

The American Vision of the Arab Region and the Palestinian Problem after the Incidents of 11th September 2001, in the Period of Bush, "the Son" between 2000-2004

Fawzi A. Tayyem¹

¹ Department of Political Science, Mu'tah University, Karak, Jordan

Correspondence: Fawzi A. Tayyem, Department of Political Science, Mu'tah University, Karak, P.O.Box (7), Jordan. Tel: 96-279-551-7064. E-mail: f_tayyem1948@yahoo.com

Received: April 23, 2012

Accepted: May 7, 2012

Online Published: August 21, 2012

doi:10.5539/jpl.v5n3p57

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v5n3p57>

Abstract

This study aims to identify and discuss the American vision towards the Arabian region in general, the Islamic phenomenon, and the Palestinian problem through the American authority positions in the region in particular. The American president Bosh "the son " divided the world into two divisions; the world of good and the world of evil, claiming he represents the world of good, and that the Arabian and Islamite world represents the evil world.

This situation was clear after the incidents of 11th September 2001 against the World Trade Center by the base or Alqa'edah organization, when the United States declared war against Afghanistan and Iraq claiming the war against terrorism. The results of this extravagant war represented in the involvement of America in an impetuous adventure without a reasonable count of its future consequences.

This study will intend to analyze the American policy towards the Arab region, and the Palestinian problem in light of the some facts which discussed in the article.

Keywords: Islamic phenomenon, American policy, international system, international stability, terrorism sponsorship, international observers, American Arab-Middle East Policy, the Arab-Israeli conflict

1. Introduction

After the incidents of 11th September 2001, on the United States of America, the middle east region had become a scene for two simultaneous wars; the United States' war against terrorism, and the Israeli war against the Palestinian revolt or (Intifada), a case that is considered to be a unique status. In the Second Gulf War and what followed, it was not in the welfare of the United States of America to join Israel in the war, since the U.S.A sought to form an international alliance that includes Arab and Muslim states to bombard Afghanistan which is considered to be a source of terrorism as the domination of Taliban movement and the existence of Bin Laden on its territories, a man who once had been an allied for U.S.A, and who was considered with his organization, 'the base or AL-Qaeda' fighters against the previous U.S.S.R for freedom, therefore, the participation of Israel in such an alliance led by U.S.A with the participation of a number of Arab states that refuse to be with Israel in the same trench, forced U.S.A to exclude Israel from this alliance.

Though, the discourse about the middle east and the Arab region in particular after this crisis, is a discourse about the American policy in this region which became very sensitive after the consequences of these incidents, and the resulted effect that could change some of the international system about a leader, that has had a great role in the re-from of the international setting since the U.S.S.R breakdown, and the autocracy of the world leadership, and the arrival of the Arab system to the highest levels of weakness, dispersion and frustration, with the arrival of the Israeli government to the highest level of using the armed force against the Palestinian uprising.

At the final outcome, the United States traced its-middle east-Arab policy according to the above data. In its campaign against terrorism, the United States listed Iraq on the list of terror powers, with the claim that Iraq is seeking to gain mass destruction weapons and creates serious danger that threatens the international peace and security in the world. On the other hand, the American administration, with the concern of the Islam Political phenomenon, divided the world into two divisions, the good one which is ' America ' and the other evil one which is the Islamic, and between terrorism and democracy, then, the phenomenon of Bin Laden came to reiterate

addressing previous ideas of what is called religious severity.

This study will intend to analyze the American policy towards the Arab region, and the Palestinian problem in light of the following facts:

First: the effects of this incident on the American policy.

Second: the American vision of the Arab region and the reflection of this vision on its policy.

Third: the United States and the Palestinian problem after 11th September 2001.

2. The Effects of the 11th Sep 2001 Crisis on the American Policy

The crisis shaped an essential turning point in the United States history as well as the international relationships history, and the dominant concepts in the international relationships, also it affected the internal American policy, and the American foreign decision makers in a way that showed hostility to the United States and the international system it rules.

