

—The TURBULENT GREATER MIDDLE EAST and the ARAB-ISRAELI PEACE PROCESS—

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE WEST BANK AND GAZA AUTONOMY TALKS, NOVEMBER 1980. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 21 November 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 40p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: W 52/5

“The problem ... that we are dealing with there, that is almost heartbreaking, is that every event has a counterreaction, and every time one party takes one step, the other feels it has to take another step, and the tension builds, and the hostility builds, and these people are not moving toward working together as amicably as they might. For a long period of time there is quiet, then suddenly something erupts, there is a guerrilla attack, or one person or another is shot on either side, and then you are back again in this churning maelstrom, which is another reason why we cannot leave it alone and say we will pack up and go back and let them worry it out, because the dangers are so great.”

APPROACHES TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East. 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 22 & 24 February; 2 March; 18 May 1972. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972. 166p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/4

“In brief, the Middle East was in limbo in 1971. The opportunity for movement toward peace was lost. All parties seemed to be waiting for some progress in some negotiations, and nothing was accomplished. This only adds to our sense of discouragement and disillusionment. We see the dangers—incidents of violence, massive retaliation, inflamed rhetoric, political instability, and war—but we are able to do little about it. And although no actions toward peace seem to be taking place now, we must keep trying. That ‘we’ involves the United States and the United Nations, for certain, but it also means Israel and its Arab neighbors.”

ARE YASSER ARAFAT AND THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY CREDIBLE PARTNERS FOR PEACE? U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 6 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 79p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AR 5/2 A: 2001-2002/27

“Some Middle East Experts have speculated that Yasser Arafat was both unwilling to strike a final deal for peace and unable to sign the agreement that was proposed at Camp David. Many of these experts contend that Arafat cannot enter into such an agreement because he lacks credibility with the Arab world, has little standing with the Islamists, and has no legitimacy with the Palestinian people.”

ASSESSMENT OF THE 1978 MIDDLE EAST CAMP DAVID AGREEMENTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 95th Congress, 2nd Session, 28 September 1978. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. 126p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/7/978

“The agreement with Egypt provides for diplomatic relations, an end to boycotts, the right to free passage through international waterways, and other ties characteristic of normal peaceful relations between sovereign states ... In the West Bank and Gaza, Israeli security forces will remain in specified security locations to provide for Israel’s security ... There will be a 5-year interim period before the final status of these territories is decided ... Egypt has laid a foundation for an overall Arab-Israeli settlement. Egypt has established a procedure and principles which can be used by all of Israel’s neighbors prepared to negotiate for peace and security ... for the first time in history a Palestinian self-governing body will be established ... These arrangements will set in motion a political process in the West Bank and Gaza which will establish Palestinian authority and administration with full autonomy there ... Israel has agreed that the solution arising from the negotiations must recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements.”

A COMMON STRATEGY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP: REMARKS AT OPENING SESSION OF THE AD HOC LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 29, 1995. U.S. Department of State. Secretary Christopher. *Dispatch*. Vol. 6, No. 41, 9 October 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. p.725-726. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 6/41

“For this next phase, we should agree today on a common strategy for building the infrastructure necessary for sustained economic development. The resources of the international community must be targeted on key projects like new roads, wells, and water and sewage systems. Above all, we must help Palestinians create the jobs and economic opportunities that will broaden the constituency for a lasting peace. The United States and the World Bank have identified a list of priority infrastructure projects.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1995/html/Dispatchv6no41.html>

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST: STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 12, 1996. U.S. Department of State. Robert H. Pelletreau. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 26, 24 June 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. p. 336-341. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/26

“The Administration is fully committed to helping secure a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. Over the past 3½ years, the United States has given strong support to Israel and its Arab partners as they take bold and courageous steps toward peace. Our support has been especially critical in recent months as the enemies of peace have waged a violent campaign to undermine the peace process. The suicide bombings in Israel in February and March, followed by the crisis involving Lebanon and Israel in April represented not only a human tragedy, but a serious challenge to the peace process. In both cases, the United States took the initiative to safeguard the peace process and refocus attention on negotiations.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no26.html>

DOCUMENTS AND STATEMENTS ON MIDDLE EAST PEACE 1979-82. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, June 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 337p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/22/979-82

“The collection begins with a section titled ‘Implementing Camp David,’ and, following the outline of the two Camp David frameworks, is divided into a section on the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty and another on the West Bank-Gaza Strip negotiations. This is followed by a section entitled ‘Alternative Peace Strategies,’ which contains proposals or peace initiatives by governments or organizations ... additional perspectives can be found in subsequent sections, which include: United Nations, Israel, Egypt, Palestinians, Other Arabs, United States, and Europeans.”

DOCUMENTS ON MIDDLE EAST PEACE, 1982-88. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 1st Session, April 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 91p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/22/982-88

“This compilation of documents ... was designed to be a handy reference volume, containing the key statements and proposals relating to the search for peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, including the Palestinians. Included in the compilation are selected key public statements and proposals by government leaders in Israel, Egypt, and Jordan. Arab perspectives are also found in major resolutions or proposals by the Arab League. A representative selection of official U.S. statements and policy declarations on the peace process is also included ... As for the Palestinians, careful attention was paid to reflect the changes in public positions of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and to include important statements by other Palestinians, including those sometimes identified as leaders of the uprising in the West Bank and Gaza Strip which started in December, 1987, and other centers of Palestinian opinion, in Lebanon and elsewhere.”

EGYPT: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. December 1990. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 425p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-43/991

“The government’s continuing concern over national security was but one aspect of the problems posed by the Persian Gulf war. The war had far-reaching political, economic, and diplomatic implications for Egypt’s future. In mid-July 1991, it remained to be seen whether Egypt would continue to evolve democratic political institutions, to reform governmental administrative structures, and to promote economic reforms designed to further agricultural and industrial development. Also in question was whether Egypt could resume the position of Arab leadership it had gained under Nasser, now that Syria’s Hafiz al Assad was reasserting his regional leadership role, and whether the realignment resulting from the war would work in Egypt’s favor.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.eg>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40273>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/egtoc.html>

FINDING THE PATH TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: STATEMENT AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 6, 1997. U.S. Department of State. Madeleine K. Albright. *Dispatch*. Vol. 8, No. 7, August/September 1997. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. p.16-21. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 8/7

“We have come too far in the process of Arab-Israeli peacemaking to allow the vultures of violence to shape the region’s future. The stakes are too high, past sacrifices have been too great, and the people of the region have been burdened for too long by bloodshed and strife. We must respond to those who have declared war on peace by waging war on terror—understanding that forging peace and fighting terrorism are not separate struggles, but rather two halves of the same struggle. We cannot succeed in one if we do not prevail in both ... in Madrid, Oslo, Washington, Cairo, and in the Arava, we have seen historic enemies come together, speaking the language of peace. We have seen ties between Arabs and Israelis expand and a process of regional cooperation begin to tack tough issues such as water, the environment, and refugees. We have seen a series of economic summits bring Arab and Israeli business people together to lay the groundwork for increased trade, investment, and prosperity.”

Online

<http://www.state.gov/www/publications/dispatch/AugSept1997.pdf> (PDF)

FOR THE MIDDLE EAST, PEACE IS THE ONLY ANSWER: SECRETARY ALBRIGHT—ADDRESS TO THE ISRAEL ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE, JERUSALEM, SEPTEMBER 11, 1997. U.S. Department of State. Madeleine K. Albright. *Dispatch*. Vol. 8, No. 7, August/September 1997. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. p.11-15. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 8/7

“Unfortunately, the momentum toward fulfillment of this vision has stalled. A crisis of confidence has evolved between Israelis and Palestinians which has, in turn, created a crisis of confidence between Israel and the Arab world. This crisis was neither inevitable nor accidental. It has been caused by the failure of both sides to live up to their full obligations as partners in peace. As I have said several times in recent days, this failure was not symmetrical, but it was mutual. And mutual actions will be required if mutual confidence is to be restored. That requires, above all, renewed understanding and acceptance of the fundamental reality recognized at Oslo: that the Israeli and Palestinian peoples are neighbors—not temporarily, but permanently—and that, in such a small land, it is vital that neighbors treat each other with respect ... I am making clear, as American administrations have in the past, that the role of the United States is not to impose peace. Peace must emerge from compromise shaped and agreed to by both sides.”

