

—U.S. INTERESTS, POLICIES and RELATIONS in the GREATER MIDDLE EAST—

ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN SAUDI ARABIA.
U.S. Congress. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East.
96th Congress, 1st Session, 25 June 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office,
1979. 81p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: EN 3

“Saudi Arabia is a country of vital importance for the United States. For over two decades the Corps of Engineers has played an important and expanding role in helping the Saudi Arabian Government with military construction activities. The list of large projects—including new military cities in the desert, port facilities, military academies and training centers—is impressive. This list will total between \$20 billion and \$25 billion over the next 10 years. Many of these projects are now entering the implementation phase ... the special economic, political, and security relationship we have with Saudi Arabia remains today, but it is clear that figures of prominence both in Saudi Arabia and here are pondering the longevity of this special relationship and question whether recent communication gaps on a series of important bilateral and Middle East issues might undermine that special set of ties.”

ADMINISTRATION COMPLIANCE WITH U.S. LAWS RELATED TO THE ARAB BOYCOTT.
U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 8 July 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 59p.
[Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AD 6/4

“American companies are rightly prohibited by U.S. law from abiding by the boycott. Yet they must compete for lucrative U.S. Government contracts against foreign firms that gain a competitive edge by complying with the boycott. Only last year, American soldiers gave their lives to protect the sovereignty of the Arab nations. Yet those same Arab nations continue to discriminate against American companies doing business with the State of Israel, even adding an additional 200 companies to the Arab blacklist months after the Gulf war had ended.”

AID AND THE PROPOSED ARMS SALES OF F-16's TO PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 12 & 17 November 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 57p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: AR 5/27

“We share the concerns expressed in and out of the Congress about the sale of expensive, high technology military aircraft to many countries in the developing world ... The United States program for Pakistan will not inject a new element of instability into the South Asian subcontinent ... We believe that a program of support which provides Pakistan with a continuing relationship with a significant security partner and enhances its sense of security may help remove the principal underlying incentive for the acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability. With such a relationship in place we are hopeful that over time we will be able to persuade Pakistan that the pursuit of a weapons capability is neither necessary to its security nor in its broader interest as an important member of the world community.”

AMERICAN EMBASSY IN ISRAEL. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 98th Congress, 2nd Session, 23 February 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 148p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.98-800

“Some in the Arab world may dream of erasing this reality, but unless they succeed in physically dispossessing Israel of Jerusalem, they will not alter the fact that Jerusalem is Israel’s capital. Present U.S. policy also attempts to refute these realities by maintaining the Embassy in Tel Aviv. The Ambassador is allowed no ‘official’ role or status in Jerusalem, despite the fact that he deals directly and frequently with the Government of Israel located there ... elements in the Arab world will oppose this step because they oppose the existence of Israel. But American policy cannot be held hostage to these rejectionists or made subject to an Arab veto.”

AMERICAN PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND ISLAM. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 27 February 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 93p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.108-21

“Americans are troubled by examples of virulent anti-American hatred in the Islamic world, and they are frustrated by public opinion in allied countries that seems increasingly ready to question American motives or blame American actions for a host of problems. In an era when allied cooperation is essential in the war against terrorism, we cannot afford to shrug off negative public opinion overseas as uninformed or irrelevant. The governments of most nations respond to public opinion, when it is demonstrated in the voting booth or in the streets.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS32659> (PDF)

AMERICA'S GLOBAL DIALOGUE: SHARING AMERICAN VALUES AND THE WAY AHEAD FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 11 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 76p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-692

“Recently, there has been much discussion of the so-called Arab Street, strong opposition to American policies toward terrorism and the Middle East peace process ... In Indonesia, opposition from the local population continues to confound attempts to improve security cooperation. Elsewhere, Europeans believe the United States is retreating from the international scene and entering an isolationist cocoon. No matter where we turn, the people of the world are either not well-informed about American policies and intentions, or recede to the anti-American messages that are more powerful or effective than our own. These revelations must serve as a wake-up call to our government. Our policies are well-intentioned, but still find little receptivity with local populations ... We must explain and broadcast American views and values much more effectively.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24032>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24033> (PDF)

ANALYSIS OF SIX ISSUES ABOUT NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES OF INDIA, IRAQ, LIBYA, AND PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Arms Control, Oceans, International Operations and Environment. 97th Congress, 1st Congress, January 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 74p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: N 88/17

“(1) The status of nuclear programs in India, Iraq, Libya, and Pakistan including reactor types, research facilities and technology sources; (2) Published statements from these governments’ officials regarding the direction and purpose of their programs; (3) An analysis of the potential for attaining nuclear weapons capability possessed by each nation; (4) The source countries which supply India, Libya and Pakistan and the extent of reliance by these supplier nations upon the United States for nuclear fuel; (5) Potential alternative suppliers of nuclear fuel and technology to these [supplier] countries; (6) The applicability of section 129 of the Atomic Energy Act and the conditions for triggering a moratorium of U.S. nuclear supply to nations assisting other countries in activities ‘having direct significance for the manufacture or acquisition of nuclear explosive devices.’”

ARMS CONTROL IN THE MIDDLE EAST—THE TIME TO BEGIN IS NOW. U.S. Institute of Peace. *In Brief*. No. 43. November 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1992. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 3. P 31: 16/43

“Four experts on East-West arms control and four Middle East analysts teamed up under a grant from the United States Institute of Peace to look at what lessons the East-West experience might have for the Middle East. Their conclusion . . . is that the regions are very different, but that the type of early confidence-building steps taken by the United States and the Soviet Union in the 1960s should be tried in the Middle East.”

ARMS SALES IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE CONFLICT IN THE WESTERN SAHARA: AN ASSESSMENT OF U.S. POLICY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs. Subcommittee on Africa. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 25 March 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 52p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/22

“What has been the impact of continued war on the economic health and military strength of our Moroccan friends? Is there any conflict between our policy toward the Western Sahara and expanding political relations with Algeria which was so helpful in arranging the return of our hostages from Iran? Is the war still judged unwinnable and will this continuation provide new opportunities for the expansion of Libyan and other outside influences? Has our policy toward the Western Sahara produced net diplomatic gains in larger international arenas, the United Nations, the OAU and the Persian Gulf States? What new policy initiatives should be considered at this time?”

ARMS SALES PACKAGE TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 1, 5, 6, 14 & 15 October 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 277p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: AR 5/26/PT.1

“Among the questions that we must examine with all of the objectivity we can muster are these: Would the sales serve our national security interests in the Persian Gulf region? What would be the impact of the sales on Saudi Arabian and Israeli-Arabian relations? How would the sales affect U.S. power and prestige in the Middle East? Would the sales pose any real threat to Israel or alter the Arab-Israeli military balance in any significant way? What are the possibilities that the sophisticated equipment might fall into unfriendly hands?”

ARMS SALES PACKAGE TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 1, 5, 6, 14 & 15 October 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 114p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: AR 5/26/PT.2

“Are we ready to go to war? Whom do we fight in the case of a civil war in Saudi Arabia? How do we prevent the AWACS from being used against our own planes or those of friendly forces? How do we prevent the quick shipment of the small, easily transported Sidewinders to unfriendly forces? We cannot stop every transport truck in its tracks. The worst could be done before the Marines landed, if we want Marines landing in the Middle East ... There is no evidence to prove that increased military capability can prevent assassination by terrorists or takeover by extremists. The greater fear is the possibility of sophisticated weaponry falling into the hands of those terrorists. The situation in the Middle East is simply too fragile to contemplate the sale of the AWACS and Sidewinders to Saudi Arabia at this time.”

ARMS SALES TO JORDAN AND THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 17 October; 7 November 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 46p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/29

“The United States’ close defense relationship with Jordan has developed over 35 years and eight United States administrations. We have become Jordan’s main arms supplier ... the arms that we propose to sell to Jordan pose no threat to Israel. Jordan has proven over the last 15 years that it is determined to ensure that terrorists do not attack Israel from Jordanian territory. The border that it shares with Israel, the longest Israel has with any of its neighbors, has been incident free for many years. Israel has been able to place confidence in Jordan to prevent infiltration along their common border ... Israel’s long-term security, however, can only come through peace with its neighbors, not military superiority. A strong and stable Jordan able to defend itself against radical pressures is in Israel’s interests as well as our own.”

