

## **Policy of USA in Conflict Management: Arab Israeli Conflict (1991-1996) as a Model**

**Mohammad Saleh Bani Issa**

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts & Science  
Middle East University, Post Box 383 Amman 11831  
Amman – Jordan  
E-mail: baniissa@yahoo.com

(Received: 11-2-14 / Accepted: 26-3-14)

### **Abstract**

This study entitled "policy of USA in conflict management: Arab Israeli conflict (1991-1996) as a Model" aimed at studying and analyzing the position and attitude of the US toward the Arab Israeli conflict between 1991- 1996, as well as shows how the US deals in its attitudes with the regional involved and concerned parties with the conflict. The US policy since a long time seeks to contain chronic conflict in the region. It manages the conflict in the region in a manner controlled by which prevent a conflict situation to turn into an armed conflict, by which it couldn't difficult to be control. Despite many of the successive US administrations, but that the US policy toward the conflict in the region adopts a philosophy of protecting Israel without other States of the region. US sees that the continuation of the conflict in the region is must and is in its interest, in order to keep all the conflict parties in the region are in need to the US assist, including Israel. The study contains of: Introduction, historical background, the successive US administrations and the Arab Israeli conflict, perception of the regional countries and their Positions toward the conflict, the position of the opposition parties, obstacles that prevented progress and success of the peace process, the position of the US administration on involved parties, US administration and multilateral talks, prospects and suggestions and the conclusion.

**Keywords:** Arab Israeli conflict, US policy, conflict management, US administrations, west Asian peace process.

### **I. Introduction:**

West Asia region saw the changes and transformations of multiple international added to the policies of the region since the convening of the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991, the Conference has the most qualitative leap in the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict by melting ice fierce conflict for decades of time between Israel and the Arabic countries. So, why the US tried to lessen tensions in the region after the Gulf War 1991. The idea of peace in the region was and still on the list priorities of US President in his foreign policy since more than half a century.

However, the possibility of a real peace between the two parties is impossible, because of the Israeli settlement policy, building settlements in the Palestinian territories, the confiscation of land, as well as which reflected negatively on the domestic situation, which has led to more

violence and extremism between the Palestinian and Israeli sides. As the "Kissinger" diplomatic step by step aimed at finding a breather for the Arab Israeli conflict and building a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region was quickly lost momentum.

There are several reasons which made US administration shows its desire to ease the tension in the region, have devoted their attention and efforts to make the process of peaceful and effective. New international situation after the collapse of the former Soviet Union, regional conditions after the Second Gulf War has made the US administration to push the region into the comparative settlement between Arabs and Israel, which reflected many benefits and interests of the US positively after removing all elements of tension with its roots in the region.

Certainly, there are three risks may become active exacerbated if all regional parties did not reach into real peace in the region. And these three risks are divided between: race in armaments and increase the size of the storage of weapons among the States of the region, using oil weapon against the West and the extremists reached to power in the Arab and regional States. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons as well as long-range missiles, nuclear development and other had become a source of concern and interest to US administration policy in the region. And it is clear that the current time of technological and technical progress that any future war between Arabs and Jews would be deadly and destructive than these wars that have taken place on the contrary years of conflict. Therefore, the desire of US administration lies not only in the sale of arms to the region, but in the follow-up mechanism for serious policy of arms race in the region and control.

The US administration and continues to aspire to a more vital and strategic interests in the region. Therefore, oil and security of Israel, as well as the security of the US allies regional countries, US military presence and selling weapons to regional counties will remain the focus of the US attention for many years to come. Therefore, it is expected that the sale of arms and military assistance, regardless of the quantity and quality of weapons, will be continue to these States.

The truth is that the possibility that the Arabs to weapons of mass destruction could not be ruled out, if they could not access to the United States, it would be able to reach the goals in most countries of Western Europe. Then, this would lessen the ability of the United States on the administrating the region, so that most Arab countries allies to the US will take more solid positions against Israel if the war broke out under any circumstance or pretext, and that the continuous threat against US interests would be doubled, especially with regard to the flow of Arab oil to the United States. Therefore, in any of the peaceful solutions between Arabs and Israel, is to support effective mechanism to achieve security and to ensure the future of the petroleum exporting countries in the region.

Hence, the importance of study in this subject, especially if what we have tried to answer the following question: Why did not the region, the Arab surrounding countries to Israel, never witness blessing and stability while many other regions of the world enjoying such blessings? The study would be more important if we consider the problem of continuity assumption humanitarian nature rather than political. The study, therefore, sought to determine the extent of the importance of finding a solution to the problem; in this context requires analytical study examines various dimensions of the problem. It would be very important to find a logical solution to the problem, and it is certain that the analysis, which has been sought by the study of great relevance to the role played by US in the collection of warring parties to the negotiating table to ease tension in the region, which is in the interest of US first and foremost.

## **II. Methodology:**

In order to access to more accurate picture of the problem of research, the researcher used the historical and descriptive analytical approaches in the preparation of the research. The researcher used the historical approach in order to give coverage of basic dimensions of the problem, while he used the descriptive analytical approach in order to identify the dimensions of the US policy toward all the concerned and involved parties in the Arab Israeli conflict.

## **III: Historical Background:**

The Geneva peace conference 1973 is the first real peace conference to be held between the Arabs and Israel; and the US administration during this conference played the role of mediator for peace in the region. Breakthrough intelligently and thoughtfully, Henry Kissinger, engineer of Geneva Peace Conference, tried to use some political concepts talks with Arabs, such as: the peace process, the momentum, confidence-building and other. Thus, Kissinger manipulation of Arabs' feelings and emotions. While he was talking about the "peace process" he aimed at changing the concept of Arabs for peace and its replacement of the goal of the process of this is intended to change the intention of Arabs to achieve peace commencing in a short time.

Kissinger wanted from the "momentum" that the peace process need to fuel, otherwise it will stop, since the Arabs need peace to regain their rights, could surely pay fuel without hesitation. As for the use of the term "confidence-building" the Kissinger pointed out that the imperative of continuing the momentum, it must be tied to action plans and policies reflected positively on ensuring the security of Israel and its life. Therefore, Israel was to bargain with its Arab neighbors with tangible (land) for the intangible (peace), and here is the step-by-step policy adopted by the US administration since 1973 to achieve peace was smart movement to involve all the concerned parties, gradually until they reach into the critical and sensitive stage of negotiations, it may be beyond difficult to return back or abandoned (Heikal, 1992: 195).

