nasser could create problems in Saudi Arabia. Because in Saudi Arabia at that time, people used to hear the Voice of Arabs from Cairo. Moreover, the teachers were from Egypt in the Saudi schools, so he tried to prove that he was a better statesman than Nasser. For this he shifted his foreign policy between radicalism and reaction. He even tried to fight Britain in the international courts, over Bahrain, denounced the Baghdad Pact and called for the liberation of Algeria and Palestine. However he failed to subdue the then

growing prestige of Nasser.

Around this time the rulers of Kuwait were busy internally. They were trying their best to make the utmost use of the oil money.

The Kuwait Saudi relations during the 60s and 70s had been quite normal. Both the states were busy creating an economic base on which the whole society relied. The policies and programme followed by each state, although differed, however they were equally successful in building a rich, prosperous state, by the beginning of 1980s. Both the states had disapproved of Nasser's nationalism as it was against the monarchies of the gulf. Still after 1967, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia provided a huge amount as loan or aid Egyptian state to help it come out of bankruptcy due to its conflict with Israel. Moreover, it increased the prestige of the two countries in the eyes of the other arab states. On the whole, Kuwait accepted Saudi Arabia as a powerful neighbour and was willing a stand by it in the coming years.

INTERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING RELATIONS

DISS

327.53670538

R188 Ku



TH6108



21.

TH-6108

The main reasons for taking 1980 as the dividing year between our study is that with the outbreak of Iran-Iraq war, there was an increase in price of oil like in early 1970's which led to massive construction programmes ranging from schools to highways. The emergence of new cold war between USA and USSR after Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December 1979. These factor have in their own respect effected the internal system like democracy and freedom of Press in both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

DEMOCRATIC SETUP

Introduction

Politically both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia are monarchies having tribal origin. It was due to this tribal nature that the existing families in both the states were able to come to power in the eighteenth century. Earlier as there were number of tribes in the Arabian peninsula region, it was very essential for them to have a capable strong leader who could protect the tribe from the attacks of the neighbouring unfriendly tribes. Thus in the past strong leader was the need of the tribe but now strong family backing is the need of the ruler.

Over the centuries a lot of transformation has taken place in these countries as well as in the other Gulf states. With the coming of petrodollars the state took up many welfare programmes in order to gain support of its subjects. Thus it is going to be an interesting study to see how the ruling family has been coping up with these transformations.

In the beginning of 1980's both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia were politically well established. They were having well organized political institutions such as the royal family, merchants in Kuwait and Ulama in Saudi Arabia, the council of ministers etc. In spite of these, commonalities one

basic difference remained the main cause of political misunderstanding between the two states. This was the existence of National Assembly in Kuwait since 1962 along with free press which were non existing in Saudi state.

Political Setup in Kuwait uptill 1980s

By 1613 A.D. tribes began to arrive and the region of Kuwait from Najd due to drought situation. Once these tribes (Bani Utub) got settled they transformed the region into an urban community having a clear political entity. Even at that time the society was so politically conscious that there were clear cut division of the power between the leader and the elite. The elite mainly comprised of the merchants as trade was the main occupation. The leader in Kuwait came from the sabah family. There are four different schools of thought on how the sabahs became rulers of Kuwait. The first says that there was an agreement in 1716 in which the heads of the al-khalifa, al-sabah and al-jalahima agreed to give to Sabahs prominence in political activity. The second school says that Sabah was chosen to lead a peaceful delegation to Basra. The third talks about the role played by Sabahs in trade and their power to collect taxes. In the fourth school their rise to power is linked with their administrative functions. The common aspect of all these schools is their emphasis on "political" power as the cause for the rise of Sabah family.

By 1758 the Sabahs were well established politically but had to face the merchants every now and then till the early twentieth century. As said earlier the main financial power was in the hands of the merchants. They could easily keep an check on the powers of the Sabah. Somehow the situation so developed by 1766 that a part of the problem was solved automatically. For reasons unclear, the al-khalifa and the al-jalahima left Kuwait for Qatar. Thus

leaving behind Sabahs as the undisputed rulers of Kuwait. Throughout the nineteenth century Sabahs successors consolidated their supremacy and maintained Kuwait's autonomy from Ottoman neighbours. And it was only during the rule of Abdullah II (1866-1892) that Kuwait moved away from neutrality. He approached the Ottomans for closer alliance in return for guaranteed autonomy of Kuwait.

During the reign of Shaikh Mubarak Kuwait signed the Protectrate treaty in 1899 (January 23) only in "order to curtail the growing but hostile Ottoman influence". The treaty demanded British control over Kuwait's foreign policy in return for British support. The treaty lasted till 1961. An important outcome of this treaty was the assured political independence of Kuwait from its neighbours. Along with this Shaikh Mubarak introduced changes in economic and political setup. A series of new taxes were levied on pearl boats and property. But due to tax rebellion in 1909 many of these taxes were cancelled. It was still a first step towards the development of state administration. Politically for the first time power was centralized in the hands of the ruler. Whereas earlier, he was first-among-equals (tribal leaders) and the nobles had a say in his selection.

The Role of Merchants.

In the Kuwaiti political system it is very essential to know the part played by the merchant class. They were not only traders on which the economy survived. In the pre-oil era they were in fact the main source of financial and political support to the monarchy. The rulers in return granted them a say in the state affairs. In simple terms Kuwait had developed a merchant class which was more politically conscious and organized than the ones in other Gulf states. The rulers needed revenue for running the small state machinery and maintaining autonomy.

1. Heather Deegan., *The Middle East and Problems of Democracy*. Buckingham, 1993. pp. 35

For this they had to pay taxes on pearl and trading boats, where the boat owners and captains helped them in collection. The only reason behind the merchants being so co-operative in levying and collection of taxes was that they in return were able to express their views on political life. That is the rulers could not ignore them until taking any political decision. And it happened the merchants organised an opposition against the ruler. The good examples of this opposition were the 1909 tax rebellion 1921 struggle and the 1938 majlis movement.

In 1909 shaikh mubarak had imposed new taxes on pearl merchants. In protest the leading pearl merchants left Kuwait for Bahrain and returned only when mubarak withdrew some of the taxes.

Whereas in 1921 the merchants revolted not on the question of taxes but on succession decision. In 1921 shaikh salim had died, giving an opportunity to the merchants to establish a twelve man council which demanded a say in the succession decision. Even though the new ruler shaikh Ahmad had promised consulting them but still the council collapsed within two months. Still it was a positive effort towards reducing the authoritarian state established by mubarak.

Majlis movement - With the arrival of oil revenue by 1935 the political relationship between the ruler and ruled changed. As the oil revenue went directly to the shaikh, it sharply cut down the merchants political influence on the state. Moreover the merchants had been giving through tough time since 1920 due to decline in pearling industries, great depression and the Saudi Arabia trade embargo. The merchants knew that they would not have the same control over oil as they did over pearl and trade. So at first they demanded that the oil revenue be considered state fund going into a state body in which merchants would also be represented. When the ruler did not respond to the demands of the merchants, they organised a political

opposition. The movements tried to use the education council and municipality created in 1930's by them as the institutions of change.

The merchants used these bodies to circulate petitions and antigovernment leaflets demanding reforms in "public policy and a greater say in succession an expansion of social services such as health and education and an end to corruption in the ruling family". The main support to the merchants come from the dissenting members of one ruling family led by Abdalla salim and his brothers. The ruler took immediate action by arrasting and beating the dissidents. This violent action of the ruler led to the creation of a Legislative Assembly by the oppsition to formally protest rulers policies and to implement new reforms. The assembly also prepared a basic law and extended convios over key public security. Shaikh Ahmad finally signed the law.

Inspite of all the opposition and use of force the Assembly could last for only six months. Still it was successful in iterducing a number of reforms like cancelling all export duties, reduced rents and market taxes , canceled monopolies opened free new schools, formed a new police force most importantly it created a new finance department .

It is important to understand that the protection agreement with Britain was concluded between two sovereign states by mutual consent. In other words "it was the independence of Kuwait which Great Britain was agreeeing to protect." This clearly reveals the freedom enjoyed by the Kuwaiti rulers to take up any political, economical or social decision within the state. Added to this was the pressure put by the merchants to bring about development reforms. Thus on the eve of Kuwaits independence the State was politically developed having insti-tutions not to be seen in other gulf states or Saudi Arabia at that times.

EUROPA PUBLICATION, The Middle East and North Africa: 1996. pp. 636.

1980s was an important decade for both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Political institutions before this period were still in their nascent stage having limited impact on the existing political setup. After this period they have started assuming greater responsibility and power in a very different political environment. The political scenario in the state like Saudi Arabia has changed considerably by the end of 1980s. Whereas in the case of Kuwait the rulers did not face much political difficulty. The reason behind this was, as in the case of Saudi Arabia the rulers had been making promises for peoples consultative body in running the state since 1962, which they never fulfilled until 1992. For Kuwait on the other hand it was not a difficult task as there already existed a National Assembly since 1963. The existence of some of the political institutions, present in Kuwait but absent in Saudi Arabia had been the major cause of rise in political tension between the two states in 1980s. Moreover added to this the international factors like the Iranian revolution of 1979 and the subsequent Iran-Iraq war in 1980, were the main reasons for these rulers to adopt strict policies within their states.

The Ruling Family

The ruling family is most important of political institutions headed by the Amir. Earlier the rulers relied more on his court favourites and merchants. The family as a unit started gaining political power only with the arrival of the British as they needed local leaders support. This political power in the oil era was used in turn to gain economic power. The combination of this new found economic and political power was used to further increase the social base of the family.

1. Middle East International, June 23rd, 1995. pp. 19.

The oil revenue after 1938 brought about drastic changes in the family. The Majlis movement in the same year demanded merchants say in the control of oil revenue. And it was at this time that the ruling family was considered as the centralized political institution by the merchants. The merchants however failed to gain any political power, as oil revenue increased, the ruling family became less and less dependable on their financial support.

After the second world war the oil revenues increased leading to extravagant spending plans and corruption by the ruling family. At this time need was felt by the ruler that in order to gain effective control over key areas of state policy making he would have to grant subsidies to the merchants. Subsidies in education, health, employment etc. were seen as a means by ruler to meet his ends as well as to placate the merchants. Such a state is called a "rentier state" in which the revenue earned is considered as personal possession and where the state spends on distributive functions only to gain support.

State Administration.

In the earlier days the Kuwaiti government was regarded more patriarchal as it never showed any signs of autocratic despotism. Decision making was more like a "functional partnership" where the other important families were also consulted. With the coming of Mubarak this changed as he consolidated the powers of the ruler. Efforts were although made in 1915 to reassert the customary consultative role but it was only in 1921 that Sheikh Ahmad on his accession as Amir agreed to establish the consultative Assembly. This Assembly of 12 chosen notables however failed due to internal divisions with the Assembly. Similarly the 1938 consultative Assembly also failed thus being unable to keep a check on the powers of the ruler. With the flowing in of oil revenues the state did take up some welfare programmes and administrative reforms only as a move towards controlling the demands of the merchants

1. MEED., May 26, 1995. pp. 2.

1. Fouad Al-Farsy., *Modernity and Tradition: Saudi Equation*. London. 1991. pp. 65.

and keeping a check on the family dissent.

Sheikh Abdallah for these reasons created a High Executive Committee in 1954, to propose reorganization in the government setup. This body mainly composed of Sheikhs and loyal supporters. One of the important act implemented by this committee was the assertion that the land outside the town was state property. Within two years lack of support from the ruler led to the slow fading away of the committee.

In 1956, a new advisory body called Supreme Council was created to replace the Higher Executive Committee. These two bodies were an effort to bring the family into politics. Supreme Council had ten members all Sheikhs. It functioned like a protocabinet which handled all the important matters of the State.