ASSESSING THE REGIONAL SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND SAUDI ARABIA; LOOKING TO THE FUTURE IN COMBATING TERRORISM; EXECUTIVE OVERSIGHT. U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 10 July 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 33p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/19: S.HRG.104-797

“It is clear that we are in a war time situation in Saudi Arabia. We are under attack, this is the second attack ... In terms of the outsider theory, the attackers may be agents of external powers such as Iran, Libya, Sudan, or Syria. Or they may be linked to one of the Islamic movements in countries like Pakistan or Afghanistan. And that theory applies, for instance, to one of the Saudi Islamic groups, namely the

Committee for Advice and Reform, which is led by Usama Bin Ladin. This group has strong ties to many Islamic groups outside Saudi Arabia, groups which have been accused of terrorism, including the Islamic Salvation Front of Algeria, the National Islamic Front of Sudan, and this group has also ties with Afghani radical Islamic groups.”

ASSESSING THE SUPPORT OF MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES FRIENDLY TO THE UNITED STATES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 23 May 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 66p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AR 5/2 A: 2001-2002/18

“While it is certainly true that terrorism is not a phenomenon found solely in the Middle East, it is equally true that some of the most active, prolific, and dangerous groups are located in and receive support from this region. As such, winning the war against terrorism will be extremely difficult without the support of friendly Arab governments and their assistance in ‘draining the swamp,’ as the saying goes, that allows terrorists and their activities to thrive there.”

BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT POSED BY IRAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on National Security. Subcommittee on Military Research and Development. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 5 November 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 58p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. SE 2/1 A: 997-98/20

“The subcommittee is deeply concerned over the rapid development of ballistic missiles by Iran, missiles which could be tested and potentially deployed within 1 year to 18 months ... We are also greatly distressed to learn that Iranian missiles will be able to reach all of our troops in Turkey, in the Middle East, in the gulf, and all of our friends and allies in this region, including Israel ... we and our allies will face a period of vulnerability during which we will have no defense against these missiles.”

BAN ON U.S. TRAVEL TO LEBANON. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 27 February 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 70p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-441

“The tragedy of the Lebanese civil war broke out in the period from 1975 to 1991. That brutal civil war ravaged one of the most beautiful cities in the world and, to some extent, ravaged the beautiful country of Lebanon. The government collapsed in the process, the country fell into chaos, and rival factions vied for power. In the midst of that civil war, U.S. citizens became targets of the various factions in Lebanon. Our

Embassy in Beirut was destroyed in an ill-founded deployment of U.S. peacekeepers. Several hundred American troops lost their lives when guards, who were supposed to be guarding their barracks, were not issued bullets for their guns and, thus, were unable to stop a terrorist attack on our peacekeepers. It was aggravated as Americans were taken hostages and held for a number of years. In reaction to much of this chaos, the United States acted in January of 1987 by issuing a travel ban ... Lebanon is still occupied by 40,000 Syrian troops, and there are a number of terrorist organizations that remain active within the country.”

CLAIMS AGAINST IRAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 7 December 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 48p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IR 1/6

“...under the Algiers Accords, which led to the release of the American hostages held in Tehran, the United States and Iran agreed to establish an international arbitral tribunal, the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal. This Tribunal ... was empowered by the Accords to decide claims of U.S. nationals against Iran arising out of debts, contracts, expropriations and other measures affecting property rights. The Tribunal may also hear certain Iranian claims against the United States. Awards issued by the Tribunal are binding on the parties and are enforceable in the courts of any nation. To assure payment of awards in favor of U.S. nationals, a Security Account was established at a subsidiary of the Netherlands Central Bank, with an initial deposit of \$1 billion, using certain Iranian assets which had been frozen in the United States.”

CONVENTIONAL ARMS SALES POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 26 June; 25 July 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 174p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/44

“The subcommittees today will want to raise questions about: This proposed Apache sale to the United Arab Emirates; Other possible U.S. arms sales to the Middle East; The policies of other major suppliers of arms to the Middle East; U.S. plans for the upcoming meeting in Paris on conventional arms restraint; and U.S. policy on seeking restraint by both arms suppliers and arms consumers of weapons in the Middle East.”

THE CRISIS IN LEBANON: U.S. POLICY AND ALTERNATIVE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 98th Congress, 2nd Session, 1 & 2 February 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 103p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: L 49/6

“Lebanon is a moderate Arab country—indeed, a democracy and a longtime friend of the United States—that has dared to negotiate with Israel and is under assault for that very reason. If the forces of extremism are permitted to overthrow a moderate government that has turned toward peace, what chances are there that other moderate Arab States will risk committing themselves to peace? If extremism takes over in Lebanon, it will strengthen the forces of extremism in the entire Middle East, and weaken and dishearten all those who believe in moderation and negotiation. The security of Israel is bound to be affected ... Letting Syria gobble up Lebanon now may only be guaranteeing that in the near-term future, an even greater crisis will occur with Syria, forcing Israel—and perhaps also the United States—to react in even more dangerous circumstances. We face another specific problem in Lebanon—the problem of terrorism. The challenge now is state-supported terrorism—not the work of random groups of fanatics, but of regimes such as Iran, Libya, and Syria using terrorism as a weapon of policy ... State-sponsored terrorism is a weapon directed against us—against our interests, our policies, and our most basic values.”

CRISIS IN PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 14 October 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 18p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-298

“It was a disappointment to see the news previously, 2 days ago, of the military takeover in Pakistan. Nawaz Sharif was the democratically elected Prime Minister of Pakistan, and he has been a good friend to the United States.”

CRISES IN SUDAN AND NORTHERN UGANDA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Africa; Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 29 July 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 167p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SU 2/2

To better understand the Sudan and Uganda region, its problems, and U.S. policy and interests related to those problems.

CRISIS IN SUDAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 4 May 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 60p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.103-395

“The situation in the Sudan, where 4 million people, and some estimates are higher, are at risk either because of starvation or because of the conflict in the southern part of the Sudan.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN LEBANON AND THE MIDDLE EAST, JANUARY 1984. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 2nd Session, 26 January 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 65p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: L 49/5/984

“The United States is involved in Lebanon because events in that country are inextricably related to broader American interests in the Middle East. We are involved because Lebanon lies between Israel and Syria, and turmoil there heightens the danger of further warfare between those adversaries ... We are involved in Lebanon because the conflict there affects the security of neighboring Israel, a fundamental U.S. interest. And we are involved because the conflict in Lebanon cannot be isolated from the wider regional conflict which we have been working for years to help resolve ... Lebanon has become a stage for the larger struggle in the Middle East between those who want peace through accommodation and those who practice confrontation, violence and terrorism.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Middle East and South Asia. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 29 March 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 43p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/12/2001

“The actions taken by Iran on an assortment of issues are of grave concern to us, and we would like the Department to elaborate on Administration’s continuing security concerns regarding Iran, specifically Iran’s efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction, their continued support for terrorism, and persistent human rights abuses. We are also very interested in the Administration’s views on a five-year extension of the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act. Moreover, in the past half-year we have seen the rapid deterioration between the Israelis and the Palestinians and a now daily level of violence and terrorism...”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 8 June 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 73p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/12/999

“Above all, we have an intense interest in preventing it [the region] from backsliding into another era of extremism and conflict marked by a new arms race in ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction. How can we widen the circle of peace while countering those who would oppose the promotion of a more normal existence for all the people of this region? The answer in our minds is clear. We must broaden

the scope and depth of our relationship with those states that share our commitment to a more peaceful and prosperous region, work with them to achieve our common vision, and at the same time we must enforce our ability to contain and overcome those states or forces that threaten our interests.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 29 July 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 106p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/12/998-2

“President Khatami’s record on policies that are of the greatest concern to the United States such as support for terrorism, acquisition of WMD and missile technology and abuse of human rights is mixed ... Iran may continue to pursue some, or all, of these policies regardless of which faction is in control. Since taking office, Khatami has continued to promote development of a civil society, implementing limited reforms such as allowing wider expression of critical views of the government ... At the same time, the conservatives reasserted themselves and are again pressuring more moderate elements of the government ... Religious persecution has also become more intense ... It is difficult to predict the outcome of what appears to be a power struggle between ‘moderate’ and ‘hardline’ elements in the Iranian government ...” Also includes discussion of Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Algeria, and the Israeli-Palestinian situation.