This development concerned the American administration which adopts the philosophy of pragmatic school in the international relations, with its vision of the international system as a system featured by mess, and the military force as the appropriate way of banning chaos and achieving the international stability, as a result, the American administration inclined to the use of force against the states which are classified by the American as (renegade states), especially the states that provide shelter and weapons to what is called by Washington; the international terrorism and its organizations. As it is known to the international community, the more the international system is the sole polar the more military act is dominant in the international communication processes, and that the foreign policies of the great states are connected with the foreign policies of the dominant states. This was the case with the United States that started preparing the war against the organizations and groups it called terrorist before four years. Therefore, the United States has a one fold vision towards Arabs and Muslims, specially on the religious-cultural level, while Muslims do not have such a vision towards the United States, although they recently leaned to share a hostiles vision towards it on the political level.

What is new on the international system after 11th Sep is the dedication of the United States as the only pole on the international power scale. This led to the result of marginalizing the U.N and its organizations since the United States transgressed them totally in its war against terrorism.

In the strikes of 11th Sep, are the ramified of the gulf war, this war took place in the way we knew, because the world had entered under the system of the military dominated solitary pole. At that time, the Arabs couldn't perceive completely this fundamental development with it all dimensions. Especially what the 1900s, of the past century witnessed serious attempts from the European Union to create an independent policy different from that of the United States towards the middle east region.

This development came as a result of several reasons, the most important one is the breakup of the U.S.S.R, and the collapse of the eastern front, and the appearance of new dangers that threaten the European security and stability, and the Europeans who were strongly supporting and combining the United States before the attacks did not hide their dissatisfaction and even anger towards the American revenge administration in Afghanistan.

It seems that the globalization powers led by the United State of America were involved in this war after the declaration. The American policy came into act by the president's deputy Deck Cheney on 21st March 2002, in his journey of the onset of the second stage of the globalization war that was declared by Deck Cheney's president on the 11th March 2002, after 6 months of the 11th Sep incidents, after Deck Cheney visits of 10 states; Britain, Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Qatar, Bahrain, Israel, and Turkey within 10 days.

The quick success achieved by the United States in Afghanistan provides significant evidence on the extent of obedience of most of the great states to the American desire and willingness, while other great states seek to avoid the involvement in a commercial, political or media war with Washington, this gives the United States an additional power to impose its will, and identifying terrorism according to what it wants, and to judge the other states and peoples in accordance with its images of the international system.

As it appears, the war against terrorism is on the opposite of what the president George Bush promised after the Gulf war, to establish a new international system based on a strict application of international law principles and the subdivided concepts of justice and the appreciation and respect of peoples' rights and states sovereignty, he had promised the Arab to work seriously to achieve a quick and fair peace compromise for the Arab-Israeli conflict.

However, the American administration sought to gain Arab-Muslim cover for its war, since this war will be against a Muslim country Afghanistan, this coverage the U.S.A sought is an Arab-Muslim coverage which is identical to the coverage it attained in the Arab summit (in Cairo, on 10th August 1990) after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

Nevertheless, there was a difference between the two incidents, since it is natural to reject this coverage by some Arab countries, and to refuse any kind of wars at this stage, particularly after the U.S consideration that the Palestinian state is a secure part in its vision of solving the Palestinian dilemma on the base of keeping Israel safe and secure.

The war of the American administration is an open war in the place, the time, the methods and styles.

Consequently, the puzzle of the American policy became the corner stone in the United States relations with the globe countries, it charged the Arab with these incidents, and after the domination of the right reserved American on the American policy, and its belief that Israel is the defender of the American interests in the region and the support of Israel consideration as an ethical and religious duty, and for Israel's obvious hostility against the Arab countries which the right reserved American considers as a source of terrorism.

All of this, led the American administration in its war in Afghanistan to be a theoretical translation of the dissertation of the American thinker Samuel Hinton regarding " the civilizations clash " as it is portrayed by media as a war on freedom and democracy, and the 'way of our life'. Thereafter, this concept spread and supported by the American Public Opinion, transferred to Europe and Britain in particular. This concept accuses the Islamic civilization, describes it with retardation, considers Islam and Muslims enemies of the western civilization under such international system, attempting to neglect understanding the causes that led to the phenomenon of using force and to discriminate between terrorism and the national liberation movement and fighting against occupation.