Online

<http://www.state.gov/www/publications/dispatch/AugSept1997.pdf> (PDF)

40 KM INTO LEBANON: ISRAEL'S 1982 INVASION. U.S. Department of Defense. M. Thomas Davis. National Defense University Press. 1987. 144p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.402: L 49

“...the most significant consequence of the 1948 war was the refugee problem. The refugees were the Palestinian Arabs who left the areas that became the state of Israel. They lost their homes, their possessions and, by their reasoning, their identity ... By the end of the war, there were approximately 700,000 Arab refugees displaced from lands now occupied by Israelis. About 60 percent of these refugees wound up in Jordan while the remainder were evenly divided between the Egyptian-controlled Gaza Strip, and areas of southern Lebanon and Syria. These people, primarily representing excess agricultural labor, were confined in camps and forced to live off the meager handouts of various Arab states and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency ... The camps have become the breeding ground of the discontent that has spawned the contemporary Palestinian national movement. To these Palestinians, the establishment of Israel is known merely as ‘the catastrophe’ and they continue to look upon the Jewish state as imperialistic, western, coercive, and dispossessive. This is the major engine driving the emotional dispute that continues to thrive in the region ... Tensions continued along the Lebanese border between Israel and the PLO and in March 1978 the Israelis invaded Lebanon up to the Litani River, following a PLO terrorist attack.”

THE FUTURE OF JERUSALEM. U.S. Department of Defense. Lord Caradon (Sir Hugh Foot). Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1980. 37p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.409: 80-1

“No problem amongst the many disputes of the Middle East raises more difficulties, excites more deep emotions, or commands more intense loyalties than the question of the future of Jerusalem, and no other danger is treated with such an ominous silence. Everything else could be agreed but without a settlement in Jerusalem all other agreements would be in vain. Can Jerusalem be transformed from a barrier into a Gateway to Peace? ... The Israelis on one side and the Palestinians on the other can never abandon their devotion and allegiance to Jerusalem. The domination of the whole city by one or the other would surely create a hopeless and disastrous confrontation, preventing all endeavors to find a peaceful settlement in the Holy Land.”

HOW DO WE PROMOTE DEMOCRITIZATION, POVERTY ALLEVIATION, AND HUMAN RIGHTS TO BUILD A MORE SECURE FUTURE? U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 27 February 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 45p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-300

“...today we want to explore some very difficult issues regarding terrorism around the world. On September 11, all of us asked, in one way or another, who would do such a thing, and why could this possibly happen? Was it from some deep-seated religious belief that caused this to happen? Was it a consequence of a perversion of a view of Islam? What was the cause? And we hear people say the cause is poverty, the cause is inhumanity, the cause is lack of democratization ... there’s an intense and excruciating poverty in Brazil. Why are there not terrorist cells—or are there terrorist cells we should worry about, coming out of Brazil? Why does it happen in one part of the world and not another?”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19769>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19770> (PDF)

IRAN: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. December 1987. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 344p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-68/987

“The Islamic Revolution in 1979 brought a sudden end to the rule of the Pahlavi dynasty, which for fifty years had been identified with an attempt to modernize and Westernize Iran. The Revolution replaced the monarchy with an Islamic republic and a secular state with a quasi-theocracy. It brought new elites to power, altered the pattern of Iran’s foreign relations, and led to the transfer of substantial wealth from private ownership to state control ... The creation of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 1979 resulted in the destruction of the power and influence of the predominantly secular and Western-oriented political elite that had ruled Iran since the early part of the twentieth century. The new political elite that emerged was composed of Shia clergymen and lay technocrats of middle-class origins. The major consequence of their programs has been cultural, that is, the desecularization of public life in Iran ... The Shia clergy have become the major political actors not only at the national level but also at the local level, where the chief cleric in each town has assumed the functions of a de facto district governor.

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.ir>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40299>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/irtoc.html>

THE IRANIAN REVOLUTION AND MODERNIZATION: WAY STATIONS TO ANARCHY. U.S. Department of Defense. Jack C. Miklos. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1983. 84p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.413: 83-2

“To many observers in the West, events in Iran leading up to the revolution in 1979 took a mystifying and seemingly irrational course. In this National Security Essay, Jack Miklos, a foreign service officer who served in several key assignments in Iran, discusses the Iranian Revolution. He looks at theories of social modernization as applied to the history and culture of Iran, and then focuses in depth on the effects of land reform and the pervasive influence of what he identifies as the Iranian national character. His purpose is to examine social science theorizing with a case study of US-aided modernization which exploded in a traditional counter-reformation. Based on firsthand observations as well as theory, the author offers insights into how modernization may have contributed to the Iranian Revolution.”

ISLAM AND DEMOCRACY. U.S. Institute of Peace. *Peace Watch*. Vol. 8, No. 5, August 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2002. p.4. [Article].

SuDoc# Y 3. P 31: 15-2/V.8/NO.5

“Exploring Islam’s compatibility with human rights and democracy leads to suggestions for strengthening institutions in the Muslim world.”

Online

<http://www.usip.org/peacewatch/2002/8/islam.html>

ISRAEL: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. December 1988. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 414p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-25/990

“Having achieved statehood, the new government faced numerous problems ... the expropriation of Arab lands—including lands left by Arabs who had fled during the 1948 war as well as Arabs obliged by the government to relocate—so as to provide a livelihood for new immigrants; the establishment of a military government to administer Arab population areas ... Israel’s relationship with its neighbors must be understood in the context of its overriding concern for preserving its national security ... it has developed various security principles: such as anticipating a potential extensive threat from every Arab state, needing strategic depth of terrain for defensive purposes, or, lacking that, needing an Israeli deterrent that could take a conventional or nuclear form, and the necessity to make clear to neighboring states, particularly Syria, actions that Israel would consider potential causes for war.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.il>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40309>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/iltoc.html>

ISRAEL, EGYPT, SUDAN, ETHIOPIA, AND SOMALIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 27 December 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 13p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IS 7/5

“The Congressional delegation discussed South Africa, Ethiopian Jewry, and a wide range of African and Middle Eastern issues during its visit to Israel ... In a lengthy meeting with the Congressional delegation at his summer residence near Alexandria, President Hosni Mubarak emphasized that both Egypt and America had strong interests in improving relations with Ethiopia ... The purpose of the delegation’s visit to Sudan was twofold: to assess the current internal political situation ... and to gain a first-hand look at the drought and famine conditions existing in western Sudan while at the same time evaluating the effectiveness of the U.S. response to this specific emergency ... The purpose of the delegation’s three-day visit to Ethiopia was manifold: to evaluate the effectiveness of U.S. contributions to the famine relief efforts; to assess prospects for improving U.S.-Ethiopian relations; to review the Ethiopian government’s attitude regarding outstanding compensation issues; and to assess the general human rights situation in the country ... political instability continued to be a major issue in Somalia, particularly disaffection in the North. Somali officials were very concerned about Ethiopian aid to the dissidents. A joint Ethiopian-Somali dissident force continues, for example, to occupy two border towns in Somalia.”

THE ISRAELI AIR STRIKE. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 18, 19 & 25 June 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 299p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: IS 7/2

“The purpose of this morning’s hearing is to review several questions in order to help Congress determine the possible consequences of Israel’s action. These questions include the following: Did Israel act in self-defense, or was its action a violation of U.S. law governing the use of U.S. arms? Did Iraq have the capability and intention to build a nuclear weapon aimed at Israel, the development of which could not be halted through peaceful means? What are the implications of the raid for U.S. interests in the Middle East? What are the implications of the raid for international law concerning preemptive strikes? What are the implications of the raid for worldwide efforts to control nuclear proliferation?”

