STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

THE US INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT: SOLUTION OR COMPLICATION?

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL MOHAMMED F. ABO-SAK
International Fellows Program, Saudi Arabia

19970623 196

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1997

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public
release. Distribution is
unlimited.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

THE US INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT: SOLUTION OR COMPLICATION?

A STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

BY

LTC MOHAMMED F. ABO-SAK
International Fellows Program, Saudi Arabia

DR. STEPHEN C. PELLETIERE
Project Advisor

US Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the United States' involvement in the Palestinian-Israeli crisis as the "mother" of all Middle Eastern problems. It shows the US position in relation to both sides and the potential results of the current US policies. It discusses why the United States is viewed as "Americael." Since the Middle East is one of the most important regions to the US and its allies, this paper presents recommendations for the US future foreign policy to help make the Middle East more secure and friendly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iii

Introduction 1

Historical Background 1

The US Endorsement of Israel 6

How the US was Blackmailed 7

The US Vetoes and What Poor Arafat Could Not See 9

The Inequality of the Agreements 13

Support of Israel/Containment of the Arabs 14

Double Standards 16

What Israel Has Done to the Arabs 20

Negative Results of US Endorsement of Israel 21

US Involvement Complicates All Around 22

The Loss of Confidence in the US as an Honest Broker and Friend 25

US National Security and Taxpayers Share the Burden 28

Sympathy Leading to Strategic Danger 29

The Worst-Case Scenario 33

Recommendations 34

Conclusion 40

Endnotes 43

Bibliography 49

INTRODUCTION

In the 1930's two strategic elements came into existence in the Middle East, which invited the United States involvement in the region. The two elements were the discovery of oil in Saudi Arabia and the creation of an activist Jewish Community in the land of Palestine. As these two factors grew, they began to dominate Middle East politics. Meanwhile the US became increasingly dependent on the Middle East oil, and for unrelated reasons US ties with Israel were strengthening.

Since the US presence in the Middle East, the United States has enjoyed strategic friendships with the Arab oil-producing countries, especially through the Cold War Era when the Arabs sided with the US fighting against communism as well as the USSR. However, the stronger Israel has become, the more the Arabs attribute this to the US heavy involvement in support of the Jewish state, thus alienating the Arab world from the US because of the Palestinian cause.

In this research I will show that the United States is in fact endorsing the Israeli position and how this will negatively affect the US future interests in the Middle East. We will proceed with recommendations on how the US position should be involved in an unbiased solution and its effect on the stability of the region.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Palestinians have continuously resided in their land since their ancestors came to Palestine four thousand years before Christ. These were the Canaanites who came there from the Arabian Peninsula. At that time Palestine was known as the Land of Canaan. As has been mentioned in the Old Testament, the Canaanite Arabs are known for

civilization builders in Palestine since they built several cities there, such as Jerusalem, Nablus, Jericho, Biesan, Aka, and Yafa. Around the year 1300 BC, another tribe name Palest came from Agea, which included the island of Crete. Because of these new immigrants, the Land of Canaan became known as Palestine. These new immigrants resided on the coastline, starting from Gaza. Before long, they assimilated into the Canaanite culture. They adopted the Arabic language from the Canaanite people and took it as their own.[1]

The Palestinians continued to maintain sovereignty in the land until the Hebrews moved into it between 1400 and 1200 BC. The history sources are not in agreement with the origin of the Hebrew people. However, they were able to establish their authority when David ruled the Kingdom of Israel. His son Solomon, his successor, enlarged the Kingdom. Even with that expansion, the Kingdom of Israel did not include all of the land of Palestine since the coastlines were mostly under the authority of the Palestinians and the northern parts were still under the power of the Canaanites. Sources indicate that the kingdom of David and Solomon lasted only during their lifetimes, approximately 80 years.[2]

When most of the Arab lands came under the Greek and Roman rule, Palestine was part of it. Islam conquered Palestine during the Roman Empire. The patriarch Safronius surrendered Jerusalem to the second Islamic Caliph, Omar Bin Al Khattab, in the year 637 AD. By that time the Jews had already left Jerusalem, so Christianity was the dominating religion present. The Caliph signed a document granting full security and protection to all Christians concerning personal safety, property, religion, and churches. The Muslims then declared Jerusalem the capital of Palestine; and the city continued to

be under Islamic rule until the end of the Ottoman Empire in 1918, except for a limited time of Christian rule under the Crusaders.

In more recent history, due to the consequences of the First World War (1914-1918) most of the Arab world, particularly East of the Mediterranean, was subjected to British and French occupation. Specifically, Palestine came under the British military administration.

England had previously encouraged the Arabs to get their independence from the Ottoman Empire and promised them support if they stood on the side of the allies during the First World War. However, England reneged on its promise. Moreover, British Foreign Minister Arthur James Balfour promised the International Zionists to establish a homeland for the Jews in Palestine. According to a Moroccan scholar and former politician, the population in Palestine at that time was comprised of 95% Arabs (both Christians and Muslims), 4% Palestinian Jews, 1% expatriates. The Jews owned only 2% of the land.[3]

Israel occupied the Palestinian lands in 1948 when they announced their independence. The rest of Palestine was captured by the Israelis in 1967. Since then the Palestinians have lived under the Israeli occupation and have been dependent upon the United Nations Relief and Work Agency and other international charitable aid and human rights groups.

With the Israeli intention of continuous occupation clear to the Palestinians, they used all means available to them through regional and international organizations to liberate themselves and their land. But their efforts have failed. The peak of the Cold War in the 1950's and 60's and even through the 1980's complicated the situation. The

Palestinian riots were lost in the competition between the East and the West to gain more influence in the Middle East as a strategic region. As a result of this East-West competition, Israel gained strong support from the West.

The Israelis became very effective in presenting their case and in winning the Western continuous support. In the meantime, the Palestinians had failed to present their case and could not persuade the superpowers to apply and enforce the United Nations resolutions 243 and 338 to their situation with the Israelis. These resolutions mainly ask the Israelis to withdraw from the Arab occupied lands.

On November 15, 1988, the Palestinian National Council met in Algeria and announced the independence of Palestine and the creation of its government in exile over the land of Palestine with Jerusalem as its capital and Tunisia as its temporary location. It received the recognition of 124 countries, with whom it established diplomatic relations. Yasser Arafat was elected to be the Palestinian President.

A peace initiative began under the auspices of the United States, cosponsored by Russia, with the first main peace conference held in Madrid in October 1991. It was attended by the Israelis, Palestinians, and most of the Middle Eastern countries and observed by delegations of the UN and the international community. Then in September 1993 was the signing of the Declaration of Principles between the PLO and Israel.

During the peace process which resulted from that conference, Israel was invited to many conferences held in the Arab countries between 1992 and 1996 as a sign to Israel of good intentions to integrate Israel in the Middle Eastern community. Morocco, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, and Tunisia have all accommodated Israeli delegations even though they did not have any political relations and Israel was still occupying territories of four Arab

countries: Palestine, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. As another sign of Israel's neighbors' good will toward them, Arab countries sent their official delegations to give their condolences on the death of their peace partner, Prime Minister Rabin of Israel.

After Prime Minister Rabin was assassinated by one of the radical Israelis opposed to peace, the Labour party lost the Israeli election of 1996, giving way to the Likud party to lead the new Israeli government, and Netanyahu became Prime Minister. This marked the beginning of the end of what had been achieved in the peace process. The new Israeli government does not want to commit itself totally to the peace accord that was signed by the previous Israeli government. Instead, it would like to have a new interpretation that suits its party vision and strategy.

Divided in their views of how the peace process should proceed, the Palestinians and Israelis initiated media campaigns for international support. This produced an escalation of tension which has ignited old scenarios of large scale wars between Israel and its Arab neighbors, taking the whole situation back to ground zero. In addition, the new Israeli government has violated the Peace Accord by building new Israeli settlements in the Palestinian occupied territories. Israel has started to play its survival issue (i.e. the alleged threat posed by its Arab neighbors), as reason for not complying to the peace accord, and at the same time the Palestinians are crying for the liberation of their territories. "Netanyahu has managed to transform the old Jewish-Arab war into a new conflict between Jewish colonialists and colonized Palestinians," notes Cohen, and then adds, "Nowhere in the world has such a battle been won in the 20th century."[1]

THE US ENDORSEMENT OF ISRAEL

The majority of the countries in the Middle East have been allies to the US, from the Cold War to the present time. This was true even throughout the arms race between the two superpowers, the USSR and the US. These US allies include Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, the UAE, Oman, Iran (pre-Khomeini), Pakistan, Yemen, Turkey, Morocco, Tunisia, Sudan, Somalia, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt (since 1973). The soil of the Arabian Gulf States contains the oil upon which the US is heavily dependent. Furthermore, the territory of these Middle Eastern countries who are friendly to the United States has provided strategic bases for America. Most Islamic nations have shared the US goal of opposing the expansion of communism. An example of these nations as excellent allies to the US in this matter is the Afghanistan campaign led by Saudi Arabia as the center of Islam. Even since the Cold War Era, these countries have proven to be valuable assets to the United States. The 1991 Gulf War demonstrated acceptance, willingness, & readiness of the Middle Eastern nations to work hand-in-hand with the Americans in a very effective way, even though the majority of the coalition partners were not directly threatened or affected by the Iraqi invasion. This coalition proved that the US could operate in the Middle Eastern region without the use of Israeli land, equipment, personnel, or any other Israeli resources.