In the past periods, the US felt of sort of fear and threats because of the former Soviet Union support to some of the leftist and nationalist movements in the region, but that those threats and fears have vanished after the collapse of the Soviet Union, but that some threats remained a list of indirectly against America, repeated warnings of Islamic groups, which calls for destroying American interests in the region; now surely - for America more than ever before - that Islamic movements tops power in a number of countries in the region at the present time or in the near future. Therefore, the US hoped that Arabs and Israel reached into positive solutions for a just and lasting peace, which would weaken the position of Islamic movements against Israel, who advocated to remove Israel completely from the region. It was for the US to declare that the region and the world alike that, extremists Islamic and fanatics pose a danger to any progress, security and stability of the region.

The US administration hopes to hold comprehensive peace agreement between Israel and the Arabs would lead the region to a new regional system, and work to find more of bilateral relations on the various levels and dissemination of more concepts of moderation among the States of the region and acceptance in the political and economic realities of the contemporary world and the desire to approach new global system, away from the asylum military political option for debugging economic development. The US victory in the second Gulf War in 1991 has helped to impose that system with transcribing, but US still needs to remove the remaining sources of tension in the region (Heikal, 1992: 198). And that U.S. hugely support for Israel has reflected negatively on the America's relation with Arab states, America could not fully engaged, or to the extent that she wants in the Arab societies, so that some Gulf countries such as Saudi Arabia is no longer willing to keep US military bases on its territories.

To Arab countries, which are still America's allies, want the recent strengthening of influence in the region and to increase its interests and concerns, while the regional countries that were not in America's row at that time, felt were in complete isolation with no other option, but only to accept the American plan, even if it is necessary to give up some of the main principles. The bad Arab situation has enabled US to impose more pressure on Arab states to get more concessions in order to serve its interests and Israel in the region alike.

The Varsity nature of the region with various customs, traditions, ideas, cultures, races, races and religions, made the region to live a life of unstable political and security for many decades, leaving behind issue which has been known as the cause of the age as defined by the modern world, that issue is the Arab-Israeli conflict, which resulted in many problems, including: arms control, refugees, water and poverty. In the light of the disposal of these humanitarian problems, it is necessary to get rid of the conflict first; this could be achieved only if all parties combined efforts in the region to work together for a just, comprehensive and lasting peace to be satisfy for all regional peoples as well as for of all future generations.

#### **IV. The Successive US Administrations and the Arab Israeli Conflict:**

US has played a great role in convening of the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991, between the Arabs and Israel; as former US President George W. Bush I, that America's role will remain firm in supporting the peace process without the direct plan shows the nature of the solution between the parties. However, it has become almost certain that access to an agreement between Israel and the Arabs will be possible only if it supported by US step by step and phase by phase. And the necessity of a third party as a sponsor for peace process is very important, the fact that the negotiating parties will reach into the critical and stuffy stage, then it must be the intervention of a neutral third party to support the negotiators and to encourage them to move forward in taking positive and bold steps or to provide some solutions enable the parties to reach satisfactory agreement to all.

The peace process has worked to make the divergent parties more closely in vision of the future of the region in goals and emotions themselves. The Madrid Peace Conference, both bilateral and multilateral, had helped to build appropriate climate, which led to the Oslo channel and then helped in the creation of a mechanism of international support to achieve peace in the region.

The peace process continues to be a focus of the attention of successive American administrations, especially after the blessed by former US President Bill Clinton in January of 1993, when he declared that America is involved and active Party in the peace process between Israel and the Arabs.

#### **V. Perception of the Regional Countries and their Position toward the Peace Process**

The perception of the involved parties in peace process is differ and develop from party to other in accordance with national interests for each of them; they realized that the Israeli government will gain more than the other parties as a result of making peace with its neighbors, but it has pursued a strict attitude and violent method of peaceful process of use of maneuver and prevarication in the talks.

After the second Gulf War 1991, the Israeli military commander General Danny Rothschild, an observer Palestinian activities in the occupied territories, spelled out that the Intifada will continue as long as the Israeli government used stick policy against Palestinian demonstrators, therefore the Government of Israel should be used carrot policy also, In other words, to support the economic development in the occupied areas. In June 1992, the Labor government

regains the Authority in Israel, led by Yitzhak Rabin, who was believed in the policy of using the stick, but he responded to advice of the Israeli military commander, for the sake of Israel. The nature of the talks and strategy in the Israeli peace process has focused on two balanced objectives: first, strengthening Israeli presence in the region and wider access to international recognition of the State of Israel; and secondly, the emphasis on the importance of the Arab states and dismantle with dissuade its ideas, and disperse necessary activity which enable Israel to monopolize Arab negotiator and weaken his argument.

In order to get the first targets, Israel insisted on the discussion of issues relating to tourism, communications networks, including cooperation in the field of the environment, the economy and other issues with Arab countries. Israel believes that the peace process could bring positive steps gradually to build confidence, and would be used to obtain comprehensive solutions in the final stages of the negotiations. Then Israel become out one of the regional states without a competing claimant, and it will be difficult for Arabs to back from what had been agreed to, even if comprehensive solutions do not realized among the negotiating parties (Mahmoud, 1999: 11).

The second objective of Israel is no less important than the first objective, the lack of unity and division of Arab countries into many feelings, ideas and emotions was, and still is obsessed with Israel since more than six decades; it seize opportunities and exploit whatever its size to find elements of division, estrangement, alienation, suspicion and lack of trust between the parties of the Arab people. It generated in Israel a convinced that a longer Peace Process in negotiations and discussions could be able to ring discord and drive a wedge between the Arab negotiating parties much more. Therefore, the Israeli negotiator came to beware that peace process will take a long time without reaching positive solutions between the parties.

## **VI: The Concerned Parties and their Positions toward the Peace Process:**

### **First: Israeli Position**

It seems clear that the Israeli government did not want to participate in the peace process, but that it had entered into the peace process carefully with a strategic and studied plan in a view to obtaining a lot of pluses, without providing a waiver of any of the objectives of the importance and sensitivity may affect the security of Israel in the future. There are a lot of elements in Israel is doing secretly to destroy the peace process, most of it are from the right-wing, National Religious extremist groups, who believe in the faith to expand the borders of Israel. These groups on the full confidence of the World Jewish position could provide all possible material and moral support to Israel when the need. The capacity of those groups in pressure on the Governments of the major powers in America and Europe, so as to not take any joint action or political decision condemning or affect negatively on Israel in the future. In addition, those groups threaten to cut all ties with America, condemn and denounces all forms of pressure and neglected them, in addition to international resolutions issued against Israel (Heikal, 1992: 195-98).

Israel was keen on the participation of all parties concerned in the Arab Israeli conflict in the Madrid Peace Conference 1991; she would like to provide advice and guidance for that would threaten the Arabs and scare in the absence of their commitment to the political process.