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 10 March 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 180p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/12/998

“We seek to combat terrorism and counter the spread of weapons of mass destruction, a scourge of a particular force in the Middle East. We seek to ensure that Iraq complies fully with all relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions and, in that process, we seek to prevent Iraq from ever again threatening its neighbors and our interests in the region. We seek to encourage change in Iranian policies which threaten our interests, we seek to promote respect for democracy and human rights and the rule of law in this region, and, finally, we seek, especially through our embassies to enhance opportunities for American business in the Middle East.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 12 June 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 99p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/12

“In response to the Hamas suicide bombings last February and March, ongoing Israeli-Palestinian efforts to combat terrorism intensified. Chairman Arafat, with strong U.S. support, has stepped up efforts to root out terrorists and their infrastructure. We have stressed to the Palestinian authorities the need to keep up a comprehensive, sustained, and systematic approach to combat terrorism ... With respect to Iran, our policy is aimed at pressing Iran to change its unacceptable policies, including its continued support for terrorism, support for groups that use violence against the Middle East peace process, pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, efforts to subvert other governments, and its abysmal human rights record. Our diplomatic efforts have focused greater international attention on these issues and helped increase pressure on the Iranian regime ... Our policy on Iraq remains firm. Iraq must fulfill all its obligations established under U.N. security resolutions passed as a result of Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 21 October 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 90p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/993-3

“We have a number of topics of interest to the subcommittee: the recent Middle East Donor Conference in Washington; the status of Iraqi compliance with U.N. resolutions; U.S. policy toward northern Iraq; developments in Iran; and the status of a number of commercial disputes between the United States and Saudi Arabia.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 27 July 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 41p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/993-2

“We have a number of topics that will be of interest to the subcommittee today. They include the escalation and violence in southern Lebanon and this past weekend’s air strikes into Lebanon; the status, of course, of the Middle East peace process; U.S. policy toward Iraq and Iran; the situation in the Kurdish-controlled area in northern Iraq; Islamic Fundamentalists; and Persian Gulf security issues.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 9 March 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 73p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/993

“We have several topics of interest today: Secretary of State Christopher’s recent trip to the Middle East; the priorities of the new administration in this region of the

world; Iraqi compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions; the progress toward the restarting of the Middle East peace process; U.S. relations with the Gulf states, Jordan and Lebanon; the situation in Iran; the status of U.S. commercial disputes with Saudi Arabia; and the human rights records of countries in the region.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1 October 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 42p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/992-3

“We have several topics of interest to the subcommittee. They include: the status of the Middle East bilateral and regional peace negotiations; the proposed sale of F-15 aircraft to Saudi Arabia; the political and economic situation in Iraq, and the status of the no-fly zone in southern Iraq; the situation in Iran; and U.S. relations with various states of the Middle East.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 2nd Congress, 24 & 30 June 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 145p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/992/2

“Topics of interest to the subcommittee today include U.S.-Israeli relations beyond yesterday’s elections; the status of the Middle East bilateral and regional peace negotiations; the development of more pluralism and respect for human rights in the Middle East; the stalemate with Iraq, U.S. relations with Gulf states, Egypt, Jordan, and Lebanon; the situation in Iran; security issues in the Persian Gulf; and arms sales to and arms control in the Middle East.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 17 March 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 157p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/992

“Of particular interest to us today will be: the status of the Middle East peace talks; the situation in Iraq; the results of the talks last week at the United Nations regarding Iraqi compliance with the U.N. Security Council resolutions; security issues in the Persian Gulf; U.S.-Israeli relations; and arms sales to the Middle East.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, APRIL 1987. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 21 April 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 89p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/987

“In recent weeks we have reaffirmed to the moderate Arab states of the Gulf our commitment to help in their individual and collective self-defense against external aggression, such as Iranian attacks on facilities of non-belligerent states like Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates and on neutral international shipping in and near the Strait of Hormuz. We share with these moderate Gulf states fundamental interests—to ensure the free flow of oil, to restrict Soviet influence in the area, to prevent the spread of fundamentalist radicalism aimed at undermining their political stability. These countries want and expect to be the first line of defense for their own interests.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, APRIL 1985. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 4 April 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 31p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/985-2

“Several encouraging developments have occurred. Israel has proposed negotiations with Jordan without preconditions, Jordan and the PLO have reached agreement on a joint approach that we have said could be a helpful step in the process leading toward direct negotiations between Jordan and Israel with the participation of representative Palestinians, and Egypt has been highly active in seeking practical steps toward direct negotiations. In addition, high-level contact and communication between Egypt and Israel have intensified, and this is an invaluable contribution to the current efforts.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, AUGUST 1986. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 14 August 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 84p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/986-3

“The subcommittee will want to review Vice President Bush’s recent trip to Israel, Jordan, and Egypt, recent developments in Egyptian-Israeli relations, the Peres-King Hassan Summit, as well as a variety of issues in various countries in the region which impact on U.S. policy, including the recent upsurge in fighting in the Iran-Iraq war ... A victory by a radical Iran would be a major setback for our interests. Our policy is unchanged. We would support new mediation efforts, but there are none now on the horizon. “

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, AUGUST 1983. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 1st Session, 3 August 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 44p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/983-3

“The hearing today will focus on the situation in Lebanon, the recent Israeli decision to pull back its troops, United States strategy for engaging Syria in troop withdrawal talks, recent developments in the Persian Gulf, and U.S. relations with the other countries of the Middle East.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, FEBRUARY 1990. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 28 February 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 155p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/990

“Of particular interest to the subcommittee today will be the status of efforts to further the search for peace in the Middle East, the U.S.-PLO dialogue, U.S. bilateral relations with countries in the region, the situation in the West Bank in Gaza and in Lebanon, the prospects for negotiations for durable peace in the Persian Gulf and Soviet Jewish immigration to Israel.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, FEBRUARY 1983. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 1st Session, 2 February 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 41p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/983

“Our hearing today will focus on negotiations for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon, the status of efforts to promote the U.S. Middle East peace initiative enunciated last September by the President, the status of efforts to bring Jordan into the peace process, and U.S. diplomatic efforts in the region.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, FEBRUARY 1982. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 8 February 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 39p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20

“Prince Fahd canceled a long-planned visit to the United States ... Saudi Arabia called on Oman to terminate its agreement with the United States on military facilities access which was an unfriendly gesture. Saudi Arabia initiated a diplomatic rapprochement with Libya at the very time the President of the United States was under a threat of assassination by Libyan hit squads ... Saudi Arabia has reduced oil production and is contemplating further reductions. Saudi Arabia advanced a plan that was clearly contrary to the purposes of our own approach in the Camp David

process. How do you explain this pattern of deteriorating relations and unfriendly acts in view of the fact that one of the principal reasons advanced by the administration for the Saudi arms sale was that these are good, close friends, and it is important to strengthen their warmth and friendship to us by selling them the AWACS and the missiles?"

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JANUARY 1986. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 28 January 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 106p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/986

"Specific issues the subcommittee will want to examine today include: U.S. policy priorities in the Middle East and Persian Gulf for 1986; the impact of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings resolution on foreign assistance programs in the Middle East; efforts to restart the peace process and Secretary Murphy's recent meetings with Prime Minister Peres and King Hussein; proposed arms sales for Jordan and Saudi Arabia; the impact of recent terrorist incidents on U.S. policy in the Middle East; U.S. sanctions against Libya; the quality of life for Palestinians living on the West Bank and in Gaza; and the current situation in South Yemen."

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JANUARY 1985. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 30 January 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 41p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/985

"Specific issues the subcommittee will want to examine today include: United States policy priorities in the Middle East and Persian Gulf for 1985; the status of the peace process and planned efforts to try to restart that process; U.S.-Israeli relations and Israeli policies on the West Bank since the formation of the National Unity Government; the implications of the proposed three-stage Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon; the status of the Iran-Iraq war; and possible arms sales to the Persian Gulf states."