The judicial system was also reorganized by 1950s. It was an important area where the British exercised some direct control. But with the growth of oil industry and coming of expatriates the judicial burden of the courts increased. In 1953 the British court heard around 4 cases which sharply increase to over 200 in 1955. For this reason the Kuwaitis wanted to increase their control on courts as the British were also anxious to find a easy way out.

The Constitution

Kuwait got independence in June 1961, and soon it was faced with a number of problems. It gave Iraq an opportunity to resume its claim over Kuwait as the British were no more a problem. With the increase in oil industry their was a need to import labour which lead to massive increase in immigrant population. The merchants of the pre oil era became the middle class of oil era who demanded political power. Added to this was the problem of rapid social and economic development. All these conditions lead the Amir to elect a Con-

stituent Assembly which was given the task to draft the constitution.

The constitution was promulgated in November 1962, by the Amir. It says that the system of government is based on the separation of powers along with co-operation. The legislative authority is vested in the Amir and the National Assembly. Whereas the executive power is in the hands of Amir and his cabinet. The Judicial power is entrusted to courts in the name of the Amir within the limits specified by the constitution. The Kuwaiti structure of government could be termed as "a liberal journalist model, characterized by a combination of benevolent personal rule, representative structures and nationalist ideology."¹:

The National Assembly,

The National Assembly, created by the constitution is an important consultative body to aid the government. It had its origin in the Majlis movement of 1938. The reasons for forming it in 1963 was the demand for political participation by the merchants and other Islamic groups. It comprises of fifty members. Two-thirds of whom are elected by an electorate which comprises of male citizen above 21 years of age. Rest one third are chosen by the Amir.

The National Assembly mainly comprises of three political and social forces - the prominent businessman, the bedouins and the middle class. Since 1963, seven elections had been held to the Assembly. And the seats won by the Bedouins have always been on a rise with a maximum of 27 won in 1985 elections. Out of a population of about 8,00,000 the electorate comprised of only 82,000 voters.

Despite the fact that the Kuwaiti National Assembly has not enjoyed much autonomy and has rarely initiated policy, it has worked perfectly in criticizing and exposing the government. Due to this nature of the Assembly it was suspended twice by the Amir.

In 1976, it was suspended as it continued the tradition of opposition with far more enthusiasm than the Amir could tolerate. Other reason for doing so was that the Amir felt it could harm its relations with other Arab states, specially Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia had always disapproved of the Kuwaiti legislative freedom. The collapse of Suq al - Manakh stock market in 1982, finally culminated into the collapse of national assembly in 1986. Soon after this the opposition members in the National Assembly started demanded the resignation of Minister of Interior and Oil. The Amir and the ruling family feared the powers of the Assembly finally called for its dissolution by 1986.

THE CABINET

After 1961, the old departments were transformed to form new and more important ministries. To head them were required the cabinet minsters. Thus the executive power was not only in the hands of the Amir but also shared by the cabinet ministers. In the bureaucracy ladder beneath the Amir is the cabinet which oversees the whole system of state function. Usually most of the important appointments have gone to the members of the royal family. In the first cabinet only three merchants were appointed against twelve of the ruling family. In 1964, recurits from one business increased to ten as against five in the ruling family. In 1980s the same proportion has continued and the ministers had started playing important role even though being controlled by the ruling family.

DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGES AFTER 1990

The Kuwaiti invasion of 2nd August 1990 has opened the eyes of Kuwaiti citizens towards the need for a better democratic setup. Even through the Kuwaiti political system is more developed when compaired to other gulf states or Saudi Arabia, but it is still an incomplete

system. Kuwait is among the oldest of Gulf states to have a national assembly and a written constitution. In spite of all this the country is facing greatest challenge to its very existence. After 1991 the demands of the general Kuwaiti population is to create a set up which includes them in running the state machinery, thus trying to reduce the powers of the Sabah family. Being aware of the growing opposition against the ruling family, the Amir in exile at Taif (Saudi Arabia) called the prominent Kuwaitis at a conference. Kuwaitis from all walks of life agreed to attend the conference. It was for first time that the opposition headed by Dr. Ahmed al-Khatib and Mr. Jasim al-Qatami agreed to cooperate with the ruling family to free Kuwait from the Iraqi clutches. The crown prince Shaikh Saad al-Abdullah al-Sabah at the Taif conference in order to gain this support of the opposition and other prominent Kuwaitis promised to hold the elections for the national assembly and lift the press censorship soon after liberation. He even talked about greater role of women in politics. While the more radical opposition leaders demanded the resignation of the al Sabah family from all important government positions.

The things were not easy after the liberation of Kuwait on 27 February 1991. The whole state structure was in turmoil. The economy was badly devastated which called for a huge reconstruction projects to be undertaken. The entire state functioning had come to a halt. To bring back this lost prestige of the state was a big task for the al Sabah rulers. Immediately after liberation the Amir called for the enforcement of martial law till the legislature actually started working. He in order to rebuild Kuwait withdrew money from the funds kept for the future generations as there was no other way to acquire finances due to destructions of oil facilities by Iraqi soldiers. All the necessary steps were taken by the rulers to rebuild Kuwait and to fulfil the logical demands of the opposition. In April 1991 he even announced the

reopening of the national assembly which was suspended since 1986.

These measures could hardly satisfy the opposition. Some of these illegal groups, such as the popular Islamic Congress, the Islamic Constitutional Movement, the National Islamic Coalition and Salafeen instead demanded

1. the cessation of the nepotism towards members of the Al-Sabah family.
2. the legalization of political parties.
3. the separation of the government and the Al-Sabah family.
4. the restoration of the freedom of press.
5. creation of an independent judiciary.

Through 1991, the opposition demanded the introduction of democracy in Kuwait. Although it was not an easy task for the Al Sabah rulers who had been going through a tough time rebuilding Kuwait to accept their demands. Still they lifted the press censorship by January 1992 and fixed election for October.

The 1992 elections were very crucial for the Kuwaiti population who wanted the creation of a political system in which some check could be levied on unrestricted powers of the Al Sabah family. About 280 candidates contested the elections for 50 seat assembly. The right to vote was restricted to about 81,400 senior citizen only, completely ignoring the women. Around 31 seats were won by anti government candidates. This was going to have serious repercussions on the working of the Assembly as decision taking could take a longer time.

After the discovery of oil in 1930s it was the oil revenues which had given emmence power to the Al Sabah to rule. In 1990s even through the oil revenue is coming but it does not

have the same power. The gulf war has left Kuwait in a declining economic situation, the huge cost of reconstruction along with increased defence expenditure has made the government shift its policies away from that of a paternalistic government. More emphasis is now being laid on ending subsidies in the service sector, privatisation, raising customs duties, imposing capital gains tax, income tax etc¹.

Government's poor fiscal position is the main factor which has forced it to accept a greater role of the Assembly. Even though the opposition hardly forms a consolidation against the ruling family it is still becoming more critical of the family. Within the opposition there is no majority group and it basically represents socialist oriented nationalists to merchantile to conservative Islamic groups who have divergent policies. The opposition still during the past one year has become very critical of the government. The 1994 budget was attacked due to increase defence expenditure. In early 1995 a potential constitutional crisis developed which urged the interpretation of Article 71 of the constitution. This article states that " should necessity arise," the government may issue decrees while the assembly is not sitting. However, these decrees should be aproved by the assembly in the first session after it has reconvened¹. Under this article the Amir had issued more than 200 decrees during 1976-81 and 1986-82 when the Assembly was suspended which it felt was unconstitutional as the article did not apply to 'suspension of assembly.'

THE SAUDI POLITICAL SYSTEM: ORIGIN

The Royal Family

The Saudi royal family in the early days did not have any real control over the country. It was basically the strongest among a large group of tribes each being independent of the other.

Each tribe concentrated over the matters of its tribesmen not much indulging in conquest and war, except with foreign powers. This system was transformed by the King Abdul Aziz. He aimed at the creation of a political system in which, he was the sole leader having overall and hereditary control. To achieve this he formed strong alliances with certain tribes, like the Suddari's and the al-Shaykh. He also married into the tribes he had conquered. Along with this he provided subsidies to tribal leaders to retain their loyalty.

The actual rule of the Saudi dynasty began in 1744, in the Najd province. Although it did not enjoy legitimacy at that time, however it took them two centuries to establish its claim to rule. Since then three dynasties of the House of Saud have ruled Saudi Arabia. The first ruled from 1744 to 1818 the second ruled continuously from 1824 to 1891. And the third began with Ibn Saud in 1902.

The interesting thing to note in these succession process, from 1744 to 1902 is that it passed from father to son. But after the death of King Abdul Aziz in 1953 this process ended. It is now based on the succession among the sons of King Abdul Aziz Al-Saud in order of their ages¹. The ruler basically depended on its family members along with personal advisors to help in the affairs of the state. Prior to a unified Saudi State system there was the traditional Majlis which aided the leader in decision making. Majlis was basically a get-together between the ruler and opportunity to the common man to bring their problems directly to the attention of the rulers. Even in the present times as there are no legal political parties or trade unions or even free press for individuals to express their views these Majlis become important bodies. They even perform the function of dispensing justice along with the courts.

The Ulama

The Saudi leaders attribute considerable importance to the Islamic religious leaders, the ulama. It is because of the fact that in 1744, it was the alliance between the Wahhabi leader Muhammad ibn al-Wahhab and the founder of Al Saud dynasty Muhammad ibn Saud, which finally culminated in the unification of the whole Arabia under one rule. This alliance was both political and religious in nature bringing out the true notion of Islamic state, that state and religion are inseparable.

The Kingdom is governed according to the holy Quran. It serves as the main guide to the rulers to ensure peace and prosperity within constitution of the state it clearly brings out the importance of the ulama, who consider themselves as the guardian of the holy book. Therefore the most important state organ controlled and administered by the ulama is the judiciary. They act as interpreters of law. All the important judicial decisions are taken by them except when the matter requires the consent of the King. Along with controlling the judicial system and upholding the Shariah (rules of Islam) they also play significant role in imparting religious education. They tend to have a strong support among the younger population as the education at all levels in school have a heavy religious component. The education of girls is entirely supervised by the ulama. Due to this the young people accept the Wahhabi values.

Another important area controlled by them is the supervision of all mosques within the kingdom. The Mecca incidence in November 1979 brought forward the importance of the ulama in maintaining order and occupying influential position within the state. As the Grand Mosque at Mecca was seized by the terrorists. King Khalid first asked the Ulama to issue a fatwa (religious ruling) giving permission for Saudi troops to invade and fight in the holy place.

Over the years the Saudi family has sought to accommodate the ulamas and taken their support in major policy initiatives. But in the 1990s the ulama feeling a decline in their position due to increased public demands for change in political set up in which they play more crucial role have time and again put up their demands for introducing reforms within the state. The ulama along with the general public demand for a system in which the role of the monarchy is reduced.

Military Institutions

Next important government institution is the military set up. The two main wings of this institution are the National Guard and the Army. They have both remained two separate bodies with different leadership which is unique for any state. The armed forces are not trusted by the regime as it has been seen that armies tend to seize political power in the Arab world. In Saudi Arabia the Air Force did attempt a coup 1969 get failed. Due to this the army is feared by the Saudi regime. Therefore the National Guard is only a counter balance by the Saudi regime. It originated from the Ikhwan Movement began by King Abdul Aziz. Although it was destroyed in 1930 due to their rebel against the King on political religious grounds. It was replaced by White Guard who became the National Guard in 1964. They fully support the royal family as they are selected from loyal tribes only and are kept isolated from the rest of the population so as to minimize outside influence.

Council of Minister (Majlis al-Wuzara)

At the administrative level the most important body is the council of ministers. It originated in 1953 as Ibn Saud finally consolidated his power. It derives all the powers directly from the King and can examine any matter of state importance. One of the most important function of the council is to prepare budgets and to aid the King in policy making. At present there

are twenty ministers, some of which came into being only in 1975.

