

Jordan's Policy towards the Peace in the Middle East

*Ghazi S. Banimelhem **

ABSTRACT

Throughout past history Jordan has participated in Arab-Israeli conflicts that took place in the Middle East. This country has participated in two wars against Israel, the first in 1967, and the second in 1973. Jordan lost both of these wars, resulting in the loss of the West Bank and East Jerusalem and causing a large number of Palestinian refugees to flee to Jordan.

In the first half of the 90's dramatic changes occurred in the world; such as the fall of the Soviet Union, Iraq invading Kuwait, and then an alliance with the United States as leader forcing Iraq to leave Kuwait. The affects of these changes led to a so called "peace" between Arab countries and Israel. In this period of peace, Jordan had participated in peace talks between Arab countries and Israel in Madrid, Spain. Then Jordan signed peace treaty with Israel in 1994 watched over by the U.S.A.

Entering these peace treaties in 1994, gave rise to many important questions. Most of which focused on the true reasons behind why Jordan agreed to peace with Israel and the American role in the process.

Thus, the researcher shall attempt to answer these questions, as well as shedding some light on the factors that affect the relations between Israel and Jordan which will be divided into internal and external affairs. The researcher will try to predict how these factors will affect the future of Jordanian-Israeli relations, especially the role of the U.S.A.

Keywords: Jordan, Arab-Israeli Conflicts, The Middle East.

1. INTRODUCTION

The peace process between the Arabs and Israel in general, Jordan and Israel in particular, is a subject of interest to the politicians and the scholars who have specialized in Middle Eastern affairs. This research imposes many questions concerning its dimensions, limits and future as being a relationship between two enemies.

The relations between Jordan as a part of the Arab World and Israel have witnessed different stages of development, mainly during the foundation of Israel, the wars between the Arab states and Israel, and finally in the peace process between both sides. This development has gotten to the extent of Jordan and Israel signing a historic peace treaty on October 26th, 1994, witnessed by the

president of the United States of America at that time. The USA had participated with Jordan and Israel in trilateral developmental discussions in which the key issues were water-sharing and security.

Therefore, in this article, the researcher analyzes the interaction between domestic political actors and events and Jordanian involvement in the peace with Israel.

2. METHODOLOGY AND THE HYPOTHESIS OF THIS RESEARCH

It is well known that a research in the policy of Jordan toward the peace process in the Middle East and an attempt to define the external actor's role toward Jordan would ultimately mean an attempt which requires the researcher to utilize both analysis and interpretation. It should be kept in mind that this topic is associated with evolutions both in internal and external obstacles in the Jordanian decision. From this arises the hypothesis of this research which is:

"As a small state with limited resources, the primary

* Department of Humanities, Faculty of Science and Arts, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid, Jordan. Received on 29/2/2006 and Accepted for Publication on 15/4/2007.

concern of Jordanian policymakers should be to safeguard the country's immediate survival and national interests. This means that, Jordan's vulnerable position is such that its survival is the principal foreign policy objective to which all the aims are subject."

Nonetheless, before commenting on the assumptions related to this subject and mentioned above. Difficulty of understanding the nature of the relationship between different states is caused by many factors such as rapid international changes and accelerated transformations, which the world is facing today. Based on that, and in most cases the analytical studies which are related to the future, international relations is faced with criticism since the studies are not based on written references related to these countries during that period.

The researcher in this case has no choice but to form his own vision based on certain circumstances, and consequently is trapped by his wrong prediction. However, such studies are a necessity, and we must take the risk and write such studies for academic purposes, also to encourage this type of analytical researches which incite the mind, and urges the researchers to study the past relations between different states.

By placing our discussion within a general foreign policy framework, we will be able to understand the nature of the Jordanian policy toward peace, and its relationship with both Israel and the USA. The essential task of foreign policies is to develop and manage to deal with other states in ways that contribute towards the protection and enhancement of one's own security and welfare (George, 1983, 17).