One problem of the United States war against terrorism is the disengagement of Israel from the world alliance against the international terrorism, a position that receives the United States acceptance and satisfaction in order to encourage some Muslim and Arab states to join the international alliance anyway, with the knowledge that Israel used this opportunity to reoccupy some of the liberated territories in the west bank and Gaza strip.

Consequently, the Israeli media started concentration on the idea that Israel solely fights terrorism and bears a great deal of loss for this. On the opposite, it could convince the United States that its war is against Arab and Muslim terrorism, and some Europeans share this wrong and unfair vision towards Islam. For example, the notions released by the Italian prime minister Silvia Berlusconi when he regarded western morals system in the west as better than that in the Islamic world.

Regarding the situation in the middle east according to this new regime, all standard turned upside down in accordance with the interests of American and its allied Israel, and the United states conversely distinguished between the occupation and the resistance of occupation, it considered the resistance of occupation in Palestine as terrorism, while it considered the Israeli occupation to Palestine as defense procedures but not terrorism.

The result of this alliance between America and Israel in this regime or system is that, the Arab viewed the United States as an allied for terrorism although its leadership of war against terrorism in the world, as it adopts the Israeli vision towards the events in the middle east, as the security counts exceeded the proper bounds of diplomacy in the field of international relations, the most serious consequences of the declared war against terrorism is the relative success of Israel in using this war by giving the impression that the Palestinian uprising (or intifada) is a terrorist phenomenon, and each Palestinian opposite is a terrorist, and all is to delude the world, it did so in the context of the war against terrorism in the world. The strikes of 11th Sep 2001, had a great impact on the American people, even the decision- makers in Washington seriously started viewing the current world system and the American strategy, this was after the characterization of president Bush to the enemy which is the terrorism represented in the person of Osama Bin Laden and his international organization, and by several system of the extremists in the Islamic countries, this was during his speech on the battle against the coming terrorism. The lines of this American policy became obvious after 9 days of the strike (on 20th September, 2001), after speech of president Bush before the Congress, where the most prominent features of the American broad strategy are identified, through which the campaign against terrorism will release after the concentration on two main points; the continuity and containment, regarding this he said " our war against terrorism starts by the base organization in Afghanistan, but it would not end there, it wouldn't end until we find all the terrorist groups in the world, besiege and defeat them, any nation in the world should take its decision right now, to be with us or with the terrorists, from now and upward, any nation continues providing lodgings for terrorism will be considered by the United States regime a hostile country. You must immediately and permanently close each terrorist encampment and extradite all the terrorists, give the United States a complete access to the terrorist encampments, otherwise, you share them the same destiny".

Following the military campaign in Afghanistan, on the 7th October, 2001, until these days, the world finds itself in front of a new stage of the American war against terrorism, therefore, the United States had a military strategy that has its own features which appeared before the incidents of 11th Sep in few years, when some terrorist operations took place against the American interests and buildings a broad, as the case with the explosions of its two

embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1988, in addition to the suicide attack against the American destroyer U.S.S. Col and the death of 17 marine soldiers, and the growing hostile policies of some regional powers against the United States as the case with North Korea and Iran after these countries owned ballistic missiles capable to bear nuclear heads, and as a result, the administration of the American president purposed a comprehensive confrontation using all its military, political, economic and social capabilities. It is clear that this strategy which started by the American military dissemination in several countries round the world far away of the Arab region and also non-Islamic states, in an attempt by the American administration, we can say that the dissemination operation is executed within the framework of the battle against terrorism everywhere regardless the area or state.

The change in the political and strategically trends was clear in the speech of several American decision-makers of both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Defense Ministry, and also in the speech of those who work in the centers of research and investigation, the lecture that was organized by Kurt Campbell, the deputy of the president for Strategy and International Security Center which is established as a result of New York and Washington strikes, Zbigniew Brzezinski briefed his address by the following:

- a. The war against terrorism has multi-faced aspect, which may lead to open more than one front.
- b. The United States should not limit its enemy in the person of Osama Bin Laden or his organization.
- c. The long period of war in Afghanistan has negative effects on the American interests.
- d. The discrimination between the Islamic jurisprudence and terrorism should be accomplished.
- e. It is necessary to distinguish between the states that support terrorism and the states that provide lodgings for terrorism.
- f. The American community should be reorganized to be ready for new strikes.
- g. The necessity to revise the political visions of the United States regarding the international community and to examine the reasons of fault.