ISRAELI ATTACK ON IRAQI NUCLEAR FACILITIES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 17 & 25 June 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 132p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IS 7/3

“The Government of Israel contends that its action was necessary for its self-defense because the reactor was intended to produce atomic bombs and would become operational very soon. The Government of Iraq has claimed that its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes and has vowed to continue this program in spite of the Israeli attack ... the Israeli action will seriously affect the already tense situation in the Mideast. Accordingly, this hearing will also attempt to examine and evaluate what some of those foreign policy implications of the Israeli action may be. For instance, does the Israeli attack represent a dangerous precedent with respect to resolving nuclear proliferation disputes? “

THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN INTERIM AGREEMENT: REMARKS AT SIGNING CEREMONY OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN INTERIM AGREEMENT, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 28, 1995. U.S. Department of State. President Clinton, Jordanian King Hussein, Egyptian President Mubarak, PLO Chairman Arafat, Israeli Prime Minister Rabin. *Dispatch*. Vol. 6, No. 41, 9 October 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. p.719-723. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 6/41

“President Clinton: ...Much remains to be done, but we will continue to walk each step of the way with those who work and risk for peace. We will press forward with our efforts until the circle of peace is closed—a circle which must include Syria and Lebanon if peace is to be complete. We will not rest until Muslims and Jews can turn their backs to pray without any fear; until all the region’s children can grow up untouched by conflict; until the shadow of violence is lifted from the land of light and gold.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1995/html/Dispatchv6no41.html>

ISRAELI SETTLEMENTS IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on International Organizations; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 95th Congress, 1st Session, 12 & 21 September; 19 October 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. 181p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IS 7/2

“There are several aspects of this subject which are of interest to the subcommittees. The first concerns the status of the settlements under international law including the applicability of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Article 49 of that convention provides that ‘the occupying power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies.’ ... A second series of questions concerns the impact that the settlements have had on indigenous peoples residing in the occupied territories. To what extent have their rights been affected? Are the settlements a source of tension between the Arabs and Jews in the occupied territories?”

ISRAELIS AND PALESTINIANS: WINNING THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE: REMARKS AT SIGNING CEREMONY OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN INTERIM AGREEMENT, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 28, 1995. U.S. Department of State. Secretary Christopher. *Dispatch*. Vol. 6, No. 41, 9 October 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. p.723-724. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 6/41

“Today, we bear witness to another extraordinary milestone on that historic journey. Israelis and Palestinians have crossed much hostile territory since they first came together on this issue. This conflict’s bitter past has not surrendered easily to a new, more hopeful future. But as we are reminded again this morning, the struggle for peace is being won. There is no turning back. The journey will be completed when Israelis and Palestinians finally live side-by-side as neighbors, with security and dignity.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1995/html/Dispatchv6no41.html>

THE JAFFEE CENTER REPORT ON THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 2 August 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 95p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: J 18

“The Palestinians will have to accept extensive Israeli security guarantees or security precautions, including an ongoing early warning presence that would probably remain in the West Bank even beyond the independence stage, as well as Israeli control over the air. Israel would have to be rewarded by many of the surrounding Arab states—and most notably Jordan—with accompanying peace arrangements and security arrangements. After all, states such as Jordan and Saudi Arabia have presented as their only condition for recognizing Israel and making peace with it a settlement of the Palestinian issue ... And finally, everyone involved will have to

make some provisions to take into account that Syria under present circumstances is a potential spoiler in any such process and cannot be ignored.”

JERUSALEM: THE FUTURE OF THE HOLY CITY FOR THREE MONOTHEISMS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 28 July 1971. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971. 226p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: J 48

“While the specifics of the future of Jerusalem must be negotiated by the Arabs and Israelis, parameters of the final settlement should reflect the following considerations: First, Jerusalem is a unique city and because of its great importance to Jews, Muslims, and Christians, any solution must maintain its special character. Second, the right of access should be guaranteed to all the holy places, and a free flow of goods and people within the city maintained. Third, insistence on the sovereignty and administration of all holy places by one nation should be avoided if an agreement is to be reached. Fourth, Jerusalem, a city, should not be divided and should, in an administrative and municipal sense, be unified ... Fifth, religious communities must accommodate each other’s interest and cannot prevent any group from access to or worship in the city.”

JORDAN: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. December 1989. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 330p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-34/991

“Because of Jordan’s large Palestinian population, a major aspect of its external relations concerns its dealings with the PLO ... Historically, Israel has been seen as Jordan’s primary threat ... Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 and the United States response in sending forces to Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf and encouraging UN economic sanctions against Iraq put Jordan in a quandary. In accordance with the UN resolution, it closed the port of Al Aqabah to Iraq, and [Jordanian King] Hussein announced that Jordan refused to recognize Iraq’s annexation of Kuwait. But Jordan expressed reservations concerning the Arab League resolution to endorse the sending of an Arab force to Saudi Arabia ... Hussein saw his role as that of an active mediator between Saddam Husayn and both the other Arab states and the West ... The king shared the view of the majority of Palestinian element of Jordan’s population that the West, led by the United States, was using a double standard in denouncing Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait to the point that it was willing to go to war, while ignoring Palestinian grievances over Israel’s occupation policies in the West Bank.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.jo>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40509>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/jotoc.html>

LEBANON. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 95th Congress, 2nd Session, 16 August 1978. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. 37p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: L 49

“The ultimate real problem of the Near East and, therefore, of Lebanon is the kind of order that should subsist among the peoples and cultures inhabiting the Great Land Bridge between Turkey and Egypt, and between the Mediterranean and the desert. This is what history is engaged in grinding out now and in the years ahead. Turkey’s, Mesopotamia’s and Egypt’s relations to these peoples and cultures are secondary to the relations of these peoples and cultures among themselves. There are five peoples (the Israelis, the Palestinians, the Jordanians, the Syrians and the Lebanese), four states (Israel, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon), three religions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) and two cultures (the Israeli culture and a general ‘Arab’ culture, whose ‘Arabness,’ because it varies in character from region to region, is to be more precisely defined) existing side by side in this one Land Bridge.”

LEBANON: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Thomas Collelo, ed. December 1987. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 282p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-24/989

“The United States support for the pro-Jumayyil, Christian brigades of the Lebanese Army during the 1983-84 Mountain War turned into a fiasco. Not only did the United States lose two aircraft to ground fire, but the shelling of Druze and Shia population centers by the U.S.S. New Jersey convinced most Lebanese Muslims that the United States had taken the Christian side. Likewise, by 1984, in the face of renewed fighting, the business of reconstruction became a faint hope. The attacks on the United States embassy and annex, and on the MNF contingent, and the kidnapping of United States citizens eventually forced the administration of President Ronald Reagan to minimize United States involvement in the increasingly ungovernable Lebanese state.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.lb>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40515>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/lbtoc.html>

LEBANON AND THE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, July 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 14p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: L 49/2

“In the spring of 1981 a major confrontation occurred between Syrian and Phalangist Christian forces in the Bekaa Valley east of Beirut ... In the summer of 1981, heavy clashes occurred between the PLO and Israeli forces across the Lebanon-Israel border ... Israel disputed the terms of the cease-fire. Israel maintained that Palestinian terrorist acts against Jews anywhere in the world as well as terrorist acts in Israel or Israeli occupied territory in the West Bank and Gaza—even if they did not originate from Lebanon—were violations of the cease-fire.”

LIBYA: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. December 1987. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 351p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-85/989

“In the 1970s and early 1980s, Libya was widely suspected of financing international terrorist activities and political subversion around the world. Recruits from various national liberation movements reportedly received training in Libya, and Libyan financing of Palestinian activities against Israel was openly acknowledged. There were also allegations of Libyan assistance to such diverse groups as Lebanese leftists, the Irish Republican Army, Muslim rebels in the Philippines, and left-wing extremists in Europe and Japan ... In general, after the early 1970s relations between the two countries went from bad to worse, even while the United States continued to import Libyan crude ... Qadhafi opposed United States diplomatic initiatives and military presence in the Middle East. As a protest against Washington’s policies in Iran, the United States Embassy in Tripoli was stormed and burned in December 1979 ... Libya’s income from oil came from sales to Western Europe as well as to the United States, and to ensure a steady supply of oil most European nations tried to remain on reasonable terms with their Libyan supplier.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.ly>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40516>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/lytoc.html>

LIBYAN ACTIVITIES. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 8 July 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 18p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: L 61/2

“Under Colonel Qadhafi, Libya has adopted a diplomacy of subversion in Africa and in the Arab world. It is a diplomacy of unprecedented obstruction to our own interests and objectives. Qadhafi has tried in every way he could think of to obstruct our efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. He has sponsored subversion from Africa to the Philippines. He actively has supported international terrorism using assassinations abroad as an instrument of his policy ... Africa increasingly has become victim of Qadhafi’s diplomacy of subversion. His goals seem to be far-reaching, possibly differing about the creation of an Arab Islamic bloc, including Muslims of Africa and the Middle East. Qadhafi sees himself as the spokesman of this group. He has no respect for existing internationally recognized boundaries. In fact, his vision of a Pan-Islamic entity is expressly intended to eliminate these boundaries.”