How the US was Blackmailed

On the other hand Israel has no strategic, social, or political depth in the region and has no coalition partners in the Middle East. In fact, Israel has been in a state of war with each of its surrounding countries since its presence there during this century. When most of the major Middle Eastern countries reacted positively and cooperated with the US-led coalition against Iraq, in 1990 Israel not only did not cooperate, but in a manner

of speaking, blackmailed the United States for being kept out of the conflict. Mr. Shawn Twing, news editor for the Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, demonstrates my point:

"Then and now U.S. government officials privately expressed anger over the economic and military bonuses demanded by Israel for staying out of the war. These included $700 million in military hardware, a $300 million addition to the U.S. military stockpile in Israel and $650 million in extra economic support funds for FY91."[5]

While the United States has been enjoying the benefits of its Arab and Islamic Middle Eastern friendships, Israel has been enjoying the benefits of strong US support. This has shaped the reality of present-day Israel. From the Arab viewpoint, this has been at the expense of the land and rights of the Palestinians, to the extent that their Biblically famed name and identity is now disappearing from existence.

The US government has been, from my viewpoint, strongly taking sides with the Israelis against the Arabs with no apparent justification. The Israeli political influence in the US administration, congress, and media clearly demonstrates this. Pro-Israeli lobby, Friends of Israel, and the AIPAC are accepted as legitimate US organizations that are able to act and react and to control the general feelings of the US officials. This causes the US government decisions against the Arab legitimate rights to be regarded as if they are something which should not be discussed, even though the US government has the facts concerning the Arab-Israeli issues. Applying these facts in accordance with the principles of the US Constitution would prevent the United States from making the biased decisions that are consistently being made.

There are many instances of the US bias, specifically regarding the Palestinian-

Israeli issue, demonstrating the results of the Palestinians being oppressed and dispossessed. For example, certain US human rights groups, non-governmental organizations, and research centers, such as the American Friends Service Committee[6] and the Seven Springs Center,[7] have been able to objectively discover the reality of what has happened to the Palestinians as a result of the US sponsorship of Israel. In addition, the findings of the United Nations support what these various groups have concluded.[8]

The daily Israeli military depredations inside the Palestinian occupied territories seems to have become an acceptable routine in the eyes of the US benefactors of the Israelis. Moreover, it seems clear that the United States is a partner of Israel in shaping events in Palestine since the beginning of this century. The events that have been happening in Israel are not driven by random actions; they are an implementation of the Zionist strategy. Their writings on the subject document this.

As Stephen Green, a specialist on humanitarian relief and author of several books, records, "[b]y early 1948, U.S. government intelligence estimates reflected a deep concern that international Zionism was dragging the United States into a dangerous program of territorial conquest in the Middle East. In March, 1948, a Joint Chiefs of Staff paper on 'Force Requirements for Palestine,' anticipating the termination of the British Mandate, predicted that the 'Zionist strategy will seek to involve [the United States] in a continuously widening and deepening series of operations intended to secure maximum Jewish objectives.' The JCS listed the objectives as (a) initial Jewish sovereignty over a portion of Palestine, (b) acceptance by the great powers of the right to unlimited immigration, (c)the extension of Jewish sovereignty over all of Palestine, (d) the expansion of 'Eretz Israel' into Transjordan and into portions of Lebanon and Syria, and

(e) the establishment of Jewish military and economic hegemony over the entire Middle East. The JCS paper added, 'All stages of this program are equally sacred to the fanatical concepts of Jewish leaders. The Program is openly admitted by same leaders, and has been privately admitted to United States officials by responsible leaders of the presently dominant Jewish group -- the Jewish Agency.'"[9]

If we compare the present Palestinian-Israeli land situation to what the above document states, we will find today's facts consistent with the 1948 objectives.

The US Vetoes and What Poor Arafat Could Not See

The main issue is that Israel occupies the Arab territories, and the United States is heavily involved in giving Israel access to the US national elements of power: diplomatic, military, economic, and informational. The US has set a pattern with official position in regards to UN resolutions. The US has continued to take the side of Israel and oppose any resolutions that would bring justice to the Palestinians. This has been the case when the United Nations consensus has come to realize the rights of the Palestinians in certain situations. The US has used its strong position as a permanent member of the Security Council to veto any resolution that might expose Israel, even in violation of human rights.

Roger Garoudy, a French thinker, comments on his book, The Myth of the Israeli Political Institution: "Israel has enjoyed 32 American vetoes in the UN from 1972 until today and the Zionist lobby in America dictates directly American Policy."[10] He added that in order for Israeli former Prime Minister Shimon Peres to win the votes of the extremists in the election of 1996, the Israeli army executed the raid on the UN compound in Qana, Southern Lebanon, killing 102 Lebanese refugees -- mostly women

and children. When the international community condemned the Israeli raid, the American position remained passive, and then became aggressive against Secretary General Butrus Ghali of the United Nations. Washington expressed disapproval of Butrus Ghali's decision to publish the UN report confirming an Israel-intended action to strike the camp. Later, the United States was the only nation to use their veto power in the security council against the installation of Butrus Ghali to second term.[11]

Khalid Al Maeena, a widely-read senior Saudi columnist asserts, "We have all seen that the United States can never find anything wrong in Israel's actions. The massacre at Qana, the shooting of children by Zionist settlers, the burning of Muslim places of worship, the brutal beatings of innocent Palestinians -- all condoned by Israeli courts -- count for nothing in the eyes of Clinton or the American media."[12] Later Al Maeena adds, "The US has always prevented the international community from taking the slightest action against Israel. Thus, the Middle East's only 'democracy' has been unhindered as it violates human rights, steals land and water, oppresses people and yet remains the object of unwavering American support."[13]

One of the latest of a string of US vetoes was reported in a March 1997 article in The Washington Post: "The United States -- which last week vetoed a Security Council motion calling on Israel to abandon the [new Jewish housing in Arab East Jerusalem] project -- was among nearly 50 nations that took part in the debate and the only one that did not condemn the Israel plan."[14]

Al Maeena also interprets Israel's attitude: "It believes that its long standing relations with the US give it a moral edge. That itself is surprising because US foreign policy has generally lacked morality -- be it in the Middle East or South-East Asia."[15]

This most recent veto came despite President Clinton's assurances to Chairman Arafat. "Clinton gave Arafat a vote of confidence in a brief photo session before their one-hour and 20-minute meeting, saying the Israeli decision to erect new settlements 'builds mistrust. And I wish that it had not been made.'"[16]

Al Maeena comments on the Arab response to the US stance: "As usual, the Arabs protest. They denounce, criticize and implore friends and foes alike. They achieve nothing. They go to the Security Council for help, hoping for some kind of satisfaction. Instead, they receive a slap in the face by the United States when US ambassador Bill Richardson vetoes the resolution calling on Israel to 'refrain from actions or measures, including settlement activities, which alter the facts on the ground, pre-empting the final status negotiations and having negative implications for the Mid East peace process.' This was the third anti-Arab US veto in as many years. The veto itself is a green light for Israel to go ahead with its activities in the occupied lands. It is still more proof, if anyone needs it, that the United States can never be an honest broker in the Middle East peace process. Its double standards and partiality to Israel have already damaged, and will continue to damage the peace process. Mahmood Khalil, the well-known Arab political cartoonist, depicted the situation perfectly: He drew a smiling Arafat seated in Clinton's office while Clinton is supposedly arguing with Netanyahu about the settlements. What poor Arafat could not see was that the phone line was unplugged."[17]

The New York Times International reports, "'We find it difficult to understand the U.S.," said Yasir Abed Rabbo, the Palestinian minister of information. "On the one hand it says it does not accept Israel's behavior, and on the other it pretends it cannot do a thing."[18]