### **Secondly: Syrian Position**

Syria was the most Arab states refused for negotiations with the Israeli side, the Syria's approval to enter into direct negotiations with Israel for several reasons: First: the collapse of

the Soviet Union, the closest ally to Syria; and the cause of the blackout Soviet support of Syria, was on Syria to discuss the positive goals that may enable it to avoid the evil of hostility, or at least to enable it to access the cold peace with Israel. Secondly: Syria economic problems; the Syrian economy suffers from many problems, especially the lack of stock of hard currency, which is one of the pillars supporting Syrian economy. Syria realized that hard currency could not be allowed to come or take place only if natural converged and opened their markets to foreign investments. Convinced to the Syrians have arisen that those economic relations with Western markets could not have been achieved only if Syria and Israel reached to lasting peace that ends the state of tension between them. Thirdly: the continued increasing of U.S. pressure; the participation of Syria and its help the alliance countries in their war against Iraq in 1991 was a hope for Syria to join the American pact, the most powerful State in the world, which seeks to keep control and compression on the region in order to maintain its national interests. Fourthly: the new regional situation following the Second Gulf War; which split the region into two halves, half of opposition, refuses to all forms of domination and hegemony even for peace with Israel, and another half moderate, seeks to achieve friendlier relations with the West and support to enter the battle of peace with Israel.

### **Thirdly: Jordanian Position**

Jordan has been living a realistic non-hostile with Israel for more than 30 years. Jordan has talked about the importance of peace in the region, especially Israeli. Jordan is serious in real and effective participation in the peace process, this is due to the fact that the Jordanian dreams and hopes may the process enable them to break the regional deadlock and the international isolation in which they live as a result of the Second Gulf War 1991; Jordan lost much of its regional and international luster after Jordan's standing side-to-side with Iraqi people during the war, and also lost Gulf, American and European aids. Jordan also had to bear the burden of more than three hundred thousand of Jordanian workers expelled forcibly and returned back home from the Gulf, they were constitute an important source of support to Jordanian national economy.

The blockade which was imposed by the United Nations on Iraq, on the background of the war, has been affected largely Jordan economic, because of not allowing to transport goods from the Gulf of Aqaba to Iraq, which was one of the major pillars in commercial projects for Jordan since the first Gulf War in 1980. Jordan hopes to lead the entire peace process to a more secure and stable in the region; Jordan believes that, if there is no just, logical and comprehensive solution for the Palestinian issue, the Palestinian people who surrounding Israel will seek further escalation of violence in the Palestinian and Israeli territories.

Jordan also affected by economic impact because of Israeli- Palestinian agreement, which caused significant decline of hard currency (US dollar) to the Central Bank of Jordan; where the stock of foreign exchange has dropped from (600) million to (200) million dollars within weeks of the signing of the agreement (Ha'aretz, 1994: 8). And the Jordanian dinar has been affected also after the Oslo Agreement 1993, when the Israeli currency (shekel) was become a circulation currency much wider in the Palestinian areas caused competition with the Jordanian dinar which has been used there since a long time. Where the Palestinians inside, fear of the future, which prompted them to replace the Jordanian dinar with the US dollar. It was for Jordan to realize that the need is urgent and necessary to re-open its economy, who is besieged on the background of second Gulf War 1991 (Ha'aretz, 1994: 8).

It is, therefore, that the Jordan direct goal behind the signing of the peace agreement with Israel was to rebuild and activating Jordanian national economy; Jordan considers Israel as broad market products of high quality and medium prices, which will provide many opportunities for work to solve part of poverty and unemployment. The peace agreement was

signed between Jordan and Israel has positive economic touches; in June 1994, the Paris Club rescheduling its debt on Jordan, which was estimated at about (1, 5) billion US dollars; America also write-off of Jordanian debts estimated at (770) million US dollars of the total debt owed on Jordan. In a related context, Israel withdrew its opposition to the sale of Jordan Military Aircraft F-16 fighter (Israel / Jordan Economic Incentives, 1994: 10-12).

Since the signing of the Israeli Jordanian peace agreement on 26 October 1994, Jordan seeks to expand and develop economic horizon and commercial interests of large foreign investment in order to serve as the weight of the parallel to those opposed the idea of making peace with Israel and also be able to develop its feet confidently on the threshold of peace supporters audience. While Jordan entered the battle for peace with governmental and parliamentary support, but the hopes and optimism for peace has decreased considerably, because the desired economic improvement of peace has not achieved the required form, where economic improvement goes very slowly.

Besides the calm, security and stability in the region with a just political settlement of the Palestine issue, Jordan has also other interests, wishes to be settled and achieved, such as, the Jordanian occupied land, Jordanian looted Water and Palestinian refugees. In addition, the Jordan core strategy of peace process, is to appear moderate for the international community and in good reputation, Jordan also hopes to provide a practical and notify more widespread voice, which enable Jordan to win the West sympathy and support, especially in matters of internal and external political and economic reforms and other; consequently, the West and America put pressure on Israel in order to respect the Arab neighbors and comply with international legitimacy (Heikal, 1992: 195-98).

#### **Fourthly: Palestinian Position (Palestinian Liberation Organization)**

The Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) hopes that the peace process will achieve the implementation of Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and other relevant international resolutions, to restore its legitimate rights to the occupied Palestinian territory. The Palestinian Liberation Organization, in its continuity since a long time ago depends on handouts and gifts, which has been and continues to be provided to it in the form of services from institutions of international non-governmental organizations such as UNRWA. But the material assistance was received it in the form of direct support from the Arab Gulf countries. During the Gulf crisis of 1991, the late Palestinian President Yasser Arafat, saw that the late Iraqi president, Saddam Hussein, may be the only regional commander capable of stopping Israeli and American intervention in the region. However, Arafat had made a mistake in his calculations when ignore the value and volume of the Arab Gulf countries, especially his relations with Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, and the consequences after standing beside Saddam Hussein. as a result of his position, Arafat has faced not only political punishment, but punishment took also financial character, he didn't estimated what will happened to the Gulf countries after the crisis of inability in economic losses, which it did not have to follow only the policy of austerity and consideration of its expenses (Mordechai, 1993: 98-99). Therefore, Gulf support to Yasser Arafat has decreased, even lacking altogether, and then was for Yasser Arafat to choose one of the two; either to hold an agreement with Israel to find new sources of support and financing, or leave the PLO in its way to bankruptcy and fall (The Economist, 1995). The Palestinian Liberation Organization has taken another political character, its belief that armed struggle may take longer in the Liberation of Palestine, while the diplomatic track had to achieve some of their rights, the most important of which put the Palestinian issue on the agenda of international attention.