SAUDI DEMOCRATIC SET UP : AFTER 1990

Kuwait was not the only country to face a difficult political environment after its liberation in February 1991. As Saudi Arabia, was the main actor in the Gulf War to take military and political decisions along with the United States, it would also have to pay the cost for involvement. For Saudi monarchy there was no choice but to fight war against Iraq and liberate Kuwait. It was crunched between two important countries, who had maintained good relations with the kingdom. On one hand was Kuwait a small neighbourly state who at one time in history (1893) given refuge to the founder of Saudi Arabia Ibn Saud. On the other hand was the United States who since the 1940s had maintained special relations with Saudi Arabia.

It was thus a very difficult task for Saudi monarchy to balance between the two and come out with a policy which would defend Kuwait's right over its territory along with maintaining the American hegemony in the region in defending their territorial rights.

The worst effect of the Desert Storm over Saudi Arabia was witnessed in the democratic set up. As said earlier Saudi Arabia is a constitutional monarchy in which the king is the final authority. He can appoint ministers to aid and advise him in this task. As there was no elected assembly, therefore citizens' representation was all together absent. Even prior to the Gulf War the citizens' dissatisfaction with the monarchy was present but there was no occasion to express it. The Gulf War brought the U.S. led coalition forces into Saudi Arabia and to a certain extent the American forces stayed back under the new defence agreements signed.

This presence of foreign soldiers on their holy land raised the anger of all the groups including,

the Islamists, the Ulama, the intellectuals and the common men. They felt that this would have negative effect on their traditional society. Fearing American domination on their society as well as increased role of the Saudi monarchy in 1991 two petitions were presented to King Fahad.

The first petition was made in Feb 1991, by the middle class and liberal elites along with the Ulama and intellectuals. It basically stressed on upholding the existing ruling system and Sharia as the constitution. It also stressed on the establishment of national, provincial and municipal consultative councils which had been absent in the Kingdom. However this petition failed to achieve anything as it was never presented to the monarch and only circulated among the Hijazi intellectuals.

In May 1991, was submitted the second petition which was signed by more than 400 ulama and professors. The main aim of the letter was to influence the King's expressed intention to promulgate the Consultative Council and system of governance. Besides this it demanded the unification of all judicial institutions granting them total independence, reformations in mass media building strong fully equipped army. The immediate reaction of the monarchy was prohibitory in nature.

As the opposition against the ruling family became stronger King Fahd in March 1992 promulgated the Basic Law of Government which was to be equivalent to a written constitution. It aimed at the creation of a Consultative Council within six months. This council would have sixty members, selected by the King for a term of four years. These members would not be given any legislative powers. However in *Al-Seyassa*, Kuwaiti newspapers quoted that the "prevailing democratic system in the world was unsuited to the Gulf region and that

Islam favoured the consultative system and openness between a ruler and his subjects rather than free elections. In spite of its limitations, the King's reforms were welcomed by better educated, third generation Saudis who felt that it was for the first time that they were given a meaningful role not only in influencing policy making but also in the succession process. It was the first step towards broader reforms in the future.

In Sept 1993, the King issued a further decree which called for the reformation of a principal system of government. According to it the Kingdom was to be divided into 13 regions, each having a Governor and a council of officials and citizens to monitor development and to advise the government. By the end of the year both the councils started operating for the first time.

THE ROLE OF MEDIA

Press has been playing a very important role in generating public opinion in a democratic system. In such a system the government at the centre is representative of people. The press is seen by the citizens as a means to judge its representatives. In the case of Kuwait the media is more open in discussing political issues either in favour of the ruling family or against their policies. Whereas in Saudi Arabia there is total press censorship due to which the newspapers do not have the freedom to discuss political issues concerning the ruling family. This basic contrast between the two states has been the main factor behind Saudi Arabia's relation with Kuwait during the 1980s.

As both the states are monarchies, the final decision making power is in the hands of the ruler. Besides this citizens' representations in the government is very limited in Kuwait and was almost nil in Saudi politics upto 1992. Due to this the citizens of Saudi Arabia do not get much opportunity to express their grievances.

THE SAUDI ARABIAN PRESS.

Nature of Press

The press in Saudi Arabia has been termed as the loyalist press. According to William A. Rugh its most prominent character is that the newspapers are consistently loyal to and supportive of the regime in power despite the fact that they are privately owned. The loyalist press tends not to attack the basic tenets of national policy as enunciated by the regime, nor does it question the major policies of the regime. But they can surely criticize government services which the general public finds are deficient. For example the Pilgrimage Ministry was criticized by the press for some issue regarding annual pilgrimage and the government schools for girls were criticized for their educational policies.

Majid Khadduri., *The Gulf War: The Origins and Implications of Iran-Iraq conflict*. Oxford University press. 1988. pp. 145.

Steven L. Spiegel., Ed., *Iran and the Middle East*. London 1982.

Ownership of Press:

Private ownership of newspaper in Saudi Arabia does not mean that they are free to publish any matter related to the state. Under the important press law which was promulgated in 1963, it is stated that the press is private and the state has no right to interfere with it except for the cause of general welfare. This clause proves that the government influence over the publishers. Further the government in order to gain loyalty, provides huge subsidies to the newspaper publishers.

Even though the newspapers were provided loans by the government, the individuals or families who owned them did not gain much. It was mainly because the country had yet not achieved the economic prosperity of 1970s. In 1963 new press laws were issued by the government under which the newspapers were to be owned by groups of Saudis and not by individuals or families. This brought in many businessmen who knew little about journalism and regarded the whole thing as profit making institutions. Thus they were least interested in raising any confrontation with the state and published only those matters which were best performed by the state. Added to this economic factor, the political environment of Saudi Arabia also played a major part in control over the press. As it has no independent parliament and no institutionalized political opposition there is no way left to express public dissent. As one of the editors put it "there is no opposition in the nation, so there is no opposition in press"

William. A. Rugh., *the Arab Press: News Media and Political Process in the Arab World*; 1979. New York. pp. 84.

THE KUWAITI PRESS

Nature and Ownership

1. Shai Feldman and Ariel Levita., Ed., *Arms Control and the New Middle East Security Environment*. Tel Aviv University, 1994. pp. 45.

The press in Kuwait is very different from the one in Saudi Arabia. As the main feature of Saudi press was its loyalist nature, the Kuwaiti press is called the Diverse Press (by William A Rugh). As from the term itself the most significant distinguishing character of this press is that the newspapers are clearly different from each other in content and they are free to express their viewpoint.

Here also the papers are in private hands who receive huge support from the opposition in order to expose the weakness of the government. Therefore, there exist some papers who support the regime in power and some who speak in favour of the opposition. In this way a greater variety of information is available to the reader. But the Kuwaiti Press is not all that free as it is forbidden by law from criticizing the ruler or quoting him without authorization. Under the law 3 of 1961 press law, no information which could affect the value of the national currency or create misgivings about the Kuwaiti economy, or advocates the overthrow of the government by force, can be published.

ORIGIN OF PRESS IN THE TWO COUNTRIES

No daily newspapers existed until Kuwait's independence even though publishing had begun much before 1961. Kuwait's first press reported consisted of a periodical called *Al-Kuwait* which was mainly a literary and religious magazine founded in 1928 and printed from Egypt. This magazine lasted only for two years and was replaced by another, *Al-Kuwait* which was published from Iraq. After the discovery of oil many new magazines were launched. In 1963, the first English daily, *The Kuwait Times*, was published. *Al Siyassah*, Kuwait's principal Arabic daily, was established only in 1965. *Al Siyassah* daily is more outspoken, liberal and diverse in its interpretation of events but still it tends to support the ruling family. Another daily in Arabic, *Al Qabas* established in 1972, does not advocate any one political line and seeks

to satisfy all Kuwaiti factions. In contrast to these dailies, *Al Anba* has strong ties with the Kuwaiti business community and is an advocator of capitalism and Arab traditions. This paper has been most outspoken of government policies.

The Kuwaiti press due to its freedom has had many ups and downs. The first publishing law came in 1957, since then it has been amended a number of times. In 1976 due to dissolution of National Assembly, some retrictions were imposed on the freedom of press and a special decree was issued introducing changes in the law. The amended law gave the government the power to suspend or cancel a newspaper if it served the interest of a foreign state or organization, and if it obtained assistance from outside the country. Due to this several dailies and weeklies were closed down. The government replied only by sayng that "these papers had become tools in the service of elements alien to Kuwait".

Middle East Economic Survey. 1976-77. pp. 340.

Similarly when the National Assembly was dissolved by the Amir in 1986, press cencorship was again levied. The new government was given greater power of censorship including the right to close down newspapers for up to two years.

In Saudi Arabia on the other hand, the first newspaper was launched in 1908 in the Hijaz province and only in 1946 the Kingdom's first newspaper, *Al Bilad Al Sa'udiyya*, was published. In 1924 the Saudi government launched a hand printed weekly, *Umm Al-Qura* in Mecca, was mainly devoted to religious and literary articles with limited emphasis on political events.

Saudi Arabia has had an image in which there are strict legal restrictions which affects the coverage of news. Due to this fact the press in Saudi Arabia is not so free to publish any matter as in the case of Kuwaiti press. Before publishing any arcle the publishers have to

keep in mind general rules laid down in the press code.

In 1964, with Prince Faisal coming to power, the expectations of the people for westernization and reforms in social and economic sphere increased. The state did undergo substantial changes. But with regard press, instead of it becoming free, restrictions were increased. The reason behind it could be that in 1962 many of the kingdom's journalists were Egyptians who were sympathetic to "Nasserite republicanism" and went on strike to support him during the war in Yemen. As Saudi Arabia was also involved in the war in Yemen it did not want socialist ideas being discussed by these Egyptian journalists in the newspapers. So was passed the new press code of 1964, which gave the government more power to intervene and to control the views of the media. Under this the small private companies who had for years owned the various newspapers, handed over their control to big press organizations, which were administered by a board of directors who had full autonomous powers in accordance with the press law. .

CHANGES IN PRESS AFTER THE 1990s

Interesting thing to note about Saudi Press is that inspite of its oldness as compared to the Kuwaiti, it continues to remain highly restricted and closely monitored by the ruling family. Whereas in the case of Kuwait, the freedom of press and publishing has been guaranteed under the constitution. Therefore, Kuwaiti press since 1962 has been functioning freely except during 1976 and 1986. During this time, the censorship on press was levied due to the collapse of the National Assambly. This was the move most appreciated by the Saudi Arabian ruling family as they always feared Kuwaiti press. Thus just before the invasion of Kuwait, both the countries had similar press restrictions which were most welcomed by the Saudis.

The second gulf war brought about a challenge to the existing press censorship. During Kuwait's occupation, the Amir promised to remove the censorship levied on press since 1986 as soon as the country was liberated. Whereas the Amir and the exiled government returned to Kuwait on 4th March 1991, no step was taken by the government to restore freedom of press uptill early 1992. In Saudi Arabia, on the other hand petitions were made to the royal family which had talked about removing the restrictions on press. Over the years, the Saudi monarchs had been time and again promising to remove restrictions on press which was strictly controlled by laws.

Even after Kuwait had eased its restrictions on the press after its liberation, Saudi rulers were still reluctant. The Saudi ruler instead of granting freedom of press to the petitioners, went ahead and accused Kuwaiti rulers for taking such a step which could prove quite fatal for her delicate democratic setup.

CONCLUSION

After knowing exactly where the countries stand with respect to their democratic institutions and use of press, it can be generalised that two states have divergent policies. Kuwait's history of democratic process dates back to 1930s when for the first time the merchants demanded a share in running the state machinery. Even though their movement was not very successful but it still it was an important step towards the creating of the National Assembly in 1963. Whereas in the case of Saudi Arabia such political movements were not entirely absent but as it had limited people's support, it failed to influence the government setup.