As a result, the American strategic identification of the enemy was developed, and after the domination of the notions that the enemy is represented by the renegade states, the notion of containment and its application after the Gulf war, the identification of renegade states represented by features such as terrorism sponsorship, the American response against terrorism was accomplished by the containment of the renegade state to itself, or working on overthrowing the regime or depilating it. On the Arab states level, the American policy distinguished through the 1990s, of the past century by a great tendency to interfere, and as a result for the human interference principle and its application for the first time in the north of Iraq, there were many forms of the American interference in the interior affairs of the Arab countries, as the case in Sudan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, this was accompanied with several American attempts to attenuate the confrontation states that have borders with Israel, through exerting pressure on the authorities in Syria and Lebanon to prevent them from developing their military arsenals, this conduct led to the adoption of adopt resistance in Lebanon to fight the Israeli projects and plans in the occupied part of its territory.

The result of all these situations, led the official Arab stand to the worst extreme of complain. On the one hand, and to worry and embarrassment on the other, after achieving two objects within the strategic system of the middle east; first, the United States released Israel's hand and could put an end to the middle east project which the American strategy sought, and the American attempt to cover the Israeli's exceeding the proper bounds and limits agreed upon which led to the anger in the Arab public opinion, after this system lost the controls.

3. The American Vision for the Arab Homeland and the Islamic Phenomenon

The American administration did not treat the Arabs as a civilized lobby that has its own individual identity, instead it preoccupied by the Middle East sense that embraces a solid group of strategic interests, in the 1970s; the American administration had broken up the region according to the detachment principle between Israel vicinity and the petroleum gulf. Following 11th Sep strikes, the American administration attempts to re-trace the Middle East map to include Pakistan, central Asia including Afghanistan. Hence, the American policy undertook two position in the Arab region; first, the project of eliminating the regime in Iran which the American administration propagated since 2001, although the Arab parties dissatisfaction. Therefore, the Middle East which includes the Arabs since the 11th Sep became the first party whereas America the second one.

The declared American goals within the framework of dealing with the consequences of 11th Sep will lead to the explosion of problems in the face of the United States which its policy aims to unconditional surrender by the Arab states and people through using power, it was appropriate for the United States to examine the causes that led to the terrorist acts on the United States on 11th sep 2001. The Islamite (Alqa'edah) who were accused with the United

States during the (Mujahedeen) or fighters war in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union or U.S.S.R, and when these fighters felt that the United States used them as a temporary means to achieve its goals, they turned to retaliation on their consideration that the United States is the radical enemy of their people's ambition. In addition, the United States had to deal with the incidents through examining the causes that led to the effects, which are represented by the feelings of external tyranny in particular due to the Israeli practices on the one hand, and the internal tyranny as a result of the regimes supported by the United States which was unable to provide the minimum degree of democratic political development, which in turn paved the way for the appearance of extremist trends on the other.

In the Arab summit, which took place in Beirut on 28th March 2002, a historical step had been taken to adopt a peace initiative which clearly identified the required commitments to establish permanent and fair peace, where the Arab show their willingness to end the Arab- Israeli conflict, and to enter a new phase of peace relations in exchange for Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories with its capital, the east Jerusalem, and to attempt the approach to fair solution of refugees on the base of 194 decision of the General Association of the United Nations, but this initiative of peace responded to by an Israeli military attack on the Palestinian people in their cities and domiciles. the American- Israeli demonstration within a series of reactions on the Arab initiative by signaling the hold of International Regional Conference that excluding the Palestinian president Yasser Arafat as well as the European Union.

4. The American Vision of the Islamic Phenomenon

The American administration intended since its early concerns in the Arab region to employ the contradiction between Islam and communism in the thought, methodology, and regime style against the U.S.S.R. and to employ this contradiction in the face of the ascending Arab Nationalism in the 1950-60s of the twentieth century, because the United States felt that alliance with Islamic powers and groups doesn't from actual danger on its interests as it supported its platoons and patrons their conferences as long as they accomplish the goals of the American policy. The controversy and conflict took place between the Islamite groups, when these groups felt that they were used and excluded without achieving their project.

