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Abstract

The problem of order in the Middle East has always been a challenging issue on the world’s political agenda. The peculiarity of the problem lies in the fact that the Middle East has a complex social and political character. The Middle East has become even a more complex region after the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 and with the advent of Arab Spring. The Middle East with its entire complex character is baffling the outsider’s mind. The Middle Eastern complexity can be identified as a diversity of ethnicities, religions and conflicting ruling styles of the nation-states in the region together with the absence of a representative regional organization. All these factors together have turned establishing order in the region into a difficult task. It has been apparent on many occasions that the problem of order in the Middle East can hardly be resolved by the intervention from outside. The core of the problem seems to be related to incapacity of governance. The problem of establishing order in the Middle East is a problem of governing the ethnic, religious and political complexity. This means developing capable states and organizations representing the region. This task is under the responsibility of the Middle Eastern countries.
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1. Introduction

The Middle East has long been known as a region of instability and disorder. It is an ever-changing region since it has always been a scene of unprecedented turbulences, civil wars and regime changes. As one author states, “The Middle East is a notorious region, known for conflicts and large-scale violence of all types.” For this very reason, it remains as a global concern. The instability and disorder in the Middle East mainly stem from a deficiency in governing a region of complex structure. It was a region of diversity and complexity in the history. It has been a more complex and volatile region especially after the First World War and the demise of the Ottoman Empire in 1922. Accordingly this paper focuses on the modern Middle East and particularly takes the political turbulences and incidents into account. Regional complexity involves, to the thesis of this paper, the diversity of ethnicities and the religions in each individual country, the lack of a representative organization, and conflicting state systems. As Robin Wright put it strikingly, every individual country in the Middle East has its own enemy. The states in the region don’t even share a common definition for the word “enemy”. The word “complexity” can therefore be a key word in grasping the core of the present problem in the Middle East. Every effort has failed to provide a solution to the problem of order in the Middle East due to its complex character. Deficiency in managing the complex structure paves the way for uninterrupted foreign interventions, presence of non-state actors, proxy wars and changing national borders. The US invasion of Iraq in 2003 and the Arab Spring have triggered unprecedented events which led to some important changes in the political map and balance of power in the Middle East. The Arab Spring has turned out to be an Arab Winter since it didn’t put forward the expected outcome and positive transformation. In the face of the present turbulences in the
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2 Florence Gaub, “Middle Eastern multipolarity in movement the instability of structural change”, Orient, IV, 2015, p. 57.


Middle East, it is a more unstable and complex region. The instability and disorder in the Middle East have also negative consequences for the rest of the world. This has been most recently shown by the refugee influx fleeing from the civil war in Syria. As one author argues, it is no more a ‘suburb of global politics’, it is rather now a core concern of the international politics with regard to the vast media coverage it has received.

This article first starts with a brief description of the ever changing nature of the Middle East. It secondly refers to main elements of complexity of the Middle East which makes the governing the region a difficult task both for regional countries and global powers. These elements will explicitly demonstrate that the outside efforts to establish order in the Middle East are destined to fail. Establishing order in the Middle East therefore appears to be a major test for not only regional states but also for global powers. They can only offer partition as a solution as experienced in the case of Syrian civil war. It is worth noting that Bernard Lewis used the term “Lebanonization” as a possible solution or destiny awaiting the Middle East.

The referendum for independence held by the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) in north Iraq in September 25, 2017 proved again that the policies of separation would bring no solution and order to the Middle East. The referendum resulted in a 92% yes vote in favour of independence. Major neighbours, Turkey and Iran, responded with strong reactions to the result of the referendum. Turkey and Iran declared to take some actions against KRG in their immediate neighbourhood. The initial reactions signalled that the Kurdistan Regional Government’s attempt to conduct a referendum for a separate Kurdish state might trigger further crises and wars in the Middle East.

6 Florence Gaub, “Middle Eastern multipolarity….”, op.cit., p. 58.
This article suggests that establishing order in the Middle East necessitates penetrating adequately into the true nature of the region. A possible order which will best suit to the Middle East can be a holistic one and only be designed by regional actors. It is apparent that the task of establishing order and securing stability in the Middle East lies with the Middle East. Regional prosperity is hardly achievable without establishing order in the Middle East for the states in this region. This article finishes with referring to the regional experience of governance developed through the course of history as a fundament to be used as know-how for establishing order in the region.