According to the above, it seems that several steps need to be followed in order to satisfy these objectives, some of which are: (a) Policy makers should clearly define their state's interests and should be able to differentiate between the essential interests and the desirable ones, and should place them under categories of primary and secondary interests (Deutsch, 1978, 100) ,(b) Foreign policy goals should not go beyond the power available (Margenthau, 1950, 117-18) (c) Rational decision makers should be the ones who lay out goals (Zechauer, 1973, 17) (d) Using logical processes to be able to explore the best way to achieve these goals, and (e) Carefully weigh out perusing them (George, 1983, 17).

In doing so, the policy maker may need to recognize analyze and deal with the conflicts of interest with other countries. However, if a mutually acceptable, accommodation of conflicting interests with other states, is

not possible, policy makers should try to reduce and narrow the issues at dispute. In ways that will decrease these issues potential for generating destructive conflicts or for contaminating entire relationships with other states (Al-Ramadanie, 1980, 120-121). Hence, the development and management of relationships with other states also requires policy makers to be able to recognize the common interests and develop policies for promoting them.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This research aims to analyze the impact of regional, international and internal problems as well as other factors which have had significant influence on the Jordanian involvement and policy in the peace process in the Middle East. Also, this research aims to offer to the readers some information about the USA's role toward Jordan.

In light of the goals of this research and its hypothesis, the research has been divided into the following sections: in the first section we shall shed light upon the theoretical obstacles that have been suggested by the use of political analytical tools upon Jordan's strategies aims and commitments toward the peace with Israel. Section two will explain the status of Jordan, historical background, decision makers and its foreign policy. Section three will deal with American-Jordanian relations, while section four will shed some light on Jordanian-Israeli relations. And finally, the researcher will come to the conclusion.

4. THE STATUS OF JORDAN: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Jordan is a relatively small Arab country. It is situated between the Levantine and Arabian Peninsula. Jordan shares its Northern border with Syria, its Eastern border with Iraq, Saudi Arabia on Eastern as well as Southern borders, and the occupied West Bank, Palestine and Israel lie on its West.

The 1948 war added hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arab refugees as well as the Palestinians of the West Bank to the Jordanian people in the East- Bank. Moreover, after a military and political struggle to defend as much of mandatory Palestine as possible from the Zionist forces, King Abdullah managed to unite Jordan and the West Bank in 1950. Afterwards, he changed the country's name to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. In

the year after, King Abdullah was assassinated in Jerusalem in July 1951, and Abdullah's son Talal, briefly succeeded to the throne. Because of his illness, his son Hussein became the King of Jordan in 1952 (Ross, 2004, 157-179).

Jordan has suffered for a long time from a severe imbalance between resources and population. Before the peace treaty with Israel, Jordan was forced to shoulder the burdens of a front-line state and the resultant military expenditures that the country's defense requirements entailed. Jordan's small economic base has also been strained by large waves of Palestinian refugees seeking refuge during the Arab-Israeli wars of 1948 and 1967, as well as the Jordanians forced to return from the Gulf States during the Gulf Crisis.

In terms of national wealth, Jordan has comparatively little in the way of natural resources. Lacking the oil riches of the Arabian Gulf states and facing a serious water shortage, Jordan has built the foundation of its economy on a well-educated and healthy labor force. However, due to the large gap between the countries scant natural resources and the need for economic and social programs to support its burgeoning population. Jordan has been forced to rely heavily on funds from external sources (The Royal Hashemite Court 1997, 1-5). Therefore, in order to maintain a reasonable defense capability as well as viable socio-economic programs, the Jordanian government has relied on the assistance of external powers, i.e., from both Arab and non-Arab countries (The Royal Hashemite Court 1997, 1-5).