The following views were included in the editorial column of *Al Sharq Al-Awsat*, a widely-published Saudi newspaper: "In response to the American veto against the European proposal to condemn the Israeli government decision to build new settlement in the occupied East Jerusalem, the Iranian Foreign Minister said, 'This was expected and not new from the US government in support of all Israeli activities,' which he described as inhumane and illegitimate. He added, 'This is a lesson for the Islamic countries that still carry hope in the US.' ...The Syrian Foreign Minister, when asked about the latest US veto, said, 'This does not help the peace process to have any progress, and the American explanation for their veto makes no sense at all for letting the peace partners do as such. Israel is the one who is occupying the territories and continuing the settlements, and the US, in one respect, is doing nothing in this respect; in another respect, it is crippling the security counsel.'...Regarding this same issue, the Iranian leader Ali Khamenei criticized the US veto by saying, 'The recent US President, in his election, listed human rights as one of his priorities but has proven by evidence that he does not know a thing about human rights. In fact, he is opposing it and represents only an abusing, biased, and deceiving government.' ...The American Administration and international Zionists are converting the world into a society that is governed by the law of the jungle which refuses to listen to the pleas of the abused legitimate home owners."[19]

The Inequality of the Agreements

Richard Falk, the Albert Milbank Professor of International Law & Practice at Princeton University, says, "I feel very disappointed by the absence of any political moral imagination on the part of our policymakers in relation to the future of the Middle East. I think we've been presented with an enormous opportunity by the end of the Cold War,

and the movement toward peace in the region."[20]

Falk further states, "The agreements that have been negotiated so far reflect the inequality between Israel and the Palestinians. The agreements do not lead anywhere near the attainment of self-determination that needs to be satisfied if the Palestinian national question is to be resolved successfully. Indeed, the present inequalities of the agreements are encouraging the very thing the U.S. government says it doesn't want; that is, the one-sidedness of the peace process ... Having just returned from Gaza, I can report with confidence that this is an existential reality, not idle speculation. A potentially very explosive situation is taking shape. The U.S. government, which has such great leverage in relation to Israel on these issues, has been extremely passive. This contrasts with what should have been, in my view, its effort to achieve a more balanced process that gives moderate Palestinians more legitimacy, more claim to its next phase. Many of the most sensitive Palestinians are now adversaries of this peace process, and many of those that are most humanistic and most committed to a democratic Palestine have become enemies of a process that is perceived as a betrayal of their long struggle. We have to notice what that means. It's not something that can be dismissed, as I think it has been generally, by the media and policy community in this country."[21]

Support of Israel / Containment of the Arabs

One area in which the United States has demonstrated a biased position is the US strategic support through weapons and equipment supply that has always insured the military superiority of Israel in quality and capability over all its Arab neighbors. Such strategic ties granted Israel victory in war (1967) and prevented defeat (1973). Even more so than the US allied NATO countries, Israel enjoys a military cooperation in

strategic programs that grant them the benefit of the US high-tech military systems.

The US also uses its influence and sometimes acts on behalf of Israel to prevent some of the Arab countries from obtaining weapons which would place them on a par with Israel. In dealing arms with Saudi Arabia, the US consistently changes the specifications, cancels deals altogether, or delays until Israel is able to obtain higher-tech items. This has taken precedence over the financial benefits to the US public that would result from sales to a friendly country like Saudi Arabia.

On the military side, the recorded history of modern Israel shows that it was born strong and continued gradually to strengthen. This was not a gift; it was a result of the support of sympathizers of Israel, the strongest of which is the United States. The partition of Palestine spelled out in the 1947 UN resolution was a result of strong US government influence in the United Nations to give most of the Arab land of Palestine to the newly immigrated small Jewish community. At that time all the surrounding Arab countries who might do anything were still under a form of western colonization.[22]

In the same way that the United States had sponsored Israel diplomatically, it also gave it continuous military support, to include supporting military projects, signing military agreements, granting a strong position to Israel in the eyes of the rest of the world, and fighting and containing the Arabs along side of Israel. Israel was able to attack and defeat the Arabs using American weapons and equipment that had been granted to Israel without constraints. Israel has become one of the strongest nations in conventional and non-conventional military power. In fact, it has become stronger than Great Britain in its nuclear arsenal. Sources from the Defense Council in Washington, DC, state that Great Britain has 200 nuclear warheads compared to Israel's 290.[23]

As was reported in Al Sharq Al-Awsat, "The annual American aid to Israel represents the most important face of cooperation ... it has a very effective role in solving many economic and social problems. The US total government aid to Israel from 1951 to 1997 has been about 68 billion US dollars, 60% of it is military aide; the other 40% is economic."[24] This is in addition to other strategic cooperation programs which are not included in the annual aid, such as the Arrow Missile Program.[25]

The US government is not limited to its direct support of Israel. It also indirectly supports it through using its diplomatic power to contain the Arabs and minimize the Palestinian rights. Part of the containment is to assure the Israeli military superiority in quality and quantity over the collective Arab forces. A recent example of this is when the US objected to South Africa selling conventional weapons to Syria in January 1997. Meanwhile, the US still supports the Israeli war machines through strategic military programs. Yet the United States has the role of being the neutral mediator between Syria and Israel in the current peace process.

Says Al Maeena, "Republican Senator Jesse Helms, who heads the Foreign Relations Committee in the US, has asked President Clinton to suspend aid to South Africa if it sells arms to Syria. In a letter to the president dated January 17, Helms said that Syria's acquisition of top military hardware 'runs counter to long-standing US national security in the region.' He warned of strict measures against South Africa."[26]

Double Standards

Notice the inconsistencies in dealing with Israel, as opposed to other nations. The US demonstrated quickness to action to enforce UN resolutions in dealing with Iraq; however, the US has been reluctant to take any action or even to verbally condemn Israel

where UN resolutions have been disregarded.

In regards to the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, the US has endorsed Turkey's authority as the country of location of the sources of the rivers, as opposed to Iraq and Syria, where the rivers end. On the other hand, in regards to rivers that end in Israel, the US has affirmed Israel's authority rather that Lebanon or other Arab nations in which the source of the river is located.

These are but two examples that confirm that friendliness, rather than judicial rights, dictates the US position. Two recent concurrent issues further demonstrate this double standard. Both occurred in April, 1997. On the one hand, when Israel violated the United Nations resolutions and the US sponsored peace initiative by building new settlements in the Palestinian territories, the United States took no decisive action and gave them protection against international condemnation. On the other hand, when the Iraqis flew Muslim pilgrims to the Saudi city of Makkah over the no-fly zone in their own country, the United States responded strongly and took the issue to the Security Council, but the US was disappointed by the Security Council's decision to play it down.[27] This humanitarian issue has drawn the same US reaction on Libyan pilgrims over the last several years. While the United States readily finds excuses and an understanding with the Israeli position, whether right or wrong, the policy-makers in Washington, DC, are unable to recognize the Muslim pilgrimage season and its humanitarian and sovereignty implications.

Furthermore, as Al Maeena points out, "The US, while attacking other nations such as India for refusing to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, is embracing a country [Israel] that has also refused to sign the treaty. What is even worse for Arabs is

that so many of Clinton's advisors are not only committed to Israel but are also [Zionist] Jews into the bargain. Thus, those responsible for formulating American policy in the Middle East are the very ones who would enslave the Arabs to the Israelis."[28]

This observation is backed by the *Washington Post,* which reports a feeling prevalent among Arabs that "five Zionist Jews' are running U.S. Middle East policy and ... (that) it is implausible that a nation the size of the United States can find no one else to maintain diplomatic contacts with Palestinians. [This] was referring to Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright; Defense Secretary William S. Cohen; [US special envoy to the Middle East peace process, Dennis B.] Ross; Ross's deputy, Aaron D. Miller, and the U.S. ambassador to Israel, Martin S. Indyk."[29]

Concerning the United States' double standard, Dr. Falk says, "Let me make one final point on the issue of nonproliferation and weapons of mass destruction. As long as we treat Israel's possession of nuclear weapons as something we can't mention, then I think the U.S. government loses credibility in the entire region when it pontificates about preventing the development of weapons of mass destruction. It's incredible to me that our policymakers will talk endlessly about nonproliferation and never even mention the fact that there's already a nuclear power in the region. The official discourse almost pretends that the Israeli nuclear capability is irrelevant to the pursuit of nonproliferation goals. Until the United States addresses these problems more credibly, it is hopeless to talk about a vision of the future. All it is likely to do is perpetuate the mistakes of the past."[30]