2. Grasping the Middle Eastern Complexity

In an earlier date of 1959, an American geographer from the Department of State, G. Etzel Pearcy, had drawn attention to the difficulty and even impossibility of making a clear-cut definition of the Middle East even in terms of geographical borders due to its complex nature. It demonstrates a rich diversity of ethnicities and religions together with the fact that region’s states have conflicting ruling styles. The Middle East also demonstrates a volatile character in terms of number of states and or non-state political actors. It is a region of emerging and to some extent vanishing states or actors as experienced in the example of Israel and Iraq. Before 1947 there was no state named Israel in the Middle East. As for Iraq, it is now something more than a unitary nation-state. The complex nature of the region poses a global challenge. Even in the case of any Middle Eastern country, the Middle East is baffling the mind, particularly that of the “outside” mind. It has incapacitated the outsiders’ efforts trying to grasp its ethnic, religious and political complexity. The Middle East appears to be a difficult region where governing has never been an easy task. The complex nature of the Middle East can be illustrated even in the example of only one country. Syria, for instance, poses a striking and challenging example with its entire complexity.
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10 See Henry Kissinger, Dünya Düzeni [The World Order], (Çeviren: Sinem Sultan Gül), Boyner Yayınları, İstanbul, 2016, s. 111-163.
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Table 1: Ethnic and Religious Diversity of Syria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>Percentage in total population</th>
<th>Religious Groups</th>
<th>Percentage in total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>87% (Official; includes Sunni 74% and Alawi, Ismaili, and Shia 13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurd, Armenians and others¹</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>10% (includes Orthodox, Uniate, and Nestorian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Druze</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish (few remaining in Damascus and Aleppo)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Analysts in the West have generally linked the problem of disorder in the Middle East today to the incapacity of governing the regional complexity. Robert Fisk pointed out that the states in the Middle East were fragile because they had been established as being weak by Western powers. This fact can, on the other hand, also lead to unexpected turbulences for the world powers¹³ and conflicts among neighbouring countries in the Middle East. William B. Quandt uses the term “a crisis of governance” to define the root cause of the problems in the Middle East. Quandt accordingly made the following statement:

“[M]any of the problems of the Middle East today are the result of decisions made by leaders who could have acted otherwise. Choices were available, and bad decisions were made time after time. Many of those responsible for disastrous developments are still in power. This suggests that the source of the region’s unhappiness lies, to a very large degree, in the political realm. It does not lie with its culture, with the structure of its society, or with its economic potential, but with its politicians. In short, those who have acquired power often have used it poorly on behalf of their

¹³ Robert Fisk made this point in an interview printed in a monthly history magazine. See Berkan Özyer, “Robert Fisk Tarih’e Konuştu”, Bugünnü Anlamak İçin Tarih, Sayı 2, Temmuz 2014, s. 23.
peoples. If the next century is to be different in fundamental ways from the present one, this core political deficit will have to be overcome.”

Table 2: Diversity of Government Types of the some major Middle Eastern/Muslim Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Political System/Government Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Theocratic Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Federal parliamentary republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Parliamentary democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Parliamentary constitutional monarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Presidential republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Parliamentary republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>In Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Absolute monarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Absolute monarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Presidential republic; highly authoritarian regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Parliamentary democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>In Transition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The unstable and fragile nature of the Middle Eastern states urges them to be dependent on the world powers, particularly on the United States of America or Russia. The situation in the Middle East reveals the role of regional organizations as instruments of regional order. Unfortunately, the Middle East lacks a regional representative organization like the European Union (EU) or NATO as which may act as a peace enforcing or representative actor for the region when needed. This is an outcome of the incapac-
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15 For a review of the absence of a competent Middle Eastern great power, see Ian S. Lustick, “The Absence
ity of the nation-states in establishing a regional organization. Samuel P. Huntington accordingly referred to the lack of a regional authority in the Middle East as a main factor for instability. The Middle East has experienced numerous attempts to shape a regional or supranational alliance for cooperation and stability like 1950 Arab Defence Pact; but unfortunately all of them failed to attain the desired results. The Arab League, as the most comprehensive regional organization of the Middle East, fails to provide a realistic representation of all the countries in the region. It excludes, for instance, two of the most important regional players, namely Iran and Israel, as Richard N. Haass contends. The discourse of Arab Unity, as Haass states, “is a slogan, not a reality”, and Arab nationalism is hardly providing a viable basis for order in the Middle East. Every individual nation state in the Middle East has its own priorities and perceptions of reality and threats which totally seem to conflict with those of the others. With the absence of a mighty regional organization representing the whole region, as seen in the example of NATO and the EU, the Middle East can hardly achieve order and stability.