THE MARRIAGE OF ISLAM AND DEMOCRACY: A MIDDLE EAST CHALLENGE TO THE WEST. U.S. Institute of Peace. *In Brief.* No. 45. May 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1993. [Book Summary].

SuDoc# Y 3. P 31: 16/45

“The key conclusion: Islamic political action is a diverse phenomenon, not necessarily antithetical to democracy or inherently hostile to Western values or interests.”

THE MESSAGE IS AMERICA: RETHINKING U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 14 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 60p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: AM 3/7

How to make better use of the media—radio, television, and the Internet—to expand the potential audience for the U.S. message and interests, as well as how to better understand target audiences and then tailor programming to maximize its impact. Also the larger question of the U.S. government’s goals in spreading its message.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42884> (PDF)

http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/107/76189.pdf (PDF)

THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 22 April; 9, 10, 22 & 23 May 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 333p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.102-176

“In 1948, as you know, the U.N. made way for the establishment of the State of Israel, and there has since been introduced into the Middle East some 4 million Jewish

residents. The Arab-Israeli war which resulted in approximately 800,000 Arab refugees which today, have increased to 3 million, spread all around the periphery of the Middle East, as well as many in this country and other foreign countries. If you add these 3 million to the 1.2 million stateless Arab prisoners of war in the West Bank and Gaza and the 700,000 Arabs in Israel who do not have full rights as citizens, this makes a total of 5 million Arabs who have been denied a homeland, for which they are not likely to forgive or forget. This is, unfortunately, one of the problems that we have to take into account in the Middle East today.”

THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, August 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 42p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/13/982

“All parties must try to understand that the United States’ relationships in the Middle East have been premised on a strong bond of friendship with Israel. American-Israeli friendship is founded in a broad range of common interests, values, and heritage. Close cooperation can benefit both our nations. As the only Western-style democracy in the Middle East, Israel and the United States share a system of government and political expression which gives us special understanding of the political processes critical to each other’s security. Our two nations are also bound by close links between our peoples ... The single issue which creates the greatest strain in our bilateral relations ... is the widely held perception in the Arab world that the U.S. Government is not committed to a just and equitable settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute, including a settlement of those grievances of the Palestinians that are reasonable and just. The United States special relationship with Israel is increasingly exploited by radical and anti-American elements through the Arab world...”

THE MIDDLE EAST AND EUROPE: ENERGY, AUTONOMY, AND DEVELOPMENT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 7 April 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 32p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/19

“Israeli officials with whom members of the delegation spoke saw the Fahd plan as an effort by Saudi Arabia to consolidate and unify rejectionist Arab forces and to allay criticism of Saudi Arabia by more radical Arab nations which have judged the Saudi position to be too sympathetic to U.S. Middle East policies. In addition to having numerous substantive disagreements with the Fahd plan’s eight points, Israelis strongly object to the fact that the plan does not appear to be a starting point for a process of negotiation in which the Arab States would recognize Israel’s basic right to exist within secure borders.”

THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE 1990s. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 4 April; 8 May; 26 June; 17 July 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 332p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/30

“Of particular interest to the subcommittee today will be: demographic, social, and economic trends in Israel; the likelihood of change in the Israeli system of government; the role of the religious parties in Israeli politics; the impact of the Palestinian uprising on Israeli politics and society; and the impact of global changes on Israel.”

THE MIDDLE EAST, JUNE 1977. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 95th Congress, 1st Session, July 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977. 6p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/13/977

“Since the end of the Yom Kippur War in 1973, the United States has pursued a policy of seeking a settlement of the outstanding differences between the parties to this regional dispute. America’s interest in finding a solution to the Middle East crisis is not new. Over the years through sundry efforts America has tried to bring about both temporary halts to conflict and to seek longer-term solutions. Numerous proposals have been raised—some in public and others in private. Some have been implemented—ranging from the insistence, with longer-term responsibilities implied, for Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in 1957—to others with more limited objectives like the Sinai agreements. None have been comprehensive in implementing a last solution.”

THE MIDDLE EAST, 1974: NEW HOPES, NEW CHALLENGES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia. 93rd Congress, 2nd Session, 9 April; 7, 14, 23 May; 27 June 1974. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974. 202p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/9

“What was once considered by some to be a problem of controlling the potential spillover effect of the Arab-Israeli conflict into the politics of oil in the Persian Gulf where most states seemed uninterested in the conflict is now a regional problem in which oil supply and availability are closely linked by most Persian Gulf producers to progress in negotiations toward a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict ... The continued escalation of terrorism and counter-terrorism and the steady unchecked flow of sophisticated arms into the conflict zone raise ominous questions about the coming months and about maintaining and enlarging upon areas of negotiated compromise.”

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 95th Congress, 2nd Session, 28 June 1978. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. 34p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/18

“Over the last few weeks, a number of disturbing events in the Middle East have come to the attention of the subcommittee. Among these are the severe outbreaks of violence between Christian communities in central and northern Lebanon; information that hundreds of Palestinian soldiers are reappearing in southern Lebanon, in areas supposedly guarded by the United Nations forces; the deaths of the President of North Yemen and the President of South Yemen, both by violence; press reports that terrorists are attempting to infiltrate into Israel through Jordan after PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] announcements to that effect; reports of new murders among different Palestinian factions; and other developments.”

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 20 September 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 352p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/10

“To support the peace process, the United States has pledged \$500 million over 5 years to the PLO as part of a \$2 billion international package of economic and development assistance for the Palestinian Authority. The Congress adopted the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, known as MEPFA. That legislation enabled the administration to provide this kind of assistance to the PLO, subject to compliance with the commitments it undertook, and permitted the PLO to open an office in Washington.”

THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS AT A CROSSROADS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 11 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 44p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: P 31/18

“One can search the world without profit in an effort to identify a situation that is more intractable, more defiant of resolution than that of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict ... Its path is littered with the abandoned remnants of once-hopeful plans and promises that are now largely forgotten. All parties claim to want peace, and perhaps they do. But we must use the term cautiously ... progress must be calibrated in the smallest and most humble of scales. We must accept that there will be many reverses, many frail and false victories ... in so bitter a conflict success will require a secular miracle, if you will allow the term. Success will require that we mere mortals perform a miracle. I have just been handed a note. Apparently, many people were killed in a bus bombing in Jerusalem just now.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42825> (PDF)

http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/108/87669.pdf (PDF)

THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS: U.S. -ISRAEL-PALESTINIAN TRILATERAL COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED: REMARKS FOLLOWING TRILATERAL MEETING, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 29, 1995. U.S. Department of State. Secretary Christopher, PLO Chairman Arafat, Israeli Foreign Minister Peres. *Dispatch*. Vol. 6, No. 41, 9 October 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. p.726-727. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 6/41

“In our meeting this morning, the parties agreed that the new commission would have, among others, the following purposes. First, to promote cooperative efforts—both public and private in character—to foster economic development, not only in Gaza, but, of course, in the entire West Bank now ... The second purpose will be to explore how to increase the availability of water resources ... Third, the commission will consult on matters of mutual interest to enhance the success of the Interim Agreement that was signed yesterday. Finally, this new commission will promote trilateral cooperation on regional issues.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1995/html/Dispatchv6no41.html>

MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROSPECTS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 94th Congress, 2nd Session, 19 May—26 July 1976. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. 396p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/14

“The subcommittee today is going to open a new series of hearings on the prospects for peace in the Middle East. In subsequent hearings, we expect to be looking at the following topics: The civil war in Lebanon and its international implications; the Palestinian problem; the oil factor and its relationship to the overall Middle Eastern problem; finally, and throughout these hearings, we shall be seeking the insights and counsel of observers from government and the academic community and elsewhere on prospects for peace in the Middle East.”

MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 95th Congress, 1st Session, 18 & 20 May 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977. 79p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/15

“Our dependence on oil imports from the Middle East has mounted in the past 3 years ... In 1975 more than 25 percent of U.S. oil imports came from the Arab oil states, by contrast to only 14 percent in 1974. Gross uncertainty on U.S. energy policy seems still to be the order of the day ... oil must remain a primary concern of the U.S. Government. But to assume that everything must relate to oil is hardly logical. There are problems in the area which can and must be examined on their own merits, though undoubtedly they will also be examined in the light of pressures that occur to our security planners as they ponder the future and the problems that might arise in the event of another war.”

THE MIDDLE EAST ROAD MAP: OVERCOMING OBSTACLES TO PEACE. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 15 October 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. 48p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.108-316

“The Road Map represented a set of guidelines. It did not represent a blueprint, because nobody had the same understanding of what its 52 paragraphs represented. This was a concept that was negotiated by the U.S., the EU, the Russians and the U.N. None of these four parties had responsibility for carrying out even one of its steps. The parties who had to carry it out were the Israelis and the Palestinians and they were asked for their comments, they were told it was not negotiable. If you did not work out with the two sides how they understood each of the obligations, if you did not work out what were the standards of performance so everybody understood in the same way what was expected of them, you were not in fact going to see the Road Map materialize.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS46121>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS46123> (PDF)

THE MULTIPLE FACES OF THE MIDDLE EAST: A REVIEW. U.S. Department of Defense. Donald M. Snow. *Parameters: Journal of the US Army War College.* Vol. 11, No. 4, December 1981. Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, 1981. p.43-52. [Article].

SuDoc# D 101.72: 11/4

“The Middle East, in all its diversity and complexity, has dominated the center stage of Western, and especially American, consciousness in recent years. The Iranian revolution, the hostage crisis, the protracted Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq War, and the assassination of Anwar Sadat have competed for headlines with the Egyptian-Israeli peace process, the Palestinian question, and the implications of the Carter Doctrine. The result has been an increased awareness of the Middle East’s chronic instability and a growing realization that the sources of conflict in this

petroleum-rich area are deep, pervasive, and sometimes bewildering. Although the area's complexity virtually guarantees that any analysis will oversimplify reality, the Middle East can, perhaps, best be viewed in terms of three simultaneous conflicts. The first, and least publicized, is the conflict within Islam itself, which is rooted in both communal and ethnic differences and affects politics and stability within most Islamic states and often the relations between them. The second is the Arab-Israeli conflict, which has vexed the world for a third of a century and the efforts to resolve that conflict. The third is the conflict over the Persian Gulf, involving not only those states whose shores are washed by the gulf but the superpowers as well."

THE NEAR EAST CONFLICT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, 21-23, 28-30 July 1970. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970. 383p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: EA 7/8

"...one aspect of this situation which is frequently overlooked is the extent to which prevailing attitudes and much analysis in radio and television, have a tendency toward oversimplification of the issues, to portray it as a struggle between good and evil. The tendency is to polarize all discussion, so that frequently people who express some human concern about the Arab refugee problem are labeled as anti-Israeli or even anti-Semitic ... Or, those who express the view that Israel has a right to exist are frequently labeled as Zionist agents by the Arabs ... There needs to be an acceptance of the concept that concern for both people does not preclude or exclude concern for one or the other, and that neither the Palestine Arabs nor the Jews of Israel can continue to survive without each other.

AN OVERVIEW ON THE MIDEAST SITUATION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 10 September 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 35p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/22

"Few observers would have believed possible the peaceful, systematic withdrawal of the PLO and Syrian combatants from Beirut. President-elect Bashir Gemayel, however, faces serious problems, including the withdrawal of foreign forces from the remainder of Lebanon, uniting Lebanese Muslims and Christians and forging shattered national institutions."

PAKISTAN: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Peter R. Blood, ed. April 1994. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 398p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-48/995

“A particularly worrisome problem is Pakistan’s unwanted role as a base for Islamic militants. These militants come from a wide range of Arab countries, including Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan, as well as nations in Central Asia and the Far East, and are mostly based in the North-West Frontier Province. Many of these militants participated in the war in Afghanistan but now serve other, more extremist, causes. An attack that killed two American employees of the United States consulate in Karachi in March 1995 has drawn international attention to the growing terrorist activity in Pakistan.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.pk>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40523>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/pktoc.html>

PALESTINIAN EDUCATION—TEACHING PEACE OR WAR? U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 30 October 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. 70p. [Special Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AP 6/2: S.HRG.108-290

“The Palestinian Authority has been making a supreme effort to convince their own children that there is no greater achievement than to die for Allah in battle, known as Shahada ... The Palestinian Authority’s Ministry of Education textbooks portray Shahada as an ideal. For example, the poem of the shadid appears in textbooks on four grade levels and extols yearning for death. A song honoring Wafa Idris, the first woman suicide terrorist, was broadcast on Palestinian television three times ... Palestinian religious leaders have been a driving force in calling for Palestinians to kill Jews, especially through suicide bombings, and direct these messages at children, as well. Palestinian polls show that 72 to 80 percent of Palestinian children desire death as Shahids. Having been repeatedly exposed to this indoctrination, Palestinian children today actively set their sights on Shahada as a personal goal ... The Palestinian Authority has created a violent death-seeking reality for their children, having taught them to see death for Allah, Shahada, as an ideal which they are expected to achieve. The examples presented in this report are a representative selection demonstrating the comprehensive campaign waged daily by the Palestinian Authority. Even if just 1 percent of the children attempt to fill their duty and seek Shahada through suicide terrorism, the ramifications will be cataclysmic. The targets of the future Palestinian terror wave will be Israel and, in all likelihood, other Western democracies as well.”

THE PALESTINIAN ISSUE IN MIDDLE EAST PEACE EFFORTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Special Subcommittee on Investigations. 94th Congress,

1st Session, 30 September; 1 & 8 October; 12 November 1975. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. 293p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/3

“At the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict stand Jewish and Palestinian nationalisms, each in search of a secure homeland and acceptance by the other. On one side, there is the Jewish state of Israel which wants the right to exist as a state with defined and recognized borders. On the other side is a growing Palestinian nationalism which wants the right to self-determination within the small confines of Palestine. These two yearnings, which are not necessarily incompatible, need to be reconciled if progress and momentum toward peace are to be achieved. To accomplish this, there must be an evolution in the thinking of all parties to the conflict.”

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 96th Congress, 1st Session, December 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 15p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/18

“Although the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty has lessened overall tension in the area, a comprehensive settlement remains a long-distance and elusive goal ... The impact of the Iranian revolution has injected apprehension in the Arab world with resulting negative influence on the general atmosphere of the entire area ... The Arab world, especially Saudi Arabia, tends to view the fall of the Shah as a reflection of U.S. weakness, from which they conclude that the United States may possibly be undependable. Some Israeli officials criticize what they view as the lack of forceful U.S. action in Iran, from which they see flowing possible future negative consequences for Israel ... Saudi Arabian officials do not accept the Camp David peace formula chiefly because they do not believe it offers a workable solution. Paramount in their minds is the status of Jerusalem and self-determination for Palestinians. However, there is considerable uncertainty as to their position regarding the creation of an independent Palestinian state.”

PERSIAN GULF SITUATION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 17 September 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 36p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: P 43/3

“...this crucial region suffers from multiple strains. They include: ... the clash between traditional values and modernization that led to revolution in Iran, the Mecca Mosque crisis in Saudi Arabia, religious clashes in Egypt, and other social unrest; Clashes among the regional states ...; And the failure to resolve the Palestinian issue which has isolated Egypt from most of the Arab world, makes most Arabs cautious in their dealings with the United States and radicalizes more of the

Arab population as time passes. Decisions to be made on the AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia could affect the United States ability to influence the course of events in the region and to implement U.S. regional security plans. “

PERSIAN GULF STATES: COUNTRY STUDIES. Federal Research Division, Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. January 1993. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 472p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-185/994

“The Iranian Revolution of 1979 introduced a new threat to stability in the gulf. Shia form a majority of the population of Bahrain and an important part of the foreign labor force in Kuwait and are considered potential dissidents in any future hostilities. Numerous terrorist actions in Kuwait during the 1980s were attributed to domestic Shia instigated by Iran ... The gulf Arabs believe that a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict will enhance gulf security. Direct conflict with Israel was a remote contingency in early 1993, although Israel’s doctrine of preemptive attack and its demonstrated ability to hit distant targets must be reckoned with in their strategic planning ... The United States and other Western powers have indicated that they will act against any new instability in the gulf that endangers their interests.”

