

AMERICAN- ISRAELI RELATIONS DURING PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON'S REIGN

Dr. Mohammad Ali Al-Rousan

Associate Professor, Al-Balqa' Applied University, Irbid University College,
Basic Sciences Department

Abstract

The study aimed at investigating the qualitative change of American-Israeli relations during President Bill Clinton's reign to recognize the American political policy and their practical applications concerning Israel to open channels of security and economic cooperation with Arab parties and guarantee Israeli superiority in the Middle East in general. Therefore, the study investigated the historical cultural background supporting those policies, the role played by the Zionist Lobby as a part of the secret government and the non-governmental pressure powers in the formation of the American bias to Israel. This was manifested in Clinton's pressure on the Arab sides during the peace process courses for the accomplishment of the agreements and arrangements which could achieve the Israeli economic and security insertion in its Arabic Surrounding. The study concluded that Clinton's administration was the most biased to Israel resulting in creating new facts that make Israel the only winning side.

Keywords: Bill Clinton, American-Israeli Relations, Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Israel

Introduction

The American- Israeli relations were not an instant historical moment, but they have been the consequences of reasons that have led to a complete American bias to Israel ever since its establishment. The study aimed at investigating these relations in regard to cultural aspects and common interests that have been revealed in political and security policies which encouraged Israeli superiority in the region.

Therefore, the study investigated the background of that relation which stemmed from the American impressionistic picture of the Muslim Arabs based on Christian-Jewish religious and cultural beliefs and historical conflict relations between the Christian West and

Muslims and all the perspectives related to Palestine and specifically the Holy Land, represented in the Prophets and the Canaan Land promised to the Jews.

The research centers run by the Jewish researchers or those biased to Israel played the same role such as the American- Israeli “Ibak” organization which took the role of premeditated influence on American elections and candidates’ policies after assuming administration and the same applies to the American Congress Members.

The biased policies of Israel were manifested in the case of the two main parties, the Republican and Democratic. Clinton’s presidential era was the most biased, especially, at the level of peace process by following up the initiative of Madrid Conference which included all the parties of Arab-Israeli conflict through bilateral and multilateral negotiations and the participation of international parties. Clinton launched “Principles Declaration” from Washington following the secret Palestinian-Israeli negotiations in Oslo. Then Clinton continued his role by sponsoring the negotiations with Jordan and Syria.

In this way, Clinton had his grand accomplishment on the Palestinian and Jordanian sides. However, the Syrian track remained in a state of standstill without impacting the stability and security of the borders of Israel in Golan Heights. Increasingly, Clinton continued his efforts to create economic and political arrangements with other Arab parties through economic and security conferences in which Israel, the United States and other International powers participated for the purpose of the insertion of Israel in the Arab region.

Through his efforts, President Clinton represented a distinctive mark in the American-Israeli relation as being the most biased presidents in the accomplishment of the Israeli aims by endorsing the Palestinian and Jordanian parties to work as Israel liked in regard to common economic, security and political arrangements.

The Study Hypothesis

The study hypothesis was that the American foreign policy was the most biased one to Israel in the Middle East during President Clinton’s administration in a way that it was formed and implemented in a complete and direct harmony with the Israeli policy (if not dictated by Israel).

It formed extensions of a long history of an American- Israeli alliance justified by American vital interests in the region.

The Study Aim and Importance

The importance of the study is in revealing the extent of the impact of internal variables on the American political decision maker and the role of economic, political structure in the formation of American foreign policy toward Israel, including Jewish

pressure powers, in addition to the role of national and vital interests of the United States in the Middle East region.

In contrast, the study revealed how the Arabic decision maker implemented the suggestions and mechanism of negotiations which were drawn by the American administration without noticing that the policies were completely biased to Israel. On the academic scientific domain, the study, in regard to its topic, may add the role of historical cultural variables, the current variant of the role of interests and pressure powers in the formation of the reasons behind the foreign political decision, as well as the variety of international order in establishing the foreign political decision, as well as the variety of international order in establishing the foreign political decision.

Study Method

The study adopted the historical descriptive analytical method based on the historical incidents in understanding the present and the future as it is not possible to understand any political situation without going back to its historical roots and its development. This way was followed in order to infer the stable and constant American bias to Israel and to build up the concepts and generalizations that explain it. The approach of international order was taken into account which included external variables that enabled the formation of the external political decision biased to Israel.

American cultural Background, Zionist Lobby and Bias for Israel

The cultural vision of America and the West toward the Arabs generally came as a negative stereotype which derived from books, newspaper articles and various studies and researches that covered the Arabic issues and daily lives of Arab peoples. This picture depicted the Arabs as ignorant, extreme, backward and closed human communities incapable of development. There has always been a state of fear and hatred to the extent that they have been amongst the constant constituents of the American policy toward the Arabs and their different issues since the World War II.