The lethal weapon system of the American industry is freely used by the Israelis against civilian targets in the occupied territories of Palestine and Lebanon. The United States Navy used its 16-inch gunship in fighting along side the Israelis in 1983-84, after

their invasion of Lebanon.[31] Despite the fact that the Arabs are prevented from obtaining nuclear weapons and WMD, Israel is using high-tech weapons against Arab targets. As a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Leonard Sullivan, Jr., wrote in a US Army War College paper, "It could well be argued that rockets and artillery used against defenseless civilian populations in places like Beirut ... and South Lebanon should qualify as mass destroyers, even though they did not recently proliferate from some far-off heinous supplier, and even though the destruction takes months rather than minutes to inflict. In fact, the wanton use of large caliber and automatic weapons in the pursuit of clearly illegal political activities is as unacceptable as the excessive use of fire arms ... in petty crimes and drug trafficking."[32]

In respect to the US government apparently trying to make the Arabs its enemies, Dr. Falk elaborates: "It seems to me U.S. officialdom has fallen into the trap of what psychologists call transference. We're trying to keep the logic of the Cold War alive in the Middle East to some extent. And maybe it's the nostalgia that people speak about for not having an enemy and rediscovering new enemies and then endowing them with greater-than-real-life properties. I think the extra-regional responsibility of the United States is in two areas which require much more critical thought than has been given. One is in the role of arms suppliers and arms pushers seen as ways of extending influence, as well as in relation to market factors. I think we will have very little credibility in relation to democracy and the peoples of the region until we pursue a policy toward arms exports that is consistent with the peoples' goals."[33]

Israel, with its very limited resources and liberal expenditures, could not have continued to exist at its superior level and aggressiveness of today without the generous

support of the United States through various means.

What Israel Has Done to the Arabs

What has the Israeli war machine done to the Arabs? It has defeated them collectively and individually in the expansion wars that Israel had actually initiated. It cost the Arabs hundreds of thousands of casualties, attrition of resources, and the devastation of several generations. Al-Mujtama'a has documented[34] tens of Israeli massacres and atrocities, including the well known massacre of Deir Yassin, where 254 mostly young people and elderly were killed on April 9th, 1948. Another well-known massacre was in the area of Sabra and Shatilla from the 16th to the 18th of September, 1982, where between 3,000 and 3,500 lives were taken, also mostly young people and elderly. The future is still uncertain. Yet all of the occupied territory are Arab lands. In fact, what remains of the Palestinian territories is riddled with Israeli settlements, to the point that routine travel of Palestinians requires passing through settlements protected by armed civilian settlers and often through checkpoints. The Israeli boundaries still have not been officially announced, and America is still supportive of Israel. Does this not qualify as US bias?

This quote from Elie Wiesel, an American professor of Boston University and a leading Zionist, seems to me to summarize the US bias: "'I support Israel -- period. I identify with Israel -- period. I never attack, never criticize Israel when I am not in Israel.' As for Israel's policies in the occupied territories, Wiesel is unable to offer a comment: 'What to do it and how to do it, I really don't know because I lack the elements of information and knowledge ... You must be in a position of power to possess all the information ... I don't have the information, so I don't know.'"[35]

This statement was made despite the fact that Wiesel had chosen forget 254 innocent men, women and children who were methodically slaughtered at Deir Yassin on April 9, 1948, just because the victims were Palestinian and the terrorists were Jews from the Irgun and Stern Gang. Since Wiesel worked for the Irgun during the very time of this massacre, it must have torn him to pieces. And since he undoubtedly read the wire service dispatches and military reports, I am sure he knew the details of this bloody event even before they were published in *The New York Times* on April 10 and April 13, 1948. And yet, even as a journalist, he kept silent and just followed orders. Like the ever-obedient soldier, he did what he had to do. Having lived through the Holocaust, maintaining this silence must have been excruciating. This kind of blind support of Israel, right or wrong, deceived the Israelis into thinking that existence and prosperity are not possible unless under war conditions, thus drumming up continuous support from sympathizers.[36]

NEGATIVE RESULTS OF US ENDORSEMENT OF ISRAEL

The United States, in its involvement in the Palestinian-Israeli problem, has caused some Arabs and Arab media to view it as "Americael" (America + Israel). In my opinion, the American endorsement of Israel, which is actually driven by a specific group in Washington, DC, has led the future of the US relations with the Arab/Muslim world into the "danger zone." I am convinced that those who are influencing the US policy in the Middle East are not serving the interests of the American people. Those policy-makers are truly complicating the future for the US presence in the region. They have left no options for the Palestinians but self-defense and self-sacrifice. These options will

harm the American interest; it could hit hard in some of the US centers of gravity. Some US valued allies will be in danger because of this policy. Of course, as the American people are proud of protecting the interests of their country, others are proud of even being martyrs in defense of their legitimate rights.

Senator Charles Percy observes, "The Middle East, of all the regions of the world, has the greatest potential for disaster. Even in times of relative calm, the clouds of war can be seen. Old antagonisms, and more recent ones, are destabilizing. Angry propaganda, surprise raids, random rocketing, massing of weaponry, vindictive UN resolutions, fears and anxiety contribute to an atmosphere of expectancy of ultimate disaster. ... American foreign policy will face some of its most serious challenges..."[37]

US Involvement Complicates All Around

Having shown the US commitment to sponsor Israel, we see that the commitment has had immediate effects on the Palestinians and all aspects of their lives. In fact, even though the Israeli government has benefited from the US sponsorship, the community itself has not realized rest and peace in their lifestyles. I intend under this heading to show those immediate effects from the perspective of the Israelis and the effects on the Palestinians in order to further demonstrate the long-term effects that the US will reap from this disastrous situation.

Permit me to begin with The Fateful Triangle's use of the "soldier's lament" as a description of the dilemma in Israel: "They arrive home on leave miserable and depressed, young in years but old in spirit, tired and battle-weary. They smile, say

'everything is fine,' but when you catch them off guard you find bitterness and what are almost guilt feelings. As one soldier puts it: 'You are asking me how I feel? If I tell you I feel [lousy], will you understand? You here in the kibbutz, can you understand what we, the soldiers, are undergoing out there? Take me as an example,' he says. 'I was called up, sent to a training camp and then straight on to patrol Nablus, to chase demonstrating school girls. Then I was transferred to Beit Sahur [also in the West Bank], where we watched the beatings and other ways in which the Arabs were maltreated. Then on to Yamit, into the war of Jews against Jews, against the opponents of the withdrawal. So you get hardened, and just as you have come to terms with it all you are sent off to Lebanon. ... All the time there is shelling and shooting, there are dead and wounded. So you look in at your mates, you attend the funerals, and you feel increasingly empty inside. Everything passes you by. I have become totally insensitive, I am an emotional cripple, though not a physical one ... Do you really believe there is any hope of ending this war? ..."[38]

In 1978, Palestinian Bir Zeit instructor and renowned novelist Sarah Kalifah declared, "Tension inside, tension outside ... You feel you are in a whirlpool, a whirlwind, a pressure cooker ... Occupation, demonstrations, news, trials, prisons, demolished houses, demolished souls. Taxes ... a new devaluation, a new settlement there; tomorrow they'll build a new one here. Where shall I go then? To whom shall I protest?"[39]

Sara Roy, in an article in Journal of Palestinian Studies, "Gaza: New Dynamics of Civic Disintegration," Summer 1993 says, "The immense economic pressures imposed upon the Gaza Strip become even more acute in light of Gaza's extremely high population growth of 4 percent per annum. Last year the refugee community alone, which comprises

73 percent of the total population, grew at a rate of 7.3 percent, giving the territory one of the highest population densities in the world. In 1992, according to conservative estimates, density levels exceeded 9,300 people per square mile when measured in terms of lands available for use by the Arab population. Density levels among the Jewish settler community in the Gaza Strip, by contrast, averaged 115 people per square mile of available land." Sara Roy also reports that "Close to 70 percent of the Gaza Strip population is 24 years of age and younger and have known nothing but occupation." She continues by reporting the results of a 1992-93 survey of 3,000 Palestinian children ages 8-15, conducted by the Gaza Community Mental Health Program as follows:

93% had been tear gassed.

85% had had their homes raided.

55% had witnessed their fathers beaten.

42% had been beaten themselves.

31% had been shot.

28% had had a brother imprisoned.

19% had been detained.

3% had suffered a death in the family.

69% had been exposed to more than 4 different types of trauma.

Sarah Roy adds, "For years many children in Gaza had neither home nor classroom, two critical venues of socialization. The impact has been profound. Psychiatrist Dr. Eyad al-Sarraj, founder of the Gaza Community Mental Health Program, reported in early 1995 that 40,000 children were in need of some form of immediate psychiatric care."[40]

If the relations between the "Fateful Triangle"[41] nations continue in the direction in which they are presently headed, the US will experience an increase of threats to its interest.