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JULY 1990. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 31 July 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 97p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/990/3

"The topics of interest to the subcommittee include the Middle East search for peace; U.S.-Iraqi relations and the situation in the Persian Gulf; the recent OPEC meeting;

water problems in the Middle East; the situation in the West Bank and Gaza; and of course, other issues.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JULY 1989. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 12 July 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 97p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/989

“Our dialogue with the PLO is not an end in itself. It is a means to advance a practical and workable peace process. In both formal and informal meetings we press the PLO to give practical meaning to its commitments of last December: its renunciation of terrorism and its recognition of the existence of Israel. We also are trying to moderate PLO positions on the peace process and create conditions under which the Israeli Government initiative can work ... President Bush and this administration are committed to defend our vital interests in the area: the free passage of oil through the Strait of Hormuz and the security of friendly regional states.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JULY 1988. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 27 July 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 155p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/988-2

“Of particular interest to the subcommittee today will be: Recent developments in the Persian Gulf and the start of United Nations sponsored negotiations to implement United Nations Res. 598. The status of efforts to restart the peace process following Secretary Schultz’s fourth shuttle to the region in June. A review of Secretary Murphy’s recent extended visit to the Persian Gulf and possible upcoming trips to Europe and the Middle East. An examination of arms sales to the region and the proliferation of missile sales, including the status of the proposed F-18 sale to Kuwait, which is pending before the committee. Recent developments in the West bank and Gaza, and trends in the uprising now in its eighth month. The prospects for presidential elections in Lebanon to be held between now and September. And the prospects for an early release of the nine American hostages in Lebanon, some of whom have been held since March of 1985.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JULY 1987. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 28 July 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 84p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/987-2

“Today, the subcommittee will want to examine U.S. policies in the Persian Gulf; the re-flagging of Kuwaiti tankers and assistance provided by the Gulf States, and our

allies to help promote shipping in the Persian Gulf; U.S. efforts to restart the peace process; issues in U.S. bilateral relations with Israel, Egypt, and Syria; and the situation on the West Bank.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JULY 1984. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 2nd Session, 25 July 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 60p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/984

“This is a time of steady, sustained effort on our part to maintain stability in the region and to deal with persistent regional conflicts. The Gulf war seems to continue on its own momentum in a prolonged twilight beyond any reason or gain for either Iran or Iraq. Lebanon is only beginning the slow and painful process of healing from nine years of bitter civil war. Israel has just held its national elections and will now proceed to form a new government ... The Iraqis are continuing their sporadic attacks against shipping serving Iranian ports in an attempt to induce Iran to negotiate, and the Iranians are retaliating against ships serving neutral ports.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JULY 1982. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 28 July 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 44p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/982-2

“(A) Israel can not be the policeman of the area. Security for the area must emerge from the mutual respect of each nation for the other. This will come with political democracy in the region and economic development being instituted in the context of a safe and viable homeland for all the people in the region. (B) The shipment of weapons of death is not a useful part of any solution to the problem in the region. Such shipments will only continue to destabilize the region. (C) There must be a homeland for the Palestinian people that evidences proper respect for their history, culture, religion and needs for economic and political development. (D) The United States must take a more rational approach to the problems in the area ... Notice the following: We have supported military dictatorships in Latin America ... We remain the chief exporter of weapons to the developing world that is using them to fight and kill. The thing we do most for the people of the Middle-East is send them weapons.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JUNE 1994. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 14 June 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 90p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/994-2

“As we noted in the most recent edition of ‘Patterns of Global Terrorism 1993’ (issued in April 1994), some Saudi citizens probably provide private funds to Hamas and other radical Palestinian groups throughout the region, as well as to extremist elements in Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen. Private Saudi benefactors also sponsor paramilitary training for radical Islamists from many countries in Afghanistan, Yemen, and Sudan. The State Department has no evidence that the Government of Saudi Arabia sponsors these activities ... The government of Saudi Arabia is well aware of our general, long-standing efforts to stop official and, to the extent possible, private support for groups which practice violence. The recent Saudi action revoking the citizenship of Khartoum-based extremist Osama Bin Laden, the most prominent private financier of radical groups, indicates that such activities are also a real concern to the Government of Saudi Arabia.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JUNE 1990. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 20 June 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 118p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/990-2

“Topics of interest to the subcommittee today will include the Middle East peace process; the U.S. dialogue with the PLO; the recent Baghdad summit; Soviet Jewish emigration; the situation in the West Bank and Gaza; American hostages in Lebanon; and U.S. relations with Iran and with Iraq.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JUNE 1985. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 19 June 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 63p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/985-3

“Some of the focus of today’s hearing will be on the tragic hijacking and hostage situation now in its sixth day being played out in Lebanon. The subcommittee will also want to discuss in detail the status of efforts to try to restart the Middle East peace process, the recent escalation of fighting in the Iran-Iraq war and current Middle East security and arms sales issues.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, JUNE 1983. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 1st Session, 2 June 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 70p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/983-2

“The agreement concluded between Lebanon and Israel May 17 ... was a major step forward for U.S. diplomacy ... The most basic elements of the agreement are: Israel

agrees to withdraw all of its forces in the context of a simultaneous withdrawal of Syrian and PLO forces ... The state of war is ended. The border between the two countries is declared inviolable. And, the territory of both countries cannot be used for hostile action against any neighbors ... The Government of Syria has thus far opposed the agreement and has not yet agreed to withdraw the 50,000 troops it now has in Lebanon ... A large number of Arab states have either supported the agreement or Lebanon's right to decide for itself. Only a few, like Libya, have joined Syria in rejection of the agreement."

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, MARCH 1994. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1 March 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 71p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/994

"Between the signing of the Declaration of Principles on September 13, 1993 and March 5, 1994, there was considerable violence and loss of life on both sides ... Five Israeli soldiers and 14 Israeli civilians were killed in the occupied territories. One Israeli soldier and six Israeli civilians were killed inside Israel. In the occupied territories, 161 Israeli soldiers and 65 Israeli civilians were injured. In the same period, 84 Palestinians were killed by Israeli security forces (40 in the West Bank and 44 in Gaza), and about 37 Palestinians were killed by Israeli settlers, including at least 29 killed by Baruch Goldstein. In addition, approximately 1,416 Palestinians have been injured (465 in the West Bank and 951 in Gaza). The figures for Palestinians injured are estimates and are not definitive."

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, MARCH 1988. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 156p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/988

"On Lebanon, we have been actively engaged in promoting in Lebanon the process of constitutional reform and national reconciliation. The efforts of the Lebanese themselves to restructure their political system are critical to the future of their country and to regional stability ... The Iran-Iraq war remains the primary cause of instability in the Gulf regions. The recent resumption of the war of the cities, throwing missiles back and forth between Baghdad and Tehran has underscored the need for the earliest settlement of that war."

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, MARCH 1982. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 3 March 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 38p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/23/982

“...there is no reason why we should continue calmly to supply these nations with the sophisticated equipment that they seem to feel necessary. If we pressure Israel ... and these terrorist groups insist on launching rockets and the people who pay for this organization of terrorism should also be equally pressured ... I would tell them quite frankly that if they continue to finance these terrorists—they will get no more arms. It is a very embarrassing position for the United States. We have nations that are under a ban because they support terrorism; but we do not apply it to all of them.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, MAY 1986. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 6 May 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 62p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/986-2

“There are many issues in the Middle East which the subcommittee wishes to cover today, such as: United States assessment of the stalled peace process; United States policy toward Libya and its role in international terrorism, and the effects of the United States raid against Libya on April 15; United States-Egyptian bilateral relations; status of efforts to improve Israeli-Egyptian relations; United States-Israeli military cooperation; developments in the Iran-Iraq war; UNIFIL forces in Lebanon; the status of United States efforts to obtain the release of the hostages still being held in Lebanon; and the political situation in the Arabian peninsula in the aftermath of the January coup in South Yemen.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NOVEMBER 1991. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 20 November 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 114p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/990-4

“Of particular interest to the subcommittee today will be: The status of the Middle East peace talks; the situation in Iraq; security issues in the Gulf states; the status of the U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf region; arms sales and arms control in the region, and several bilateral issues.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NOVEMBER 1989. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 22 November 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 56p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/989-3

“The subcommittee would like to focus today on a wide range of topics, including the status of efforts to further the search for peace in the Middle East; ballistic missile proliferation in the region; the situation in the West Bank and Gaza and in Lebanon; the prospects for moving toward a durable peace in the Persian Gulf; and bilateral relations and problems with states in the region. The Chair understands that another tragedy occurred in the Middle East this morning. We understand that President Moawad of the Republic of Lebanon was killed a little more than two hours ago when a car convoy in which he was traveling was bombed, and that twelve others died with the President.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, NOVEMBER 1983. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 1st Session, 14 November 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 70p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/983-5