The Saudi Prime Minister, Prince Faysal in 1962 announced a number of reforms in which one of the clauses talked about the creation of a consultative council. But due to internal tension King Saud and Prince Faysal, these reforms could not be executed. It was only in 1992 that finally some steps have been taken for the creation of this council which actually began functioning in 1993. Similarly in the case of Kuwait, the National Assembly was reopened in 1992 after it was closed in 1986. This was all due to the mounting pressure the ruling families faced at the end of the Kuwaiti crisis.

From 1980-1989 there was not much mutual influence of each other in their democratic system. As it was mainly due to the Iran Iraq war that the attention was shifted from internal political matters towards maintaining security to safeguard their independence. Whereas after 1991, both the states especially Saudi Arabia, has been deeply shaken by strong demands for increased participation of people in running the government. It was mainly due to the second gulf war that the weaknesses of the existing system of governance in the two states were exposed. The people were aware of the fact that it was mainly due to the American military intervention under the U.N. supervision that Kuwait was finally liberated. From the happening of matters so far it was quite clear that the Americans were going to play an important role in the coming

years in these countries. The increase American presence on their soil after 1991 is most feared in Saudi Arabia as it would lead to eroding of their culture, beliefs and religious sentiments. With respect to use of press, even though the newspapers were first published in Saudi Arabia than Kuwait, it was very much clear that the Kuwaiti press is more open and liberal. After 1991 the Kuwaiti rulers in a message to the nation had promised to restore the freedom of press once the life become normal in the devastated Kuwaiti economy. Whereas in the case of Saudi Arabia, the issue about press censorship was talked most by the petitioners. However the ruling family in Saudi Arabia has been reluctant in lifting the censorship on press.

EXTERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING RELATIONS

SECURITY

Introduction

Up till 1980 external security was not a problem for Kuwait at least. Although the Iraqi threat of earlier days was there but it was not the main issue of problems in eighties. Saudi Arabia in this respect was a bit more prepared by 1980s for any security lapses, as since mid 1950s it wanted to create its image as a leader of the Arab World. And to keep up to this it had to maintain very close relations with the United States, one of the superpowers of the time.

The need for having a firmer security by the two sisterly states was the question of Iranian revolution of 1978 which led to Iran-Iraq war of 1980s. To protect themselves, the gulf states (six) founded the GCC. With the end of the first gulf war (1980-88) the seeds were sown for the second gulf war (1990-91). These wars have changed the whole security perception in the gulf.

THE SAUDI PERCEPTION

Security issue of any state either big or small can be better understood by looking into the foreign policy of that state. Saudi Arabia since its creation in 1932 was very much aware of its huge size and wealth it was going to have. This led to King Abdul Aziz to carve out a policy in which special place would be given to Saudi Arabia in the arab world. He wanted to see Saudi Arabia as the leader the Arabian peninsula. Being the largest in size and wealthiest it saw the neighbouring principalities as part of the kingdoms security parameter and at time asserted over them a kind of Pax Sa'udiana especially after 1971.

This theory of Pax Sa'udiana clearly brings forward the Saudi policy of emerging a leader among the neighbouring states. The Saudi state has tried its best to ensure this theory. For

example, Providing financial assistance to Bahrain and Qatar. In 1961, soon after Kuwait's independence the Iraqis threatened to take over Kuwait. Arab League under the support of Saudi Arabia and Egypt came to its rescue. Again during the Iran-Iraq war Saudi Arabia along with Kuwait provided huge financial aid to Iraq. As Iranian victory to Saudi Arabia would mean a moral threat to its security. Moreover it felt that the interest of the state would be best served if neither Iraq nor Iran were to win. Thus Saudi Arabia since the end of Second World War has carried out foreign policy in which it sees itself as an important actor in the Arab world in general and the Gulf in particular.

Saudi Arabian Security over the years

What security has meant to the Saudis has varied over the years. Three broad phases have been divided to exactly know how they wanted to maintain security and what were the factors due to which there was a threat to security.

PHASE -I 1744 to 1954 - This phase can be termed as the "conquest period". Starting with the Al-Saud-Wahhabi alliance, culminating into a force which over the centuries led to the creation of Saudi Kingdom in 1932. Here the focus of attention was on internal conquest. Battles were fought mainly for controlling or bringing the various tribes of the peninsula under one rule. There was no involvement of any sort of foreign power by the Saudi rulers to aid in conquest. Even though they had signed a quasi protectorate treaty with the British, they were never actually asked for military support. After 1901, Ibn Saud with his own resources completed the conquest of the peninsula. Most difficult was the Al-Hasa region where Sharif Husain was very powerful.

From 1932-1954 Ibn Saud kept himself away from external conflicts. His policy was that

of " leading all options open and avoid any alliances with the power that might irreversibly alienate him from another." During the Second World War he kept his brigades open to both the Britain and Germany. And soon after the war he played a leading role in establishing the Arab League for the unity of the states.

Phase II 1954 - 1980's After the discovery of oil in Saudi Arabia and death of Ibn Saud a number of factors affected the Saudi security perception. Beginning from 1952, it was the Egyptian revolution under Gamal Abdul Nasser which posed a direct challenge to the gulf monarchies as he opposed the monarchical rule. Then there was the formation in 1958-1962 of U.A.R. between Egypt and Syria. After this there was a revolutionary war in Yemen (1962-1967) which posed a direct threat to Saudi Arabia. Due to estranged Saudi-Egypt relations at this time Egypt who was the main actor in Yemen war tried to pick up fight with Saudi Arabia.

Things were going tough for Egypt after Yemen war, on 5 June 1967 it was struck by Israel and was badly defeated. The West was accused of aiding Israel by the Arab world. At this time Kuwait and Saudi Arabia along with their oil producing states decided to cut off supplies to the Western nations and increased their financial aid to the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO)

After the 1973, Arab-Israeli war and the Israeli occupation of territories under the leadership of Saudi Arabia, the Arab oil producing states imposed an embargo on the U.S., Holland and Portugal. It along with Arab gulf states pledged \$2350 millions for economic and military aid to Egypt, Syria, Jordan and the PLO. Even though all this was going on still Saudi-American relations there excellent. By 1977 Saudi investments in U.S. amounted to \$50 billion. And

the value of American manufactured goods sold to Saudi Arabia was around \$ 2.7 billion.

PHASE - III 1981 upto 1995

This is the next important phase in the leadership of Saudi rulers. In the second phase Saudi Arabia had already emerged a leader in the Arab world due to its oil power. With respect to gulf states it started playing a leading role only after 1981.

Gulf Co-operation Council

The Gulf co-operation council was formed in March 1981, where Saudi Arabia along with Kuwait were the founding nations. They along with other gulf states formalized a security agreement in which Saudi Arabia was to play a leading role. Moreover it was the need of the hour which compelled Saudi Arabia into such an alliance with the overthrow of monarchy in Iran (1978) and the capture of power by Khomeini, a fundamentalist anti-sunni leader. Added to this was the Iran-Iraq war which posed a direct threat to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia like Kuwait provided basically financial aid to Iraq, not at all indulging in warfare. But things became quite difficult during the second gulf war (1990-91). Saudi Arabia was the main player along with the coalition forces to indulge in military activities against the Iraqi forces in occupied Kuwait. Saudi Arabia had played a very important part in liberation of Kuwait - It was like paying back the favour done, by Kuwaitis in 1893, by providing shelter and military aid to the exiled Saudi ruler.

In the 1980s the war of insecurity was very eminent in the gulf more particularly in the case of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. The Iran-Iraq war had just started leaving the whole region in a very tense situation. The fear of war spreading in the neighbourhood led to the creatio

of gulf co-operation council in May 1981.

The primary focus of the GCC was on economic cooperation. Security was not uppermost in the minds of the framers. Many bilateral and multilateral agreements between the gulf states were concluded by 1960s and 1970s in the field of economics, politics, social and cultural affairs. Regarding security in 1976, at Muscat, the foreign ministers of the eight gulf states (including Iran & Iraq) met to discuss the issue of gulf regional security. However no success was achieved as the Iranians and Iraqies had divergent ideas.

Security had become as important issue in the GCC only after Dec 1981 who attempt in Bahrain. Added to his was the threat from the anti-monarchical Iranian revolution and the direct threat to Kuwait due to its approximity to the waring states. Thus as a regional aorganization the GCC clearly attempted to strenghen and facilitate the coordination of security among the member states.

The Iranian threat was most severe to the six gulf states. They all had some ideoligical difference with regard Iran be it the Shia population or the boundary issue in these states. In such a situation collectite security' among the states was seen as an important security arrangement. But this idea was opposed by Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia since the early days wanted an arrangement in which it would dominate the alliance. It was more of a U.S. policy in which it looked towards Saudi Arabia (Twin Pillar Policy) as an important actor in the gulf to acquire allies against the Soviet Union. Whereas Kuwait historically aimed at developing a federation among the GCC states in which it would dominate the alliance. Kuwait basically wanted an alliance to counter weight Saudi Arabia and the other regional powers.

U.S.-SOVIET POLICY IN THE GULF

The U.S. policy in the region has varied with respect to time and country. After Second World War till early 1970s U.S. relation with the gulf was based more on economic friendship and less on military agreements. Gulf was seen as a market for the cheap supply of oil to Europe and U.S. who were going through a period of recovery and prosperity.

Even after 1970s it was not the U.S. who had suddenly changed its policies towards the Gulf region. But the prevailing situation had so developed that US, had to look more towards acquiring military alliances rather than continuing economic friendship. The reasons for it could be the oil embargo of 1973-74, under the leadership of Saudi Arabia led to increase in price of Oil. In 1979, the U.S. Embassy was occupied in Iran and the hostages held the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979, and lastly it was the destruction of oil facilities in the region due to Iran-Iraq war.

With the British withdrawal from the region in 1971, the US policy makers looked towards the gulf as important area. Differences between the two countries became larger when the Saudis proposed an internal security pact between itself and all other gulf states. For maintaining security GCC had to develop mutual defense structures such as Rapid Development Force, Air Defense, transport and procurement. And in order to reinforce them internal security pacts had to be signed between Saudi Arabia and all gulf states. All states agreed except Kuwait. In Kuwait there were mass protestation by the public and the National Assembly against government decision to join the pact. Their basic fear was that the intrusion of gulf states security forces into Kuwait might harm Kuwait's unique political and cultural system and jeopardize its balanced policies towards other regional states.

Very soon Kuwait had to change its policy and join the military alliance. It alongwith other gulf states indulged in air natural exercises Kuwait had realized its small size and powerless armed forces would not be able to defend its soverienngnty.

The events of late 1970s brought forward the need for creating a new policy in the region. Nixon doctrine was replaced by Carter Doctrine. The Nixon Doctrine talked about “two pillar” system for the security of the gulf only by supplying arms and advisers without direct intervention.

Where as Carter Doctrine called for creating a strong capability for military action like building “rapid deployment force” which could be used immediately in case of crisis.

With respect to United States relations with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait it was a known fact till the second gulf war that the Saudis were their closest ally in the region. After the war things have taken a new shape whereby it is now Kuwait who looks more towards the US and west.

Saudi-American relations uptill 1970s was more of an interdependence on trade and commerce. As early as 1943 a secret agreement was signed by the countries under which the US secured the Dharan air base for three years.

Due to its size Saudi Arabia plays a substantial role in securing the region. This Saudi desire was enhanced by the US policy. After 1970s it was due to US policy which made it easy for Saudi Arabia to have advance weapons such as F-15s and F-16s along with Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACS), the relations between the two countries remained excellent uptil 1985.

In 1985 due to congressional opposition to the Regan administration plan to sell advanced aircraft to the Saudis, the Kingdom instead concluded an agreement with the British government for purchase of 132 British Tornado jets. This was the largest single purchase order in the history of British military aviation (\$4.5 billion).

Such congressional opposition in the US parliament were very common in 1980s. This was an important issue as the Gulf states had to look towards either UK or France or Soviet Union to buy military equipments.