Online

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/bhtoc.html>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40114>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/kwtoc.html>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40156>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/omtoc.html>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40157>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/qatoc.html>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40158>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/aetoc.html>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40159>

PERSPECTIVES ON THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS, DECEMBER 1981. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 16 December 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 145p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/21/981

“...until it is recognized that there are two nationalisms competing for recognition in the contested territory of Palestine there cannot be a lasting peace ... there must be this mutual recognition between Israelis and Palestinians ... there must be a division between the two peoples of the contested area, that is, the territory that was the subject of the Palestine Mandate from 1922 to 1948 ... The West Bank and Gaza populations have resisted the new civilian administration, generally through peaceful demonstration and strikes, but also with violence, such as youths throwing rocks, bottles, and gasoline bombs, and on one occasion the assassination in Ramallah of a Village League official viewed as a collaborator, an attack which also took the life of his nephew. The Israeli military response has included the killing of a 17-year-old in Gaza and the wounding of two others; the wounding of a 15-year-old boy in Jenin; the demolition of seven houses of families of youths accused of violence ...”

PLO APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP IN WHO. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Operations. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 9 May 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 30p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/11

“Yassir Arafat has written to director-general Hiroshi Nakajima asking for the admission of the ‘State of Palestine’ into the World Health Organization. WHO’s annual World Health Assembly convenes on May 8, and among the organizational business it takes up at the outset is the application of states for membership. To Americans in particular, the affair reeks of crassest politics, since the PLO’s motive for applying for WHO membership plainly has little to do with health, and everything to do with political legitimacy. However, unlike resolutions critical of Israeli occupation practices, the question of admission to membership is indisputably an appropriate item for an agency’s agenda, and each agency’s constitution specifies its qualifications for admission.”

PLO COMMITMENTS AND COMPLIANCE REPORT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 24 May 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 112p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/15

“U.S. policy toward the PLO over the year was shaped in large measure by an undertaking entered into by the U.S. at Israel’s request in 1975. At that time, as part of a package of arrangements believed necessary to conclude a second disengagement agreement between Israel and Egypt, Israel asked the United States not to recognize or negotiate with the PLO until the PLO had met two conditions, namely, recognition of Israel’s right to exist and acceptance of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Subsequently, we added a third condition, namely, renunciation by the PLO of terrorism ... we told the PLO that its behavior must

improve and that it must try to ensure that the entire PLO act as one in adhering to the commitment to renounce terrorism and recognize Israel.”

THE PLO'S EFFORTS TO OBTAIN STATEHOOD STATUS AT THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 4 May 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 67p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/12

“...the self-declared Palestinian State, which the U.S. does not recognize, does not satisfy the generally accepted criteria under international law for statehood. And thus it does not qualify for membership in U.N. agencies ... the United States is opposed to the introduction of such a divisive political issue into the important technical work of these specialized agencies ... any effort to bestow legitimacy on the self-proclaimed Palestinian State would harm efforts underway in the region to bring about peace ... the Arab-Israeli problem can be resolved only through a process of negotiations between the parties, not through unilateral acts such as declarations of statehood or an effort to achieve that through some backdoor entry into a U.N. agency.”

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 2 October 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 85p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 75/25

“...whether or not we do intervene in Pakistani politics (and largely we do not) most Pakistanis take it as an article of faith that we have enormous influence over their domestic political process ... Thus we are assumed to support any government that we do not actively oppose and when one falls, our connivance is suspected ... Americans and their elected representatives cannot look with total unconcern at how their money is spent ... Pakistan is an important country internationally and plays an important role in its part of the world. It is thus a matter of concern to us that Pakistan hold together and develop in ways that will enable it to play a still more positive international role ... We and the Pakistanis have a number of parallel interests in the Gulf (especially support of Saudi Arabia) ...”

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE MIDDLE EAST: 1973-78. U.S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 21 April 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 575p. [Joint Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. EC 7: P 75/973-78

“This is a compilation of research papers, prepared at our request by scholars and specialists dealing with the momentous events in the Middle East during recent years

and their economic consequences for the nations of the Middle East and the rest of the world. Events in the past few months have heightened awareness of the importance of this region. The taking of American hostages in Iran, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the brief insurgency at Mecca and the latest round of OPEC oil price increases underscore the volatility of the region and United States and Western interests in it.”

PRIORITIES FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 94th Congress, 1st Session, 23-24 July 1975. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. 217p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/12

“First, the government of Israel and the PLO should issue declarations by which they denounce war and territorial expansionism and commit themselves to the principle that all territorial war gains are returnable. Second, the government of Israel should issue a declaration by which it recognizes the right of the Palestinians to form a state of their own west of the River Jordan within the internationally recognized boundaries. Third, the PLO should reciprocate by issuing a declaration recognizing the right of the Israeli people to live in their own state peacefully and securely. Fourth, the government of Israel should declare itself ready to negotiate with the PLO, directly, as the representative of the Palestinian people, on all future relationships between the two states.”

PROBLEMS OF PROTECTING CIVILIANS UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. 93rd Congress, 2nd Session, 4 April 1974. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974. 108p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/7

“The Palestinians ... have continuously inhabited that same area known as Palestine since time immemorial. Since 1948, after the creation of the state of Israel on that territory, they are living in forced exile ... The territory and population of Palestine had always remained an identifiable entity from either the Roman Empire, the Islamic nation, or the Turkish Ottoman Empire ... After 1947-48, the Palestinians, however, ceased to be a ‘people’ and became refugees just as Palestine ceased to exist as an identifiable region. Between 1948 and 1969, Palestinians were almost uniformly treated as ‘refugees.’ Even the United Nations in its oft-reaffirmed resolution of 1948 (Res. 194) granting the ‘refugees’ a right to return to their former homeland and to compensation for their lost property never admitted to the reality that these refugees constitute a ‘people.’”

THE QUEST FOR PEACE: PRINCIPLE UNITED STATES PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS ON THE ARAB-ISRAELI PEACE PROCESS, 1967-1983. U.S. Department of State. Washington, DC: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, 1984. 145p. [Collection].

SuDoc# S 1.2: P 31/25/984

“Every American Administration since 1948 has actively engaged in the search for peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors. The collection of public statements and documents presented here focuses on U.S. efforts to help resolve the Arab-Israeli dispute since the June 1967 war. The collection includes public statements elucidating the U.S. position toward a settlement and describing U.S. peace efforts, the texts of more recent agreements achieved through U.S. intermediary efforts, and several key UN Security Council resolutions.”

RADIO ADDRESS TO THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE: RAMALLAH, WEST BANK, SEPTEMBER 12, 1997. U.S. Department of State. Madeleine K. Albright. *Dispatch*. Vol. 8, No. 7, August/September 1997. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communications, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. p.8-10. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 8/7

“We have seen your enthusiasm, your perseverance in the face of adversity, and your insistence on being treated with dignity. We have felt respect and a desire to help. That is why the United State has long insisted that any peace agreement should recognize your legitimate political rights and aspirations. It is why the United States has been a leader in providing economic assistance to help you build viable democratic institutions. It is why we have encouraged the efforts of the World Bank, the IMF, and other international agencies to work with you to meet basic needs and to create new opportunities for your people. It is why we convened a process through which nations from around the world might contribute to the Palestinian Authority’s success. Above all, it is why the heart of the message that I have brought to the region this week—a message I am conveying on behalf of President Clinton and the American people—is that for you and your neighbors, peace is the only option for the future.”

Online

<http://www.state.gov/www/publications/dispatch/AugSept1997.pdf> (PDF)

REALITIES OF THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 94th Congress, 1st Session, May 1975. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. 37p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/9

“First, there is America’s vital interest in the survival and security of Israel as an independent state. Our commitment to Israel is important in our own national interests—and it also involves our basic moral values as a nation. Every country and group should understand that this interest cannot be made hostage to any form of economic, military, or diplomatic pressure ... Beyond Israel, a second reality of the Middle East is the presence and growing power of permanent, independent Arab states. Some of them are richly endowed with oil. All of them are rich in historical and cultural values. Peace requires their assent and their cooperation ... A third inescapable reality is the presence of several million Palestinians with an uncertain future and an unsatisfactory present. Peace cannot be made or maintained without their consent ... They are entitled to be heard and to the same principle of self-determination that others treasure.”