Also an important issue that kept Jordanians in conflict was the fact that Palestinians immigrated to Jordan causing much instability. Research shows that the amount of Palestinians in Jordan today exceeds the number of Palestinians in the West Bank (Mutawi, 1987, 12-50). Lastly, Jordan's economy is relatively weak and Jordan must be supported by some Arab countries and by more powerful foreign states. There are many reasons for Jordan's weak economy and one of the most important is that Jordan lacks natural resources that will bring financial input (Moffettm, 1989). Jordan imports much more products into its country than it exports. This obviously negatively affects the economy and stunts expansion and development.

5. THE HISTORIC ROLE OF EXTERNAL ACTORS IN JORDAN

It seems to me that, King Hussein's decision to enter

the peace accord with Israel in the 1990s should be understood in the larger historical, political, economic and regional dynamics within which it developed. Historically, Jordan as a small state has been vulnerable to the impact of external events and actors at the domestic level, because of many reasons among of which are its geo-strategic proximity to the Arab-Israeli crisis, its lack of natural resources, its small size and population, and the renters' characteristics of its economy (Cunningham, 1998, 1). So, the King decision has been directed toward offsetting Jordan's vulnerability to external actors and their ability to instigate or exacerbate internal challenges to the political regime, as what happened in the late 1950s and in the beginning in the 1970s, as well as challenging the territorial integrity of the Jordanian state (Cunningham, 1998, 2).

From its foundation and establishment as a state, Jordan has been highly susceptible to internal disruptions caused by external events. Those events have been Political, of- course with respect to the Palestinian participation and refugees in Jordan, economic need and development, military crisis and confrontation between regional actors.

Moreover, Jordan's internal instability, as a result of Israel's presence, threatened the King's status, but at the same time it was known that the situation was going to affect the country's future in the long run. It was evident that Jordan needed future national development and reconstruction. Thus, the political and economic uncertainties confronting Jordan had served as a potent reminder for the King that something had to be done to assure the future of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (Alrawabdeh, 2006).

During his rule in Jordan, King Hussein's moderate stand, his regime's dependency on the West, and the rebellious mood of the times, acted as a major constraint on the ability of the King to implement Jordan's foreign policy. Accordingly, Jordanian leadership may recognize the importance of steering Jordan's policy closely with the United States. Due to the fact that it was a superpower and more importantly, the only country which promised to significantly influence the policies and course of action of Israel.

Toward his end, the King acquired a deep understanding of American policies and policymaking toward the region as well as the values and goals which animated them. So, in order to protect Jordan from foreign intervention, the process of maintaining Jordan's

tenuous position in the region, King Hussein's basic orientation had been pro-western; he has sought economic and military assistance from the United States and Britain in particular.

To achieve this King Hussein was required to develop a close interpersonal relationship with the United States. The King was able to do this by, insisting on frequent contact with diplomats and policymakers, and had stressed throughout these meetings the need for absolute fairness and lack of prejudice (Kunkle, 2001, 3). These meetings also provided the opportunity for the King to clear up his reasons, aims to the conflicts, with extreme honesty and integrity. All this gave him good appeal and recognition in the West as a reliable voice, and ultimately as a highly valued and respected partner in the region.

These meetings were noticeably effective, starting a highly personalized relationship with the West that would last over forty years. Till his death in 1999, King Hussein is said to have made more White House visits than any other chief of state (FRUS, 1964). Diplomats and scholars relate his character to the reason why America supports and remains involved in Jordanian issues throughout the years. The King agreed that it was his duty to inform the outside world of the role Jordan plays among Arabs (Kunkle, 2001, 8).

King Hussein was successfully able to lead the United States in participating in security matters. This was all achieved as he built his own personal credibility and potential as a regional associate, by insisting on honest and informative dialogue and frequent communication.

In this way, the King emphasized shared interests and values, which may have otherwise been hidden or prevented by traditional cultural or political factors (President Kennedy's Speech, 1963).

6. FACTORS EFFECTING JORDAN'S POLICY TOWARD PEACE

From the above circumstances one might say that, the Jordanian's vision of peace is linked with economic and security concerns. Jordan's longing for peace was expressed in terms of the need for internal stability and development, educational initiatives and job creation that may lead to prosperity and social progress. Jordan's urgent need for economic restructure, terrifying geographic position, and King Hussein's strong sense of personal destiny and history, were the needed factors that motivated the King to urge for peace at a time when it

was dangerous and risky for him and the country.