### **Fifthly: The Position of the Opposition Parties**

The peace process has been met with international and regional support and welcoming repercussions; however, there are many Arab political voices stood against the idea of peace with Israel. Some of them, believe that the Arabs are living very difficult situation, does not help them to achieve their goals, and they look at the process as an adventure, a gamble blind, which only that gives Israel much more international legitimacy and regional recognition on the land of Palestine, and some of them believed that the peace process would destroy justice of the Palestinian cause, which may give the Palestinians some of the rights (autonomous authority) under the administration and control of the Israeli government, and that some people believe that the peace process may lead to some conventions that would put pressure on the Arab countries to open their markets, industries and investments to Israeli products; which will benefit Israel and strengthen it regionally and reduce its dependence on foreign aid, in return, would affect the Arabs and delay their efforts in the development of their countries (Heikal, 1992: 195-98).

As the anti- parties to the peace process, do not trust sudden seriousness of the US administration toward the peace process in the region; they reasoned that the desire of the US in the peace process in that time is to impose the policy of new American world on the region and its peoples, and keep its continuation in supporting Israel's settlement policy and pressure on the Palestinian Arab people in order to deport them from the Israeli areas. Also the US emphasizes that, the Arab unity represented a unified Arab stance, which is capable to achieve Arabs political and economic goals in the region (Cohen, 1983: 35).

### **VII. Obstacles that Prevented Progress and Success of the Peace Process:**

The peace process in its various stages faced a package of obstacles, which prevented the ongoing solution to the conflict between the Arabs and Israel; including:

- American domestic situation of crumbling economic conditions; the American people called the successive governments not to get involved in policies that do not serve America, so it should work on the employment potential and abilities to solve issues and crises inside US, as a result of that, was the coup d'état against George Bush, the father, in 1992 after the winning of the Democratic Party, which led by former US President Bill Clinton in the US presidential election (Middle East Journal, 1991,).
- US serious role in patronage the peace process and the lack availability of real guarantees to push the involved parties in continuing with the US track in all circumstances and conditions. Israel has refused to provide real negotiated before 1992 elections, as it expected to get much more stringent government than the government of Yitzhak Shamir at that time, enabling Israel to pay more pressure on the Israeli negotiator to achieve all the goals of the State of Israel without substantial concessions to the other negotiator side, and thus will lead the negotiating to a block way, in which reflect negatively on the peace process, either by destroying it totally or be progressing slowly and boring.
- After the Arab sides have provided more substantial concessions, they have found it difficult to follow the American policy in the region, which certainly is interested in the affairs of the interest of Israel more than the other States of the region. Notably, the America's economic interest and its political future is with Arabs, but America resorts into internal security makes it sticks to Israel, vowing to stand to Israel in all related issues. Regardless of the current situation of Arab countries, but the Arabs are

sovereign entities, and possess several natural sources and many important strategic sites with large educated peoples, which may enable them to impose their wills and opinions, and achieve their goals and retrieval of their rights if they want.

- differences between the leaders of the Arab countries and their promises to their peoples of the importance of the peace process, Arabs have expected to achieve all the rights as a result of the peace process, but those hopes and aspirations had scattered after substantial concessions in many of the key issues, for example, Palestinians expected that negotiations will lead to the establishment of a Palestinian state on the basis continuing promises of their leaders. If the peace process continue on this way without progress with continuing of the U.S. pressure on the Arabs, inevitably it helps growth of new wave of pessimism, it may have negative effect on the Arab's minds whom already disappointed, and there will be a fertile environment chance, grow in which the opposition to the peaceful process, which is embarrassing Arab leaders to continue negotiating process with Israel.

In spite of continuing US influence in the region, however, that America is not able to dictate non-realistic solutions are not compatible with the demands of the rights of any of the sides to the conflict, but that the Arab parties would like the U.S Administrations to pressure Israel in order to get the real and substantial opportunities, that may lead into realistic and tangible agreements. So, the U.S Administrations have variety positions and interests with all the involved sides to peace with Israel (Heikal, 1992: 195-98).

### **Firstly: The Position of the US Administration on the Syrian Party**

America has pledged to put pressure on Israel to withdraw to the borders of the fourth of June with nominal recognition to Syrian authority on the Golan Heights, and it also pledged to make the Golan region devoid of military capacity and must remain under civilian management of an international nature under supervision of international peace-keeping forces, the majority of it from the American soldiers, in order to protect and ensure the Israeli security and prevent any attempt of the eruption of chaos and instability in the region in the future. Syria, however, rejected the US proposal which is that does not give full sovereignty over its territory in the occupied Golan Heights since June War 1967. As a result of Syrian bad economic situation, US managed to involve Syrian government in direct talks with Israel through temptations West trade and investment. While Israel won't withdraw from the Golan Heights, unless the security element realized, which protects its future, and If Syria and Israel have reached into a genuine settlement, Syria must accept in the demilitarized zone (DMZ) under the auspices of the international peace-keeping forces.

### **Secondly: The Position of the US Administration on the Lebanese Party**

America promised to force Israel to leave the territory, which claims to be a security zone in southern Lebanon; and forcing Hezbollah and other armed factions to leave south Lebanon. It also pledged to withdraw Syrian forces from southern Lebanon with remaining some Syrian forces in order to preserve the Lebanese security inside and prevent armed factions from attacking Israel, with maintaining the international peace-keeping forces in south Lebanon to end all attacks against Israel, in return, Israel should give guarantees and undertakings of the Government of Lebanon to stop air attacks and other attacks against south Lebanon.

### **Thirdly: The Position of the US Administration on the Palestinian Party:**

**a. Us and the Self-Governance Project:** America agreed to draft a provisional self-government for the Palestinians inside the occupied Palestinian territories since 1967. The project gave rights for Palestinian people more than they are, especially in conducting elections, and Israel must withdraw its military forces from the densely populated Palestinian areas. By this Israel may be able to get its border security, in addition to its military security bases on near Palestinian self-rule areas. The US do pressure on Israel to stop its settlement policy and dismantle the existing settlements within the areas of the Palestinian self-rule, the settlers have to choose either to remain within the limits of self-rule and to ensure the necessary protection to them or to leave to the inside of Israel.

Jerusalem is one of the most difficult issues; as US wants to internationalize the holy City which is rejected by the Palestinian and Israeli sides alike; US also wants to find a unified authority of the Israeli and Palestinian sides to manage Holy City and make it the capital of the two parties, and wants to re-divide the City into two sectors, eastern under the control of the Palestinians and western under the control of the Israelis. As a result of the opposition pressure, the issue of Jerusalem has been postponed to the final stage negotiations (Heikal, 1992: 195-98).