To begin with, the constant state of war in which the Palestinians have lived will

result in a society's psychological suffering that will lead to a revolt using any and all means possible. Sara Roy has documented the mental health of the Palestinian population and has shown that even since the beginning of the peace process in 1991, the psychological well-being of the Palestinian people has declined as a direct result of the violence experienced by this generation, which is the status quo that has been forced upon them. The threat that this presents is potential retaliation in the Middle East region and even in the United States. Mr. Ali Abu-Kamal who randomly shot people at the Empire State Building in New York before killing himself (2/23/97), the Jordanian soldier who shot the Israeli girls on the border (3/97), and the young Palestinian suicide bomber in Jerusalem (3/97) are recent examples of my point.

The Loss of Confidence in the US as an Honest Broker and Friend

As I have shown in the previous section, the voices of those who are not traditionally considered friends of the United States are beginning to be heard and becoming logical. They are simply saying, "Wake up! If you are discovering 'America' today, we have seen its face long before." I believe that this is a victory for such a group and a defeat of the United States' informational and psychological efforts to maintain a positive image and accepted presence in the view of the people of the region.

Dr. Ahmad Al-Rabie, a former Kuwaiti Minister of Education and member of Parliament, notes, "In the midst of the Arab-Israeli conflict, American behavior is a mystery. Because of America's long involvement with the problems, it is surprisingly a one-way street. American policy is not consistent with America's historical relations with the Arabs, nor with American interests in the Middle East. It has reached the point where

America does not see eye to eye with her European allies when it comes to Middle Eastern matters." The status quo of those discussed by Sara Roy "will of course aid a return to terrorism throughout the Middle East and also in Israel itself. It was a slap in the face for all peace-loving people who wish to keep war away from the region."[42]

As Director of Research and Policy Analysis at the Middle East Policy Council, Thomas Mattair, explains, "[W]hen people are poor and powerless, no one should be very surprised that they would turn to extremism and violence in order to try to change their circumstances. Extremism is not an inherent characteristic of Islam. It grows out of suffering."[43]

A historic example of the risk taken by an influential nation is when Great Britain lost its position in the Middle East due to unwise political stances taken. As Al Maeena voices on behalf of the Arab people, "[T]he 'strongest power on earth' -- the United States -- which is seemingly unable to do anything in the Middle East without Israeli approval, must be made to realize that the people of the area have had enough. ... Future generations will never forgive them [their ancestors] for becoming the dupes of political and diplomatic manipulation."[44]

Isa Nakhlah, a former Palestinian politician, gives insight: "As a result of their [the Palestinians] devastation they are in a very bad situation, and most of them can not basically feed their families. ... If the Palestinians happen to use arms then lots of blood will be shed. ... Of their seven million, they are ready to sacrifice a million souls in defense of their land."[45]

The US position has begun to produce a mistrust among the Arab people, including those considered to be friends of America. The present US position has given

occasion to those who have historically opposed to the United States to justify their opposition of the US influence in the region.

Senator Percy notes with concern, "Many Israeli acts seriously harm our relations with Israel's Arab neighbors, yet a strong American position throughout the Middle East is in Israel's interest as well. Israel cannot expect the United States to continue isolating itself from the world community to defend questionable or objectionable actions and policies. The Israelis must stop 'surprising' the international community and the United States with preemptive acts that are viewed by the community of nations as violations of international norms, harmful to U.S. interests and damaging to the peace process that must now proceed in the Middle East."[46]

In reaction to Al-Rabie's article, one reader says that the US veto in the UN Security Council against the condemnation of Israeli new settlement in Jerusalem "is so frustrating and I always ask myself: so what is the solution? I know one thing: that certainly the US will never be a solution or part of it, but it will always be the biggest obstacle."[47] This summarizes one of the most undesirable results in relations between the United States and the Arab world.

"In a related development, Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the US, Prince Bandar Bin Sultan Bin Abdul Aziz said that recent events 'have not been encouraging, to say the least. They have the potential of unraveling years of hard work and shattering the hopes and aspirations of millions of people. What is at stake not only affects the Palestinians and Israelis, but the entire Middle East. And what happens in the Middle East has repercussions throughout the world. ...'"[48]

US National Security and Taxpayers Share the Burden

If the US sponsorship of Israel is maintained, the US tax-payers will be continuing to take the financial burden of the Israeli war machine. Al Maeena reports, "While American social services are cut and pared on all sides, the aid to Israel increases by leaps and bounds."[49]

Shawn Twing reminds us that "[t]wo decades ago the U.S. government borrowed money to lend to Israel on the assumption that the Israelis would pay it back and the U.S. then could use the repayments to repay its own debts. Now the U.S. government continues to pay interest on the money it originally borrowed to lend to Israel, and also pays the interest on the money Israel borrowed from the U.S. ... In January 1992 ... [The US government] agreed to provide Israel with $10 billion in loan guarantees to be distributed at the rate of $2 billion a year over five years. ...Israel's retransfer of U.S. defense technology, virtually all of which is provided to Israel by U.S. taxpayers, threatens U.S. national security, creates unfair competition for U.S. defense firms, and has strengthened regimes guilty of serious human rights abuses or actively working against U.S. national interests. ...Consider this: one year of U.S. military aid to Israel could purchase 18 months of the much needed F-22 next generation fighter aircraft for American pilots, at the staggering price of $100 million apiece. The Pentagon plans to procure for U.S. use more than 400 of the F-22s over the next two decades. Eliminating Israel's annual aid subsidy during that same time frame would accomplish just that, without the additional cost to U.S. taxpayers. ...[E]xceptions, which are not made for other countries receiving U.S. military aid, enable Israel to expand its defense industries, which compete on the international market with U.S. defense firms. The exceptions for Israel

are completely contrary to the original intent of the foreign military sales program. ...[O]ffsets from [Israel's] own (and largely U.S.-subsidized) defense industry ... lower[s] the cost of the items it purchases and provid[es] jobs for Israelis by reducing jobs in the American companies providing military goods and services to Israel."[50]

Sympathy Leading to Strategic Danger

A continuous debate between lobbyists for foreign countries will end up harming the US interest by going far beyond sympathy. Sustained US involvement may add to divisions in the United States itself, pitting Israel-sympathizers against friends of the Arabs, with the federal government becoming crippled by not having a clear vision that would represent the United States citizens' true interest in the region. Rather than economic-based interests directing US policy, it would be controlled by lobbyists in Washington.

Because of this information age and the global village in which we live, the reality of the situation will become obvious to the American people and the balance will tip in favor of the Palestinian sympathizers. Here is one example of what is available to the American people to read: Concerning the attempts by the Israeli government under Netanyahu to "deprive Arab-American residents of East Jerusalem of their residence rights unless they give up their US citizenship," Khalil Jahshan, president of the National Association of Arab Americans "characterized the Israeli threat as 'another Olympic record in Israeli arrogance, gall, and racism. American Jews residing in Jerusalem, including the occupied part of the city, are certainly not being asked to give up their American citizenship' He declared that 'President Clinton must make it clear to Prime

Minister Netanyahu that a threat directed at any American citizen is a threat against all Americans. Arab Americans are not fair game for the Likud government -- or any other government, for that matter. 'I would expect a little more respect for US citizenship from the closest ally we have in the region and the largest recipient of U.S. foreign aid largesse,' Jahshan concluded."[51]

Twing gives an example of this: "The new year started off on a sour note for the controversial U.S.-Israeli "strategic relationship" when two reports from the Department of Defense and one from the General Accounting Office (GAO) highlighted Israel's espionage activities against the United States and Israeli thefts of U.S. military technology secrets, and confirmed that Israel has illegally retransferred U.S. technology from the largely U.S.-funded Lavi fighter program to China. ...The report, 'Defense Industrial Security: Weakness in U.S. Security Arrangements With Foreign-Owned Defense Contractors,' claimed that 'Country A' (publicly identified as Israel in the Feb. 22 *Washington Times*) 'conducts the most aggressive espionage operation against the United States of any U.S. ally.' The list of espionage operations described in the report included the following:

'An espionage operation run by the intelligence organization responsible for collecting scientific and technologic information for [Israel] paid a U.S. government employee to obtain U.S. classified military intelligence documents. [This is a reference to the 1985 arrest of Jonathan Pollard, a civilian U.S. naval intelligence analyst who provided Israel's LAKAM espionage agency an estimated 800,000 pages of classified U.S. intelligence information.]

- 'Several citizens of [Israel] were caught in the United States stealing sensitive

technology used in manufacturing artillery gun tubes.