In addition, the United States support to the non-democratic Arab and Muslim regimes, empowering them to continue was one of the controversy reasons between the two parties. As a result of these powers rejection of the unqualified regimes which are unable to eliminate the man's tyranny in these countries, either the internal, and a division had happened between the authority and the community which led to the birth of trends that seek a path to express themselves far from the official channels and the legal rules of the political movement.

This Islamite phenomenon received the attention of several west universities and research centers. A great amount of studies dealt with this phenomenon either positively or negatively, although the American administration conceived Islam erroneously, it could not differentiate between the care of religion and the product of the social and political conditions that Muslims live, the American administration linked between Islam, terrorism and violence and not to recognize the other, it viewed the strife or (jihad) as a method of offense but not a legal way to drive back hostility and attaining justice, freedom and get rid of tyranny.

The United States treatment with the Islamic phenomenon after the incidents of Sep came in the same superficiality it dealt with before, but the present quarrel is that the Islamic phenomenon in the past phase had positive benefits for the United States policies (Afghanistan's situation), but at the present time, the ambitions of the Islamic phenomenon exploded in the face of the United States which viewed it again with the same superficiality since it reduced all the phenomenon in the security and intelligence procedures in particular, it considered the base organization, and the Islamic political groups in general, groups of murderers and terrorists, and that their tendency to violence is a part of the Islamic nature, their Islamic culture impedes them from understanding and conceiving the western values represented in human rights and democracy.

5. The United States and the Palestinian Case after the Attacks

In the first place, the United States dealt with the Palestinian issue and contention with negligence and depreciation. Moreover, it equated between the Israeli occupation and the whole people struggle, considering the interrelated violence between parties that are equal in power and rights, Thus, the third millennium came but the Arab and Muslims didn't find enough methods to protest against the American policies but through the clash method in Iraq or the Taliban one in Afghanistan or through violence waves. Although the difference among these methods, they expressed the frustration situation in the Arab and Islamic world as a result of legal demands especially in Palestine.

As result of the above, the American administration after the incidents of 11th Sep dealt with the armed battle as a

sort of terrorism. Thus the American administration could provide the Israeli cabinet with all its needs, practically, it cut the links with president Arafat, also it worked on impeding all international efforts that aim to send international forces to the Palestinian territories, opposed the notion of sending international observers, it remains practicing pressures on the National Palestinian Authority.

The most important is that the United States does see the continuous Israeli hostility against the Palestinians as a kind of self-defense, and so it continued asking the Palestinians to what it calls "actions of violence and terrorism".

The second stage of the war against terrorism, the attempt to extenuate the extensity of the American support to Israel, with an obvious goal which is paving the way to hit Iraq. Several times, Washington encountered embarrassment by Israel, one of them is that, when Sharon himself said, "the Jews dominate the United States and the Americans knew this".

Based on the above, the United States announced the consignment of General Anthony Zany to resume his efforts to approach a security agreement to suspend confrontations and to discuss the execution of "Tenit" report but after investigating the implementation of the recommendations of Mitchell's Committee regarding the political side.

Whereas the United states aims to sign a Palestinian - Israeli security agreement, that paves the way to enter negotiations regarding the political aspect, the mission of Cheney was opposite to his previous tours when he declared that he will resume his efforts to achieve his goals, but nothing concrete has happened on the real ground, even the United states intervention to lift sanction on the Palestinian president's residency and the Cradle Church was according to regional and international considerations that are in the Israeli and American interests at the end, although the apparent goal is to agree on cease- fire and to get into the stage of political negotiations.

Thereafter, new American developments had happened which represented in symbol tic concrete steps, when the security Council issued its 1397 decision which is for the first time of the Arab-Israeli conflict stipulated a call to establish an independent Palestinian State near Israel, the issuance of this decision came in accordance with the American inclination, to extenuate the Arab resentment regarding its continuous consolidation to the Israeli policy, and to attain the Arab agreement to hit Iraq, the American unwillingness to join Europe in the peace process and the political solution without a green light from America. As a result, the initiatives of the European states towards the Arab- Israeli struggle became ineffective in running events for the American inflexibility and unwillingness of the European participation in the Middle East or other region.