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and Southeast Asia. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 17 October 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 34p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/15

“The September 11 events should cause us and the key actors in the Middle East to rethink many of our assumptions about that region. We should not forget that many members of the al-Qaeda terrorist network, including Osama bin Laden himself and his top lieutenant, Ayman al-Zawahiri, are opposition figures in the societies they come from—Saudi Arabia and Egypt respectively. The lack of democracy in the Middle East seems to have created fertile ground for the development of terrorist movements in these countries.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42272> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/107/75760.pdf (PDF)

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OF THE BAHAI'S IN IRAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations. 98th Congress, 2nd Session, 2 May 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 108p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: R 27/6

“For those who have been forced to look at what has happened in Iran during the past years, the view has been an ugly one. Executions of political or religious victims is an almost daily occurrence. Since 1979, according to Amnesty International, approximately 5,500 people have been summarily executed by the Iranian Government. However, even this mind-boggling figure reflects only the officially announced executions and excludes those countless secret executions not announced

by the authorities. Those citizens who have lost their lives encounter restrictions of their basic freedoms—freedom of speech, political freedom, and freedom of religion. Countless numbers of Iranians have sought shelter and refuge from this tyranny in other countries.”

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OF THE BAHAI'S IN IRAN, 1988. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 29 June 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 76p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: R 27/6/988

“Losing their lives is not the only problem now facing Baha’is in Iran. Even though they represent the largest religious minority in that Middle Eastern country, their religion is not recognized and their places of worship are destroyed. Their marriages are not sanctioned, and their children are denied the opportunity to attend universities. There is nowhere for them to go for justice, for every vestige of due process has been eliminated. The Baha’is are a gentle and peace-loving people who espouse equality and education. Those of us who know them wonder why the Baha’is, who teach about the eradication of prejudices, have been do prejudiced against, and why their prosecutions and persecutions continue in Iran.”

REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, 1978. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 95th Congress, 2nd Session, 12 June 1978. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. 216p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/5/978

“...in 1948, we committed ourselves to the existence and to the survival of Israel as a Jewish state, as a home for victims of the holocaust and others who wished to come, and as a functioning democracy. By the early 1960s, the advent of intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads and the fact that the U.S.S.R. had achieved an active position in the Middle East caused us to shift from seeing national interest primarily in terms of the Middle East’s geographic position to a perception of the Middle East in global strategic terms. We wanted to enhance our influence in the area partly because the Mediterranean remained an important lifeline to our NATO allies and our allies to the east, but also because of the importance of oil to Western Europe and the political orientation of key states. We did not at that time see a direct threat to American interests coming from this area. Direct U.S. economic interests, apart from our interest in the reliable availability of oil to our allies at reasonable prices, largely centered in oil-related activities.”

REVIEW OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 95th Congress, 1st Session, 8 June 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977. 128p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/5

“...the core issues on which we have focused our diplomatic efforts have been, first, the nature of the peace to be established between Israel and the Arab States; second, Israel withdrawal from occupied territories and agreement on final borders together with the related question of arrangements to make final borders secure; and, third, the resolution of the Palestinian issue ... “There must be fairness; there must be some flexibility; there must be a forgetting about past differences and misunderstandings; there must be determination; there must be a resolution of the Palestinian problem and a homeland for the Palestinians; there must be some resolution of border disputes; and there must be an appearance of permanent and real peace with guarantees for the future security of these countries, which all can trust.”

REVIEW OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, 1979. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 26 July 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 84p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/16/979

“Modernization and development did produce for many people a better material life in Western terms, but in some cases these were accompanied by massive social dislocation and urbanization as labor forces moved away from traditional agricultural pursuits and family life in the established Islamic context. Education and mass communications further fed the appetites. With the passage of time, however, it became apparent that for most people the gap between expectation and fulfillment increased rather than narrowed. This in turn resulted in mounting frustration, individual and collective—a growing perception that benefits were not being shared equitably. In Iran, collective anger was a sign of underlying pervasive psychological disorientation, and it expressed itself in political agitation. It was natural that individuals came to resent the imported cause of dislocation and reached for comfort in a value system more indigenous and satisfying to their needs. The abiding values of Islam were at hand, institutionally eroded but never eradicated or even basically weakened ... We believe we will continue to see Islamic aspiration to reassert identity and self-esteem through reasserting the importance of religion.”

SAUDI ARABIA: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. December 1992. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 351p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-51/993

“On the one hand, it [the Saudi government] feared the extremism of some of the traditionalists, which could well undermine the economic, education, and social development programs that the government had been implementing and which also constituted a threat to internal security. On the other hand, as guardian of the holy places of Islam, the sites of the annual pilgrimage for Muslims the world over, the government needed to legitimate itself as an ‘Islamic government.’ The government therefore has sought to achieve political and social compromises ... In the foreign policy arena, Saudi Arabia historically has sought to walk a narrow line between East and West. Because of its strong commitment to Islam, the kingdom abhorred the atheist policy of the former Soviet Union and therefore tended to be somewhat pro-Western concerning defense matters. However, Saudi Arabia also strongly opposed what it considered to be the pro-Zionist policy of the United States with regard to Israel and the rights of the Palestinians.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.sa>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40637>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/satoc.html>

THE SITUATION IN IRAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 8 May 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 48p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: IR 1/4

“The unwarranted Iranian seizure of the American hostages, who have been held illegally since November 4, 1979, has presented extremely difficult problems for the United States ... As we consider the present situation in Iran, we should have no illusions about the difficulties our nation faces ... We are dealing with a country torn apart by continuing revolutionary turmoil. In an important sense, our people are hostage not only to the terrorists, but to internal power struggles and rivalries inside Iran...”

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 15 July 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 46p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/21

“This morning, we begin a series of hearings on the current situation in the Middle East. The hearings will explore the wide range of policy choices available to the United States during this unusual period of rapidly changing political conditions. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the Iranian attack into Iraq are creating new

circumstances in the Middle East which could influence vital American interests for the foreseeable future.”

A SINO-SOVIET PERSPECTIVE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on the Near East. 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 26 April 1972. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972. 42p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/3

“Analysts have all too often seen the third world as relatively passive, a subject of manipulation by the Soviet Union, China, the United States, France, and Britain. This is the least true in the Middle East of any major third world area. Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and South Yemen are not complete satellites of the Soviet Union, nor is Saudi Arabia a satellite of the United States, and Israel is clearly not under American control. Middle Eastern politics is a process of interaction between the local and great powers ... Since the death of Nasser, much of the Arab world has moved from the left toward the right ... This move toward the right arose because of the death of the Arab world’s leftist charismatic leader Nasser; of continued Arab frustration over the failure of the Arab left and their patrons, the Soviets, to push the Israelis out of any of the conquered territories; and, we may assume, from a revival of the traditionalist, Islamic, and xenophobic currents in Arab history.”

THE SITUATION IN LEBANON: JULY 1989. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 25 July 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 173p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: L 49/7

“The Syrian presence in Lebanon is synonymous with destruction, death, and missed opportunities for peace. Since the inception of the civil war, 125,000 Lebanese have lost their lives; many of these deaths were inflicted directly by Syrian forces and many more by Syrian proxies. Furthermore, Assad has proven to be especially adept at subverting intra-Lebanese and foreign peace initiatives—most notably the 1983 United States plan which ended with the car bombing of the United States Embassy in Beirut and the killing of over 250 U.S. Marines.”

SOMALIA: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. May 1992. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 282p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-86/993

“With regard to Somalia’s future, the role of Islamism, sometimes referred to as fundamentalism, concerned the United States and some of its allies. In the north, Islamic militants, who were well trained and armed and supplied with funds

primarily by wealthy Saudis, had at one time controlled the town of Bender Cassim ... The traditional response of practicing Muslims to social trauma is to explain it in terms of a perceived sin that has caused society to stray from the 'straight path of truth' and consequently to receive God's punishment. The way to regain God's favor is to repent collectively and rededicate society in accordance with Allah's divine precepts. On the basis of these beliefs, a Somali version of militant Islamism (sometimes seen as fundamentalism) sprang up to fill the vacuum created by the collapse of the state."