- 'Agents of [Israel] allegedly stole design plans for a classified reconnaissance system from a U.S. company and gave them to a defense contractor from [Israel].
- 'A company from [Israel] is suspected of surreptitiously monitoring a DOD telecommunications system to obtain classified information for [Israel] intelligence.
- 'Citizens of [Israel] were investigated for allegations of passing advanced aerospace design technology to unauthorized scientists and researchers.
- '[Israel] is suspected of targeting U.S. avionics, missile telemetry and testing data, and aircraft communications systems for intelligence operations.
- 'It has been determined that [Israel] targeted specialized software that is used to store data in friendly aircraft warning systems.
- '[Israel] has targeted information on advanced materials and coatings for collection. An [Israel] government agency allegedly obtained information regarding a chemical finish used on missile re-entry vehicles from a U.S. person.'"[52]

... "Following is [part of] an undated document issued by the Defense Investigative Service and Circulated in October 1995 to U.S. defense contractors. ...The strong ethnic ties to Israel present in the United States coupled with aggressive and extremely competent intelligence personnel has resulted in a very productive collection effort. Published reports have identified the collection of scientific intelligence in the United States and other developed countries as the third highest priority of Israeli intelligence after information on its Arab neighbors and information on secret U.S. policies or decisions relating to Israel."[53]

Also according to Twing, "Despite the remarkably generous treatment given to

Israel by the United States government, Israel consistently has abused its relationship with Washington and has shown blatant disregard for U.S. laws. There are two important conditions for receiving U.S. military aid that Israel has violated repeatedly. Under the Arms Export Control Act, military hardware provided by FMS funds can be used only for defensive purposes or to maintain internal security. Israel violated this agreement during its 1982 invasion of Lebanon when it used U.S.-made cluster bombs against both military and civilian targets in Lebanon."[54]

Again quoting Twing, "In the Feb. 19, 1996 issue of *The Jewish Week of Queens*, NY, Bryen condemned the profile as 'blatant racism,' but admitted that 'the biggest problem is primarily Israel's sale of war materials to countries that may be adverse to our interests, and maybe Israel's, too.' He concluded that 'Israel's attitude seems to be, we don't care about that -- we're just arms merchants.' Bryen's comments were notable because he is the founder and his wife is executive director of the Washington-based Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), a hard-line lobbying group with ties to Israel's arms industry."[55]

The Worst-Case Scenario

This unlimited support of Israel will allow Israel to reject the just solutions of the problem, and it will enable Israel to attract continuous immigration of Jews who actually live in stability and prosperity in countries like the United States and European nations. At the same time, as the population of Israel grows, the United States will increase its commitment to Israel.

As was reported on the Internet, "It is no secret that Israel, with the help of the United States aims at maintaining its qualitative edge in the region. ... According to latest

military reports, Israel can mobilize over 700,000 strong in less than 72 hours. You can imagine the size of such an army taking into consideration the population of Israel of over 5 million compared to a similar 200 million soldiers in China."[56]

Continuous US bias will result in embarrassment of Middle Eastern friendly governments, allowing an increase of opposition, which will lead to a radical shift and/or coup in the region, weakening US influence. Remember how much it cost America when the Shah of Iran was deposed and exiled and the US lost its position of influence in that country. The United States is still paying for its awkward relationship with Iran.

In addition to what went wrong in the US Middle East foreign policy-makers surrender to the Israeli extremists, which already endangered the US interest and planted the seeds for future complications, a worst-case scenario, with Israel assured of US support, would embolden them to further expand, as it did in the 1967 war against the neighboring Arab countries. This time the Arab response would be more aggressive than in the past, leading into American heavy involvement or Israel using its nuclear weapons. Such a war would jeopardize the stability of the region and would even affect the interests of the whole world. Specifically, the US involvement would be set back to the very beginning, having wasted all previous efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the Middle East is a very important strategic region, its value affects the US citizens, and since the United States is deeply involved in the Middle Eastern affairs, it is wise for the government not to "bury its head in the sand" by remaining heavily involved in the region, and yet placing the situation in seemingly low priority. The

Middle East should have high priority in the US foreign policy, not as recent officials have implied, i.e. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and National Security Advisor Samuel Berger, by placing Middle Eastern concerns far down the list in the agenda of US foreign policy .[57]

Following are recommendations which, I believe, if followed will result in a favorable US position:

First, *I recommend that the US government should consult their Arab partners* who they can trust as being honest concerning the Palestinian cause, specifically the Saudi government who is known to have the longest stable and secure political system in the region and, at the same time, the longest political relations and mutual interests with the United States. I assert that following this recommendation will save the US policy from further complications.

Secondly, *securing a just peace should take priority.* William Quandt, the Harry F. Byrd Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Virginia and a former member of the National Security Council, asserts that the Middle Eastern region "has paid a very, very heavy price for the continuation of high-level conflict. And if the Middle East is going to be at all a different region in the future, those wasted expenditures, those losses of lives, have to be avoided in years to come. ...The priority is not in fact on things like regional, economic cooperation. The priority is on peace and security, which will then open the way to regional cooperation where it makes sense. But there's a tendency to try to short-circuit politics, and unless the political agreements are solid and meet the basic interests of the peoples in the region, economic cooperation will not happen, and the region will be worse off for it."[58]

Mattair remarks, "Richard Falk wrote in the Middle East Journal about two years ago that there is a difference between a solution and a bargain between unequal adversaries. That's why I'm making a reference to Palestinian self-determination. That's a solution. If there is a real solution that satisfies the Palestinians, I think it will undercut extremists. ...As to the benefits of Arab-Israeli peace, I think that if the political solution is correct, then there may be some significant economic benefits. Economic growth and development has been blocked for decades by wars and civil wars and the peace agreements will enable the parties to remove trade barriers and permit trade and investment to take place."[59]

Falk contends, "I believe that if the United States has any sort of long-term vision of stability in the region that is to some degree based upon justice, then it is essential to resolve these national questions in accordance with the principles of self-determination and human rights."[60]

Quandt summarizes the above recommendation points: "As of now, it is quite plausible for Palestinians to believe that the whole Oslo approach is simply meant to calm things down and leave the Israelis with the upper hand for the indefinite future. I think at some point there will be a strong backlash against the whole concept of making peace through negotiations and compromise, unless Palestinians can really see that: first, they're getting a tangible improvement in their daily lives; second, that they are getting more control over the decisions that affect their lives; third, that they're getting to exercise the political democracy that they have been deprived of for so long. Now, all of that is compatible with a version of the Oslo accords, but it is not guaranteed by them. I would also like the United States to weigh in more heavily in favor of Palestinian

elections soon. I think it's extremely important to give legitimacy to this peace-making process by letting ordinary Palestinians express their views on it, by letting them participate through elections in the selection of their own leaders. ...I think we should support that. We should do so very tangibly, by saying that we will be prepared ultimately to support the idea of a Palestinian state, provided that it is a democratic one. That's not our official American policy now. I think it should be. It would give a great boost of confidence to Palestinians who now see the possibility that at the end of this prolonged transitional period they are still going to be deprived of the one thing they most want, and that is statehood with democracy."[61]

Following is my definition of a lasting peace:

The Mutual and full recognition (that is without reservation that may threaten sovereignty) of the separate identities of Israel and Palestine will invite the surrounding countries, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, etc., to also recognize both sides, to cooperate with them, and to begin to resolve tensions throughout the Middle East.

In turn, resolved tensions (the elimination of the state of war and military readiness amongst the above-mentioned nations and the creation of a secure environment on the official level), economic stability(the creation of economic opportunities without intervals of struggle and fears of war to affect it), and cooperation (maintaining open channels for trade and political, security, and social relations) among the Middle Eastern states will eliminate the need for arms build-up and the obtaining of weapons of mass destruction. Elimination suggests the complying (without the exception of *any* country) with the UN resolutions in the dismantling/destruction of existing weapons and facilities and cessation of production or importing of such weapons and facilities. In other words,

if peace is not achieved, the WMD market will be perpetuated.

Without the need for an arms race, the political solution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict will result in economic growth for the two peoples themselves as well as set the tone for the surrounding countries. In speaking of the solution, we indicate the final state of agreement on territory divisions and absolute, independent political sovereignty. When speaking of economic growth, we imply created opportunities to provide an individual income, improve lifestyle, and provide job opportunities.