U.S. relations with Kuwait :

Kuwait's relation with the United States is not very old. Uptill 1961 Kuwait was more closely associated with Britain than with U.S. It was basically the British policy which did not allow Kuwait to have relations with U.S., as it wanted to remain the regional power in the Gulf. It was only in 1971 that the United States embassy was opened in Kuwait paving the way for future arms sales and closer economic ties.

Kuwait-U.S. relationship was not as smooth as the Saudi, U.S. relations. As Kuwait being more democratically aware, there was always a fear that too close ties with the US would jeopardize Kuwait's assertion of neutrality in the region. Moreover as US supports Israel whom the Arab states look down upon, any alliance with US would mean unpopularity for the Kuwaiti rulers both domestically and regionally.

After 1979 Kuwait US relationship received a attack due to Camp David accord. And it was only after 1987 that Kuwait approached U.S. and U.S.S.R. to reflag its oil tankers due to attacks by the Iranian Naval Ships.

The Iran-Iraq war was proving too dangerous for Kuwaitis after 1986 Iranian occupation of Faw peninsula. Kuwait by asking for protection of its tankers wanted to internationalize the war, to bring U.S. and Soviets to interfere and thus end the war.

In Mid 1988 Kuwait and United States signed a package deal worth \$19billion, the biggest arms deal Kuwait had ever signed. The deal included F-18 fighter bomber aircraft, alongwith a variety of missiles and bombs. But due to the Kuwaiti invasion in 1990 the delivery was delayed.

Although in the post cold war, the Soviet Policy has taken new shape but it is still important to know about its relations with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait that is because American policy would be meaningless without knowing the Soviet policy.

According to two school of thought the Soviet gulf policy can said to be primarily defence and offence in nature. By being defensive it tried to protect the region from being used as a base for military attack against U.S.S.R. The offensive school talked about limiting and excluding the western influence from the region and its replacement with the Soviet influence. This theory is more practical due to its friendship and co-operation treaties with Egypt in 1971, Iraq 1972 and Afghanistan 1972.

Kuwait's relations with Soviet Union had been much deeper than Saudi relations with them. It was since 1976 that Kuwait Soviet Union signed their first military agreement worth \$300 million for the transfer of military equipment. Kuwait's motive behind signing military agreement with the Soviets was basically to built up its military capacity due to constant Iraqi claims. Whereas it created discomfort domestically and regionally, the most important was the Saudi opposition. It accused Kuwait for opening its door to Marxist indoctrinization through

military training. Saudi Arabia went up to the extent of occupying Kuwaiti islands of Qaru and Umm Al-Maradim.

The matter did not however stop Kuwait from having diplomatic relationship with the Soviet Union. In 1981, it sought the protection of Soviet Union due to Iranian attacks on its Kuwaiti shore. As the Iran-Iraq war progressed Saudi Arabia moved closer to United States. And Soviet Union did not want the same to happen with U.S. Kuwait relations. They got an opportunity when Kuwait approached it to protect its tankers from the Iranian attacks in 1984. As well as it signed an arms agreement with the Soviet Union for \$300 millions, first major arms sale of Soviet Union to any Gulf State.

Uptill 1990 Kuwait had good relations with Soviet Union whereas with respect to Saudi Arabia there was not much progress.

KUWAITI PERCEPTION OF SECURITY.

Uptil 1961, Kuwait was very much secured under the British protection. The only and immediate threat to Kuwait over the years has emerged from Iraq. Eventhough Kuwait has substantial Shia population but still Iran is not a threat. Thus any security measures taken by Kuwait were basically to defend itself from Iraq.

Unlike Saudi Arabia, which does not face any threat from a neighbouring state. Kuwait over the years had to live under the Iraqi threat. Uptill 1961 not much was done by Kuwait to defend itself, as it was always sure of British aid. Even after this there was no drastic increase in armed forces. In 1961-62 there were only 2000 men in the military force. By 1975 there were 15000 men which increased to 18000 in 1988. With respect to Kuwait's small size and meages population the proportion engaged in armed forces looked satisfying. But with regards

Iraqi armed force of about 150,000 in 1980 the Kuwaiti forces were very less.

As Kuwait could not do any thing about its population increase to involve more citizens into the armed forces, it concentrated on expanding its military infrastructure. In 1976 the first, seven years Defence Development Program, was enacted by the National Assembly. The program called for the establishment of a naval base and military college; purchase of arms from a variety of source; and military services for a period of 9 to 18 months to citizens applying. With regards relationship with the superpowers, Kuwait had adopted a policy of neutrality. For Kuwait neutrality involved "maintaining relations with both superpowers". Whereas Saudi Arabia has clearly shown its inclination towards U.S. Kuwait's relations with the United States began when the Dutch Reformed Church of U.S. established Kuwait's first modern health services in early twentieth century. Later after the discovery of oil and in the formation of the Kuwait Oil Company (KOC) the Americans owned half the Shares. Uptil 1972 the two countries basically had only economic relations hereafter they began signing defence agreement for the sale of arms.

Kuwait had cultivated good relations with the Soviet Union beginning from 1976. During the Iran-Iraq war Kuwait had moved closer to Soviet Union. Kuwait military expenditure over the years has been increasing tremendously. Starting from 1961 to 1974 the military budget was less than \$200 million even though it was increasing. After 1979 there was a drastic increase in the budget beginning with \$500 million to \$1000 million in 1985 this clearly shows the Kuwait fears due to Iran Iraq war.

After 1985 there was a sharp increase in military expenditure due to attacks on Kuwaiti oil tankers and the occupation of the Arabian Peninsula by the Iranian forces. Kuwait therefore signed huge arms

agreement with the U.S., U.K., Yugoslavia, France for the transfer of advanced military equipment.

At the time of Kuwait's invasion on 2nd August 1990, there were hardly 20,000 armed force personnel who proved insufficient to the 200,000 Iraqi men. Even though Kuwait had upgraded its military infrastructure but they all failed to defend it. Thus after Feb 1991 when Kuwait was liberated a new security mechanism had to be built.

NEW SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS :

The Kuwaiti invasion on 2nd August 1990 had proved enough that the whole security arrangement of the state was inefficient. Even the GCC as the regional organisation failed to produce any decision of for reaching consequence. As Saudi Arabia, though having men and material proved incapable without the U.S. support. This clearly shows the inherent weakness of the Gulf monarchies who inspite of knowing the prevailing dangers could not do much. For example Kuwait since its independence in 1961 had been aware of Iraqi claims over its territory but still it could not do anything to defend itself as it felt the problem could be solved by dialogue whenever the need arose.

Soon after Kuwait was liberated on 26th Feb 1991, by the U.S. led coalition forces, the immediate task before Kuwait and Saudi Arabia was to build stronger defense mechanism. The states especially Kuwait, were under so much pressure from its citizens, who demanded a change in the whole state setup starting from the royal family down to the question of providing right to vote to women.

Syria and Egypt were among the Arab states who had provided a substantial number of armed

personnel in the coalition force. At the end of the war they were seen as main contenders. There was a possibility that they would join the six GCC states under the clause of Damascus Declaration, soon after the end of war. But the things did not go so well for them. Both Saudi Arabia and Kuwait refused to undertake the financial commitments demanded by Egypt and Syria moreover they viewed the Egyptians as potentially destabilising if they became a semi permanent feature of these unchanging gulf societies.

The two options left after this were either to improve relations with Iran or to strengthen ties with the west. With respect to Iran it was her neutral stand during the war which helped her win over the gulf states. The foreign minister of the GCC states in their meeting in May 1991, to discuss security arrangements in the region, talked about holding "intensive contacts" with Iran over regional security. Relations between Iran and Saudi Arabia looked to be improving when diplomatic relations were reestablished between the two in March 1991. Similarly Kuwait also improved its relations and considered Iran as an important regional power, who could play a role in maintaining future security in the region. Besides Iranian military might differences do appear between Iran and Saudi Arabia over the question of export of militant fundamentalism to the Arab Muslim world.

With respect to closer alliance with the west one thing had become clear that the gulf war demolished the taboos concerning overt co-operation and defence relations between the GCC countries and America." So any agreement signed between the gulf countries and west had to range some solid assurances. Even the West was very much interested in signing defence agreements and economic agreements with these countries only to be assured of continued supply of oil.

In Kuwait the Americans gained much more than what they had prior to the war. During the war it was basically US aid supported by other European countries, who had helped Kuwait win back its independence. Due to this important role played by the US the Kuwaitis in order to pay them back signed a number of contracts which were designed to basically rebuild Kuwait. Along with economic agreement the two countries signed security pact for ten years. The agreement basically included provisions for the stockpiling of U.S. military equipment in Kuwait, use of Kuwaiti ports by U.S. troops and periodic joint exercises.

Besides the American Kuwait also concluded defence pacts with the British, French and Russia. The agreement with France was also signed for ten years in August 1992. It allowed for joint military exercises and the provision for a French military advisor attached to the Kuwaiti armed forces.

The pact with U.K. was signed in February 1992, in terms it was very similar to that with the USA the only point stressed by the Defence Secretary Thomas King was that, "the British land forces would not be stationed in Kuwait in long run." The Kuwaitis and the Russians concluded five agreement in 1994 basically voting mutual protection, investment economic, scientific and technical co-operation. Along with these provisions one common element was the sale of military equipment.

The Saudi Arabia U.S. relations were at their lowest just prior to the operation Desert Storm. It improved to its best when the Americans rushed to defend Saudi Arabia in Aug 1990 from any Iraqi attacks. After the war the main concern of Riyadh before signing any defence arrangement was to reduce to a minimum the presence of US troops on the kingdom's territory. The Saudis claimed that such a presence the Saudis did not favour any permanent stationing

Keesing's Record of World Events. 1994. pp. 40204.

pp 40204, Kesing's Record of World Events. 1994

of American troops on its soil after the war as it would lead to an anathema to most Saudis particularly to militant fundamentalists. This had led to some tension in US-Saudi relations in Mid 1991.

Position the Saudis also refused positioning armour and heavy weapons by Washington in King Khalid military city (northern Saudi Arabia) as they insisted on buying the weapons and fully controlling them. It seemed that Saudi Arabia wanted to transform its defense oriented army into rightly sophisticated offensive force, modelled upon American forces. Washington being aware of Saudi limitations rejected their proposal.

After the war matters had taken a new shape in Saudi Arabian politics. Strong objections were raised by some senior Saudi Princes, the established ulama and the intelligentsia against the permanent stationing of U.S. troops on Saudi soil.

ISRAEL AS A FACTOR IN SAUDI KUWAITI RELATIONS

Introduction

Israel as a state came into existence only in 1948. The area allocated to Israel was mainly the one occupied by Palestinians for years. Prior to this the Jews were living all over the world mainly concentrated in Europe and Russia. Although they had achieved huge success in these countries they were amongst the richest and powerful, but still they were treated as second class citizens. By the end of nineteenth century the situation had become so bad that they were severely persecuted and punished due to their ideology. This was the time when Zionism as a concept came into being which strives to create a separate homeland for the Jews. The creation of Israel by the Britain in 1948, by ceding Palestinian territory, was enough reason for the Arabs to dislike the Jews. Added to this was the fact that they were the only

ones in the region with a different religion and language.

SAUDI ISRAEL RELATIONS

Saudi monarch since the beginning of this century had taken a deep interest on the question of Zionism and the creation of state of Israel. During the second world war King Abdul Aziz Al Saud even though hated the Jews felt horrified by Hitlers extermination of the Jews. According to him Jews were a race accused by God according to his holy book and destined to final destruction and eternal damnation. He added that "our hatred for the Jews dates from Gods condemnation of them for their persecution and rejection of Isa (Jesus Christ) and their subsequent rejection later of his chosen Prophet (Mohammad).

Robert Lacy, *The Kingdom*; London 1981. pp. 259.

