

# Essay on politics of the middle east

[Business](#), [Management](#)



1. What major streams of Islamism can be identified in the contemporary Middle East? What attributes do they share? How do they differ? How do you think the rise of Islamism in the Middle East will affect the transition to democracy in the region?

In the Middle East, two streams are notable - Political Islamism and Armed Islamism. Aside from the notion that Islam influences these groups to work on their aims, both political and armed Islamism are both concentrated in promoting nationalism and undermining the importance of Middle Eastern leaders' control over their territories rather than allowing foreign influence to settle their domestic affairs. As their names imply, the two streams differ as to how they apply Islamism to their ideals and actions. In political Islamism, Islamists adopt models of political idealism to gain political power by undergoing political strategies, accepting the legitimacy of their country. Some examples of Political Islamism movements are the Jamaat-i Lalami (Pakistan), the Muslim Brothers (Egypt), and the Justice and Development Party (Turkey). Meanwhile, Armed Islamism utilizes arms to ensure their control over their territories. Under the Armed Islamist stream are three sub-categories - armed activities against foreign powers, armed activities against the nearer enemies, and the Al-Qa'ida, which both attacks foreign and nearer enemies. The rise of Islamism in the Middle East presents two different possibilities for democracy in the region. The first possibility pertains to the return of democracy to the Middle Eastern territories as Islamism would welcome change and supporters would become invigorated to remove the leaders, which is the main reason why democracy does not progress in the region. However, the second possibility may lead to more

confrontation from the West as Islamists such as the Al-Qa'ida would utilize both armed and political action to resist the Western aid and may threaten the globe if they continue to force their influence through force .

2. Why has political reform in Iran failed since the advent of the Islamic Revolution? What accounts for the continued existence of the clerical regime?

The political reform in Iran has failed to flourish since the dawn of the Islamic Revolution due to the continuous clerical rule of the shah-influenced government. The government had established various policies to support the deals posed by the shah in lieu of Iran's economic problem by lowering down the price in oil. However, the drop in oil prices had caused additional problems as Iran succumbed to inflation and the conviction of many businessmen investing in the country. The government not only imposed inflation policies, but also imposed wage and salary freezing policies that would help in their additional tax reforms. The public had immediately showed their displeasure with the additional taxes and restrictive policies, especially those from the middle class. Those from the public sector who are depended to government support were also affected by the government's policies as the government also reduced their expenditures. Political reform was also thwarted because the growing opposition against the shah rule is already stressing how weak and limited the political reform the government applies. The shah was restricted by the growing opposition as there is a need to repress the reformists or to move for reform to maintain power. There was also the reduced backing of the American government which reduced the chances of political reform in Iran through the ruling of the shah. Clerical

regime in Iran under the Ayatollah Khomeini administration was sustained due to the consolidation of power between all the clerical leaders. There were attempts to Islamicise all the government's institutions to ensure total control of the administration's Shia rule. Newspapers and companies who did not support the ideology of the government were banned, similarly suppressing other ideologies. The clerical regime also opposed groups wanting to make their own identity .

3. What is the " Oslo-process"? Did it succeed? What are the main obstacles to a lasting Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement?"

The Oslo Process or the Oslo Process pertains to the Israeli-Palestinian political discussions, which began in January 1993, to end the conflict between the two parties. Under the Oslo Accords, the two nation's hopes to reach a Permanent Status Agreement that would ensure that Israel and Palestine would meet a compromise between their settlement conflicts, including the territories that surround both the Israeli and Palestinian borders. The Permanent Status Agreement and the Oslo-outlined Declaration of Principles were also part of the Oslo Accords that would also form several agreements that support the would-be creation of a Palestinian state and diplomacy between Israel and Palestine, which the United Nations has tried to foster since the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflicts. By September 13, 1993, a Declaration of Principles, outlining the entire Oslo Accords, was signed in the White House under the 1978 Camp David Accords.

Despite the good intentions of the Oslo Accords to create a compromise agreement between the two warring groups, the Oslo process eventually failed to progress as both Israel, and the Palestinian Authority disagreed with

several policies that would enable both groups to benefit from the creation of their own territories. Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority found diplomacy to be unsustainable for finding a compromise for the conflict. For the Palestinian Authority, they saw the Oslo Accords as a decolonialization effort that would self-determine Palestine's right on their territories. Israel saw Oslo as a means to transform their military efforts to a direct confrontation of the territories controlled by Palestine. Israel then applied additional force to get the Palestinian territories .

## **Works Cited**

Bisharah, Marwan. Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid: Occupation, Terrorism and the Future. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003. Print.

Fisher, David and Brian Wicker. Just War on Terror?: A Christian and Muslim Response. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2010. Print.

Richards, Michael. Revolution in World History. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.