Thirdly, *I recommend that the US be encouraged to share the burden and the responsibility of the peace process.* In solving the Israeli-Palestinian problem or any similar issues, it would be prudent for the US to invite and encourage involvement of other countries who share an interest in the Middle East, such as the European Community nations and Japan. The reason for this is two-fold. On one hand, if the peace process succeeds, the implementations thereof will be costly and would require some economic aid to the nations attempting to achieve peace, i.e. the Palestinians, the Israelis, and the Jordanians. Nations which have the potential to be involved with the economic aid will be discouraged from contributing if they have not been allowed to participate in the peace process, adopting the attitude of "no participation, no donation." If, however, these countries are able to participate in the process, they will be likely to share in the financial burden of securing a lasting peace. Otherwise, the United States could be left holding the bag. On the other hand, when the responsibility of the peace process is shared, and if the efforts fail, no single nation would take the blame for the failure. The Middle Eastern nations could not point the finger at the United States, holding them solely responsible for misplaced trust, and thus damaging valuable relations

with those Middle Eastern countries. Nor could interest groups within the United States place blame on their own administration for taking a specific approach, when the major countries of the world are working in concert toward an end. The United States will have been in consensus with the international community, thus disallowing the US to be singled out by interest groups as the liable party.

***Fourth**, I believe that the principal of promoting peace and preventing war would be in the United States' best interest in dealing with the Middle East.* The United States must recognize the sovereignty and national interests of the countries involved. Since the United States is the only superpower that has an interest and presence in most of the Mediterranean countries, history indicates that many problems will occur ranging from tensions and media wars to violence of varying intensity. Solving this problem does not only depend on looking at them from an American point of view. The US government's impatience and short-sightedness will exacerbate and compound the problem. For example, the dual containment of Iran and Iraq, as well as that of Libya, did not lead to stability in the region. Rather, it led to increased tensions and animosity in the vicinity, as well as jeopardizing the US interests. In the case of dual containment against Iran and Iraq, the United States seems to be left alone implementing the containment and its consequences. On the other hand, other countries, including the US Western allies, are exploiting the United States' absence in making economic and political relations with the target countries of the containment. Therefore, the policy-makers' awareness of the sovereignty and national interests of each people is essential.

History has shown us that facts and reality of the Middle Eastern issues are the biggest casualties, and 50 years' accumulation of false information has led to the current

crises. Therefore, I caution those who work in the US foreign relations offices to be aware that the information they are obtaining is likely to be tainted. In answering the question "Who has the greater right to go and reside in the Holy Land?" one must take a moment to peel away many lines that have been fed him. Does a Jewish resident of Brooklyn who possibly never had ancestors who saw the land of Palestine have the right to establish a home there, while millions of families wait with keys and deeds in hand to re-enter homes they have been forced to leave?

CONCLUSION

Throughout this paper we have witnessed the US involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian problem and its relation to the rest of the Arab world in which the United States has important interests.

I must admit that I fully realize that the United States is being abused and exploited by its close friend and ally, Israel. However, this does not diminish the responsibility of the US government to be an honest broker in the Middle East.

In conducting this research I have seen nothing but the United States taking sides with the Israelis against the Palestinians in particular and the Arabs in general in all efforts that serve the Israelis' interests and not necessarily the cause of justice.

I have no doubt that this US position and its double standards will have adverse effects on its relations with the Arab/Muslim world. This will lead to problems which the United States does not need. Furthermore, the increase of conflicts within the United States (between Israeli-supporters and Palestinian-sympathizers) will take a turn for the worse.

In listing my recommendations, I have endeavored to show that the best solution for the US intervention is to maintain an unbiased position, and that is the greatest guarantor for long-range US interests and justice for each of the entities involved. The vast improvement in the international media and communications is already awakening the global community to recognize what is actually happening to their fellow-man. Therefore, the United States will stand alone under the sun at odds with both the International community and its own critical interests.

ENDNOTES

[1]Cheryl Rubenberg, Israel and the American National Interest: A Critical Examination, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1986, 24.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Abd Alhadi Butalib, "The Situation of the People of Palestine: The Colonial Remains," *Al Sharq Al-Awsat*, 14 January 1997, 14.

For more on the evolution of the demography of Palestine, see
Cheryl Rubenberg
&
Noam Chomsky, The Fateful Triangle -- the United States, Israel & the Palestinians, Boston, MA: South End Press, 1983.

[4]Richard Cohen, "The Settler Mentality," *Washington Post*, 19 December 1996, A27.

[5]Shawn L. Twing, "The Cost of Israel to U.S. Taxpayers: A Comprehensive Guide to U.S. Aid to Israel," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 14, no. 8, April 1996, 52.

[6]American Friends Service Committee, A Compassionate Peace: A Future for the Middle East, New York: Hill & Wang, 1982.

[7]Joseph N. Green, Jr., Philip M. Klutznick, Harold H. Saunders, Merle Thorpe, Jr., The Path to Peace: Arab-Israeli Peace and the United States, Mount Kisco, NY: Seven Springs Center, 1981.

[8]United Nations, An International Law Analysis of the Major United Nations Resolutions Concerning the Palestine Question. 1979.

United Nations, The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, Part I: 1917-1947. 1977.

United Nations, The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, Part II: 1947-1977. 1978.

United Nations, The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, Part III: 1978 1983. 1984.

[9]Stephen Green, Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations with a Militant Israel, New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1984, 20-21.

[10]Dr. Tawfiq Al-Wa'i, "Roger Garoudy Facing the Octopus Alone," *Islamic Perspectives: The Newsletter of the Islamic Circle of North America*, 4, no. 3, March 1997, 1

[11]Steven Lee Myers, "Plan to Pay off U.N. Dues Stalls," *New York Times*, 20 May 1997, A1, A8.

[12]Khaled Al Maeena, "The Likelihood of New Bloodshed in the Occupied Lands," *Arab News*, 17 December 1996, 4.

[13]Khaled Al Maeena, "The Challenge of the American Veto," *Arab News*, 11 March 1997, 4.

[14]Reuter Wire Service, "PLO Calls on United Nations To Denounce Israeli Plan," *The Washington Post*, 13 March 1997, A27.

[15]Khaled Al Maeena, "Time for a Serious Look at the Peace Process," *Arab News*, 7 January 1997, 4.

[16]William Neikirk & David Cloud, "Arafat Crusades Before Clinton and Larry King," *Chicago Tribune*, 4 March 1997, 1.

[17]Khaled Al Maeena, "The Challenge of the American Veto," *Arab News*, 11 March 1997, 4.

[18]Serge Schmemann, "'Fed Up' With Criticism, Netanyahu Lashes Out," *The New York Times International*, 13 March 1997, A10.

[19]Editorial, "Arab Affairs," *Al Sharq Al-Awsat*, 10 March 1997, 5.

[20]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, "Symposium, The Middle East: What is Our Long-Term Vision, Middle East Policy," *Middle East Policy*, 3, no. 3, December 1994, 11.

[21]Ibid, 10.

[22]John Pimlott, The Middle East Conflicts: From 1945 to the Present, London, England: Orbis, 1983, 47.

[23]Jamal Mohammed Ali, "The Israeli Nuclear Arsenal," *Okaz*, 18 April 1996,14.

[24]Nabeel Al Sahly, "Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process," *Al Sharq Al-Awsat*, 6 December 1996, 14.

[25]Shawn L. Twing, 50-51.

[26]Khaled Al Maeena, "The US Cannot Dictate to Mandela," *Arab News*, 27 January 1997, 4.

[27]Associated Press, "Iraq Defies Sanctions with Flight," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 10 April, 1997, A14.

[28]Khaled Al Maeena, "Time for a Serious Look at the Peace Process," 4.

[29]Barton Gellman, "Arafat Asks for Clinton's Intervention: Palestiinian Leader Calls U.S. Envoy's Mission a Failure," *The Washington Post*, 17 May 1997, A1, A19.

[30]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 12.

[31]Dan Tschirgi, The American Search for Mideast Peace, New York: Praeger, 1989, 199.

[32]Honorable Leonard Sullivan, Jr., Meeting the Challenges of Regional Security, U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1 February 1994, 3.

[33]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 9-10.

[34]Hussan AbdRabu, Mohammed Al Natshah, "The Black Record of the Zionist Terrorism Over 60 Years: 1936-1996," *Al Mujtama'a*, no. 1192, 19-25 March 1996, 20-29.

[35]Noam Chomsky, 16.

[36]Daniel A McGowan, "If Deir Yassin Victims Were Jews," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 14, no. 8, April 1996, 42.

[37]Senator Charles Percy, "Senator Charles Percy Talks to Al-Hewar Center About Middle East Issues in an American Political Life," *The Arab American Dialogue*, 8, no. 3, February 1997, 16.

[38]Noam Chomsky, 442-443.

[39]American Friends Service Committee, A Compassionate Peace, New York: Hill & Wang, 1982.

[40]Lee Hamilton, Brian Atwood, Peter Gubser, Sarah Roy, "Symposium, Development Assistance to the Middle East: Critical Perspectives," *Middle East Policy*, 4, no. 4 April 1996, 26.

[41]Noam Chomsky.