**b. US and the Final Solution Project:** US would not in any way prefer in the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. On the other hand, it is difficult to find a Palestinian leadership to accept any plan, whether American or others, don't support granting the Palestinians role in effective management to their internal and external affairs by themselves, as well as enjoyment of all political, economic and social rights and other. Since Israel is reluctant to dissolve would, giving an independent foreign policy for the Palestinians, and so it would be impossible to reach a final agreement between the two parties.

In addition, that the final solution may be hampered by the thorny issue of the border which stood between the two parties since a long time ago; It is conceivable that Israel withdraw from Arab areas crowded with Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip lands, Israel, however, in return, annex the areas inhabited by Jews in the city of Jerusalem and Hebron, in addition to annex most of the mountains and summits, parallel to the Jordan Valley. Israel believes that the Palestinian party accept to hand over those strategic areas in order to minimize future Palestinian state, especially after Palestinians offered to many concessions, including tacit recognition of Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories which have carved out of Palestine in 1948 (Quandt,1994: 209-210).

### **Fourthly: The Position of the US Administration on the Jordanian Party**

The priorities of Jordan in its talks with Israel are to preserve and deepened the unity of Jordanian national identity. Jordan has worked at full capacity in order to protect its political and geographical presence in the region and coherence its national fabric and to protect its internationally and regionally role, especially after its complete deadlock role on the background of the second Gulf War 1991. Jordan has worked on re-demarcation of its borders with the Israeli side and installs them which were threatened after June 1967 war. Jordan sought to obtain its full water rights of both Jordan and Yarmuk rivers, which are estimated at about (783) million cubic meters; which contributed in solving the water problem in order to secure its citizens with sufficient water for drinking, agriculture, industry and other purposes, of course, would reflected positively on the Jordanian national economy (Quandt,1994: 210).

As a result of foreign cut aid on Jordan and increasing of foreign debt was evident decline in the Jordanian economy after the Second Gulf War 1991; taking negative character of the pattern of social and political life of Jordan.

Therefore, the attention of the Jordanian negotiator has been focused on claim America, the European Union and Japan to provide economic assistance to Jordan and reduction of foreign debt, as well as to ask America do presser on the Arab Gulf States to re-give economic and financial aid to Jordan, which stopped on the background of the second Gulf War. Accordingly, America has worked hard to ease economic blockade imposed on Jordan as a result of that war, by lifting the siege on Port of Aqaba and exempting Jordan of some of the debts owed by America. The European countries follow America in this matter, as well as the Gulf States restore their relations with Jordan.

This has led to a new life to Jordan by re-steering wheel of the Jordanian economy newly, also developing and revitalization it with the flow of funds in the local markets, which revitalization of the Jordan investment market.

On the other hand, both America and Israel ensured to make Jordan as a model and an example to be effective on the rest countries of the region, in order to settle relations and open their doors with Israel.

### **VIII. US Administration and Multilateral Talks:**

US was able through multilateral talks, to obtain the guarantees that would prevent any retreat from the agreed plans after that take the first steps toward peace process. America's desire lies here in removing an element of uncertainty between the parties to the conflict in the region. Security is considered one of the most important guarantees, which was keen to America, where Israel has asked for it in order to support the special security to block any state, group or person to threatening it in the future.

In order to provide protection for Israel, America had to take the following measures: First: The persistent policy of arms control in the region; to prevent its countries, especially Arab, that possesses weapons of mass destruction or even effective conventional weapons at all. Secondly: to ensure the protection of Israel officially, as America pledged absolute responsibility for the security of Israel at present and in the future, considering that any attack on Israel is real and direct attack on America. Thirdly: Keep U.S. forces planted in the region; that America has followed a policy of containment by sending a signal reassure all regional states that increasing US forces in the region was not only to protect Israel, but came for the sake of peace and protection it from any external threat. And U.S. hopes to double of its forces wages in the region and to be paid directly from the oily states (Lowi, 1995: 212-217).

Arab Israeli conflict has created large arms market; no one can ignore it in the region. It was to the peace process, international changes and the emergence of America as sole superpower in the world, a big impact in stopping the sale of weapons to the region. America has threatened to impose economic blockade as well as political pressure against any regional state that does not comply with the conditions for the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. America also hopes the Arabs to reduce from their supply of weapons and resolve to use the peace process as a means of achieving that objective by international support (Heikal, 1992: 195-98).

US and Israel have worked to achieve the so-called real peace and ending the state of hostility based since a long time in the region. In the Madrid Peace Conference 1991, George W. Bush, the father, confirmed that the real peace in the region need for treaties, security,

diplomatic relations, economic relations, exchange of trade, investment, exchange of cultural and tourist (Kemp, 1991: 15).

So that peace with Israel is not only open Arab markets in front of the Israeli investment and make free trade with Israel, but will ask the regional countries also to consulate Israel in drawing up plans for joint economic for the region. US want to harness its national and Israeli companies to contribute in building a solid foundation which can enable Israel to link with various Arab states. Therefore, Israel linked the West Bank and Gaza Strip with communications, electricity, water, and wish that the peace process could able to link it with the rest of the neighboring Arab countries (Heikal, 1992: 601-603).

US has worked to encourage the Gulf countries for the redistribution of some of their wealth to the rest of the Arab world in order to reduce the occurrence of economic problems, which are the main causes of political instability in the region. So the economic progresses have a positive impact in enabling US to attract the opposition into its side and in reduction of seriousness in the region.

The success of the peace process is one of the most important priorities to US, while its failure will increase the Palestinians conviction in armed struggle as the only way to ensure the retrieval of their looted lands and rights. In order to put their case on the list of priorities of international attention, the Palestinians would follow the policy of violence and resistance against Israelis and against US interests in the region, which negatively reflected on the Arab States, and weaken the links and trust between leaders of those countries and their peoples, then will lead to instability and impeding the economy and development of Arabs (al-Jaafari, 1979: 73-78).

The nature of the Arab Israeli conflict is complex one, which is require a long-range comprehensive solution, and that any political solution to the conflict needs a radical change, especially with respect to political freedom; as the new regional order parades to peace in the region basis on openness, urbanization, social and political progress, especially on the political discourse and intellectual. Those freedoms, will face fighting and preventing even of expressing their opinion, any statement regarding calling for Arab unity, or to stop US crawl in the region, or call for dismantling and destruction of Israel, such statements will be considered as extreme positions, and those groups who calling for such slogans are terrorist groups, and are aiming to create strife and instability in the region, but the truth is to justify a policy of oppression and domination on the region (Middle East Journal, 1991).