Moreover, anything related to the Arabs and the Arab and Islamic region is considered as a threat to Israel by Americans (Said, 2001: 76).

That impressionistic picture has been in harmony with the common Christian-Jewish beliefs. The American researcher, Jerice Halcel explained in her book “Prophecy and Policy”: Christians and Zionists “this American sympathy to Israel by saying that “the base of the doctrine of Christians and Zionists is based on the concept that God has predetermined the occurrence of this thing; Israel has done it without being aware of it and therefore it has

performed the will of God". In this way, Christians believe that they have to support what is done by Israel without hesitation (Abdul-Sadiq, 2004: 95).

On these principles, both Jewish Zionism and Christian Zionism movements agreed upon the project of occupying and usurping Palestine and providing all sorts of support which enabled Israel to uproot a person from its land and put other people in its place. Ideology had to form the supporting background for that and for this cultural dimension to transfer to the political domain.

When the historical moment planned by Zionism to accomplish its colonial project in Palestine came, the United States of America practiced its pressures in Britain, as being the mandatory power in Palestine, to present the project of Palestine partition before the General Assembly of the United Nations, besides the pressures on some member states in order to vote to the advantage of this resolution (Shadeed, 1985: 70-71).

The United States did its best to convince the Arab countries to shelter Palestinians in the Arab hosting countries and transfer the UNRWA activities to the Arab governments. Therefore, the Palestinian people did not exist in the lexicon of American foreign policy, but as refugees. The American secretary of foreign affairs, John Forster Dallas, in June, 1953, suggested a solution to the problem of Palestinian refugees through giving them citizenship in Arab neighboring countries (Buhring, 1971, pp. 100-118).

The cultural dimension was not their sole motive, but research centers and the Zionist Lobby played their role through their impact in making the political decision of the new administrations and public opinion.

The influence of Zionist Lobby represented that attitude which extended further to the Washington Institute for the Near East Policy, the American Institute for peace, Brookings Organization, the Institute of Foreign Policy Researches, Heritage Organization, the Institute of Foreign Policy Analysis and Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (Aiyish, 2006: 97).

Under the Impact of those centers and organizations, Clinton's administration continued to benefit from the experts of intellectual centers who occupied political positions during Clinton's administration. The Zionist Lobby and the groups supporting Israel, at the top of which was the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee were the major players.

IBAC cares about its influence within the American society and governmental and non-governmental organizations through recruiting influential employees. It does not disregard practicing influence on election campaigns and their finance, pressure on congressional legislators and decision makers in executive administration, reporters and

investigators in the media, University instructors and students and researchers and managers in research centers to impact decision makers and public opinion (IBAC Conference, 2004: 147).

IBAC Committee is in full control of the congress in a way that the policy of the United States is undebatable. Democratic ex-member of the Senates, Ernest Holings confirmed this fact while leaving his post: “you cannot have an Israeli policy other than that provided by IBAC in this place”. This was openly revealed by Arael Sharon when he said, “when people ask me how they can help Israel, I tell them: help IBAC”. Moreover, anyone who says that there is an Israeli Lobby, will be charged as anti-Semitic, and nobody here can bear this charge. In other words, when you criticize an Israeli policy, you become identified as an anti-Semitic one (Shimer, 2007: 87).

The Jewish pressure groups in the United States have not left any aspect of American official life without getting involved in it and practicing its influence to direct the official policies and the American public opinion to the advantage of Israel. This seemed clear in the Zio-American administrative structure and the policies adopted by Clinton’s administration.

During Clinton’s reign, “IBAC” committee accomplished its greatest penetration in the history of the American administration, although the power of IBAC’s influence has not been confined to Clinton’s administration, but it has been a natural continuity of this role. According to what was reported in New York Times Newspaper in 1987, IBAC became a main power in drawing the policy of the United States in the Middle East, and the organization became so powerful that it could have an influence on choosing the presidential candidate and his administration people (Findly, 1993: 115). Amongst research centers, Washington Institute for the Near East policies which was the Zionist intellectual arm as being an influential power in the American foreign policy. It was managed, during Clinton’s reign, by Mark Andick, the counselor of national security (Khafajy, www.albayan-magazine.com/bayan-13.htm).

The intellectual favoritism of President Clinton’s administration was influenced by a report about the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1992 under the name “constant partnership” which was written by a research committee formed by the Washington Institute for the Near East Policies from all influential people including six officials who held political and administrative positions during Clinton’s administration. Important recommendations were presented which directed the American policy toward the requirements of Israeli interests (Washington Report, 8 September, 2005, www.e;ap.com).