“Since the last open session of the subcommittee on this issue September 26, there have been several important developments, including the ghastly terrorist attack on the French and American peacekeeping forces in Beirut and on the Israeli military headquarters in Tyre, the start of Lebanese national reconciliation talks in Geneva, serious fighting in and around Tripoli with the fate of PLO Chairman Arafat’s leadership in question, the appointment of Donald Rumsfeld as Special Presidential Envoy to the Middle East, and the visit of Under Secretary Eagleburger to Israel, accompanied by Assistant Secretary Richard Murphy.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, OCTOBER 1994. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 4 October 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 147p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/994-3

“...including the progress of the peace talks between Israel and Syria, the status of Israeli-Palestinian efforts to implement early empowerment and move toward Palestinian elections; the administration’s decision on a deduction from Israel’s fiscal year 1995 loan guarantees; Israeli-Jordanian efforts to achieve a peace treaty; the status of the Arab boycott; the status of U.N. sanctions against Iraq; the upcoming report of the U.N. Special Commission on Iraq; and our U.S. policy toward Iran and Egypt.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, OCTOBER 1988. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress,

2nd Session, 13 October 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 99p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/988-3

“Above all we need to create an environment of moderation that will encourage all sides to move closer to the negotiating table. The human costs of the intifada have been great for both Palestinians and Israelis and underscore the need for a political settlement. A further hardening of hearts is the last thing we want to see in Israel and in the West Bank and Gaza. Palestinians have experienced great economic losses, the destruction of crops and houses, the loss of almost an entire school year, and a general disruption of daily life. The uprising has also undermined some of the economic strides Israel has made in the past several years.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, OCTOBER 1986. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 8 October 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 79p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/986-4

“...there is a remarkable convergence of evidence of direct Syrian Government complicity in a whole series of outrageous international terrorist acts. The British prosecutor in the El Al bomb case told the court just yesterday that the terrorist was instructed by a high Syrian military intelligence official to blow up the plane. He was taught the use of the device by a high Syrian military intelligence official. He was provided with funds, was given an official passport by the Government of Syria, and after this attempted heinous crime, he went to the Syrian Ambassador, and then he was taken to a safe house ... The Government of France has produced over a period of recent weeks and months incontrovertible evidence of Syrian Government complicity in terrorist acts in France.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, SEPTEMBER 1989. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 19 September 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 82p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/989-2

“The subcommittee will want to discuss a wide range of issues with our witness today. These will include developments regarding American hostages in Lebanon; the status of diplomatic efforts to further the proposal or elections in the West Bank and Gaza; the situation in Lebanon and the latest Arab League effort to achieve a cease fire in Lebanon; and an assessment of the new Rafsanjani Government in Iran.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, SEPTEMBER 1987. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 15 September 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 128p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/987-3

“This month, the Iran-Iraq War enters its eighth year with tensions in the Persian Gulf high and with diplomatic efforts on the upswing. The subcommittee will want to examine United States policies in the Persian Gulf; the resumption of attacks on shipping by Iraq; U.N. efforts to obtain a cease-fire in the war; and assistance provided by the Gulf States and our allies to support free navigation in the Persian Gulf. The subcommittee will also want to review the status of United States efforts to restart the peace process; United States bilateral relations with Israel, Egypt, and Syria; the situation on the West Bank; and in Lebanon; and recent reports regarding possible arms sales to Saudi Arabia.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, SEPTEMBER 1985. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 18 September 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 77p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/985-5

“Private and candid discussions with King Hussein, Prime Minister Peres, and President Mubarak have enhanced our understanding of their positions on the key issues. We hope it might soon be possible to move toward a shared objective—direct negotiations on the substantive issues of peace between the parties. Our efforts to achieve this shared objective are greatly complicated by the continuing—and recently intensifying—acts of violence and terrorism in the region. Those who practice violence cannot be regarded as participants in a peace process. Nor will those responsible for these acts of terrorism be allowed to deter us from the pursuit of peace.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, SEPTEMBER 1983. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 1st Session, 26 September 1983. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 55p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/983-4

“We are greatly heartened by the announcement of the cease-fire within the last 24-hours. It was announced last evening. It went into effect at 6 o'clock this morning local time in Lebanon, and it is holding as of this moment in all areas. This cease-fire is a recognition by all parties that their differences are better accommodated at the negotiating table than on the battlefield ... It has come about as a result of intense

effort and determination on the part of the mediators, both Saudi and United States mediators, and also a recognition by Syria that violence and turmoil have gone too far. Lebanon, as we all know, has seen other cease-fires, and they have not always held, and this one at this point must best be described as fragile and hopeful.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, SEPTEMBER 1982. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 22 & 29 September 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 59p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/20/982-3

“Our hearing today will focus primarily on the President’s Middle East peace initiative enunciated September 1, on the next steps in U.S. diplomatic efforts, on the tragic events which have occurred in Lebanon this month, including the assassination of former President-elect Bashir Gemayel, the advance of Israeli forces into Beirut, and the massacres which took place two weekends ago in the two Palestinian refugee camps.”

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST: ROBERT H. PELLETREAU, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS—STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 25, 1996. U.S. Department of State. Robert H. Pelletreau. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 40, 30 September 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. p.484-488. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/40

“An extraordinarily wide range of U.S. national interests converge in the Middle East. Among these crucial national interests are: achieving a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace between Israel and its neighbors; maintaining our long-standing commitment to Israel’s security and well-being; combating terrorism and countering the spread of weapons of mass destruction; nurturing close relations with our Gulf allies and ensuring the United States’ access to the area’s vital petroleum reserves; promoting democracy and respect for human rights and for the rule of law; and enhancing business opportunities for American companies. Promoting these interests requires that we continue our active political engagement in the region and back it with American military power—with the support of our allies whenever possible.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no40.html>

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF, JUNE 1984. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 98th Congress, 2nd Session, 11 June 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984. 71p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/7

“Our security assistance program with Saudi Arabia, our cooperation with other states in the region, our military presence in the Arabian Sea, have all enhanced the confidence and the capabilities of our friends. The tragic war in the gulf has raged for almost 4 years. Not only, however, has the oil continued to flow from the gulf, but our friends have been able to defend themselves without the presence of U.S. combat forces. When Saudi Arabia shipping was threatened by Iranian air strikes, the Saudis were strong enough to meet the challenge. They had the tools to do the job, and when the Saudis needed help against a specific threat, they could rely on the United States for a prompt and appropriate response ... The current attacks on nonbelligerent shipping to neutral ports directly threaten the Gulf States and also our own shipping interests. If the war spread, the vulnerable oil and port facilities of the Gulf States would be endangered along with a major share of the world’s oil supply. We would not be immune from the effects of an oil disruption. There is one worldwide oil market, and we still import about one-third of our oil supply.”

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INTEGRATION AS A CATALYST FOR PEACE: A “MARSHALL PLAN” FOR THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 24 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 95p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: EC 7/10

“A sustained effort at promoting commerce, jobs, and a free economy throughout the region can help restore the dignity of all, and will unleash the true potential of entrepreneurs, investors and civic leaders to create wealth, renew hope, rebuild institution, and escape the culture of violence. But no one will invest so long as the killing continues. Our efforts to build a strong economy will be to no avail—even the most attractive investments in the world will not find backers in an atmosphere of hatred and violence.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42850> (PDF)

http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/107/80963.pdf (PDF)

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND PROGRAMS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 96th Congress, 1st Session, April 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 79p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/13

“The purpose of the staff study mission was to gather information on U.S. Economic Support Fund and other U.S. economic aid programs being administered in the Middle East. The Economic Support Fund (ESF), formerly known as security supporting assistance, is economic assistance provided because of special economic, political, or security interests of the United States. The Middle East area has been the prime recipient of Economic Support Fund aid. Of the \$1.9 billion authorized for ESF assistance globally in fiscal 1979, approximately \$1.8 billion was for the Middle East. The Middle East recipients were Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria.”

EFFECT OF IRAQI-IRANIAN CONFLICT ON U.S. ENERGY POLICY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 30 September 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 70p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/7: IR 1/2

“The United States and its Western allies, who import over 17 million barrels of oil a day from the Persian Gulf region, have anxiously watched this battle drag on over the past week. The very lifeline of the industrialized world, the Straits of Hormuz, may be threatened by this long simmering border dispute which has escalated into a full scale battle. This hearing is designed to help prevent some of the mistakes that we as a nation have made during the past threatened or actual oil supply interruptions. When the Iranian revolution led to a cutoff of oil exports from that troubled nation last winter, for example, a sense of panic and a psychology of shortage took hold. As such, both industry and Government sought frantically to obtain oil on the spot market. Spot market prices soared dramatically. That, in turn, led to a major increase in OPEC contract prices to the further detriment of the Western economies. In the present instance we appear more sophisticated and less inclined to panic.”