Therefore, any peace treaty between Israel and Arabs will not only affect the policies of Arab states, but also affect the Arab economy, because peace, which Israel is calling for in the region, makes competition of the weak Arab economy with strong Israeli economy inevitably and unrealistic. In addition, any solution to the Arab Israeli conflict will enable US acting freely with the Arab economy, and thus impede the positive development of the economy in the region, and prevents the rise of Arabs in manufacturing internationally competitive goods. And the linking of the Arab economy with the US and Israeli economy will weaken the political potential of Arab States inevitably, because of the adoption of the Arabs on foreign sources more than ever before. And the peace in Israeli means inevitably will impose on the regional states to do educational changes on their educational texts in order to lining with US and Israeli symbolic for the restructuring the region with the peace process. Therefore, any ideological trend anti-Israeli presence in the region would fight, in particular religious trend (Middle East Journal, 1991).

The question may rise now: how can the US administration and Israel to prevent the Palestinians to achieve their aspirations? The US administration and the Israeli government worked to choose moderate Palestinian leaders, and thus support and provide them with financial assistance in order to be able to improve the living conditions of the people around

them. As well as to impart a degree of legitimacy and credibility to them, as a prelude to begin to work on stopping the Intifada, and the declaration of an independent elections in Palestine. And who wish to candidacy must be of those whom believe in peace, stop the Intifada and accept coexistence with Israel. While the opponents to all that abstain and consider as a source of concern and a threat to self-Palestinian Authority and must be repressed (Middle East Journal, 1991). However, the responsibility of preventing the Palestinians from attacking Israel lies on the Palestinian Authority, and thus weaken their legitimacy and to demand their rights to their lands. At the same time enabled Israel to liquidate the Palestinians under the pretext of the right of self-defense (The Washington Post, 1991).

## **IX: Prospects and Suggestions**

The Palestinians have the most to lose from the current peace process. While the Arab states may make peace with Israel, it is unlikely that the Palestinians will be given anything substantial. The Palestinians' cause is thus likely to be largely forgotten in the Arab world while the Palestinians will simultaneously lose the international legitimacy connected to their struggle for freedom and independence.

The West Asia Peace Process needs to reckon with two imponderables: One, the viability of a truly independent and sovereign Palestinian State and two, the fact of a nuclearized Israel in the midst of a non-nuclear region. An independent Palestinian state is very difficult to be established and if it is established according to the Oslo accord, it will not meant the designation of a full-fledged state, but rather that of a mini-state. In reality, the original Palestine and the present-day Israel are one and the same geographical entity with identical borders. To the east is Jordan, to the north is Syria and Lebanon, to the South is Egypt, and to the West the Mediterranean Sea. The Palestinian population has comprised both Jews and Arabs over millennia, and the Land belongs to both. Neither side can claim exclusive rights to it. Both could very well co-exist under a confederation with the same boundaries. If a Palestinian-Jordanian confederation is acceptable to Israel, a Palestinian-Israeli confederation should be equally possible and acceptable.

Even assuming that a Palestinian state is eventually established on the West Bank and Gaza, which would of course be a significant step forward in the peace process; one can question whether such a step would lead to a lasting peace. Such a mini-state would be truncated one inasmuch as the West Bank and the Gaza strip would not be contiguous and would require a corridor to connect the two. Such a corridor would always be respectable to interception and would require international guarantees which, even if forthcoming, would not be easy to enforce in situ. Rather than establishing a truncated mini-state with all the attendant ramifications, it would be better to think boldly and unconventionally along the lines of merger of Palestinian and Israeli areas into one nation-state as both Palestinians and Israelis have the right to stay in this part of the world. But whether through total merger or through confederation of clearly demarcated areas, a single state would be better formula for a Long-term solution.

However the question arises here as to what the name of the new state should be, given that the Palestinians would like to retain the name of Palestine and the Israelis of Israel. A real sacrifice is called for from both sides for the sake of peace. They should agree to change the name of the area, choosing a suitable name which reflects the fact that this land is sacred to three great religions of mankind. Such a name could be, for example, The United Holy Lands, with Jerusalem as its capital.

Both sides should work together for reconstructing and developing their new state. The citizens should be able to move about freely and have the right to live anywhere without

discrimination. The most important requisite for this is a radical change of old mind-sets, replacing suspicion with trust. Such a state will be a genuine symbol of new hope and of a lasting peace and will surely be recognized by all peace-loving peoples.

No doubt, no one will come out as a mere winner or a mere loser, Rather, both sides will win the prize of a genuine, just and comprehensive peace, while losing only old antagonisms. As a corollary, there will no longer be any justification for radical anti-Zionist rhetoric in the Islamic world in general or the Arab world in particular.

However, one major question that needs to be addressed is that of Israel's acknowledged nuclear status. Crypto nuclear weapons are a serious obstacle to a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region. Israel must give up its nuclear weapons and sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT), as the surrounding Arab states did. Israel is not the only state seeking security for its citizens and stability in the region. Other states have similar concerns. Jews and Arabs are no different where human dignity and human rights are concerned. Some are not more equal than others. Thus, security, dignity and an assured livelihood are vital requirements of all peoples in the region. Any political arrangement must take care of all these aspects. Thus, there can be no justification for Israel maintaining a nuclear arsenal on the plea that its security must be guaranteed. It must be borne in mind that the Arab states, at least some of them, are also capable of acquiring nuclear weapons but this would be viewed as proliferation.

All parties should work together to get rid of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Such weapons do not discriminate among ethnic groups and are a threat to peace everywhere. Peace cannot be secured by piling up weapons but by rendering them irrelevant. Likewise, peace must not be sought after only for the sake of security but for its own sake. If land conquered by force of arms can be returned in exchange for a durable peace, it is worthwhile trade-off. Hence, the relevance of the land-for-peace formula envisaged by U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338.

Israel should realize that its nuclear program can only spell disaster for itself and for West Asia. It should not forget that it is an integral part of this region which it claims to have inhabited for thousands of years. If however, it functions as an outpost of Europe or America, it will find living with its Arab neighbors a difficult proportion. This will only go to prove that the Israelis are not original inhabitants but immigrants who have inducted an alien culture that does not blend with local customs, traditions and aspirations. Thus, for a lasting peace, a different mind-set is called for an old stereotypes need to be discarded.

Arabs and Israelis should henceforth work together to reconstruct the region that has suffered from many wars that have enfeebled it and left it divided and exploited both by regional and outside powers. The peace process between Israel and the Palestinians and other Arab states necessarily must continue if there is to be a comprehensive peace agreement. There may be setbacks and crises, shootings and bombings, but there is simply no alternative to a historic compromise between Jews and Arabs. The Israelis are in Israel to stay, the Palestinians are in Palestine and they won't go away either. The alternative to peace is neither "Greater Israel" nor "Greater Palestine", but fanaticism and death. Surely both Israelis and Palestinians will choose life.