King Hussein had expressed to USA that Jordan and other Arab countries needed more support to counter the Israeli threat in the region. These problems that the Arabs faced increased the division in the area and stunted growth and development (FRUS, 1963). The King associated peace with economic growth and concentrated on confidence-building where there is mistrust and developing relationships. Due to Jordan's efforts and concerns to achieve peace, the US's pessimistic view on the future of the Arab-Israeli conflict was changed.

Subsequently Israel launched a surprise attack on June 5th, 1967, and Jordan paid the heftiest price of all the Arab states involved in the war. More than 300,000 Palestinian Arabs became refugees and fled to Jordan. The West Bank, which produced 60-65 % of its fruits and vegetables, and where about 70% of Jordan's agricultural land was located, was lost (Nevo, 1998, 1-10). Moreover, half of the Kingdom's industrial establishment was in the West Bank. Needless to say that, the loss of Jerusalem and other religious sites affected the tourism industry in Jordan. The occupation of Israel accounted for approximately 38% of Jordan GNP (Day, 1986, 2-3).

Jordan's next step was to ask for military assistance from Washington and stated that if the USA could not comply he would be forced to think of alternatives. The King stated that, "I will not try to mislead you, not to blackmail you, by telling you I will turn to the East". Then he added that, "I cannot and will not do so; my reign has been devoted towards building Jordan to be a self-sufficient, moderate and evolutionary state" (Nahar, 1997, 50-60).

7. JORDAN-ISRAELI RELATIONS

Before the 1991 Madrid international peace conference, Jordan had refrained from establishing diplomatic relations with Israel. The absence of formal relations notwithstanding, the two states had cooperated directly or indirectly after the 1967 war in a multiplicity of matters pertaining to the West Bank, the Israeli-occupied territory whose Palestinian population retained Jordanian citizenship until 1988 (Kunkle, 2001, 10-20).

King Hussein's aim at that time was to regain control of the West Bank, a goal that had not been realized by 1988, when he renounced Jordan's aim to sovereignty of the area (Alrawabdeh, 2006). Jordan's ambitions were frustrated by Israel's unwillingness to negotiate seriously

any withdrawal from the West Bank and by the increasing popularity of the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

In the second half of the 1970s, however, when Egypt had initiated direct negotiations with Israel that events led to a separate peace agreement, Jordan was unwilling to follow Egypt's lead without prior pan-Arab acquiescence (Alrawabdeh, 2006). Moreover, Jordan apparently believed that in the absence of broad Arab support to legitimize any political talks with Israel; its own rule in the East Bank could be threatened.

Consequently, the Jordanian leadership refused at that time to participate in the Camp David process and was skeptical of US's 1982 proposal for a West Bank entity in association with Jordan (Alrawabdeh, 2006).

Israel's rejection of the US's plan had provided Jordan the boon of not needing to respond to an initiative that the Palestinians claimed would deny them genuine self-determination. Anyway, Jordan was called for an international peace conference that would include a joint Jordan-PLO delegation. Jordan had received an international forum that brought together the Super-Powers, (the USA and the Soviet Union) as well as the Arab States and Israel as a protective umbrella under which Jordan could enter into negotiations with Israelis (US. Library of Congress, 1997).

After years of experience and experimenting, King Hussein realized that it was hard to achieve the necessary changes and internal structural strength he thought was needed for peace. It was then evident to him that Arabs would have to accept the existence of the State of Israel in the region. If this did not happen it would be hard for each side, especially the weaker Jordan, to continue with their interests and goals (Alrawabdeh, 2006).

All the above mentioned circumstances led King Hussein to enter in peace negotiations led by the US. Finally, King Hussein took a pivotal step when he signed the 1994 Peace Treaty between Jordan and Israel.