THE ELECTIONS IN PAKISTAN AND OTHER DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH ASIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 2 November 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 57p. [Hearing].

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

“The relationship between the United States and Pakistan is at a crossroads. We have the opportunity to move forward on the basis of mutual benefit, but this requires several things of Pakistan: A genuine commitment to democracy, non-interference in the affairs of Pakistan’s neighbors, and a new willingness to address U.S. nuclear concerns. Within this framework, everything is possible. Without it, we will have reached a parting of ways. We will also look at recent events in India at today’s hearing ... we will also assess recent developments in Kashmir...”

EMERGENCY SITUATION IN ZAIRE AND SOMALIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 5 February 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 23p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.102-534

“Somalia is the most acute humanitarian tragedy in the world today. Hundreds of thousands of people who have fled the fighting in Mogadishu are in dire need of food and medical care. Tens of thousands, especially mothers and children and the aged, are at risk of dying. Food aid cannot be delivered ... because of the fighting and lack of security for aid workers ... To give you an example of the economic disaster that has overtaken Zaire, our Embassy reports that the annualized rate of inflation for the past 3 months was more than 23,000 percent ... As the economy continues to crumble, more and more Zairians have no income at all.”

EMERGENCY SITUATIONS IN SUDAN AND LIBERIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 27 November 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 102p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.101-1163

Discusses the chaos of these weak-states, exploring famines, corrupt governments, humanitarian violations, mass executions, and civil war, with some testimony concerning Islamic fundamentalist extremists in these countries.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE IRAN-LIBYA SANCTIONS ACT AND INCREASING SECURITY THREATS FROM IRAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 25 June 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 50p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IR 1/16

“...ILSA was first passed by Congress in August 1996, and it was reauthorized on October 3, 2001. The bill places a ceiling of \$20 million in investments in the oil sectors of both Iran and Libya before United States sanctions become possible. The catalyst for the legislation was the mounting concern that investment in these countries’ oil fields would provide them with the funds necessary to expedite their development of weapons of mass destruction and expand their ability to fund, train and to supply terrorist organizations around the world ... However, it appears that the use of ILSA as a vague and unfulfilled threat is seen by some as more important than the actual application of it. As a result, the deterrent effect has been lost. It is not taken seriously by those investing in Iran, as illustrated by the statement made last year by a Washington oil consultant who referred to ILSA as a ‘paper tiger.’”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS43337> (PDF)

http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/108/87998.pdf (PDF)

THE FUTURE OF JERUSALEM. U.S. Department of Defense. Sir Hugh Foot Caradon. February 1980. Washington, DC: National Defense University, Research Directorate, 1980. 37p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.409: 80-1

“The prospect is consequently one of mounting Arab anger and frustration accompanied by a buildup in Arab military strength and an increase in Palestinian violence, with fierce Israeli retaliation and possible Israeli preemptive strikes against Arab neighbors, and with Egypt temporarily helpless to intervene. In these most dangerous circumstances and without a comprehensive settlement on the issues, there can be no hope at all of any agreement between Arabs and Israelis over Jerusalem. The likelihood is that Jerusalem will continue as a cause of deep-seated enmity with passionate feelings, inflamed by nationalist and religious extremists, leading on to a vast, destructive conflict.”

THE FUTURE OF SAUDI ARABIAN OIL PRODUCTION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on International Economic Policy. 96th Congress, 1st Session, April 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 37p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: SA 8 A/2

“This report details the technical, conservationist and financial parameters which will affect Saudi Arabian oil production decisions. The effect of the Saudi Arabian concern about the erosion of its oil revenues by inflation, as well as about the optimum expansion of industrialization given the economic and social realities on oil production decisions is beyond the scope of this report. The report also does not attempt to evaluate political, diplomatic and security factors which may have a bearing on decisions respecting future production levels. Based upon information collected by the Committee staff over the last year, it seems evident that the United States should not base its energy plans on the premise that Saudi Arabia, as residual supplier, will produce enough oil to supply the needs of the United States or the world economy over the next two decades at anticipated rates of oil consumption.”

THE FUTURE OF U.S. -SAUDI RELATIONS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 22 May 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 63p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: F 98

“Even before September 11, of course, there were many sources of friction: the near total lack of political and civil rights in Saudi Arabia has troubled many Americans for

years ... Saudi Arabia has been unreliable as a base for the U.S. military against Saddam ... is one of only three nations which maintained diplomatic relations with the Taliban ... Individual Saudis have made important contributions to the United States as immigrants, investors, and religious leaders. And Saudi Arabia actually sells its oil to us at a little below the ... world price in order to maintain a market share here, hoping to gain influence.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42268> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/107/79761.pdf (PDF)

GROWING U.S. SECURITY INTERESTS IN CENTRAL ASIA. U.S. Department of Defense. Elizabeth Wishnik. October 2002. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2002. 56p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2003004212

“The author argues that by placing a priority on anti-terrorism in U.S. policy toward Central Asia and rewarding Central Asian leaders for basing rights, the Bush administration is shoring up authoritarian regimes and encouraging public distrust of U.S. intentions in the region. She points out that weak regional security organizations, contingent support in Russia and China to the expanding American military foothold in the region, and instability in Central Asia will post considerable challenges for the U.S. military. In conclusion, the author recommends an emphasis on rapid deployment from existing bases in Turkey rather than continued basing in Central Asia, a more coherent regional strategy and improved foreign area expertise for the Central Asian region, and a multilateral approach to addressing instability in the area.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24951> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2002/usintrst/usintrst.pdf> (PDF)

GULF SECURITY AND THE IRAN-IRAQ WAR. U.S. Department of Defense. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Middle East Research Institute; Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 192p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 5.402: G 95

“The realistic preoccupation with the dynamic relationship between external threats and domestic vulnerabilities, combined with a growing perception that the United States cannot be relied upon to help them meet many of the threats they face, has led to a reassessment of the wisdom of relying on the American commitment for security. Beyond the problems associated with specific issues, there is already discernable in

the attitudes of the ruling elites in the Gulf the fear that the Arab world—possibly the entire Muslim world— may soon be swept by a new tide of radicalism, and that to survive in these circumstances, they may need to begin now to position their nations somewhat more distantly from the West. This goes beyond formal security arrangements and could extend to a deliberate policy of weakening the myriad political, commercial, cultural, and educational ties that thus far have bound them closely to the West.”

THE IMPACT OF THE OCTOBER MIDDLE EAST WAR. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia. 93rd Congress, 1st Session, 3, 23 & 24 October; 29 November 1973. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973. 159p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/6

“(1) The United States needs the Arab world and has many friends in the area ... We must continue and strengthen our ties with those countries ... (2) We must return to an evenhanded policy in our relations with the Arabs and the Israelis. We must not be pro-Arab. We must not be pro-Israeli ... (3) We are morally committed to the continued existence of Israel, but we must recognize that all of our interests do not coincide with all of those of Israel, and we must avoid being overly committed to Israel ... (4) We must avoid thinking or voicing emotional clichés ... It is also possible for a serious and impartial observer to believe that we are overindulgent in support of Israel without that person being the slightest bit anti-Semitic. Such clichés as ‘Arab oil for Israeli blood’ are gross misstatements of the problem ... (7) We must recognize that the use of force to retain or increase the flow of oil is not an acceptable instrument of policy, either to Americans or to the rest of the world ... (9) We must encourage a balanced response to acts of terrorism. The Arabs must not be permitted to criticize Israeli terrorism and condone radical Arab actions equally or more outrageous ... (10) Above all we must do what we can to understand the complexities of the issues and to encourage public and responsible debate ... These principles would ... assure us of a better chance of coping with a difficult problem.”