In this way, several factors combined supported each other during Clinton's administration: cultural background, stable way of American administrations, research efforts of research centers and the guidance and pressures of Zionist Lobby, one of the sides of the American secret governments with their economic and political dimensions, especially in light of a political structure of the American administration supporting Israel which was clearly evident in its influence and role in the American files of the Middle East.

Clinton and the American Policies in the Middle East Files: Ever since the first days of Clinton's administration, it was clear that it was the most friendly one to Israel. President Clinton (1993-2001) was surrounded by a Zio-American administration which had its role in a lot of political decisions biased to Israel.

Aron David Miller referred to this dimension of the American administration structure and its reflection on Foreign Policy by saying: "after years of leaving my job in the American government, I wrote an article in the Washington Post under the title 'Israel's lawyer' to explain how many officials in Clinton's administration, considered me as being one of them, had a strong inclination to look upon the Arab-Israeli conflict with an Israeli lens. He added in regard to 'IBAC' that this organization does not only bring support to Israel, but also determines how one can be loyal to it and to make sure for the election of people who sympathize with Tel Aviv (Miller, 2012).

Like other American Presidential candidates, Clinton has started his support for Israel since his election campaign in a statement before the Jewish Lobby in which he considered Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel, stating his opposition to the establishment of a Palestinian Sovereign State. This support was practically consolidated after presiding the American administration by providing all aspects of political, financial and military support. He brought this support into effect through the establishment of American-Israeli Agency for Science and Technology which functioned under the supervision of the American Ministry of Commerce, that financed about five hundred research projects determined by Israeli organizations (Al-Sheikh, 7/10/2008, mamdouhalshikh.elaphblog.com/posts.aspx).

The Arab-Israeli peace process came to crown the bias of Clinton's administration through the economic, security and economic agreements which served Israeli interests, on one hand, and the beginning of an alliance and policies serving the interests of the United States and rooting its military existence in the region, on the other hand. This was in harmony with the Israeli-Western alliance which considered Israel the bridgehead of the Middle East.

All this was furthered by the structure of the international order which enabled the United States to get the international appropriate climate ready based on its influence as a

leader of the world, and therefore security its vital interests in the Middle East, especially its control of the Arab Gulf oil and its easy flow to the United States and the West (Indick, 1993: 86).

Arab-Israeli negotiations came after significant changes in the international and regional order which resulted from the second Gulf War and the breakdown of the Soviet Union. Clinton continued his efforts in the American administrative initiative in the Madrid Conference with the presence of Israel and Arab and International sides on 30/10/1991, and the bilateral and multilateral negotiations which resulted from it.

Madrid Conference

The conference was held and its work frame was determined through the invitation message by launching two separate but parallel tracks: bilateral and multilateral. The invitation message determined what was relevant to the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations and they would be centered around temporary autonomy, while the negotiations on permanent status would be on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338 which would start three years after the transitional period (Journal of Palestine Studies, 1992: 120-121). The multilateral negotiations took their track and the bilateral ones took a parallel one, but on the Palestinian side it took a secret way in Oslo which resulted in “Oslo Agreement”.

Oslo Agreement

The track started in Oslo the capital of Norway in January 1993 through secret negotiations between the Palestinians and the Israelis. The first draft of the agreement upon principles was formed by both sides following the end of the rounds of negotiations.

The negotiations were completed on 9 September, Clinton was informed by Israeli prime minister Isaac Rabin that a peaceful agreement had been reached between Israel and Palestinian Liberation Organization. On September 10, Clinton stated that the Israeli and Palestinian leaders would sign an agreement in the White House on 13 September. Ever since that moment, Clinton has stated that most of the work that they had to do was to bear the difficult task related to solving intricate issues and drawing the implementation items of the agreement, raising money to finance the necessary expenditures for implementation which is necessary for different things such as the security and economic development of Israel, resettlement of refugees and compensations for Palestinians. In general, the statement of principles in Oslo was a great step forward (Clinton, 2003).

Signing the agreement at the same table that witnessed the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli Camp David could be a symbolic indicator of the peace frame drawn by the United States with a complete harmony and conformity with the Israeli vision. Clinton’s suggestion

for subsequent rounds of negotiations was successively toward the accomplishment of the agreements that served the Israeli aims.

In spite of that, and following the signing of the Oslo Agreement in the White House in September, 1993, some Israeli lobbies and the new conservatives launched a great campaign against the bargain of “Land for Peace”. Following the assassination of Israel Prime Minister, Isaac Rabin, in 1996, the Research Department of the Institute of Political Strategic Studies asked many researchers to conduct a series of studies about the best ways of the abolition of the Oslo Agreements with the aim of presenting them to the new Israeli Prime Minister (Binjamin Nitinyaho) (Beilin, 2001: 120).