The Biltmore programme of May 1942 finally called for the opening up of Palestine for the Jewish immigrants. For King Abdul Aziz it was the greatest blow to his prestige as he was all along fighting for the right of the Palestinians. The king felt that the British were mishandling the question and therefore looked towards the USA for help. The U.S. President Roosevelt, met King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud in 1945. In their meeting King Abdul Aziz mainly stressed on the point that the Jews be allowed to stay in Germany, as they did not have any thing to worry from the events so far. President Roosevelt promised King Abdul Aziz that "he would do nothing to assist the Jews against the Arabs and would make no move hostile to the Arab people". But with Roosevelt's death and Truman becoming new President, his efforts culminated in recognition and assistance to the new state of Israel.

About 78,0000 Arabs either fled or were expelled from their homes by the creation of Israel

in 1948. Most of these Arabs were Palestinians who took refuge in near by countries like Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In countries like Kuwait and Saudi Arabia the Palestinians were in quite a demand for their educational qualifications and therefore were accommodated. These countries provided shelter to the homeless Palestinians and they engaged themselves in the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948-49 which was mainly fought by outside Arab forces to aid Palestinians within the new state of Israel. After the June war of 1967, the whole scenario in the Arab world changed due to Egypt's defeat. At the end of six day June war Israel was in control of Syria's Golan Heights, West Bank and the rest of Jerusalem and the entire Sinai Peninsula. It meant a virtual blow for Egypt's prestige in the Arab world. There was a shift in the Arab centre of gravity from Cairo towards Riyadh. The loss of old Jerusalem was grieved most by King Faisal. The city was regarded third Holy Place after Mecca and Medina for the Muslims. Therefore as he being the guardian of Islam's Holy Places "He felt a personal responsibility to recapture what had been lost, He pressurised the entire Islamic world to confer in a summit. It was for first time in history that Muslim heads of state had gathered together in such numbers.

Saudi Arabia, due to Israel had to face difficulties with America. After the Six Day war, the American support to Israel increased. Due to this Saudi Arabia had been accused a number of times by the radical Arab States such as Syria, Jordan, Algeria, Libya for maintaining relations with Israel's friend. Whereas gaining Jewish vote was an important issue during the American presidential elections. But the justifications the Americans gave King Faisal was that it was to counter the Soviet arms supply to Egypt and Syria. Whereas Faisal argued that the more US aid Israel received the more radical grew the feeling of the Arabs.

Uptil 1970s the Saudis remained aloof from the Arab-Israeli conflict. It only played a secondary

role of providing funds to the Arab states involved in the conflict. But the October war of 1973 brought Saudis directly into the arena as they took the lead in deploying the oil weapon on behalf of the Arab States.

The 1980's has been important in the relations between the two states . The invasion of southern Lebanon by Israel in March 1978 on the Palestinian strong holds lead to a deteriorated situation by 1980. with the coming to power of Likud leader Mr. Begin in 1981 general elections, a more aggressive foreign policy was followed by Israel. The Israelis launched a series of air attacks against Palestinian targets .One such target included urban areas of South Lebanon in which many people were killed. This incidence raised the response of Saudi Arabia to end the war in Lebanon and to solve the whole Palestinian problem peacefully .

In August 1981 crown prince Fahad came up with an eight point peace plan for the Middle East. Although the plan failed due to lack of support from some Arab states but it still indicated that Saudi Arabia was prepared to recognize Israel if it completely withdrew from the occupied territories. This was for first time since the creation of Israel in 1948 that Saudi Arabia was willing to recognize the Jewish state of Israel. This was the most important issue for the first half of the 1980s. During the latter part of the decade, Israel was out of attention for some time for the Saudi state as it got more involved in the matters concerning the Iran Iraq war.

Kuwait - Israeli Relations.

Kuwait Israeli relationship has been more of an indirect affair. Unlike Saudi Arabia, Kuwait has shown its concern for the Jews only through the Palestinian problem or Arab - Israeli wars it never got directly involved with Israel like Saudi Arabia did, as military might of

Israel could be the main reason for it to not directly interfere. Whereas Saudi Arabia on the other hand was militarily strong, therefore Kuwait tried to use palestinians as the main issue to deal with Israel.

The creation of a separate homeland for the Jews was going on in Britain and the United States, Kuwait on the other hand kept itself busy to avoid this from happening. This issue was treated so seriously in Kuwait that in 1930s the Kuwaiti Youth Association formed a committee to study the Palestinian problems, and in order to help them it collected about 7500 rupees as an aid to their struggle. After the creation of state of Israel many Palestinians took refuge in Kuwait. In Kuwait the Palestinian community became the largest minority and the second largest group after the native Kuwaitis. It was large population with respect to Kuwait as they made up some twenty - one percent of the total population. Due to this the palestinians had to be accomodated in society and were offered good jobs and schools to teach their children at. As they became part and parcel of Kuwaiti system, the government realised the sufferings of the palestinians and pledged to support their struggle.

This accomodation of Palestinians by Kuwaiti government was resented by Israel. Israel on its part maintained hostile relations with Kuwait as the money financed by Kuwaitis to Palestinians was used to keep the struggle alive in the occupied territories. In the late 1950's Kuwait became the home for the Palestinian Liberation Organization, as most of the orginal founders of PLO began their career and formed revolutionary strategies there.

After Kuwait's independence in 1961, Palestine issue became the core of Arab politics which was of muct concern to Kuwaitis. The first formal Kuwait's address to the General Assembly when it was admitted in 1965, delt with Palestinians. The Kuwaits foreign Minister, Sabah

Al-Ahmad talked about the legitimate rights of Palestians to their homeland and that they should be allowed to return to their country. Due to this stand taken by Kuwait , in 1964 it permitted PLO to open up an office in Kuwait. Even Al-Fatah operated from Kuwait before moving to Syria in 1966 The Kuwaiti government's startergies showed to Israel that it never accepts the state of Israel and would continue to support PLO till some logical soultion to the whole problem is formulated.

Arab economic boycott of Israel in 1950s was fully supported by Kuwait. It did not even care for estranging relationship with the United States who protested Kuwait's action against American companies to verify their relations with Israel and Israeli companies. Later also during the June war Kuwait suspended its oil shipments to Britain and the United States because of their support to Israel.

In 1967 war as support to the Arab States, Kuwait even went to the extent of forming a symbolic military unit, the Al-Yarmouk Brigade, which was to work along with other Arab troupes along with this Kuwait also declared a defensive war against Israel. Even though the 1967 war was defeat for the Arabs but still it increased the credentials of Kuwait due to both financial and moral support given by it to the Arab States. Similarly in October war 1973, Kuwait provided military aid to Egypt and Syrian forces by sending two of its military units. In the same year at the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries(OAPEC) conference in Kuwait, it played the major part in deciding price increase and oil reduction. Kuwait's concern for palestine issue was so emmense that it even refused the nomination of Brandon W. Grove. Jr. as American ambassador to Kuwait, as he had previously served American consul in Jerusalem. This clearly brough out Kuwait's stand for Palestinian cause and the status of occupied Jerusalem. Similarly Kuwait had earlier broken off diplomatic relations with West Germany in 1965 for recognizing Israel. It also broke off relations in 1982 with Zaire for

reestablishing relations with Israel. On the other hand Israel criticised Kuwait for supporting the Palestinians. In 1969 it complained to the United Nations for Kuwait's open support to Arab commandos and providing finances to them to wage a war against Israel. This created fear in the minds of Kuwaitis of a vital attack against some of Kuwait's desalination plants. But the matter cooled down gradually. By 1990 Kuwait Israeli relations were at its lowest point and it was left to be seen how their relations would emerge in the coming decade.

ISRAEL'S RELATIONS AFTER 1990.

Although Israel was not directly involved in the Kuwaiti crisis but it emerged as one of the principal beneficiaries of the whole crisis. It had been up till that time been internationally isolated for its procrastination over the peace process and for the repressive attacks in the occupied territories. Israeli leaders felt that it was the right time to restake their old gain and stressed that it was the lack of democracy in the Arab world, not Israel's occupation of Arab territories which was the principal cause of instability in the region.

Israel is one of the few democratic states in the Middle East whereas most of other states especially in the Gulf are monarchies who lack a complete democratic system. In the post Gulf War period the citizens have demanded greater share in policy formation as the existing system had failed to safeguard the individuals.

One of the major change in Saudi policy after the Gulf war is with respect to Arab - Israeli question. Prior to it Riyadh was reluctant to take the lead publically on peace issues, except the Fahd plan of 1981 and advocated strong anti - Israeli policy. It even boycotted the companies doing business with Israel. Similar was the attitude of Kuwaiti government. But after 1991 Saudi Arabia has demonstrated a new willingness to deal with Israel. The kingdom's ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar ibn Sultan ibn Abd al- Aziz Al Saud along other GCC States were present at the opening session of the Madrid peace talks in October 1993. It was for first time that Saudi Arabia along with other Arab States were willing to make peace with Israel if acceptable terms could be found. Saudi Foreign Ministry under Prince Saud al - Faisal went up to the extent of representing the kingdom at the multilateral talks in Moscow (1992) despite the syrian and Palestinian boycott.

An important decision taken by Kuwait in June 1993 was the unilateral lifting of the secondary aspect of boycott under which the Arab states black listed companies from third world with strong Israeli links. Whereas it was only by September that Saudi Arabia along with other

five members lifted the "secondary" as well as the "tertiary" aspects of economic boycott levied on Israel by these states. Under the tertiary boycott, companies which dealt with blacklisted companies were also boycotted. Whereas the primary aspect of the boycott - forbidding direct trade between Arab League States and Israel would continue to be observed. This move was welcomed by Israeli Finance Minister Avraham Shocat who predicted that it would provide a significant boost for the Israeli economy by encouraging major European and Asian companies to invest in Israel.

Besides this issue there are still many areas of indifference between Saudi Arabia - Kuwait and Israel. Both the Gulf States along with other GCC members called upon Israel to sign the NPT. Nuclear program of Isreal is most feared by the Arab States as they feel that it would be used against them due to the support given by them to the PLO. In another meeting the Gulf States refused the establishment of a new Middle East regional bank which was to include Isreal. This proposal was put forward by a group of Arab States who where holding an economic Summit in Casablanca, November 1994. The GCC states replied by saying that "the Arab world is not in need of an institution or a development bank in which Isreal participates. This clearly brings out the attitude of both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia in maintaining relations with Israel.

IRAN AS A FACTOR IN SAUDI-KUWAITI RELATIONS

By the beginning of modern era, the Arab region was dominated by two muslim powers, the Ottoman and the Persian. The ottomans had control over the western part of the gulf, whereas the persians were in command of the eastern. Conflicts between them were very common. The coming of the British, a century and a half later in the gulf region, the conflicts began to be solved peacefully by making them sign bilateral agreements. After the British withdrawal from the region in 1971, the responsibility of maintaining peace was left in the hands of gulf states, mainly Iran and Saudi Arabia.

Since Saudi Arabia was not adequately militarily equipped, Iran seized the opportunity of British withdrawal to assert claims over gulf leadership. The United States always preferred a joint leadership between the two countries. The Iranian American relation had been excellent during the reign of Shah. But with the fall of shah in 1979 and the beginning of Iran - Iraq war in 1980, the Iranians became anti-American. Thus by the beginning of 1980s a new scenerio for relationship between Iran and Kuwait Saudi Arabia was laid. From 1980 to 1990 - the relations between the two were at its lowest. And it was only after the second Gulf War 1991, that reapproachment in their relationship is visible.

Relations from 1980-1990.

With the outbreak of Iran - Iraq war Kuwait feared its consequences on its shia population. About 40% of Kuwait's population is Shia. They were responsible for carrying out a number of bomb explosions in Kuwait city, the French and US embassies, and on international airport at the time when Iran-Iraq war was in progress. Along with this the most important was the attack on the Amir Shaikh Jabir al- Ahmad al Sabah in May 1985 when he narrowly escaped a suicide bomb attack. For all these activities responsibility was claimed by Islamic Jihad, a group of militant Shiite Muslims.