Finally, as we know, Arabs and Jews are ethnic cousins, and whatever their differences, they may be trusted to sort them out over time. A mediator may not after all be needed, particularly if the mediator takes a stand that is at best ambivalent and at worst biased. Such mediation can only complicate matters and prolong the deadlock. The ethnic cousins are capable of setting their differences amicably and of achieving a lasting solution and they should be left free to do so.

## **X. Conclusion:**

Several years have passed since the Madrid Conference 1991 and the commencement of the bilateral peace process in the region. During these years, the region has undergone important changes. At the heart of the Arab Israeli conflict, Israel and the Palestinians have gone beyond a point of no return moving toward reconciliation, negotiation and compromise between the government of Israel and the PLO.

In light of these impressive developments, it can be said that the inhabitants of the region are partners in a collective historic experiment, a passage from enmity to peace and cooperation. As threatening perceptions of six or more decades abates, the peoples of the region are gradually becoming accustomed to the inclusion of Israel as a permanent member of the regional community. Since the Gulf conflict, and in the new world order that has arisen, most of the regional nations and their leaders have come to understand that national security interests are best promoted by a shift away from exclusive dependence on militaristic force. This enlightened comprehension is the foundation of a new regional vision. Peace is just ahead of it on the horizon. The regional peoples can make it materialize into a concrete reality, one step at a time.

In contrast to the emergence of normalization in the Arab Israeli relationship, expressed in important policy statements on the bilateral and multilateral fronts and in international organizations, there looms the threat of violence and terror supported by religious fanaticism and by political radicalism. The peoples of the region must unite to act against this threat. The success of the peace process depends on two factors. Firstly, the sides should conduct the process at a pace which will assure its immediate visibility in the field.

The nations of the region must be able to perceive the dwindling of the animosity and distrust and the establishment of a new climate of relations to prime and reinforce the collective hope for peace. The dialogue must move forward, the sides must reach constructive compromise and new policy perceptions must be set in place. This is the task of the bilateral track. Secondly, the sides should go on cooperating, with the goal of establishing a basis for a shared existence. They need to work together to find solutions to regional challenges. Such as refugees, water, economic growth, disarmament and environmental issues. It is very important that the states in the region have come to a point that peace is a strategic goal; peace serves the interests of all the nationalities of the region. Everyone in the region must fight for peace.

The peoples of the region have to live a life of freedom, a freedom from obstacles, and from the threat of violence and terror. Shared development will bring about a revolutionary growth in tourism in the region, growth in mutual trade among the regional states and the expansion of trade with the rest of the world. Cooperation can lead to purposive action in preserving the quality of their natural environment, a benefit to the region and to all of the surrounding regions. Economic development will bring prosperity to the people of the region, ushering in a period of stability and halting the otherwise almost perennial drift towards crisis and conflict. Prosperity counter balance the threats against societies and governments of the states. It will help the underwrite and foster human and civic rights, build confidence in economic and political processes and encourage the trend towards disarmament and maintaining a realistic military balance in the region. All sides must leave the region free from nuclear weapons and remove the threat of weapons of mass destruction. All sides must believe in good relations and in strengthening their ties with the world around them.

The spirit of regional cooperation permits a frank assessment of reality. The economies of the region differ from each other, some are wealthy in fuel resources, and other lacks such resources. Some are based on industries, others on agriculture. These differences add to the

difficulty of developing mutual trade, and the several economies might develop in undesirable directions, widening the gaps instead of bringing the sides together.

The centrality of regional economic cooperation to the design of the new region is clear. The establishment of a new climate to encourage private investment would spur the growth of the regional economy. The states in the region must work together to expand commercial exchanges among them. The removal of the artificial barriers and lifting of the boycotts will allow the development of tourism, direct communications and the commencement of an ongoing commercial and economic dialogue.

Thus, a lasting peace in the region will flourish in response to two parallel and essential efforts: on the one hand, removal of the atmosphere of hostility and political and military enmity; on the other, opening up and integration of markets so as to promote the maximum regional economic development. Resources that were diverted to support militaries and purchase of arms were thus far not available for the development of national and regional economic infrastructure on all sides of the divide. And all parties to the conflict have paid the price for it.

The problem of refugees is one of the most difficult challenges arising from the regional conflict. It is perhaps more humanitarian than political in nature. There are many Palestinian refugees who fled from their homes because of the Arab Israeli conflict and are living in camps in surrounding Arab states. But many of them have migrated to other parts of the world and are no longer refugees.

Many of the Palestinian refugees have been deprived of basic human rights. The question of their return to their hearths and homes is a legitimate issue and is supported by most states and international organizations. The PLO, after signing the Oslo accords with Israel, announced that there are more than two million Palestinian refugees living in exile and that they have the right to return home according to the accords. According to Israel, Palestinian refugees number not two million, but at most some eight hundred thousand, and most of them fled after the 1967 war. Those who fled before 1967 are not refugees from the point of view of Israel and do not have the right of return. Moreover, Israel is not willing to take back automatically all the 800 thousand Palestinian refugees and will discuss their return in the final status talks. Even if Israel agrees to receive eight hundred thousand refugees, what about the remaining one million two hundred thousand?

The parties should agree on an equitable formula for the refugees either by allowing them to return to their homes and lands or by compensating them as also the countries which hosted them over several decades. Jordan, for example, is host to more than a million of Palestinian refugees presently living in camps. It incurs an expenditure of more than \$ 300 million per year on them. Thus, Jordan should be adequately compensated to enable it to rehabilitate the refugees in new permanent homes within Jordan itself if the refugees choose to stay on.

One may ask why Israel is not willing to solve the refugee problem by dismantling the Israeli settlements which it has planted on Palestinian territory. The dismantling of the settlements should be a trade-off for the one million two hundred thousand Palestinians whom Israel refused to recognize as refugees. Besides offering just compensation, Israel should dismantle the settlements built on Palestinian lands. The settlements are a serious obstacle to peace, as they are like a time bomb that might explode any moment, shattering the prospect of a durable peace.