This attitude was confirmed when the Israeli Prime Minister, Nitinyaho, in 1996, during a meeting with the American President, Bill Clinton, in the White House, refused the principle of “Land for Peace”, stating that the settlement is a right and a duty. He demanded that terrorism should be fought and the security and land of Israel should be protected. In return, President Clinton confirmed the American Commitment of supporting Israel and maintaining its military superiority and its right to follow the policy rendered by it as suitable for achieving peace (Hussein, 1998: 5).

His confirmation of the continuity of supporting Israel came in his reply to a reporter at Sharm Al-Sheikh Conference on 15 March, 1996, that he would not change his straight forward stand during his election campaign that Jerusalem is the Capital of Israel.

But now he gave priority to urge the different sides to continue with Peace talks and his care about their success with ensuring the solidary of the United States, its care of Israel’s security and the progress of the peace process and stating that the issue of Jerusalem would be discussed in the negotiations of the final status. Every time Jerusalem was mentioned Clinton did not hesitate to state his supportive stand for Israel (Clinton, 18/3/1996, p. 489, www.ebeschost.com).

With the same level of Clinton’s clear bias to Israel during his first Presidency, he continued that during his second presidency. His diplomacy came in conformity with the Israeli vision and in response to the different Israeli leaderships. In a parallel way, he practiced the diplomacy of giving hope to the Palestinian side which was waiting for American assurances and hopes for a change in Israeli policies by the change in the leaders of Israeli decision makers.

Way River Agreements

In November 1998, Clinton called for a meeting and holding talks between the Palestinians and the Israelis in Way River. They resulted in the signing of Yassir Arafat,

Nitinyaho and Clinton about security arrangements with Israeli, Palestinian and American participation under the title of fighting terrorism. Then Way River 2 negotiations were held in Sharm Al-Sheikh with the presence of Ayahood Barak after the victory of the labor party government over the Likood Party led by Nitinyaho (Tinit, 2007: 83-97).

In the meeting which included President Clinton and Ayahood Barak, the Israeli Prime Minister in Washington, on 19 July, 1999, regional, security, economic and scientific cooperation and the accomplishment of the necessary agreements were emphasized as a token of friendship relations, strategic partnership, democratic values and common concerns which combined the two sides as it was stated in American justifications of this support (President Documents, 26/7/1999: 1412, www.ebschost.com).

With the continuity of American support of Israel, the Palestinian side was to be blamed for the responsibility of the obstacles. Shlowmo Bin Aamy, ex-minister of foreign affairs and internal security blamed the other side calling the Palestinian authority the enemy. “Shair” revealed the game of Ayhood Barak, Israeli prime minister which he called “the imposed fact”, when he invented a new scheme, namely, the “frame agreement” as “a precaution for the agreement about the final status”. It was a new transitional stage before the final solution which was rejected by the Palestinians. Bilin affirmed that Barak’s maneuver easily aimed at abolishing Oslo Agreement (Sher, 2001: 195).

In this way, the Israeli and the Americans agreed upon one vision which implied the stop of negotiations and the involvement of the Palestinian side in new rounds which aimed at wasting time and giving the Palestinians the illusion that the solution was approaching. When the negotiations came to a closed end, the Palestinians would be responsible for that. In this way, the game of negotiations would continue under American new pressures and suggestions. Another round would be called for where the only winner was the Israeli side through American arrangements to achieve its aims, but with Palestinian instruments when the Palestinian leadership itself took legal and security arrangements and procedures. Following the same way, Clinton called for a new round in Camp David on 11 July, 2000.

American President Clinton called President Arafat and Israeli prime minister, Barak, for the Camp David Summit. This time, also, American and Israeli thoughts and stand were identical and harmonious, when the American suggestions implied ideas that did not conform to the logic of international legitimacy. The promised Palestinian state would be disarmed and in accordance with the requirements of Israeli security and population facts. The issue of Palestinian refugees was dealt with without the least consideration of the rights acknowledged by tens of international agreements/ Jerusalem became an open city and the

capital of both Israeli and Palestinian states. Upon that, the suggestions seemed written by Israeli pens (Al-Kar'I, 2004: 125-126).

Therefore, this round of negotiations failed due to the deep disagreements between the two sides about Jerusalem, the return of refugees to their homeland and other unresolved issues in spite of the promises that Clinton had expressed before Arafat.

All those sweet promises were cited by Madlin Albright, American Secretary of Foreign affairs, during Clinton's second reign when she said that Clinton tempted Arafat, during Camp David Summit, of the opportunity of making his dream come true if he agreed upon the thoughts presented to him, expressing his readiness to support him when the Palestinian flag would be raised. Clinton considered that as a historical moment in his life (notes of a minister, New Life, 2/10/2003).