After the death of King Hussein in February 1999, King Abdullah II was crowned King of Jordan. Although he says he places the Arab-Israeli conflict as his priority, many people criticize him in the sense that he has not taken much action that indicates this (Alrawabdeh, 2006). He has been loyal to maintaining peace with Israel and the US-Jordanian ties. Although peace is a common goal, Abdullah has been side tracked with the idea that he must control the escalating issues between Israel and Palestine before taking any step (Alrawabdeh, 2006).

Though, King Abdullah was able to strengthen US-Jordanian relations. An excellent example of this is the US-Jordan Free Trade Agreement October 24, 2000.

Also, he was able to maintain the financial support from the US. The total US aid to Jordan is approximately \$3.9 billion, including \$2.1 billion in economic aid and \$1.8 billion in military aid (Prados, 2003, 1-14). This may seem to be a great deal, but the Jordanian military forces, though well trained and disciplined, are still outnumbered and outgunned by each of Jordan's neighboring forces (Prados, 2003, 1-14). Israel is supported by foreign countries, and to a greater extent and by a larger moving population than Jordan. King Abdullah is becoming successful in maintaining his father's views on peace, for example in his speech to the Jordanian Parliament said: "my government will continue its efforts in advancing the peace process and allowing it to achieve the sought advancement on all tracks" (Alrawabdeh, 2006). One might say that, despite his willingness to follow his father's view on peace he cannot and has not helped the region to the extent of King Hussein.

8. ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES

It was apparent, that the terminations of the cold war between the super-powers pushed the Arab-Israeli problem to be treated as a regional one. Also, the Gulf Crises and Wars redefined the balance of power in the Middle East, reshuffled inter-Arab relations, and demonstrated once again the need to work toward a just and comprehensive regional peace. For once, a real effort was put into the prospect of peace between the Arabs and Israel at Madrid in 1991. After that year, one may say that, some significant developments have been achieved including the Oslo agreements, the Jordanian-Israel Treaty of Peace, the establishment of a Palestinian National Authority in Gaza and Jericho, as well as the redeployment of Israel from parts of the West Bank (Ross, 2004, 160-80).

Jordan and Israel had signed the actual Peace Treaty on October 26th, 1994. For the Jordanians, when their government opted for peace, they might think that, it did so based on a strategic decision to rid the region of the policies of conflict. They might also develop a new environment of cooperation and interdependence with all parties in the region, including Israel.

Furthermore, Jordanian government has sought a

normal and truly peace with Israel, going beyond the mere signing of agreements between governments to normal interacting among peoples of neighboring countries. This means, the Jordanian government has been committed to full implementation of the peace treaty, as well as to a proactive approach in seeking future areas of cooperation (Muasher, 1997). One may get this idea from the framework of the peace treaty between Jordan and Israel. The framework is a peace treaty full with references to cooperation and mutuality, 15 sub agreements covering all areas of cooperation. This qualitative peace provides real opportunities for development for both sides involved and for the region as a whole despite the very real risks they might face ahead (Cunningham, 1998, 2-5).

Jordanian government actively participated in the multilateral track of the peace process and also signed a number of bilateral agreements with Israel which covered almost every aspect of cooperation, be that economic, social or cultural, and also in security matters.

Yet, despite these achievements, serious challenges remain ahead and facing the Jordanian Peace treaty with Israel. The Jordanian government was aware that its policy of peace can be negatively affected by a number of variables beyond its sphere of control or influence. Specifically, Jordan realized early on that some elements needed to be in place if the causal relationship between development in the country and regional cooperation is to materialize (Muasher, 1998).

The most important of these elements are: Firstly, Israel must see the benefits of the peace approach and should make every effort to make it bear fruit. Secondly, the peace process on the on other tracks, i.e. with the Palestinians, Syrians and with the Lebanese must be expedited to reach an early comprehensive settlement to the conflict. Finally, the international community, particularly the USA should realize the importance of supporting the peace process in the Middle East .They need to make every effort to support the new development in this region (Muasher, 1997).