Prior to these events in Kuwait, an urgent need was felt by the Gulf states to form a more realistic regional security organization, in 1976 the foreign Ministers of the eight Gulf Countries met in Muscat to discuss on forming a security pact but it failed as no common consensus was reached. It was only in 1981, due to serious threats posed by Iran - Iraq war that these countries overcame local differences and formed the GCC.

Along with fully supporting the new organization, both Saudi Arabia and Kuwait adopted other measures to secure themselves from any unforeseen Iranian attack. Iran-Iraq war provided an opportunity to Saudi Arabia to improve its relations with the U.S. which had reached a low point due to the U.S. government's rejection of Saudi arms demand. Whereas this gave a new occasion for "military cooperation" between the two countries. It is surprising to note that the U.S. - Iranian relations which had been excellent since 1955 with the rise of Mohammad Reza Shah as dictator, suddenly deteriorated after 1979 revolution. The main reason for this were the sudden change in Iranian arms procurement policy and the American hostage crisis in Tehran in the same year. Due to this, U.S. improved its relations with Saudi Arabia (one of the two pillars of its Gulf policy). In 1980 the U.S. supplied Saudi Arabia with AWACS (Airborne Warning And Control System) aircrafts along with other arms. In 1986,

\$265 million deal was signed between the two which had many controversies. Later another agreement worth \$8,600 million for the sale of AWACS was signed.

Similarly Kuwait signed a number of defence deals with the U.S. and U.S.S.R, owing to a series of attacks on its oil tankers passing the Persian Gulf in 1984. In 1984, when USA refused to provide the Stinger anti aircraft missiles to Kuwait, they instead signed a military training agreement for Kuwaiti pilots. With U.S.S.R, Kuwait signed a pact for the delivery of Soviet surface to air missiles. And in 1986 a \$230 million arms sale agreement was signed by them. Earlier in 1983 Kuwait signed an arms deal with France worth \$300 million including "Mirage F-1" air crafts.

Iraq was provided with huge financial aid to keep Iran off at a distance. Both Saudi Arabia and Kuwait were sure that an Iraqi defeat in the war would mean a direct Iranian threat to their sovereignty. Thus in spite of the fact that Iraq was Kuwait's old enemy due to its reported claims over Kuwait it went ahead and supported Iraq only to save itself from next calamity. In the first two years of war, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and UAE provided nearly \$30 billion in grants and loans to Iraq.

But after 1982 direct military aid provided to Iraq stopped. Instead Kuwait allowed access to its strategic ports for the export of Iraqi petroleum. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia even agreed to export up to 310,000 b/d from the neutral zone on Iraq's behalf and provided the financial proceeds to Iraq. Saudi Arabia also provided access to the Iraqi pipeline (650 km long) to use the Saudi port.

During the war (1983 -1990) Iran imported about \$14.5 billion worth of arms and Iraq imported \$39.5 billion. Iraq became the third world's largest arms importer during 1983-1986 whereas

Iran was fifth largest.¹ this clearly shows the huge payments made by the end of war Iraq was over-armed inspite of having a huge deficit exceeding \$70 billion .

The Iranian answer to all this were bombing of Kuwaiti oil installations at umm al-Aish in 1981, in 1983 six bombs exploded in Kuwait city, in 1984 Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian oil tankers were bombed, in 1986 Iranian attacked merchant ships sailing to or from Kuwait and seized cargo . Besides all this in march 1988 , for the first time Iranian and Kuwaiti armed jorces clashed when there Iranian gunboats attacked Bubiyan island.

With the end of war in Aug. 1988 relations between Kuwait and Iran improved despite Kuwait's support for Iraq during the war. In April 1989 the Prime Minister Saad al-Abdullah al Salim al Sabah announced that relations with Iran were moving towards stability and normalization. Whereas with respect to Iranian - Saudi relations on the eve of end of Gulf war, were very strained. Just prior to the end of war in 1987 the Mecca (Hajj) incidence took place in which about 402 people were killed, of whom 275 were Iranians. This lead to mass demonstrations in Tehran against the Saudi ruling family, thus renewing Iranian fears in the mind of Saudi Arabians like the ones been aroused after the islamic revolution in Iran in 1979.

AFTER 1990 - Gulf war

Since 1989 when President Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani had formed the government , his main task has been to move away from ideology towards pragmatism in economic and political field. He changed Iranian, foreign policy from one of adventurism and belief in use of force to one based on realism, cooperation and negotiation. He wanted the restoration of relations with neighbouring states based on international law and mutual respect.

The new Iranian policy has been best proved by the neutral stand taken by Iran during the Kuwait crisis . It condemned Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and supported all U.N. resolutions. It even opposed the linkage theory proposed by Saddam Hussein on linking Kuwaiti and Palestinian issues. This was the most remarkable aspect of Iranian Kuwaiti foreign policy .

Due to this positive stand taken by Iran in Kuwait's favour it earned huge respect in the west as well as among the Gulf states. Within the Gulf region there was a sharp departure from Iran's

Islamic revolutionary ideology of keeping the foreign military presence out of the Gulf, towards accepting it as a bare necessity. Rafsanjani was quoted saying that "we have no objection to them obstructing aggression, anybody may help in any way. However it would have been better if the regional countries would have done so. Iranian foreign policy vis-e-vis the Gulf, was not the one in which it opposed the western alliances in the region but it aimed more towards creating a security alliance with the neighbouring countries based on regional co-operation with least dependence on the west.

In reply to Rafsanjani's anti-Saddam stand the exiled Foreign minister of Kuwait Shaikh Sabab visited Tehran on 22 August 1991 to meet his counterpart Ali Akbar Velayati, expressing regrets over their "past mistakes". Ali Akbar Velayati, in order to gain some place for Iran in future security arrangements, paid a visit to other Gulf states. The whole issue was taken so seriously by the Gulf states that in the forthcoming GCC summit at Doha , the summit communique contained a special section on "Relations with Iran".

The summit marked the best of the GCC- Iran reconciliation moves. The GCC states welcomed Iran's growing interest in the region only if it could carry out a good neighbourly policy of

non interference in the internal affairs of these states . But as Iran could not keep itself away from reasserting its claim over Abu musa island, Saudi Arabia become suspicious of Iranian assetions.

Saudi Iranian Relations: 1990-1995.

Due to the Mecca incidence Saudi Arabia broke off all relations with Iran in April 1988 . Tension had although been building bitween the two since the beginning of Iran-Iraq when the Saudis became a major financial and logistical supporter of Iraq. The Kuwaiti crisis had brought a new ray of hope for normalising relations between the two states .

With the intersification of Kuwaiti crisis by end of 1990 the western military presence also increased. The Iranian hardliners wanted the government to oppose this military builtup which was mainly due to Saudi Arabia. Instead the government went ahead and supported Saudi Arabia, putting all the blame on Iraq for creating such a situation. This was clearly a two way stand taken by Iran: in one it continued its support towards Saudi Arabia & Kuwait and on the other it wanted to reduce US presence in one region as it would change the balance of power in favour of Saudi Arabia.

Fearing a decline in its position Iran decided to reestablish relations with Saudi Arabia. Therefore in March 1991 foreign minister of Iran, Ali Akbar Velayati, met prince Saud al-Faisal in Jeddah to discuss the main areas of contension. Soon a Joint Iran Saudi communiqe announced the restoration of juel diplomatic relations between the two countries. The opening of ties was very essential for both the states to maintain good relations with Iran, as it was the regions most powerful state. Whereas for Iran it meant access to Saudi financial aid. In November 1992, the Islamic Development Bank, mainly financed by Saudi Arabia, sanctioned a number of projects in Iran amounting to more than \$130 million.*

CONCLUSION

Security has been an important issue in both the state. Be it either regime security(internal) or state security (external) since the formation of these states, has had a very important role to play in maintaining the legitimacy of the ruling families. The Saudi-Kuwaiti perceptions on security have however varied. In the case of Saudi Arabia, since 1950s it maintained special relationship with the United States. As early as 1951, the first defence agreement was signed between the two countries which included the renewal for five years of lease for Dhahran base controlled by the Americans since 1942. In the present time the U.S. continues to use this base which had played a crucial role during the Kuwaiti crisis. In contrast to this Kuwait had maintained relations not only with the U.S.A., France and Britain but also with the Soviet Union and the communist block. During the Iran-Iraq war, when the Americans failed to provide

immediate safety to the Kuwaiti tankers being attacked by the Iranians in 1984, it went ahead and requested the Soviet Union to safeguard its oil tankers. Prior to this event, Kuwait had already maintained relations with the Soviet Union since 1975 being the only country in the Gulf to do so till early 1980s. It was basically the Kuwaiti policy of non-alignment which made it maintain good relations with both the super-powers in spite of Saudi anger against Kuwait for maintaining relations with Soviet Union. For Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union was the main issue of content as it was involved in the Yemen war which had destabilised the Saudi economy. Moreover the Saudis were opposed to communist ideas which according to them were against the basic teachings of Islam.

After 1991, while the Saudi rulers increased their military dependence on the U.S. only, Kuwait on the other hand signed military agreements with all the permanent members of the Security Council. In the case of Kuwait none of the agreements signed talked directly about the permanent stationing of foreign soldiers on Kuwaiti soil. It is only with respect to the agreement with the United States that there is limited reflection on the U.S. presence in Kuwait, as it provided for the use of Kuwaiti bases and air bases by the U.S. troops to conduct joint exercises. Whereas in the case of Saudi Arabia, a new arms deal worth U.S. \$919,000,000 was signed which basically talks about the transfer of military technology and defence equipment with limited emphasis on any permanent stationing of troops except while providing training to the Saudi Military. Due to this stand taken by the two countries in their relations with external powers, there has been a mixed reaction amongst the citizens of the two countries. In the case of Kuwait, the general public supports the ruling family, in inviting the foreigners to help in the building of a secured state. The monarchy as well as the people do not feel any direct threats from these pacts and feel that they are very necessary to defend the future of Kuwait.

Abdul Reda Assiri, *Kuwait's Foreign Policy: City-State in World Politics*. (Westview Press. 1990)

pp. 51

On the other hand, in Saudi Arabia, there were mixed reactions against the Americans during the gulf war which had made the matter difficult for Saudi rulers over the past years. Some of the Saudis felt relief and gratitude on the American presence in Saudi Arabia during the gulf crisis as it was the only way to protect the Saudi sovereignty. On the other hand some felt that it would finally be used to bring political and social changes to suit the American policies in the region in the coming years. A Saudi teacher was quoted saying that "the American soldiers are the new kind of foreign workers. We have Pakistanis driving taxis and now we have American defending us."

However important a role these defence agreements played for both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia has to be seen in the future. Although it is very much clear, that whatever arms procured by these countries earlier either from U.S.A., France, U.K., Germany or Soviet Union, that they have failed to defend these countries especially the freedom of Kuwait.

Iran and Israel however remain an important issue in the bilateral relation between the two countries. Kuwait is seen to be more enthusiastic about improving its relations with both of these countries. Before its invasion around six lakh Palestinians lived in Kuwait. Due to this fact, Kuwait was always willing to support their cause and provided huge financial aid to the PLO. But during Kuwait's invasion, most of the Palestinians and the PLO were seen openly supporting Saddam Hussain. Due to this, after Kuwait's liberation most of the Palestinians were asked to leave the country. This Kuwaiti move in turn has helped in the cooling of Jewish attitude towards Kuwait, who earlier felt that Kuwait was responsible for providing huge finances to the PLO to continue their struggle in the occupied territories. On the other hand Saudi Arabia looks more towards the solving of Arab Israeli conflict, as the main issue before the normalisation of relations between the two states.

reestablishing relations with Isreal. On the other hand Israel criticised Kuwait for supporting the Palestinians. In 1969 it complained to the United Nations for Kuwait's open support to Arab commandos and providing finances to them to wage a war against Isreal . This created fear in the minds of Kuwaitis of a vital attack against some of Kuwait's desalination plants. But the matter cooled down gradually. By 1990 Kuwait Israeli relations were at its lowest point and it was left to be seen how their relations would emerge in the coming decade.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

Kuwait-Saudi Arabian relations are not all that cordial and friendly as it should have been between two sisterly GCC states. There is a myth in the minds of the common man that they cooperate with each other on all matters of internal or external interest without showing any disagreement.