Every time the negotiations were blocked, the Israelis and the Americans rendered the Palestinians responsible for their failure. Following the end of the Camp David Summit in 2000, Israel, represented by Barak's government and the American democratic administration which sponsored the negotiations, started saying that the Palestinians had wasted the historic opportunity and that Yassir Arafat was responsible for that and he was considered as part of the problem not part of the solution (Al-Sha'iry, 2006: 193).

At the level of the American role in the United Nations, it was clear that it did not want Butrus Ghali to be again the Secretary General of the United Nations as a result of his moderate stand.

This is what Madlin Albright, American Secretary of foreign affairs, recommended after losing the American consent when he forgot that he was working in the American United Nations. America, as confirmed by Madlin Albright and by the right of its veto to prevent any peace process if it did not conform with its interests on 15 December, 1996, Clinton was reelected for a second period and New York Times Newspaper described Anan's nomination as an important thing as if the United Nations was a department of the American government (Raghib, 2008: 543-547, 554).

In spite of all that, Clinton's diplomacy recurred by calling the sides through the presentation of new suggestions for rounds of negotiations that concentrated on the issues of settlements, refugees, Jerusalem, borders and security in December, 2000.

Clinton, in a trilateral meeting which included the Israelis, the Palestinian and the Americans, presented suggestions related to those issues. However, this time there was no indication of the whole area of the Wet Bank, and whether East Jerusalem was a part of the West Bank. No indication was for the expansion of settlements at the expense of Palestinian

inhabitants. Those suggestions asked the Palestinians to give up the lands which were confiscated illegally by Israel and to maintain the illegal Israeli settlements according to International law. In regard to Clinton's suggestions about the Palestinians' right of return to their homeland, they were not clear but vague. They only referred to a Jewish State and a Palestinian State, based on the religion of each one, disregarding the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland from which it was expelled. At the security level, the suggestions determined an Israeli withdrawal, in three years, and the existence of an international force. At the end of this period, the Israeli existence in Jordan Valley continues, as it is determined by the possibility of any threats to Israel (Al-Baba, 2001: 14).

In general, files were transferred, as in Oslo, to subsequent stages, and in effect, Israel is continually transferring the Palestinian territories to the Israelis with the increase in the number of settlers and the prospect of creating a Palestinian state will be blocked.

Clinton's policy always implied a biased stand for Israel. The moment it stated its sponsorship of the peace process, its real essence conformed, in principle and in practice, with the Israeli policies contradicting with the international legitimacy.

With the degree of Clinton's achievement to the advantage of Israel though its negotiations with the Palestinians which have not finished yet, it achieved a final solution on the Jordanian-Israeli track.

The Jordanian File

Clinton's efforts resulted in the signing of the Jordanian-Israeli agenda on 14 September, 1993 as a continuity of the application of what resulted from a trilateral summit which included King Hussein, Clinton and Rabin in Washington on July 25, 1994 who signed "Washington Statement" which confirmed a comprehensive peace agreement based on resolutions 242 and 338 (Oleimat, 2000: 164).

This proclamation paved the way for elaborate negotiations which resulted in the signing of the Jordanian-Israeli peace treaty by Jordanian prime minister Abdulsalam Al-Majali and Israeli prime minister Isaac Rabin and the presence of Bill Clinton, King Hussein and Israeli president Aizra Wiseman on 26 October, 1994 during a celebration held at bordering Wadi Arabah crossing between Jordan and Israel (Clinton, 1994: 2).

During the signing celebration, Clinton addressed King Hussein saying: "Your Majesty, King Hussein, today, in this Arabic land, you are making true the dream of the man who taught you to seek peace, namely, your grandfather who left you a heavy burden and a great dream at his martyrdom, four decades ago. He believed that one day the Arabs and the Jews would live on the banks of the Jordan River in peace. You shouldered this burden in an

unparalleled courage and made that dream come true”. Then he addressed Rabin saying: “You spent your life as a soldier fighting in the beginning to establish your state, and after that defended it. You struggled all your life with due courage to achieve lasting and secure peace for your people. You now have given hope and life and as you said, you are before a challenge to secure the home of Israel and make it a homeland” (Al-majali, 1994: 78-79).

Clinton excluded Jerusalem from the frame of the late Palestinian-Israeli negotiations when he addressed king Hussein saying: “Your Majesty, in this statement that you will sign, you have a role as a protector of Islamic holy places in Jerusalem, including Al-Aqsa. Israel has agreed to give priority to the historical role of Jordan in regard to these holy places in the final status negotiations: (Publications of the Palestinian Academic Society for International Affairs, PASSIA, 2004: 13).

This public confirmation came further than what Clinton’s suggestions implied concerning Jerusalem. In this way, the files became interlapping and more confused, not only for the bilateral negotiations between the Palestinians and the Israelis, but also for the Arabic negotiating sides themselves. Thus, Clinton was able to accomplish the file of Jordanian-Israeli settlement which included agreements that comprised economic, political and security dimensions that guaranteed secure borders for Israel and its entrance in the Arab market via the Jordanian gate represented in the economic interrelations and the establishment of Israeli economic installations in Jordanian free zones.