In spite of the above mentioned risks, the Jordanian government has pursued and followed up its move toward peace with Israel while vigorously attempting, on the other hand , to ensure that conditions for its success remain in place. However, the events that unfolded throughout the 1990s up to the present time proved that the Jordanian peace efforts alone are not enough, and that this move will remain fragile as long as it is exposed to

regional risks such as ,failure to make further progress on other tracks, failure of achieving benefits of Peace to the Jordanian people, erosion of domestic support or domestic opposition, disparities in level of economic development between Jordan and Israel, and fragility of the transitional period.

The first obstacle that faced and still faces the Jordanian policy for peace is that Jordan, as a small Arab country, is affected by regional developments which have an impact on economic performance and the domestic national consensus which is essential to its move vision and help it endure the test of time.

So, the lack of progress on the tracks, the Israeli attacks on Palestinian targets and vice versa, Israeli military strikes against South Lebanon and some targets in Syrian Lands, renewed settlement activities, and most importantly, the erosion of confidence in the peace process that resulted from all this, took a heavy toll on the Jordanian economy. Foreign investments-known to shy away from unstable regions- failed to materialize as expected or planned (Muasher, 1998).

The second one is, when the Jordanian government had signed the peace treaty with Israel, it was seen as the treaty that returned their land and water. At the same time they thought they will have a promised prosperity and a better life for all peoples through regional cooperation. Furthermore, some of the Jordanians thought of expanded trade opportunities, and through giving Jordan the opportunity of a fresh and healthy start by relieving it of its debt burden. But and as a fact that the benefits of the peace treaty with Israel were very slow to materialize and some actually never did. An agreement with Israel to identify sources of additional waters to be provided to Jordan a years after signing the treaty is yet to be reached.

Also, Israeli barriers to trade triggered by security concerns or protectionist tendencies have substantially impeded exports to Israel and to the Palestinian territories. In addition, the job creation and economic activity that were expected to accrue from the peace agreement with Israel have not materialized, and not trickle down effects have been felt. It is quite right to say that, no major creditor other than the United States of America did write off Jordan's debt, while other countries like Germany and Japan step up their assistance to Jordan.

And finally, People's expectations after the signing peace treaty with Israel were elevated by statements of strong support by world leaders. Those statements were

understood as promising much more than what actually materialized.

There have also been other groups which that peace is carried out in the Middle East, and their ways of achieving that peace are not always non-violent. One such development is the formation of Hamas. Formed in 1987 Hamas is now one of Palestine's largest and most influential militant groups. It has gained popularity with the Palestinian population, winning over the PLO in the 2006 elections. Hamas is divided into two main areas of operation. One is social programs the other has the militant operations (News .bbc.co.uk 2001).

Hezbollah - or Party of God - emerged in Lebanon in the early 1980s and became the region's leading radical Islamic movement, determined to drive Israeli troops from Lebanon. In May 2000 - due partly to the success of the party's military arm - one of its main aims was achieved. Israel's battered and bruised army was forced to end its two-decade occupation of the south. Hezbollah now serves as an inspiration to Palestinian factions fighting to liberate occupied territory, (Hezbollah, Aljazeera.com. 2003).

The invasion of Iraq by the US in 2003 has sparked much controversy. The claim that Iraq was making weapons of mass destruction was made by the US to justify the invasion. Later it was discovered that there was no truth behind these allegations. After Saddam Hussein was removed from power, chaos spread in Iraq. Till now the United States army can not get control of the revolt running rampant all over Iraq. Now a civil war like state has spread in the Middle Eastern country, breaking Iraq into two sides, the Shiites and the Sunnis. The La Times reports that about 3,800 Iraqis were killed by section violence in Baghdad alone during the first six months of 2006 (News, Aljazeera.com. 2006).