IMPLEMENTING U.S. POLICY IN SUDAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 11 July 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 79p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-784

“The U.S. has a number of fundamental policy objectives in Sudan: countering terrorism, promoting human rights and democracy, ending the war, and supporting humanitarian assistance.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS26059> (PDF)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE ARSHAD PERVEZ CASE FOR U.S. POLICY TOWARD PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 17 February 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 83p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/10

“Last spring, while Congress was being urged to grant Pakistan another exception to Glenn-Symington, Mr. Pervez was trying to smuggle maraging 350 steel, a sensitive nuclear-related technology, out of the United States. When the relevant committees of the Congress agreed to an extension of the waiver for Pakistan, Mr. Pervez’s smuggling efforts did not slow; they expanded, to include an attempt to smuggle beryllium, which is used in the construction of nuclear bombs ... Pakistan is providing important assistance to the Afghan mujahadeen. But this is not a matter of choice for them, it is in their own essential national interest. Pakistan’s assistance to the Afghan rebels was not bought with American assistance and will not end if we suspend it.”

THE IRAN AGREEMENTS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 17 & 18 February, 4 March 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 361p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: IR 1/5

“First, the United States has not apologized to Iran. Second, the United States has not paid ransom to Iran ... Third, the United States has not taken sides in the Iraq-Iran conflict and has maintained its position of noninvolvement. Fourth, the Shah was not returned to Iran, and Iran’s claims to the property of the Shah and his family will be given effect only if they are adjudicated in United States courts in full accordance with due process of law. Fifth, an international arbitral tribunal, backed up by a \$1 billion security fund, will be set up in order to hear and pay the commercial claims of United States citizens against Iran.”

IRAN AND PROLIFERATION: IS THE U.S. DOING ENOUGH? THE ARMING OF IRAN: WHO IS RESPONSIBLE? U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 17 April; 6 May 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 108p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.105-289

Export controls in China, Russia’s interests in Iran, Chinese and Russian suppliers to Iran, Iranian nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons: implications and U.S. responses.

IRAN CLAIMS LEGISLATION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 20 May 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1985. 131p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.99-146

“...the need for the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal arose as a result of the Islamic revolution in Iran and the unlawful seizure of the U.S. Embassy. As a result of these events, extensive contractual arrangements between the government of Iran and U.S. nationals were breached and many American investments in Iran were expropriated. The disposition of private claims against Iran was therefore a major issue in the resolution of the hostage crisis. The Algiers accords which led to the release of the hostages also included provisions for the resolution of these private claims. The Accords created the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal to hear the claims, as well as certain government-to-government disputes, and established a security account, initially funded at \$1 billion from blocked Iranian assets, to secure payments of Tribunal awards in favor of U.S. nationals ... To summarize, we think that the prompt passage of the Iran Claims Act is essential. The legislation will allow the Government to more effectively represent the interests of the U.S. nationals. Small claimants would particularly benefit, since it not only provides standby authority for adjudication by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, but does so at a fee significantly less than that currently required by law.”

IRAN: CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS AND U.S. POLICY. U.S. Department of Defense. Kenneth Katzman. 25 April 2003. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 14p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: IB93033

“President Bush has identified Iran’s efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and delivery means, coupled with its support of terrorist groups, as key U.S. concerns. In particular, Iran’s nuclear program has made major strides recently and prompted a level of Administration concern that some describe as alarm.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/20242.pdf> (PDF)

IRAN: EVALUATION OF U.S. INTELLIGENCE PERFORMANCE PRIOR TO NOVEMBER 1978. U.S. Congress. House. Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Subcommittee on Evaluation. January 1978. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 8p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/18: IR 1

“Clearly, there was a warning failure, in that the attention of top policymakers was not brought forcefully to bear on Iran until October 1978. By then, the degree of

dissidence there had made orderly transition away from the Shah's autocratic rule nearly impossible. U.S. policy options which might have existed earlier—such as encouraging the Shah to bring opposition elements into his government—no longer held promise. Rather than simply an 'intelligence failure,' however, this staff report finds a failure to which both the intelligence community and the users of intelligence contributed. The intelligence and policymaking communities must each carry part of the blame for insensitivity to deep-rooted problems in Iran. More importantly, intelligence and policy failings were intertwined..."

THE IRAN HOSTAGE CRISIS: A CHRONOLOGY OF DAILY DEVELOPMENTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, March 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 421p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IR 1/3

"Shortly after the November 4, 1979, seizure of the American Embassy and 66 hostages in Tehran, Iran, it became apparent that the Congress of the United States needed a consistent and concise summary of events in Iran ... Information for the chronology was drawn from unclassified news sources and foreign broadcasts considered sufficiently reliable to merit attention. CRS [Congressional Research Service] made no attempt to verify each report included in the chronology and has not edited the chronology to remove items later proven false or inconsequential. The chronology remains as it was presented to Congress each day, either in printed form or on computer terminals accessible to congressional offices. A chronology covering major events for the 2 years prior to the embassy and hostage seizure has been added to provide a frame of reference for the crisis."

THE IRAN HOSTAGE CRISIS: A CHRONOLOGY OF DAILY DEVELOPMENTS—JANUARY 1-25, 1981. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, May 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 36p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IR 1/3/981

"...the information in the chronology is drawn from unclassified public sources and has not been verified. It is published by the committee for use by the Congress and the public for review and analysis of this 14-month ordeal that was endured by the hostages, by the U.S. Government, and by the American people."

IRAN: LIMITS TO RAPPROCHEMENT. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 106th Congress, 1st Session, 22 July 1999. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999. 31p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-245

"Under Khatemi Iran has continued its arms delivery to radical groups around the world, such as Hezbollah in Lebanon, Iran continues to seek to undermine the Middle

East peace process, arrest innocent Jews and charges them with spurious accusations of espionage, and Iran has accelerated its missile program and will in a few short years, at the latest, have an ICBM capable of carrying a nuclear warhead.”

IRANIAN ASSET CONTROLS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 8 May 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 31p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IR ½

“...the President signed an Executive order and declared a national emergency in connection with the situation in Iran. The principal prohibition essentially blocked transactions and transfers of property belonging to the Iranian Government, the Central Bank of Iran and Iranian official entities; that is, entities that were controlled by the Iranian Government such as, for example, the National Iranian Oil Co ... the invocation of this authority for these purposes seemed appropriate then and it seems appropriate now premised as it was and is on the continued attacks on our people and our institutions by the Iranian authorities.”

IRANIAN WEAPONS PROGRAMS: THE RUSSIAN CONNECTION. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs; Subcommittee on European Affairs. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 5 October 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2001. 42p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-880

“...Iran has been identified by the Department of State as ‘THE’ most active state sponsor of terrorism. The urgency of the threat posed by Iran’s foreign policy has been increased exponentially by Tehran’s efforts to develop and deploy missiles of increasing range and accuracy and its efforts to complement that offensive capacity with the full spectrum of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons ... Russian equipment, training, technology, and know-how permeate the entire Iranian military. The Iranian army is equipped with modern Russian tanks and Russian air defense systems. The Iranian navy deploys Russian diesel submarines.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10949>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS10950> (PDF)

IRAN’S SEIZURE OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 17, 19 & 25 February; 11 March 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 285p. [Hearing].

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

“The aborted rescue mission, the fall of the Shah, the emergence of Khomeini, the provocative seizure of our Embassy, and the hostage agreement raise important questions in regard to the effectiveness of our intelligence and paramilitary operations, the soundness of our Embassy security and crisis management, as well as the administration and conduct of U.S. foreign policy—past, present, and future. Moreover, the attack upon our Embassy in Tehran underscores the danger of American Government service in a world increasingly bent upon terrorism. With expanding U.S. strategic interests in Third World regions, a growing awareness of the interdependency of all people, and the advent of modern communication which can televise events around the world, terrorism has come of age. As a result, the United States must know how to cope with a sizable terrorist threat ...”