We can describe the results of the negotiations between Jordan and Israel as a model of a strategic interaction which included a winning side and a losing another. The winning side, in this case, is Israel while the losing one is Jordan (Oleimat, ed.,: 167).

In accordance with what was agreed upon in the Madrid Conference, Clinton did his best to urge Syria and Israel to start negotiations and accomplish peace on the Syrian track. The settlement process which was launched in Madrid happened to two negotiations tracks: the first track implied the direct bilateral negotiations to settle the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, South Lebanon and Golan Heights, while the other track included the multilateral negotiations.

The Syrian File

Talks between the Israeli and Syrian delegates started in Washington following the Madrid conference in the frame of Madrid formula. In 1994, negotiations at the level of ambassadors in Washington happened. These talks resulted in discussions centered on security arrangements and two meetings of the Israeli and Syrian Chiefs of staff in December, 1994 and June, 1995.

The Israeli negotiators informed the Syrian side that Israel would accept the principle of withdrawal in the Golan Heights in the frame of a settlement of four essential issues: depth of withdrawal , timetable and period of the withdrawal process, withdrawal stages and their connection with relations normalization. In this regard, as it was in Egypt, Israel insisted on a recommended period for normalization, open borders, two embassies before withdrawal to indefinite borders and agreements of security arrangements. Two rounds were held under the patronage of the United States in the Conference center in Way River in December, 1995 and January, 1996. All participants in the two rounds agreed that they pushed in a noticeable way the discussion about crucial issues which created a solid base for further discussions. On 8 December, 1999, President Clinton stated that Prime Minister Ayahood Barak and President Al-Assad had agreed to resume the peace negotiations between Israel and Syria from the point it stopped in January, 1996. This was followed by a summit hosted by President Clinton on 15 December between Prime Minister Barak and Syrian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Farouq Al-Shari', followed by a round of talks in West Virginia in January, 2000. These negotiations were conducted with an effective support and participation of American senior officials, besides two meetings between president Clinton and Al-Assad and a series of tours of foreign secretary Warn Christopher in the region (Communication, 2008).

Clinton admitted that ex-President Hafiz Al-Assad was earnest in his desire to make peace and that he was ready to be flexible and positive in the negotiations with Israel, but when Clinton cited in his book Al-Assad, he did not hesitate to refer to his support of terrorism. He meant by that Syria's support of Hizbullah in Lebanon. In this, he adopted the Israeli opinion which implied the idea that whoever opposed the Israeli occupation of the Arab land would be considered a terrorist person (My Life, ed.,)

President Clinton's vision was completely in harmony with the Israeli one which was expressed by the different Israeli leaderships with all colors of the political spectrum that Syria was supporting terrorism and strategically connected with the Irani extreme regime. So, the talks ended without agreeing upon how the Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights in the way believed and described by Syria. The Syrian track remained standstill but Israel benefited from the truce agreement which kept its borders on the Golan Heights secure.

Meanwhile, Clinton's administration did not lose hope in working outside those sides by moving forward other Arab sides with the aim of Israel's economic and security integration with other Arab sides through holding the economic conferences with Arab-Israeli participation and other international sides which guarantee Israel as an existing and effective power in the Middle East region.

Economic and Security Integration of Israel in the Region

In the same way as Clinton accomplished biased policies to Israel, he continued his efforts to build its relations with the other Arab countries which were not connected with peace agreements through multilateral conferences and summits. He aimed at integrating it in the Middle East regional order and through the frame of prevalent international order.

The Economic Summit Conference of Development in the Middle East and North Africa was held in Morocco in December, 1994. Warn Christopher, American Minister of Foreign affairs confirmed that the conference aimed at ensuring the economic integration of Israel in the Middle East and giving the settlement process economic dimension (Hussein, ed.,: 13-14).

The second economic summit was held in Amman in October, 1995 (29-31). This conference came to end the Arab boycott of Israel in the context of what was proclaimed by Ronald Brown, American minister of commerce to arrange the region's economic issues to the advantage of Israel and the United States (Ameen, 1996: 41-42).

The third conference in Cairo was in November (12-14), 1996 as Martin Indick, the Ambassador in Tel Aviv, referred to it aiming at building the Arab-Israeli co-operation as being the best way for achieving complete peace in the region (Al-Ahali Almassriyyah, 6/11/1996).

Then Al-Doha conference came on November 16, 1996, in which Israel lessened the tension of criticisms toward Israel because of its blocking the settlement process, despite the absence of Egypt which had signed a peace agreement with Israel (Lebanese Al-Safeer Newspaper, 10/11/1997).