Arabs and Israelis should search for a substantive peace in the region. Since 1948 most of the regional states were technically at war with Israel and refused to recognize it as a legitimate state in the region. The peace process has come to change the outlook of some regional states

against the Jewish state. They agree that peace in the region is a strategic option. However, the peace process has divided the regional states into four groups, each with its own orientation towards the State of Israel. The first group is a 'done deals' group. Such states are Egypt, Jordan and a non-Arab state, Turkey, all of which have already made peace with Israel and have opted to give Israel the benefit of the doubt, though they are disconcerted by the policies followed by the Netanyahu government with its uncompromising ideology. Netanyahu's policies could destroy Israel's pact with the PLO. The second group is a wavering group, comprising countries on the periphery of the Arab-Israeli conflict that have begun to trade or establish low-level diplomatic ties with Israel. Netanyahu's election has made them more cautious. These countries are Oman, Qatar, Tunisia, Mauritania and Morocco. The third group includes states that would follow Syria's lead if it signed a peace treaty with Israel, depending on whether the latter returns the Golan Heights to the former or not. These countries are Algeria, Yemen, UAE, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. The fourth group is the 'never' group, comprising these states relentlessly opposed to Israel, which is one reason why the US wants them isolated. These countries are Libya, Sudan, Iraq and the non-Arab Iran.

It follows from the foregoing that the Arab Israeli conflict, especially with regard to the question of Palestine, is a complex and difficult to resolve, only if all the parties have joined together in order to build peace accepted by all the peoples of the region, the peace process cannot be achieved positive targets only if it meets with the favor both the Palestinians and Israelis hopes alike, in which the Palestinian factor wants to legitimate rights of life in the establishment of an independent Palestinian state with dignity and freedom, while Israeli factor wants security and stability.

With regard to the normalization between Arabs and Israel after the launching of the peace process 1991, the Arab and Israeli sides did not succeed of direct threat from the extremist and intolerant religious or political groups by carrying out acts of violence against peace and assassinate its makers.

The peace process need two goals to achieve success, namely: First: putting the peace process on the right track and make it a real and measurable and not utopian, a material peace and not moral one, a peace of peoples not a peace of governments, and to work together as a team to change the meanings of violence, aggression and lack of confidence and replacing it with the concepts that contribute for peace-making and realizing it. Secondly: the parties must work together for life and survival, and find solutions to the challenges that facing the region also, such challenges as the problem of refugees, the problem of water, the problem of volatile economic growth, the problem of armaments and the problem of environment.

All the parties must also adopt an approach consider that the peace in the region is a strategic option in order to serve the peoples of the region, and work hard together to achieve the desired peace, in order to enjoy the peaceful lives free of conflicts and the nightmare of violence, fear and instability. The peoples of this region have the right of freedom of movement, freedom of trade and coexistence side by side with security and stability. With the participation of the peoples of the region in peace-building, that will help in creating a fertile environment for regional tourism, which, in turn, increase the volume of trade and development regionally and internationally, this reflect positively on the increase in per capita income, which supports the region and make it much more secure and stable.

After the signing of the Oslo accords with Israel in 1993, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) regret that there are more than two million Palestinian refugees live away from the land of Palestine and have the right to return to their homes, while Israel does not recognize only with (800) thousand refugees, who fled during the war of June 1967, but who escaped before the war of 1967, is not considered a refugee according to Israeli vision and policy, and has no right to return, that Israel does not intend to return (800) thousand

Palestinian refugees the retreat from this number, so that Israel agreed to the return of the (800) thousand what is the fate of the one million refugees and (200) thousand others? Therefore, the problem remains that the list has not been fundamentally resolved to dissolve that satisfies all parties.

## References

- [1] A. Mordechai, *Oil Power and Politics Conflict in the Red Sea and the Gulf*, (1974), London, Frankness.
- [2] A. Mordechai, *Saudi Arabia Government Society and the Gulf Crisis*, (1993), New York (Rout Ledge).
- [3] A.K. Abdullah, *New World Order: Facts, Doubts International Policy*, (1990), Al-Ahram, Cairo.
- [4] A. Al-Bursan, *Peace Process in the Middle East the Motives and Feedback 1991-2001*, (2002), The Center for Middle East Studies, II, Amman.
- [5] A. Al-Bursan and A. Adwan, *Peace Process in the Middle East the Motives and Implications (1991-2001)*, (2002), Middle East Studies Center, Amman.
- [6] J. Al-Hamad, *Peace Process in the Middle East: The Palestinian and Jordanian*, (1996), The Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.
- [7] J. Al-Hamad, *Independent Peace in the Middle East*, (1999), the Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.
- [8] A.H. Al Kiali, *American and Israeli Strategic Position of Political Changes in the Arab Region*, (2011), the Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.
- [9] Al Shanti, Woman, a victory: The United States of America: The intifada, peace process, Palestinian state and enduring economic, 24(2002) (July-December), 129-130.
- [10] M. Azmi, *Israeli Nuclear Capabilities Strategic Danger to Peace and Security in the Middle East*, (1999), The Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.
- [11] A.M. Bakkar, *Al-Hussein Cruise and Peace*, (1996), The Rally for Publishing and Distribution, Printing, Amman.
- [12] A. Dajani, *The Future of International Policy toward the Middle East*, (1996), The Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.
- [13] I. Fahmi, Talks for Peace in the Middle East (Part I), *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, September 19 (1983).
- [14] M. Fineman, The arms race: Round 2, *Los Angeles Times*, March 23 (1993).
- [15] T.G. Fraser, *The Arab Israeli Conflict*, (1995), London.
- [16] W. Jaafari, *Israeli Project to Implement Self-Government: It's Roots and Its Developments and Risks*, (1979), Beirut.
- [17] G.J. Oslem, *US Strategic Interest in the Gulf Region*, (1987), West View Press, Boulder and London.
- [18] G. Kemp, The control of the Middle East arms race, *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, (1991).
- [19] M. Maali and others, *Bilateral and Multilateral Negotiations for Peace in the Middle East*, (1995), The Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.
- [20] M.R. Loei, Water and power, *Journal of International Affairs*, 49(1) (Summer) (1995).
- [21] M.H. Heikal, *Gulf War: Illusions of War and Victory*, (1992), Al-Ahram Press, Cairo.
- [22] W. QuandtStiftung, *Peace Process, U.S. Diplomatic Arab Israeli Conflict Since 1967*, (1994), Interpretation Al-Ahram Center for Translation and Publication, II, Cairo.
- [23] W. Khaldi, *The Middle East Post-War Environment*, (1991), Washington, DC, Institute for Palestine Studies.
- [24] W. Quandt, *Peace Process, US Diplomacy Arab Israeli Conflict Since 1967*, (1994), Translation of Al-Ahram Center for Translation and Publication, II, Cairo.

- [25] E. Youssef and A. Al-Sabbagh, *The Future of International Policy toward the Middle East*, (1996), the Center for Middle East Studies, Amman.