9. CONCLUSION

Through our study of the Jordan's policy towards the peace process in the Middle East and the US's role and according to the theory of this research, the researcher reached a number of results and possibilities which help in giving a future overview about the form of relationship between Jordan and Israel.

The researcher found through this study to the relations between these states that there are private benefits, common ones, problems and obstacles that may affect the nature of relations between Jordan and Israel.

We can see that because the internal and regional factors that the policy of each of them is based on deference and change.

As for Jordan we can see that it acknowledges the weakness of its internal factors and its need of the American support, where as Israel continue looking to achieve its interests in the Arab Land and region through using different mechanisms and ways. To maintain its country's security and stability Jordanian government followed a practical and rational policy in dealing with its relations with the peace process in the Middle East.

The Jordanian government opted for peace with Israel after Egypt, the Palestinians and other Arab states did so. It did so based on a strategic decision to rid the region of the policies of conflict, and develop a new external environment of cooperation and interdependence with Israel and all parties in the region as the only way that would ensure sustainable development.

So, the Jordanian leadership kept a close relationship with the US, which helped economic and military assistance for Jordan's building and development. At the same time the relationship assured the influence of the US to stabilize Jordan's borders and check the perceived territorial ambitions of Israel.

Using the pressure provided by the US, Jordan wished to directly move towards peace negotiations and stability. In this way, King Hussein was extremely active in moving the region toward peace and stability, drawing on a series of complex approaches and strategies designed to keep his borders secure while fostering economic development and nation-building at home.

While the treaty of peace with Israel has brought the aforementioned immediate benefits, Jordan is actively promoting an overall peace settlement which will free the peoples of the region from the burdens of war and give them the opportunities necessary to build a better future. Moreover much of the vast wealth that is currently spent on arms can be redirected to promote development. A healthy regional peace also promises to spur political participation and a greater appreciation of human rights, as the absence of an Israeli military threat will make justifying authoritarian police states and large armies more difficult.

The events leading up to 1994 helped excel peace and strengthen US-Jordanian ties. Perhaps King Hussein's thoughts and determination should be used today to achieve regional stability. After King Hussein's hard work, he struggled to improve the relationship of the East

and West Bank, and unite them once again, but he was forced to accept peace with Israel in the year 1994. King Abdullah is in power now and has not achieved what his father was capable of. There are several reasons for this and the first is the fact that he has less experience than King Hussein.

Jordan at the present time is in need of the US's help because of many factors. Jordan urges economical support and strength from US. It depends on the American arming expertise, economic assistance and other factors and techniques that as a result may lead to serve the American interests in the Middle East.

Accordingly, one might say that, as long as Jordan's economy remains weak and inferior to Israel, Jordan can not achieve recognition and power. The Jordanian government political behaviors may have come as a result to its inability to move away from the American leadership and control i.e. that the Jordanian freedom in manipulating to achieve its goals through moving away from the American policy is a difficult matter.

It is in the light of the above circumstances one may say that, there are many different scenarios when the future of Israeli-Jordanian relations is questioned. The first scenario or possibility is the Jordanian's in ability to risk its security and taking steps that may lead to Israeli response that may form a threatening act on the Jordan security and stability, therefore it should be continue in its moderate policy with America.

The second possibility is, Jordan can look for

numerous weapons and economic resources and adapt an arming development plan, and depending on circumstances it may abandon the adaptation of the American policy in the Middle East. We can say that with our confession that Jordan can't go through this possibility especially after what happened in the Arabian Gulf 1990-1991 and after that and what accompanied that of an American existence in the Middle East.

As for the third scenario we can say that the Jordanian government can look for alternative foreign relations other than those with Arabs and Islamic countries but with one condition: having the confidence factor between the known systems and the need to move away from the foreign policies that can serve its national interests.

To conclude, one could say that, the King understands that Arab and Islamic relations are important for the regime, but he seems unwilling to place the interests of other regional states above those of Jordan.

The king appears to have calculated that the best possible way to secure Jordanian advantage is to align with the USA & with the West, and that what is necessary at the regional level is to reach a minimal level of agreement with Arabs based on coordination and cooperation in areas of mutual interests.