The American efforts succeeded in holding Sharm Al-Sheikh Summit on 13 March, 1996 as was called for by President Clinton and the Presence of Arab and European leaders and Russian President Yeltssin. In the opening speech, Clinton emphasized the call for preventing the powers of terrorism and evil from stopping the peace process. He talked about combining all efforts in order to foil the mischievous aims. In a press conference with President Mubarak he stated about the formation of an open follow-up group for all participants in the Summit (Middle East Newspaper, 14/3/1996).

Immediately and in an assurance of the practical implementation of the recommendations of the conference, Clinton participated in a minor meeting of the Israeli cabinet.

Besides him and the American minister of foreign affairs, Warn Christopher, head of the central intelligence and officials in American security departments attended the meeting.

Clinton was committed to offering (100) million dollars to help Israel in facing terrorism and chasing Muslim extremists. He said in a press conference with Bariss that the United States and Israel decided to start negotiations for a bilateral agreement to encounter terrorism and the United States would increase its co-operation with Israel in the field of intelligence to chase extremists. Warn Christopher and John Dwitch, head of the Central Intelligence Agency asked Israel to resume talks in regard to the security agreement which emphasized strengthening the war in three areas: providing Israel with equipment and additional training, co-operation between the two countries to develop new ways and technology to encounter terrorism and to promote communications and co-operation between the two countries and with the governments which participated in the war against terrorism (Life, 15/3/1996).

In this way, Clinton was greatly successful employing Sharm Al-Sheikh Summit and his visit to Israel in gathering this big number of leaders and representatives of countries and providing the American Umbrella by giving Israel the leading role in the new regional security order and consolidating the strategic alliance between the two countries on the basis of the commitment of the United States to maintain the qualitative superiority of the Israeli army, providing Israel with modern military technology and the formation of a regional security force with the participation of the countries of the region, headed by the Arab countries. Therefore, Sharm Al-Sheikh formed a regional security alliance whose strategic center and powerful force is Israel.

In addition to those efforts started by the United States since Madrid conference and the peace agreements and conferences that resulted from it to integrate Israel in the region, they went further than the governmental official level to the area of cultural normalization.

For the first time, an American document publicly appeared after Camp David which included the importance of the role played by the Arab educated person in explaining the American and Israeli vision projects about peace in the Middle East. On this basis and under the patronage of the Danish and European Union a meeting was held in January (29-30), 1997, in which a number of educated Arabs from Egypt, Jordan and Palestine participated with Israelis. The meeting was ended by issuing Copenhagen Declaration (Husseini, ed.,: 295).

Conclusion

The historical and cultural background and American interest constituted internal reasons, while the characteristics of the international order constituted external reasons in the making of the American external political decision, upon which the American-Israeli relation biased to Israel was formed.

The physical, geographic, economic, social and political variables represented in the main republican and democratic parties, pressure groups, such as “IBAC” Organization and the American public opinion constituted the internal environment, whereas the only authority occupied by the United States in the international order constituted the external environment.

Based on that, the strategic alliance between the two sides was built on two pillars: the first is the Jewish Lobby and its role in American decision making in the Arab region, and the other is the strategic interests of the United States and safeguarding Israel’s security and expansion.

In this way, the diplomacy of patronizing the negotiations in the Arab-Israeli conflict represented one of the ways of this alliance which responded to the Zionist pressure powers as elements of the “secret government or centers and powers of economic and political influence, taking into account that the Zionist symbols, their instrument represented in IBAC” and research centers were part of that administration during Clinton’s reign, when they dictated their vision to the Presidential administration and the Congress. It was put into practice through the policies and decisions biased to Israel in all the issues of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. President Clinton and a lot of senior officials in his administration had a strong inclination to look at the Arab-Israeli conflict with an Israeli lens. And they even ignored the international resolutions which did not serve Israeli aims, to the extent that they opposed all the resolutions not desired by Israel. Thus, Israel was able to impose real facts through the increase of settlements, especially in the area which surrounds Jerusalem from all its sides, benefiting from the diplomacy of time wasting and building a strategy of negotiations for negotiations, namely, transferring the mean to an aim in itself. It seems that there is no end to the dark tunnel of final solution which has been neglected in the bilateral negotiations and what was cited in international resolutions.

In Summary, Clinton’s reign and administration were not more than a carriage in the train of the American stand and policies supporting Israel, and even seeking the impact on Arab sides to integrate Israel in the region to ensure its qualitative superiority in the region, the continuity of the standstill peace process on the Syrian track, as long as the truce agreement ensures Israel’s security on the Golan Heights Borders and imposing real facts that serve this aim.

Arabic References:

Al-Baba, Jamal, 2001, Land Settlements And Jerusalem In Clinton’s Thoughts, Palestinian Planning Centre Magazine, First Year, No. 1, March.