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.so>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40639>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/sotoc.html>

STATUS OF MIDDLE EAST PEACE TALKS REGARDING THE WEST BANK AND GAZA, OCTOBER 1979. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 23 October 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 34p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/17

"According to the Camp David accords, negotiations were to commence after the conclusion of an Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty on an agreement which would lead to autonomy and the creation of a Palestinian self-governing authority for the West Bank and Gaza and which would set up modalities for elections in those areas. In the last 4 months, there have been several meetings of Egyptian and Israeli negotiators to discuss some of the complicated issues involved in these negotiations and in determining the powers and responsibilities of a self-governing authority. Unfortunately these negotiations have not progressed very far."

SUDAN: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Helen Chapin Metz, ed. June 1991. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 336p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-27/992

"Despite its economic dependence, the Bashir regime refused to support the Saudi position during the Persian Gulf crisis of 1990-91. Other than the receipt of a small quantity of Iraqi military supplies ... its motive for its pro-Iraq stance remained obscure ... Khartoum's reluctance to cooperate with the humanitarian program prompted United States officials in early 1990 to criticize publicly the Bashir government for impeding the distribution of emergency aid and even confiscating relief supplies ... In this atmosphere, it was perhaps inevitable that Bashir would mistrust the motives of the United States when it proposed a peace initiative to end the civil war ... Khartoum's support for Iraq during the Persian Gulf war further

strained relations between the two governments. Finally, in February 1991, the United States withdrew all its diplomatic personnel from Sudan and closed its embassy in Khartoum.”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.sd>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40650>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/sdtoc.html>

SYRIA: A COUNTRY STUDY. Library of Congress. Thomas Collelo. April 1987. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 334p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.22: 550-47/987

“In the mid-1980s, much media attention was paid to Syria’s alleged use of terrorism to achieve diplomatic, military, and strategic objectives in the Middle East and elsewhere. Although the exact Syrian role was murky, in the mid-1980s Syria’s intelligence and security networks were strongly implicated in the support of Middle Eastern and other international terrorist groups in Western Europe ... Various news organizations have claimed that, as part of its overall support network, in the 1980s Syria provided training camps for Middle Eastern and international terrorists ... large numbers of international terrorists known to Western intelligence sources have turned up in Damascus ... Syria’s goal was to employ as surrogates terrorists whose operations left few traces to Syria ... Syrian intelligence created new radical Palestinian factions, such as As Saiqa, which were, in effect, integrated components of the Syrian armed forces and hence direct Syrian agents. The radical Palestinian Abu Musa group, which was almost totally dependent on Syria, was another example of such a relationship...”

Online

<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.sy>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS40652>

<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/sytoc.html>

SYRIA: FRAGILE MOSAIC OF POWER. U.S. Department of Defense. Martha Neff Kessler. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1987. 142p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.402: SY 8

“Syria, a nation unfamiliar to many Americans, is a crucial player in Middle East affairs. Its involvement in Lebanon requires that any attempt to resolve the problems there take into account Syrian interests. Syrian-Israeli animosity and recent

confrontations in Lebanon and the Golan Heights make Syria pivotal in Arab-Israeli relations. Its historically strong role in the Arab world gives Syria the potential to help shape Arab views today, to mediate on behalf of Arabs...”

TERRORISM OR PEACE: THE STRATEGIC CHOICE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: OPENING STATEMENTS AT A JOINT PRESS CONFERENCE FOLLOWING MEETING, JERUSALEM, JUNE 25, 1996; OPENING STATEMENTS AT A PRESS CONFERENCE, CAIRO, EGYPT, JUNE 26, 1996; OPENING STATEMENTS AT A PRESS CONFERENCE, DHAHRAN, SAUDI ARABIA, JUNE 26, 1996. U.S. Department of State. Benjamin Netanyahu, Warren Christopher, Amre Moussa, Yasser Arafat, Saud al-Faisal. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 27, 1 July 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. p.345-347. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/27

“The bomb that exploded last night was a direct and deliberate attack on the citizens of the United States and on our friends and allies ... The scourge of terrorism that we’ve seen so often in this region is an assault on the very fabric of our society. It is a tool used by those who want to kill peace and want to reward hatred. It’s a danger that knows no borders or geographic limits. The President and I have made combating terrorism a central objective of our policy both at home and abroad ... These acts of terror only strengthen our resolve to stay the course and to defend peace and those who take risks for peace.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no27.html>

TURBULENT PEACE. U.S. Institute of Peace. *Peace Watch*. Vol.7, No. 6/Vol. 8, No. 1. October/December 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2001. p.5. [Article].

SuDoc# Y 3. P 31: 15-2/V.7/NO.6/& V.8/NO.1

“The United States needs to intervene early to stabilize failing states, which are the breeding grounds for the terrorists of the world, cautions panel of experts.”

Online

<http://www.usip.org/peacewatch/pdf/pw1201.pdf> (PDF)

THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE PEACE PROCESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 74p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/23

“What stymied the talks throughout most of 1981 and 1982 were the following issues: whether or not Palestinians living in Jerusalem could vote for the self-governing authority; what were to be the powers and size of the self-governing authority; what would be the role of the various parties in the internal and external security of the region; what guarantees would there be that scarce water resources would be shared fairly and equitably; and what regulations would govern public lands in the West Bank and Gaza and the rights and claims affecting those lands.”

U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE WEST BANK AND GAZA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 14 December 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 272. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: W 52/10

“U.S. Policy toward the West Bank and Gaza has two major objectives. First, we support a resolution of the status of the territories in the context of a lasting peace to be achieved through direct negotiations between Israel and its Arab neighbors. And, second, we want to improve the quality of Palestinian life in the territories ... The expectation that a just and comprehensive peace is possible and that active efforts are continuing to achieve it preserves hope and encourages movement toward reconciliation. At the same time, practical measures to improve the daily lives of Palestinians help to reinforce efforts toward a comprehensive political settlement while reducing the frustrations that are one cause of extremism and violence. Active efforts for peace and improvements in the quality of life are therefore essential to sustain each other.”

WARFARE IN LEBANON. U.S. Department of Defense. Kenneth J. Alnwick and Thomas A. Fabyanic, eds. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1988. 113p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.402: W 23

“But perhaps the most immediate concern for the U.S. is the extent to which Lebanon has become a breeding ground for violence and terrorism, and its propensity to spread those activities beyond Lebanon’s borders. In the past several years, there has occurred a series of grim events such as hijackings, bombings, and political assassinations. These events, although stretching across the globe, have roots that can be traced back to Lebanon. As these events have been taking place, a new generation has grown up in Lebanon, one that embraces violence as a normal way of life and accepts it as a means for political expression. Compounding this phenomenon, there also has occurred the growth of Shia radicalism and the development of Iranian inspired aspirations for the creation of an Islamic Republic of Lebanon. The Iranian influence in Lebanon is particularly disturbing. Islamic revolution, virulent Shiite fundamentalism, has leapt past the Sunni strongholds of Baghdad, Amman, and central Syria to the shores of the Mediterranean ... Hizballah, through fanatic

commitment to its cause and its effective Iranian support, threatens to eclipse more moderate groups...”

WASHINGTON SUMMIT ON THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS: JOINT DECLARATION: RELEASED BY THE WHITE HOUSE, OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 28, 1995. U.S. Department of State. *Dispatch*. Vol. 6, No. 41, 9 October 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. p.724. [Article].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 6/41

“President Clinton, His Majesty King Hussein, President Mubarak, Prime Minister Rabin, and Chairman Arafat met today to review the dramatic progress which has already been made on the road to realization of a just, comprehensive, and lasting peace in the Middle East and to consider ways and means together to reinforce and accelerate that process ... The five leaders expressed their condemnation in the strongest possible terms of all acts of violence and terror. They reaffirmed their determination to confront all enemies of peace and reiterated the need for all possible measures to be taken—founded upon the rule of law—to ensure security for the citizens of Israel and for the Palestinian people.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1995/html/Dispatchv6no41.html>

THE WEST BANK-GAZA ECONOMY: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 28 December 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 52p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: W 52/4

“This report analyzes the economic situation in the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza and surveys measures needed for sustained growth. The study seeks to examine the major economic trends in an area which is now the subject of crucial Middle East peace efforts. What happens in the West Bank and Gaza can be critical for the success of many United States Middle East policy initiatives and the preservation of many of our national interests in the area.”