Under the confrontations with the Israeli occupation, the national Palestinian unity seemed immune against penetration, the extensive pressures by Israel and America with an occasional participation by Europe, did not succeed to drag the Palestinian authority to explode a civilian war, this was apparent where all the Palestinian trends were wise in administrating the struggle and elapsed the only opportunity to put an end to the Palestinian Intifada or revolt.

The alliance and congruence between the United States and Israel in the region after the incident of 11th Sep to achieve their various goals, the most important one is the attempt to averting the creep of technology and atomic materials and achievement to states described as renegade by America, and according to the now expression of president Bush " the evil axis " and prevent these state even the moderate ones from owning or getting them, to preserve the Israeli military qualitative superiority.

Although the support of the states of European Union including France in particular to the Saudi initiative issued by prince Abdullah, the regent of Saudi Kingdom in Feb. 2002, the United States had its own reservation on this initiative at the beginning, then it saw positive points with this initiative although it called for the first time by the Saudi government to complete recognition and normalization of relations with Israel by the Arab states in exchange for the Israeli pullback from the Palestinian occupied territories in 1967, even though it considered an Arabian initiative, the united states evaded and didn't attempt to practice pressure on the opposite side" Israel" to approximate the points of view to immediately approach the negotiations table.

The Arab had staked on the American which was expected to be more uprightness and unbiased towards Israel on the base that it is possible to convince the American Administrations to separate the American interests from the Israeli ones, since alignment to Israel by America will lead to damage the America interests. Moreover, some Arabs were staking that the Israeli strategic value in relation to the American interests in the region had lost its core with the end of the cold war and the fall of the Soviet Union

After 11th Sep and under the administration of President Bush and its clear bias to Israel, and under the rule of the Israeli right-wing cabinet, it was clear that this stake had lost its value, unless some essential modifications are done.

It was apparent that the Palestinian uprising was the first victim of the American war against Afghanistan, as the

United States still exert pressure on the Palestinian Authority-on the base that the resistance is unjustified particularly by the Islamite movements to sooth the situation and back to negotiations on the base of "Mitchell Committee Report" which ended the two tracks; the Syrian and Lebanese of its accounts after the American administration described the Palestinian people legal resistance against Israel war as violence.

The other reason for the American concern is represented in Deck Chaney tour in the region to convince the Arab states to support the war against Iraq, which requires freezing the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation and to attempt paving the way for negotiations. The military escalation with its destructive effects, generated intense European critics against Sharon's policy, as a result, the American foreign minister Colin Powell expressed his criticism to Sharon in which he said, "there is no benefit for accounting the slain on the Palestinian battlefield". There is no doubt that the United States desertion of its apathy and exercised actual pressures on Sharon which later brought forth when the later gave up his claim of the seven days of tranquility before any negotiations, and the "release of Arafat" as a result for the occurrence of two significant essential events that the American administration had to consider them in its policy in the middle east.

The first event; represented in the start of the American preparations to terminate its war rounds on what it called terrorism, which put the Iraqi regime on the front, while the other event represented by the approach of holding the Arab Summit (27-28 March 2002) which required America to take to take policies that relieve the Arabian congestion increased with the continuous Israeli escalation which may lead to increase in the official embarrassment for the states of the region.

These American movements, started with the declaration of sending General Zeini again to the region simultaneously with the issuance of 1397 proposal by the security council and states, "the right of the Palestinians in a state with secure borders," through the American interest in prince Abdullah initiative that calls for peace or total normalization basically related to the above developments, as it attempts to tickle the Arab emotions, demanding exerting pressure on Israel, and asking the Arab to support the military campaign against Iraq in opposite to freeze the Sharon's attack, all what the movements provided is the project vision of a Palestinian state, even the Arab adaption of the Saudi initiative which encountered with American coolness.

There are some who believe the existence of a bargain between American and Saudi Arabia, the Saudi proposes a bargain: "take Saddam and give us Sharon" which means, we are the Saudi wont impede the authority change in Iraq in case of bringing back the peace process, and Sharon tries to hit the potentiality of the bargain success.