But this is not the actual position of relations between them. After the second Gulf War, both the states have been shaken badly by the repercussions of the war. In the case of Kuwait, the destruction of the economy was foreseen during the war as Saddam Hussein talked about burning the oil wells. Not only the oil wells were sabotaged but infrastructure was also ruined partially. Kuwait after its liberation had to reorganise its political and economic infrastructures keeping in mind the general public demand. Whereas in the case of Saudi Arabia similar effects were visible, especially in the economic field, even though it was not directly affected by the war.

Both the states currently are facing the biggest challenge to their rule and in order to remain in power, the rulers have to take important decisions which may not be entirely in their favour. Solving these problems is the greatest challenge to the rulers. The most important step taken by them should be to introduce a system of greater public accountability which would eliminate the bureaucratic system and reduce public sector holdings. The quality of education should also be improved along with giving people greater access in national policy making. This political inclusion of common citizens should be meaningful in giving them actual power in running the state machinery. In the case of Kuwait, the National Assembly has elected members who inflict a greater influence on the ruling family. Whereas in the case of Saudi Arabia, Majlis-al-Shura, is only a consultative body which came into being only in 1993.

The Saudi rulers for past thirty years have been promising the creation of consultative assembly since 1962. King Fahad feels that it is due to the existence of the National Assembly in Kuwait since 1963, which makes the Saudi population aware of such a system. After the gulf war(1990-91), the promises made by Shaikh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Salab for increased participation of citizens in running the state by reopening the National Assembly were looked down by the Saudi ruling family. The Saudi rulers wanted their counter parts in Kuwait to slow down their progress towards democratization as it was having spill over on to Saudi Arabian political setup. The Saudi population was beginning to demand greater share in decision making which the rulers were reluctant to grant as it would curb their power. The main problem with the two families in granting greater share to their citizens, in decision making is that, they feel they are the actual owners of the state as they have been responsible for transforming the state from a traditional tribal society into a modern oil rich state.

Even while dealing with countries like Iran and Isreal, both Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, should adopt a more pragmatic approach. As of today, Iran is an important regional power after the containment of Iraq in the second gulf war. It has the capability to play a wider role in maintaining security in the gulf region. Kuwait after its liberation, welcomed Iran's neutral stand during the war and both the countries have in the past few years shown willingness to establish relations in the field of economics, education, trade, etc. Saudi Arabia on the other hand is still doubtful of it's relations with Iran. Even though it has shown signs of normalisation while dealing with Iran, the Saudi rulers still fear the radical Shia government in Iran.

Isreal is going to be an important factor in the Kuwait-Saudi Arabian ties until the Palestinian problem is resolved. Kuwait was among the first of the GCC states to lift the secondary aspect

of economic boycott on Isreal. At first Saudi Arabia felt out manoevered by Kuwait for having indirect contacts with Isreal, but later it accepted the lifting of embargo on Isreal along with the other members of the GCC states.

To sum up, there is greater need for a greater understanding between the rulers of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Due to their common origin, following almost similar traditions and economic beliefs with no actual barrier in between the two states with respect to religion, belief, customs, language, race, land, history. Cooperation in political field between the two states should bring out the true notion of muslim brotherhood. Thier utmost aim should be prosperity of the state and it's subjects. Its is when both bury their mutual differences, that they can improve their relations in order to have peace, security and stability in the region. Both can learn from each others experiences in this field and try to bring out the best of their relationship by showing more cooperation and understanding to fulfill the final goal of prosperity of the state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- JILL CRYSTAL, Oil and Politics in the Gulf: Rulers and Merchants in Kuwait and Qatar. (Cambridge; 1990)
- CORDESNAN, (ANTHONY. H), Western Strategic Interests in Saudi Arabia (London 1987)
- NAKHLEN, EMILE A, The GCC " Policies, Policies and Prospects (Newyork, 1986)
- HIRO, DILIP, Desert Shield to Desert Storm; The Second Gulf War (Lonodon 1992)
- GOLDBERG JACOB, The Foreign Policy of Saudi Arabia; The Formative Years, 1902 - 1918 (Harvard, 1986)
- ABIR, NORDECHAI, Saudi Arabia; Government, Society and the Gulf Oasis (London 1903)
- MALIK, HAPEEZ, eat, International Security in South West Asia (New York 1984)
- UANDT, WILLIAN B, Saudi Arabia in the 1980's; Foreign Policy, Security and Oil (Washington, 1981)
- DEEGAN, HEATHER, the middle East and Problems of Democracy (Buckingham, 1993)
- BULLOCH, JOHN, Saddam's War: The Origin of the Kuwait Conflict anf the international response
- HELNS, CRISTINE, NOSS, Cohesion of Saudi Arabia : Evolution Political Identity (London, 1981)
- ASSIRI, ABDUL REDA, Kuwait's Foreign Policy: City-state in World Politics. (Westview Press 1990)
- CRYSTAL, JILL
- BHUTANI, SURENDRA, edt, the Contemporary Gulf (Delhi, 1980)
- Vine, Peter and Casey, Paula, Kuwait : A Nation's Story (London, 1992)
- AL-PARSY, FOUAD, Modernity and Iradition: the Saudi Arabia Equation (London 1990)

HUREWITZ, J.C., Middle East Politics: the Military Dimension (Westview Press 1982)

BULLOCH, JOHN and HARVEY MORRIS, The Gulf War: Its origins History and consequences (London, 1989)

HICKS, NEIL and Ghanim al-Najjar eat

LACKNER, HELEN: A House Build on Sana; Political Economy of Saudi Arabia (London 1978)

LACEY, ROBERT, The Kingdom (London 1981)

KOUR, 2H, Arab state (N. Delhi, 1991)

RUGH, WILLIAM. A, The Arab Press: New Media, Political Process in the Arab World (New York, 1979)

DIETL, GULSHAN, Through two wars and Beyond (N. Delhi, 1991)

SPIEGEL, STEVEN L. ed, Iran and the Middle East (London, 1982)

KHADDURI, MAJID, The Gulf War the origins and Implications of the Iran-Iraq Conflict, (Oxford University Press, 1988)

FELDMAN, SHAI and ARIEZ LEVITA, eat, Arms control and the New Middle East security Environment (Tel Aviv University, 1994)

ROBINS, PHILIP, The Future of the Gulf: Politics and Oil in the 1990's (London 1990, P.HD Dissertation)

ALLEN, RICHARD, Crescent; Sources and Prospects of the Arab-Israeli Conflict (Westview Press, 1984)

FELDMAN, SHAI, Israel Nuclear Deterrence, A strategy for the 1980's (Columbia University 1982)

FREEDMAN, ROBERT. O, eat, The Middle East after Iraq's Invasion of Kuwait (Florida 1993)

PINDLAY, ALLAN M., The Arab World, (London, 1994)

KUMAR, RAVINDER, India and the Persian Gulf Region (1858 - 1907) (N. Delhi, 1965)

HAMEED, MAZHER A., Saudi Arabia, the West and the Security of the Gulf (,1985)

MARR, PHEBE and WILLIAN LEWIS, eat, Riding the Tiger: Middle East Challenge after the

Cold war (1993)

Bibliography

PERETZ, DON, *The Middle East Today* (Praeger, 1983)

ZAHLAN, ROSEMARIE SAID, *The making of the Modern Gulf States* (London, 1989)

BULLOCH, JOHN and Hariey Morris, *The origins of the Kuwait Conflict and the International Response* (London, 1991)

AL-NAQEEB, KHALOOUN HASAN, *Society and State in the Gulf and Arab Peninsula A different perspective.*

SPIEGEL, STEVEN. L, ed, *Iran and the Middle East: and the Western Alliance.* (Los Angeles, 1982)

CHAN, STEPHEN and Andrew J. Williams ed, *Renegade Stales, The Evolution of Revolutionary Foreign Policy,* 1994

LAMBERT, LEE R. and Erin Lambert, *The Other Kuwait* (Washington, 1992)

CRYSTAL, JILL, *Kuwait: The Transformation of an oil State* (Westview Press, 1992)

DICKSON H.R.P., *Kuwait and Her Neighbours* (London, 1956)

AMIRAHMADI, HOOSHANG & NADER ENTESSAR ed, *Reconstruction and Regional Diplomacy in the Persian Gulf* (London, 1992)

NORTON, Augnstus Richard ed, *Civil Society in the Middle East, Vol. 2,* (London, 1996)

JOURNALS

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Nov/Dec 1995, VAHAN ZANOYAN *After the Oil Boom: The Holiday Ends in the Gulf.*

FOREIGN AFFAIRS , Summer 91, *The New Arabia,* James E. AKINS pp 37

MEED SPECIAL REPORT, TOBY ASH, 23 February, 1996, pp 7 to 17 Kuwait

STRATEGIC ANALYSIS: 16(6), Sept, 93, pp 701-20 Iran in Gulf; Gulshan Dietel

STRATEGIC ANALYSIS: 16(6), Sept 93.

STRATEGIC ANALYSIS: 17(4) July 94, Sajedi Amir ABIDI.

CURRENT HISTORY, DON, DERETZ, *Israel Since the Gulf war*, 91(561), Jan 92, pp 17-21

DIGEST OF MIDDLE EAST STUDY, SHAFIR GHABRA, Vol 2, No.1, Winter 1993

KEESINGS WORLD EVENT RECORDER For the years 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995

MIDDLE EAST CONTEMPORARY SURVEY 1980-81, Vol. 5 ed. COLIN LEGOM (New York)

HOOTS, CHARLES, Kuwait puts off the Inevitable, MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL - 23

June 1995 pp 19-20

RATHMELL, ANDREW, the GCC: Will retrenchment lead to Political Change, MEI, 26 August,

1994 pp 17-18

MEED SPECIAL REPORT, DEFENCE IN THE GULF, 26 April 1991 MEED pp 9-21

COOPER, JOHN, Testing Times for Kuwait democracy, MEED 20 May 1995 pp 2

COOPER, JOHN, Kuwait, Meed Special Report, 2 February, 1995, MEED, pp 9-20

DEKMEJIAN, R. HRAIR, The Rise of Political Islamism in Saudi Arabia, Middle East Journal,

Vol. 48 No. 4, pp 629-643. Autumn 1994

Middle East Review- Fall 1978, The creation of Saudi Arabia and the Erosion of Wabbabi

Conservalisn by George Linabury, pp 5-12

LASKY, HERBERT, Saudi Arabia: A Short History of an Immoderate State, Middle East Review

- Fall 1978 pp 13-17

FARSH, MAHUMUD A. Saudi Arabia and the Gulf Crisis: Foreign and Security Policy Dilemma,

Middle East Review - Summer 1987, pp 47-53

SALIH, KAMAL OSMAN, Kuwait: Political Consequences of Modernization, 1750-1986, Middle

Eastern Studies, Vol. 27, No. 1, January 1991, pp 46-63

EILTS, HERMANN, FREDERICK, The Persian Gulf Crisis: Perspectives and Prospects, Middle

East Journal - Vol. 45, Winter 1991, pp 7-22

GHABRA, SHAFEEQ, Voluntary Associations in Kuwait: The Foundation of a New System,

MIDDLE EAST JOURNAL, Vol. 45, No. 2, Spring 1991, pp 199

KUWAIT, ANNUAL STATISTICAL ABSTRACT, 1988, Ministry of Planning, Edition XXV

STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK, United Nations, Thirty-Seventh issue 1988/89

- 38th issue 1990/91.

- 39th issue 1991/92