[42]Dr. Ahmad Al-Rabie, "America and the Middle East," *Asharq Al Awsat*, 10

March 1997, 8.

[43]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 12.

[44]Khaled Al Maeena, "Arabs Must Stand Against Pressure," *Arab News*, 11 February 1997, 4.

[45]Isa Nakhlah, "A Reaction to the Unjust Peace Process," *Asharq Al Awsat*, 6 December 1996, 14.

[46]Senator Charles Percy.

[47]Fahed Kouli, http://www.arab.net/arabview/articles/rabie2.html, 31 March 1997.

[48]Editorial, "Saudi Arabia Concerned About Developments in Jerusalem," *The Arab American Dialogue*, 8, no. 3, February 1997, 5.

[49]Khaled Al Maeena, "The Likelihood of New Bloodshed in the Occupied Lands," 4.

[50]Shawn L. Twing, 7, 49, 51.

[51]Editorial, "NAAA Condemns Israeli Threats Against Arab Americans," *The Arab American Dialogue*, 8, no. 3, February 1997, 31.

[52]Shawn L. Twing, "Defense and Intelligence: Pentagon, GAO Report Israeli Espionage and Illegal Technology Retransfer," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 14, no. 8, April 1996, 14, 113.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Shawn L. Twing, "The Cost of Israel to U.S. Taxpayers: A Comprehensive Guide to U.S. Aid to Israel," 51-52.

[55]Shawn L. Twing, "Defense and Intelligence: Pentagon, GAO Report Israeli Espionage and Illegal Technology Retransfer," 14, 113.

[56]Peace Process, "Sparta's Second Coming: The Israeli Military Mentality is Here to Stay," http://arabia.com/digest/sparta.htm, 9 March 1997.

[57]Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, "Focus on U.S. Foreign Policyl," *ROA National Security Report*, March 1997, 23-26.

[58]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 5-6.

[59]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 13.

[60]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 11.

[61]Bruce Riedel, William Quandt, Richard Falk, Thomas R. Mattair, 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AbdRabu, Hussan; Al Natshah, Mohammed, "The Black Record of the Zionist Terrorism Over 60 Years: 1936-1996," *Al Mujtama'a*, No. 1192, 19-25 March 1996, 20-29.

Ali, Jamal Mohammed, "The Israeli Nuclear Arsenal," *Okaz*, 18 April 1996, 14.

Albright, Secretary of State Madeleine, "Focus on U.S. Foreign Policyl," *ROA National Security Report*, March 1997, 23-26.

Al Imam, Ghassan, "The Femininity of the US Politics," *Asharq Al Awsat*, 4 February 1997, 7.

Al Maeena, Khaled, "Arabs Must Stand Against Pressure," *Arab News*, 11 February 1997, 4.

Al Maeena, Khaled, "The Challenge of the American Veto," *Arab News*, 11 March 1997, 4.

Al Maeena, Khaled, "The Likelihood of New Bloodshed in the Occupied Lands," *Arab News*, 17 December 1996, 4.

Al Maeena, Khaled, "The US Cannot Dictate to Mandela," *Arab News*, 27 January 1997, 4.

Al Maeena, Khaled, "Time for a Serious Look at the Peace Process," *Arab News*, 7 January 1997, 4.

Al-Rabie, Dr. Ahmad, "America and the Middle East," *Asharq Al Awsat*, 10 March 1997, 8.

Al Sahly, Nabeel, "Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process," *Al Sharq Al-Awsat*, 6 December 1996, 14.

Associated Press, "Iraq Defies Sanctions with Flight," *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 10 April, 1997, A14.

Al-Wa'i, Dr. Tawfiq, "Roger Garoudy Facing the Octopus Alone," *Islamic Perspectives: The Newsletter of the Islamic Circle of North America*, 4, no. 3, March 1997, 1.

American Friends Service Committee, A Compassionate Peace: A Future for the Middle East. New York: Hill & Wang, 1982.

Butalib, Abd Alhadi, "The Situation of the People of Palestine: The Colonial Remains,"

Al Sharq Al-Awsat, 14 January 1997, 14.

Cattan, Henry, Palestine and International Law: the Legal Aspects of the Arab-Israeli Conflict. London: Longman, 1973

Chomsky, Noam, The Fateful Triangle -- the United States, Israel & the Palestinians. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1983.

Cohen, Richard, "The Settler Mentality," *Washington Post*, 19 December 1996, A27.

Editorial, "Arab Affairs," *Al Sharq Al-Awsat*, 10 March 1997, 5.

Editorial, "NAAA Condemns Israeli Threats Against Arab Americans," *The Arab American Dialogue*, 8, no. 3, February 1997, 31.

Editorial, "Saudi Arabia Concerned About Developments in Jerusalem," *The Arab American Dialogue*, 8, no. 3, February 1997, 5.

Findley, Paul, Deliberate Deceptions: Facing the Facts About the US-Israeli Relationship. Chicago, IL: Lawerence Hill, 1993.

Findley, Paul, They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby. Westport, CT: Lawerence Hill, 1985.

Gellman, Barton, "Arafat Asks for Clinton's Intervention: Palestiinian Leader Calls U.S. Envoy's Mission a Failure," *The Washington Post*, 17 May 1997, A1, A19.

Green, Joseph N., Jr.; Klutznick, Philip M.; Saunders, Harold H.; Thorpe, Merle, Jr.; The Path to Peace: Arab-Israeli Peace and the United States. Mount Kisco, NY: Seven Springs Center.

Green, Stephen, Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations with a Militant Israel. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1984.

Hamilton, Lee; Atwood, Brian; Gubser, Peter; Roy, Sarah; "Symposium, Development Assistance to the Middle East: Critical Perspectives," *Middle East Policy*, 4, no. 4, April 1996, 26.

Kouli, Fahed, http://www.arab.net/arabview/articles/rabie2.html, 31 March 1997.

McGowan, Daniel A., "If Deir Yassin Victims Were Jews," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 14, no. 8, April 1996, 42.

Myers, Steven Lee, "Plan to Pay off U.N. Dues Stalls," *New York Times*, 20 May 1997, A1, A8.Nakhlah, Isa, "A Reaction to the Unjust Peace Process," *Asharq Al Awsat*, 6 December 1996.

Nakhlah, Isa, "A Reaction to the Unjust Peace Process," *Asharq Al Awsat*, 6 December 1996, 14.

Neikirk, William & Cloud, David, "Arafat Crusades Before Clinton and Larry King," *Chicago Tribune*, 4 March 1997, 1.

Peace Process, "Sparta's Second Coming: The Israeli Military Mentality is Here to Stay," http://arabia.com/digest/sparta.htm, 9 March1997.

Pelletiere, Dr. Stephen C., Hamas and Hizbollah: The Radical Challenge to Israel in the Occupied Territories. US Army War College: Strategic Studies Institute, 1994.

Percy, Senator Charles, "Senator Charles Percy Talks to Al-Hewar Center About Middle East Issues in an American Political Life," *The Arab American Dialogue*, 8, no. 3, February 1997, 16.

Pimlott, John, The Middle East Conflicts: From 1945 to the Present. London, England: Orbis, 1983.

Reuter Wire Service, "PLO Calls on United Nations To Denounce Israeli Plan," *The Washington Post*, 13 March 1997, A27.

Riedel, Bruce; Quandt, William; Falk, Richard; Mattair, Thomas R.; "Symposium, The Middle East: What is Our Long-Term Vision, Middle East Policy," *Middle East Policy*, 3, no. 3, December 1994, 5-13.

Rubenberg, Cheryl, Israel and the American National Interest: A Critical Examination. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1986.

Schmemann, Serge, "'Fed Up' With Criticism, Netanyahu Lashes Out," *The New York Times International*, 13 March 1997, A10.

Sullivan, Honorable Leonard, Jr., Meeting the Challenges of Regional Security. U.S. Army War College: Strategic Studies Institute, 1 February 1994.

Tschirgi, Dan, The American Search for Mideast Peace. New York: Praeger, 1989.

Twing, Shawn L., "Defense and Intelligence: Pentagon, GAO Report Israeli Espionage and Illegal Technology Retransfer," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 14, no. 8, April 1996, 14, 113.

Twing, Shawn L., "The Cost of Israel to U.S. Taxpayers: A Comprehensive Guide to U.S. Aid to Israel," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 14, no. 8, April 1996, 7, 49-52.

United Nations, An International Law Analysis of the Major United Nations Resolutions Concerning the Palestine Question. 1979.

United Nations, The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, Part I: 1917-1947. 1977.

United Nations, The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, Part II: 1947-1977. 1978.

United Nations, The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, Part III: 1978 1983. 1984.