Nevertheless, the American position or stand started a relative change in the favor of the Palestinian problem after the formation of the tetrad committee (the United Nations, Federal Russia, European Union, and the United States), the American call to establish a Palestinian state through three years, the meeting of president Bush on (19 Feb. 2002) with the foreign ministers of Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

6. Conclusions

Through the above discussion of the American strategy and policy in the Middle East region towards the Arab states, the basics and ingredients of this policy since the events of 11 Sep, and through answering the following key inquiry: what are the bases and foundations of the American policy towards the Arab middle east countries after the events of 11th Sep in its main topics? It is obvious that since the 11th Sep strikes on the United States, the Middle East has been considered the first party and the United States the other in the last war on terrorism which included a war against states, groups, organizations and individuals. Since that period the Middle East is considered the stage for two simultaneous wars the Israeli war against the Palestinians, and the American war against what it calls terrorism, this situation is considered a new one. In the second gulf war and what came after, there were no uprising, the American and Arab were adhering to neutralize Israel, but the political situation after the events of 11th Sep, and period was different. Thus, talking about the middle east is considered to be about the Arab region after the events of 11th Sep 2001, it also about the United States policy in the region which is susceptible after the consequences of 11th Sep events and what they left of impressions that could change some features of the international solitary polar system of a pole that has had a crucial role in the restructuring of the international environment since the United States autocracy of the world leadership and marginalized the European role in the region, and the reach of the Arab system to the highest level of incompetence.

Although the American invitation to establish the Palestinian state within three years, the meetings of the tetrad committee to discuss the Palestinian situation, are no more than a theoretical profound unless its application on the real ground, and extenuating the endurance of the Palestinian people.

References

Aldajani, Ahmed. (2002). Sedqi of the Diaries of the Globalization War, from Afghanistan.To Palestine. *Arab*

- Affairs, summer* (110), 53-55.
- Alhawari, Anwer. (2012). "Middle East: The Binary War". *International Policy, April* (148), 55-61.
- Alkeilani, Haytham. (2001-2002). On the Margin of the American War on Afghanistan. *The Magazine of Middle East Studies, winter* (18), 44-49.
- Alkhalayleh, Ahmed Abdelraheim. (2003). *The Strategic Folder; The International System & The Future of the Arab System*. Amman: the Center of Future for Strategic Studies.
- Alshoabaki, Amroa. (2002). The Future of Islamic Political Movements. *International Policy, April* (148).
- Amir, Taheri. (1987). *Holy Terror*, Hutchinson. London.
- Aruri, Naseer. (2003). *Dishonest Broker: the US Role in Israel and Palestine*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- Aruri, Naseer. (Ed.). (1989). *Occupation: Israel Over Palestine* (2nd ed.). Belmont, Mass: AAUG Press.
- Ashrawi, Hanan. (1995). *This Side of Peace*. New York: Touchstone.
- Aziz, Al Azmeh. (1996). *Islams and Moderates*. Verso.
- Bassam, Tibi. (2001). *Islam between Culture and Politics*. Palgrave: Basingstoke.
- Beinin, Joel, & Rebecca, Stein. (Eds.). (2006). *The Struggle for Sovereignty: Palestine and Israel, 1993-2005*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, with the Middle East Research and Information Project.
- Beit, Hallahmi, Benjamin. (1993). *Original Sins: Reflections on the History of Zionism and Israel*. New York: Olive Branch Press.
- Benvenisti, Meron. (2000). *Sacred Landscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land Since 1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boyle, Francis. (2009). *Palestine, Palestinians and International Law*. Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press.
- Carey, Roane. (Ed.). (2001). *Introduction by Noam Chomsky. The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid*. New York: Verso.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1999). *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. Forward by Edward Said. Updated Edition. Cambridge: South End Press.
- Christenson, Kathleen, & Bill, Christenson. (2009). *Palestine in Pieces: Graphic perspectives on the Israeli Occupation*. London: Pluto Press.
- Christison, Kathleen. (1999). *Perceptions of Palestine: Their Influence on U.S. Middle East Policy*. Updated Edition with a New Afterword.
- Cohen, Esther, R. (1985). *Human rights in the Israeli-occupied territories, 1967-82*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Davis, Uri, & Mezvinsky, Norton. (Eds.). (1975). *Documents from Israel: 1967-1973*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Farsoun, Samih, & Nasser, Aruri. (2006). *Palestine and the Palestinians: A Social and Political History*. Boulder: West view Press.
- Finkelstein, Norman. (2003). *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*. (2nd ed.). New York: Verso.
- Finkelstein, Norman. (2012). *Knowing Too Much: Why the American Jewish Romance with Israel is Coming to an End*. OR Books.
- Glu, Pappé, Ilan. (2011). *The Forgotten Palestinians*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gordon, Neve. (2008). *Israel's Occupation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Green, Stephen. (1984). *Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations with a Militant Israel*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Green, Stephen. (1988). *Living by the Sword: America and Israel in the Middle East 1968-87*. Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books.
- Hadawi, Sami. (1991). *Bitter Harvest: A Modern History of Palestine*. New York: Olive Branch Press.
- Halper, Jeff. (2008). *An Israeli in Palestine: Resisting Dispossession, Redeeming Israel*. London: Pluto Press.
- Halper, Jeff. (2009). *Obstacles to Peace: a reframing of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. (4th ed.). Jerusalem: ICAHD.

