

In the military sphere, the situation in the Near and Middle East has changed not only because of the conflict with Iran. A few weeks ago, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and Turkey signed the Mecca Joint Defense Agreement. Under this agreement—similar to NATO—an attack on one ally is considered an attack on all other countries in the pact.

By Mohamed Diwan 

The pact does not name an adversary, but it refers to Iran. The Mecca Pact is therefore not an anti-Israel coalition. It is primarily a safeguard against fears of American unreliability—in other words, an attempt to place the region's own security vis-à-vis Iran on a broader footing, rather than relying solely on Washington.

But the Mecca Pact is still problematic for Israel. Not because of Saudi Arabia, but because of Turkey under President Erdoğan, who has close ties to the terrorist organization Hamas and harbors it within his own country. Added to this is the fact that the third member of the alliance, Pakistan, possesses nuclear weapons and maintains no relations with Israel whatsoever. If Egypt were to join the pact later on, the Jewish state would also find itself directly confronted by the Mecca Pact on the Sinai Peninsula.

The military alliance between Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Pakistan also shows that the Abraham Accords are not the only way for countries in the Near and Middle East to resolve their security issues. And even though the common enemy, Iran, was the primary focus when the Mecca Pact was formed, Israel is in a poor position to apply for membership.

The only option left for Israel, therefore, is to ensure its own indispensability in terms of military technology. After all, whoever provides the best missile defense and reconnaissance will not be sidelined by a military alliance that fails to mention them in the treaty text.

---

Mohamed Diwan is an Arab political analyst. He lives in Switzerland.