Andick, Mark, 18/5/1993, Mark Andick's Speech In Washington's Institute For The Near East Policies, Palestinian Studies Magazine, No. 15, Summer 1993.

Ameen, Jalal, 1996, Amman Summit, A Seminar of The Arabic Future Magazine, The Arabic Future Magazine, No. 204, 1996.

Tinit, George, 2007, In The Middle of The Storm: The Years I Spent In The C.I.A., Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi, Beirut.

Hussein, Ghazi, 1998, Economic And Security Summits And Conferences, From Normalization To Domination, Publications of The Union of Arab Writers.

Khafaji, Bassim, Intellectual Alternatives For The New American Administration, www.albayan.magazine.com/bayan-259/bayan-13.htm.

Raghib, Nabeel, 2008, The Secret Government in American Politics, Dar Ghareeb for Printing Publication and Distribution, Cairo.

Al-Sha'iri, Salih Yahya, 2006, A Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes, Madbooli Bookshop, Cairo.

Shaymar, Meirz et al., 2007, Israeli Lobby and American's Foreign Policy, Printing, Distribution and Publication Company, Beirut.

Shadeed, Muhammad, 1985, United States And The Palestinians Between Embracing And Elimination, Translation of Kowkab Al-Riyyiss, Arabic Studies Society, Jerusalem.

Al-Sheikh, Mamdouh, 10/7/2008, The Role of Science and Technology in The Zionist Project, <http://mamdouhalshikh.elaphblog.com/posts.aspx?U=619&A=5022>.

Aayish, Husni, 2006, Israeli America And American Israel, Arabic Establishment for Studies and Publication, Beirut.

Abdilsadiq, Ali, 2004, Groups of Jewish Pressure And American Policy, Al-Mahroussah Centre, Cairo.

Oleimat, Mahmoud Ulayyan, 2000, An Assessment of The Jordanian Negotiations Performance With The Zionist State In Light Of What is Called Peace Process, International Studies Magazine, No. 9, July 2000, International Studies Centre-Baghdad University.

Findly, Paul, 1993, Deception: New Things In American-Israeli Relations After The Book: "Who Dares To Talk?", Translated by Mahmoud Youssuf Zayid, Printing Company for Distribution and Publication, Beirut.

Al-Kar'i, Ahmad Youssuf, 2004, The Future of Jerusalem After Oslo Agreement Over Geneva Document, International Policy Magazine, No. 155, January 2004, Al-Ahram Establishment, Cairo.

Clinton, Bill, My Life, 2004, Translation of Muhammad Tawfiq Al-Bujeirami, First Edition, Cultural Dialogue Corporation, Beirut.

Miller, Aaron David, 5/4/2012, Legends About American-Israeli Relations, www.aljazeera.com/20120405/sald.htm.

Al-Majali, Abdullah and Muhammad Al-Aabidi, 1994, The Course of Jordanian-Israeli Peace Process, 1991-1994, Amman.

References:

Buhring, Edward, 1971, The UN and the Palestinians Refugees, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Beilin, Yossi, 2001, Le Manuel d'une colombe blessée, Yedioth Ahronot Books, Tel Aviv.

Clinton, Bill & Warrenal William J. Christopher, 1994, President Clinton Hosts King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin meeting in Washington, Dc., US Department of State Dispatch Supplement, Vol. 5, Issue 31, www.ebscohost.com.

Sher, Gilda, 2001, A portee de main: les negociations de paix israelo-palestiniennes, 1999-2001, Yedioth Ahronot Books, Tel Aviv.

Reports, Documents, Newspapers and Electronic Publishing:

Washington's Report, Semi-Governmental Management of The Arab-Israeli Conflict, September 8, 2005, www.elap.com.2005.

Communication: Site of Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, A Guidbook for the Peace Process: Israeli-Syrian Negotiations, 21 May, 2008.

www.altawasul.com/MFAAR/israel+and+the+middle+east/peace+process/guide+for+peace+israel+syria+16122007.htm.

Minister's Notes, New Life, 2/10/2003.

The Publications of the Palestinian Academic Society for International Affairs, PASSIA, Jerusalem, 2004.

Jerusalem Cause Between Historical Heritage And Political Geography.

"IBAC" Conference, 2004, An Open Workshop for Serving the Zionist Project, The Annual Political Conference, A Researcher for Studies, Beirut.

Al-Ahali Al-Massriyyah, 6/11/1996.

Lebanese Al-Safeer Newspaper, 10/11/1997.

Middle East Newspaper, 14/3/1996.

Life, 15/3/1996.

Journal of Palestine Studies, Vol. xxi, No. 2, Winter 1992: 120-121. President Documents, 26/7/1999: 1412, www.ebscohost.com.