3. Establishing Order from the Complexity in the Middle East

The Middle East has always been a focus of attention for the world, particularly for great powers due to its rich history, historic monuments and geopolitical location. In the face of today’s complex and unsolved problems, the Middle East has now turned into a global problem. The challenging and complex character of the Middle East might be best summed in Richard N. Haass’s following statement:

“The Middle East will remain a troubled and troubling part of the world for decades to come. It is all enough to make one nostalgic for the old Middle East.”

---


19 See Richard N. Haass, ibid, p. 7.

20 Richard N. Haass, ibid, p. 11.
The West which shaped the previous structure of the Middle East seems rather incapable of developing a solution for the region. This fact has been seen through the bloody events triggered by just after the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. The interference of the great powers into domestic affairs of the Middle East made the situation in the region worse. Many analysts stated that the US politics towards the Middle East remained inefficient. Mark Leonard, for instance, pointed to the inefficiency and inappropriateness of the US policies towards the Middle East. The incapacity of the Western governance of the Middle Eastern affairs shows that it cannot bring stability and prosperity to this region. The analysts in the West have accordingly come to the conclusion that it is not possible to establish order in the Middle East by the interventions from abroad. There is a widespread pessimism in the West of the feasibility of establishing order in the Middle East. Wolfgang Günther Lerch stressed the fact in a newspaper analysis that it is no more possible to establish order in the Middle East through intervention from outside. The West’s pessimism in this regard can be regarded as a confession of the West’s incapacity to establish order in the Middle East. As German expert Jochen Hippler states, the task of establishing order in the Middle East necessitates a direct involvement of this region’s dynamics:

“Neither Russia, nor USA nor the EU can secure the stability from the outside. The source of the violence is the regional actors. It will not be possible to establish peace unless regional actors decide to stop war.”

The complex nature of the Middle East makes this region no more a mere object of governance. It is rather a complex and challenging problem which requires an adequate and competent handling. The Middle East necessitates and deserves a proper approach of understanding which is hardly gained without having a domestic insight into the very nature of this re-
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22 Richard N. Haass, op. cit., p. 2.
24 For Jochen Hippler’s statement see “Ortadoğu’da ‘yeni düzen’ arayışı” [The quest for a new order in the Middle East], Deutsche Welle, October 23, 2015, available at: http://www.dw.com/tr/ortado%C4%9Fuda-yeni-d%C3%BCzen-aray%C4%B1%5F%C4%B1/a-18802448; accessed: June 18, 2016. The statement was translated from Turkish to English by the author of this paper.
This task requires, first, the direct involvement of the regional actors. Against this background, the Middle East faces the prolonged task of establishing order which must encompass the regional complexity. This means in a sense that the lacking order must be established from its complex nature through aligning the countries in the region around a common goal. William B. Quandt summarises the core of this task in following way:

“The biggest challenge facing the Middle East in the years to come is the development of better systems of governance. This means governments that are accountable, in some acceptable manner, to their people. Without some means of accountability, mistakes, which all governments make, cannot readily be corrected; the art of compromise, necessary in any healthy polity, will not flourish; and individual rights will be ignored.”

In this endeavour, the Middle East’s rich history presents many valuable experiences of numerous dynasties, kingdoms and empires. It is a historically a proven fact that almost all empires or rulers in the history which had dominated the Middle East over the course of history in the Middle East maintained order and stability over a long period of times through only a governance style encompassing the regional complexity. The Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire present the most well-known examples of this fact. The long-sustained order during the Ottoman Empire was only possible through skilful management of complexity and multiplicity in the Middle East. The Ottoman Empire lasted for more than 600 years. The long existence of the Ottoman Empire was attached to its governance style. It developed an order of coexistence which had encompassed all the ethnic and religious diversities in the Middle East. The Ottomans made no difference among its ethnic and religious communities. The Ottoman style of governance was shortly named as Pax Ottomana, an Ottoman peace order. The Ottoman Empire has left a legacy of good governance in
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25. This point poses a major challenge for the West in its attempt to grasp the true nature of the Middle East. The West’s attempts towards to this end are in fact in vain. See Edward W. Said, Orientalism, Pantheon Books, New York, 1978.


27. For further details on the Ottoman Empire’s policy towards its ethnic and religious communities, see Kemal H. Karpat, Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History. Selected Articles and Essays, Brill, Leiden, 2002, pp. 712-729.

the Middle East. Its style of governance has been, even today, regarded to some extent as a good model.