- Hanafi, Hassan. (2002). Islam & West. *The Magazine of Arab Affairs*, spring (109), 55-60.
- Jad, Imad. (2002). Sharon & the Peace Option, Failure, Indications. *International policy*, April (148), 60-658.
- John, Laffin. (1979). *The Dragger of Islam*. London: Sphere.
- Mamoun, Fandy. (1999). *Saudi Arabia and the politics of Dissent*. Macmillan: Basingstoke.
- Masalha, Nur. (2004). *The Palestine Nakba: Decolonising History, Narrating the Subaltern, Reclaiming Memory*. London: Zed.
- Mearsheimer, John J., & Stephen, M. Walt. (2007). *The Israeli Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Morris, Benny. (1999). *1948 and After: Israel and the Palestinians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mussa, Amroa. (2002). The Issue Word. *Arab Affairs*, summer (110), 25-30.
- Nehra, Fu'ad. (2002). The Variables of the American Policy towards Arab. *The Affairs of the Median*, winter (105), 22-28.
- Noman, Essam. (2002). America and Muslims; A relation Problem, *The Arab Future*.
- Okashah, Sa'eed. (2002). The European Initiatives in the Middle East. *Scribbles on the Hard Wall, Arab Vision. International Policy*, April (148), 30-37.
- Pappe, Ilan. (2004). *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peres, Shimon. (2003). *The New Middle East*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Qansoah, Wajeih. (2002). Islam & the West after 11th September. *The Middle East Affairs*, winter (05), 46-49.
- Qarm, George. (2002). The World of uni-polar and It's Attitudes. *The Arab Future*, April (278), 23-27.
- Quigley, John. (1990). *Palestine and Israel: A Challenge to Justice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rifat, Sa'eed. (2002). the Israeli Invasion, Between Goals and Outcomes. *Arab Affairs*, summer (110).
- Sarah, Helm. (2002). *The human Time Bomb*. London: Sphere.
- Samour, Ali. (2002). The Independent war & The Legendary Palestinian Endurance. *Intermediate Affairs*, 106, 20-27.
- Shehadeh, Raja. (2008). *Palestinian Walks: Notes on a Vanishing Landscape*. London: Profile Books.
- Sherna, Berger. (1994). *An American Feminist in Palestine: The Intifada Years*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Shlaim, Avi. (1995). *War and Peace in the Middle East: A Concise History*. New York: Penguin.
- Shlaim, Avi. (2001). *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Suleiman, Adel, Mohammad. (2002). The American Campaign against Terrorism Outside Afghanistan. *The International Policy Magazine*, April (148), 50.
- Tolan Sandi. (2006). *The Lemon Tree: An Arab, a Jew and the Heart of the Middle East*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Yossef, Bodansky, & Bin, Laden. (1999). *The Man Who Declared War on American*. Rocklin: Calif, Fourm Publishing.
- Zinkhanah, Sabah. (2002). The International Cooperation in the Islamic Cooperation from the Iranian Prospective. *The Arab Future*, May (279), 12-18.