The overall success of this process is presently uncertain: what is clear is that Jordan has repeatedly shifted its alliances depending on where its interests were perceived to be best served.

REFERENCES

- Al-Ramadanie, Mazen. 1980. *A Study in the external Behavior*, The University of Baghdad, 120-121 (in Arabic).
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime minister of Jordan, An Interview,
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime Minister of Jordan, An Interview,
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime Minister of Jordan, An Interview.
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime minister of Jordan, An Interview.
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime minister of Jordan, An Interview.
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime minister of Jordan, An Interview.
- Jordan, An Interview.
- Alrawabdeh, A.A. 2006. The Former Prime minister of Jordan, An Interview.
- Cunningham, Karla, J. 1998. The Causes and Effects of Foreign Policy Decision Making, an Analysis of Jordanian Peace With Israel, *World Affairs*, 2-5.
- Day, Arthur R. 1986. East Bank/West Bank, Jordan and the Prospect for Peace, *Council in Foreign Relations*, INC, USA, 2-3.
- Deutsch, Karl, W. 1978. *The Analysis of International Relations*, Second Ed, Prentice and Hell INC, Cliffs, 100.
- FRUS, 1964. X1, No, 171, 299.
- FRUS. 1964. X1, No, 289, 22.
- George, Alexander, L. 1983. *Detente the Search for a Constructive Relationship at Managing US- Soviet*

- Rivalry*, Westview Press INC, 17.
- George, Alexander, L. op.cit, 17.
- Hezbollah, http://www.aljazeera.com/me.asp?service_ID=10029-2003 invasion of Iraq, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003_invasion_of_Iraq.
- http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/middle_east/2001/israel_and_the_palestinians/profiles/1654510.stm.
- Jordan Relations with United States, Library of Congress, 1997.
- Kunkle, Lynn. op.cit, 10-12.
- Knuckle, Lynn. King Hussein's Strategy for Peace, The American University, Washington D.C.USA, 2000, Unpublish Article, 3-10.
- Lynn Kunkle, op. cit, 8-15.
- Margenthau, Hans, J. 1950. *In Defense of National Interests*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 117-118.
- Moffett, George. D. 1989. Jordan: Impetus for Change Grows, *Christian Science Monitor*, 15.
- Muasher, Marwan. 1997. *Jordan's Model of Peace in the Middle East: Supporting Sustainable Development*, 1-19.
- Muasher, Marwan. 1998. New Relationships that are Reshaping the Middle East, AIPAC Policy Conference, Washington .D.C.
- Mutawi, Samier, A. 1987. *Jordan in the 1967 War*, Cambridge University Press, and 12-5.
- Nahar, Ghazi Saleh. 1997. *Jordan Foreign Decision toward the Gulf Crisis and War 1990-1991*, in Arabic, Majdalawi Publisher, Amman, Jordan, 15-40.
- Nevo, Joseph. 1998. The Jordanian, Palestinian and The Jordanian- Palestinian Identities, the Fourth Nordic Conference on Middle Eastern Studies, *The Middle East in Globalizing World*, 1-10.
- Prados, Alfred B. 2003. Jordan: US Relations and Bilateral Issues." Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division, *CRS Issue Brief*, 1-14.
- President Kennedy's Speech, 1963.
- Ross, Dennis. 2004. The Missing Peace, *The Inside Story of The Fight for Middle East Peace*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, NY, 159-179.
- Ross, Dennis. op. cit, 160-180.
- Stocky and Richard, Zechauser. 1973. *For Policy Analysis*, Norton and Company N.Y, London, 17.
- The Royal Hashemite Court. 1997. Foreign Affairs: The Jordanian Perspective, *Jordan Diary 1997*, International Press Office, 1-5.
- Who are Hamas? 2006.

*

.1973

1967

1994

1994

2006/7/29

*

.2007/4/15