It is widely known that almost every state in the Middle East had been ruled over a long period of time by only one political figure till the advent of the Arab Spring. The political figures who ruled and dominated the Middle Eastern countries were called as ‘tyrants’ or ‘autocrats’. The tyrants or autocrats or to paraphrase with the widely used term ‘authorities of one-man’ have been the main cause of the Arab Spring. However, the long period of authorities of one-man involves a hint of governance beyond the pure fact of using the hard-power instruments of state apparatus. It would not be an overestimation that the long-sustained rule of hegemons and even dictators which lasted for about 40 years was not become a mere outcome of a ruling style of iron-fist administration. Even long-ruled one-man hegemonies of the Middle East were conscious of the fact that they had to create an order through distributing power among diverse ethnic, religious and interest groups. The best example of this case was Hafez al-Asad’s administration in Syria. Hafez al-Asad, who ruled Syria for about 30 years from 1970 to his death in 2000, had been also known for his unique skill of administrating a multi-ethnic and multi-religious country. Interestingly Bill Clinton, the 42nd President of the United States, praised al-Asad with reference to his skill of creating and administrating a multi-ethnic society. Clinton was reported as saying that Hafez al-Asad was the only leader who he had ever seen who had managed administrating a multi-ethnic and multi-religious country. This assessment reveals a valuable point which must be taken into account in an endeavour of establishing order in the Middle East. All feasible solutions for establishing order in the Middle East reveal the importance of encompassing the regional complexity. Henry Kissinger strikingly stated in his book, *The World Order*, that one of the major reasons that hampered the process of Arab Spring in Egypt was the doubt of the religious minorities in this country. They were afraid of an unjust attitude towards them under a possible Muslim Brothers’ administration. The European Union (EU) which has long been named as the most successful
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29 For this reference, see Ilan Pappé, *Ortadoğu’yu Anlamak* (Understanding the Middle East), [Original Title in English: The Modern Middle East: A Social and Cultural History], (Çeviren: Gül Atmaca), NTV Yayınları, İstanbul, 2009, s. 19-20.


31 Don Belt, ibid, p. 60.

32 See Henry Kissinger, p. 144.
example of regional integration and order has been developed and come out as a product of the concept of *unitas multiplex*. Edgar Morin, the author of the book named *Penser L’Europe*[^33] (*Thinking Europe*) referred to the success of the European order as a success of the idea of *unitas multiplex*. *Unitas multiplex*[^34] as a concept means a unity of plural or diverse entities. Shaping an order through regional integration in Europe has never been an easy task as it involved the unity or harmony of separate European nations having different languages, political interests and even to some extent religious beliefs and social customs. The real success of the EU has been establishing an order of peace and a united Europe through employing the instrument of regional integration. The EU has inspired other world regions to follow its example to accomplish the regional integration in their own regions.[^35]

4. Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to draw attention to the challenging task of establishing order from the complexity in the Middle East which is a prolonged problem in the region. The main conclusions of the paper can be summarised in the following points:

1. The core of the Middle Eastern problem has always been establishing order and securing stability in a complex region. The Middle East is today one of the most conflict-prone regions. And this in return paved the way for the foreign interventions which again fostered instability in the Middle East.

2. The problem of disorder in the Middle East is a problem of governing the complexity of the Middle East. It is a region of diverse ethnicities, religions and government systems.

3. The Middle East has been today transformed into a more complex and unstable region. The consequences of disorder and instability in the Middle East aren’t limited to the region itself. It is rather a global concern. However the Western powers which shaped the structure of the Middle East in the past seem today incapable of developing a viable solution for the Middle East.


[^34]: Edgar Morin, age, s. 29-30.

[^35]: See more on this point, Muammer Öztürk, *Die regionale Integrationsstrategie der Europäischen Union als Erfüllung systemischer Aufgaben*, unveröffentlichte Dissertation, Universität Wien, Mai 1999.
4. A careful consideration of the past and present features of the Middle East may contribute to the solution of the problem of disorder in the region. It has always become a cradle of many civilisations and practices of governance in the history. The Ottoman Empire, for instance, left behind a legacy of good governance in the Middle East. The Ottoman managed to rule for a long period of time in a complex region through its governance model based on the notion of encompassing the regional diversity.

5. Understanding the modern Middle East requires a careful study of its complex and challenging nature. It can then be possible to develop a feasible model of governance resembling those established in the past in this region.

6. Developing a solution to the problem of disorder in the region is the responsibility of the Middle Eastern countries.

The following quotation from R. Buckminster Fuller may serve as a proper concluding remark for this paper:

“You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.”
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