LANDPOWER AND DUAL CONTAINMENT: RETHINKING AMERICA’S POLICY IN THE GULF. U.S. Department of Defense. Stephen C. Pelletiere. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999. 37p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2001035516

“Dual containment, promulgated in 1993, was supposed to constrain the two most powerful area states, Iran and Iraq, by imposing harsh economic sanctions on them. But, the author contends, the policy has only antagonized America’s allies, while Baghdad and Tehran continue to defy Washington and threaten the oil sheikhdoms Washington is trying to protect ... The Dual Containment policy must be changed, the author believes. And foremost, the practice of trying to police Iraq by aerial bombing should be abandoned. This tactic is counterproductive, according to the author; it is driving the Iraqis to rally behind the regime of Saddam Hussein, the very outcome Washington is seeking to discourage.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS12010> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/1999/dual/dual.pdf> (PDF)

<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/ssipubs/pubs99/dual/dual.pdf> (PDF)

LEBANON: PROSPECTS FOR PEACE, SECURITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH ASIAN AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, DC, SEPTEMBER 25, 1996. U.S. Department of State. Elizabeth D. McKune. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 40, 30 September 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. p. 489-490. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/40

“The U.S. is interested in seeing the resumption of negotiations between Israel and Lebanon, and we have continued to urge both sides to be prepared to exploit

opportunities for peace. The Lebanese Government has indicated that it looks forward to proceeding as soon as a favorable atmosphere develops. Israel also would like to see negotiations resume to address its concerns about security along its border with Lebanon ... The Lebanese Government has been able to gradually expand its authority in the country. There has been an improvement in the security situation since the last U.S. hostages were released in 1991, and there have been no recent attacks against Americans. The government has limited the activities of many violent individuals and some groups in Lebanon, taken steps to combat terrorism, and acceded to some international and anti-terrorism conventions. The government also continues to provide personal security to some high-profile Americans visiting Lebanon.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no40.html>

LIBYA-SUDAN-CHAD TRIANGLE: DILEMMA FOR UNITED STATES POLICY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Africa. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 29 October; 4 November 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 104p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: L 61/2

“In some ways, therefore, Qadhafi is a typical fundamentalist in that he finds his faith and basis in Islam, and has in fact tried to convert most of the African heads of state that he meets to the Islamic religion. In other ways, he is far from the precepts of fundamental Islam in that he follows his own re-creation of Islamic religious principles as codified in his green book, or in his third way, and presents them in a way that is different from capitalism and communism from the Third World ... Another element of Libyan foreign policy that was important in the beginning, and now largely accomplished, is the effort to free Libya from all elements of foreign control: Foreign bases, foreign oil companies, and so on.”

LONE RANGER NO MORE. U.S. Institute of Peace. *Peace Watch*. Vol. 7, No. 2, February 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2001. p.12. [Article].

SuDoc# Y 3. P 31: 15-2/V.7/NO.2

“The United States needs to develop new approaches to international conflict management and peacebuilding that take full advantage of its global diplomatic reach, expertise and credibility in peacemaking, and unrivaled capacity to build and sustain winning coalitions ... In short, ‘Lone Rangerism’ won’t do the job.”

Online

<http://www.usip.org/peacewatch/pdf/pw0201.pdf> (PDF)

LONG-TERM ENERGY SECURITY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 9 May; 7, 22 & 28 June 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 642p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. B 22/1: 101-22

“We have had the bombing of the Pan American aircraft that fell at Lockerbie, Scotland ... we have had Mr. Rafsanjani’s threat of last week that those who wish to avenge what is happening in the West Bank and Gaza should go out and assassinate Americans ... He is moderate ... in relation to some of the others. All of this ... reminds us that in this world of fluctuation ... the instability of the Persian Gulf. And for that reason our growing dependency not only of the United States but of all of the free world on the Persian Gulf must be looked at with some degree of concern ... the concern about the Middle East is commerce, the security of supply may suddenly be interrupted as it has been on three or four occasions during the last several decades ... To rely on free market forces alone as we have in the recent years, means but one thing for the United States, a growing dependency upon foreign sources of supply concentrated increasingly in the Persian Gulf with all of the instability that represents.”

MIDDLE EAST ARMS TRANSFER POLICY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 6 June 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 38p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.102-245

“In fact, there is no common interest in the region, and that is the problem. The rulers of the Islamic States are at war with one another to rule the region, and they are at war with significant numbers of their own people for whom Islamic fundamentalism is a bar to constructive relations with the West. With the possible exception of Egypt, the Islamic countries are still at war with Israel ... the vast majority of countries in the region are opposed to the very existence of a non-Islamic country such as Israel in a region still dominated by Islam.”

THE MIDDLE EAST, 1971: THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN THE PEACE. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East. 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 13-15 & 27 July; 3 August; 30 September; 5 & 28 October 1971. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971. 369p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: EA 7/10

Includes several days of hearings on topics in the Middle East: strategic and economic implications of the opening of the Suez Canal; the Palestine movement in 1971; the

Persian Gulf at the end of 1971; the economic implications of a partial or full settlement; U.S. bilateral options with Israel to insure a multilateral settlement; the Arab socialist states and peace in the Middle East; the moderate Arab regimes and peace in the Middle East; and political and social developments in Israel.

THE MIDDLE EAST PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE: PROMOTING DEMOCRITIZATION IN A TROUBLED REGION. U.S. Congress. House Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 19 March 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 46p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/19

“...the root cause for Arab underdevelopment is threefold: A deficit of freedom, a deficit of women’s rights, and a deficit of knowledge ... Arab countries must begin to rebuild their societies by taking steps to provide for full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms as the cornerstones of good governance, the integration and complete empowerment of women, and education as a means of achieving social advancement rather than a means of perpetuating poverty and a discriminatory class system. Since the 1950s, the United States policy toward the Middle East has focused on trying to meet the economic and social needs of the people in the region. The desire to raise the quality of life of our fellow human beings in the Arab world has been a fundamental premise of our actions. However, it was perhaps only after September 11th that the need to free the people of the region from deprivation in all of its manifestations became a matter of national security. On that grim day in our nation’s history, we realized the nexus that exists between the lack of freedom and human rights and the rise of terrorist violence.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS34091> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/108/85842.pdf (PDF)

MIDDLE EAST PEACE AND OTHER VITAL INTERESTS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 28 July 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 47p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 31/20

“The historic joint declaration of Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein represents a watershed in the quest for peace in the Middle East. Together with the Israeli-PLO Declaration of Principles signed last September, and the multilateral talks, the Washington Declaration will help transform the Middle East landscape. Our aim in the Middle East is to replace a 40-year old pattern of conflict with a new structure of peaceful relations, a new structure between Israel and each of its neighbors and the entire Arab world ... The Washington Declaration of the two parties is a practical document that establishes the foundation for a full-fledged peace between Jordan and

Israel that not only terminates the state of war but does practical things such as opening direct phone links, planning for the integration of their electricity grids, opening border crossing points and allowing free access for third country tourism. It provides for negotiations to open an international air corridor, to develop bilateral economic relations, and to end the Arab boycott against Israel.”

MIDDLE EAST REGIONAL COOPERATION PROGRAMS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 6 May 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 137p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/28

“Over the last five years the program has proved itself a remarkable success, both in terms of the familiarity and trust it has built among the Israelis and Egyptians that have taken part ... In the case of Israel and Egypt or any two countries struggling to live at peace with each other there are two ways to work toward that peace. The first is negotiations among governments, and the second is grass root effort involving both side’s citizens. The aim of the first, of course, is to produce a breakthrough agreement like the Camp David Accord. The purpose of the second is to try and create the underlying popular attitudes of trust and understanding that is necessary to stable long-term peace.”

MIDDLE EAST STRATEGIC PROBLEMS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 95th Congress, 1st Session, 3 October 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977. 128p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/16

“First, continued stagnation of peace efforts creates an unacceptable threat to vital U.S. interests. It threatens the supply of Arab oil and investment in the U.S. and the other Western industrial societies ... It virtually guarantees a state of tension and turmoil throughout the region that will lead to a new Arab-Israeli war ... And, not least, it threatens the wellbeing and possibly even the long-term security of Israel. The second crucial fact ... is that the Palestinians are indeed the heart of the problem ... If a peaceful solution is possible it can only be achieved if the Palestinian Arab political community is brought into the settlement process in a credible way. The historical essence of the Palestinian problem is the denial of self-determination to the Palestinian Arabs after the collapse of Turkish rule in World War I—a time at which they constituted 90 percent of the population; their ultimate displacement as a people from their land during the 1948 war ...”

MILITARY SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA—1975. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs. 94th

Congress, 1st Session, 4 November; 17 December 1975. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. 42p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SA 8 A/975

“The United States has, for many years, pursued friendly relations with the Saudi Government. From the mid-1930s, the United States has taken positive action to support that country. Significant among this initial support was the effort directed toward the exploration for petroleum resources and the subsequent involvement of the American firm, Aramco, in the development of those resources. In the 1950s, the United States increased its support of Saudi Arabia, as well as the Kingdom of Jordan, to counterbalance other Middle East influences considered to be hostile to those two countries. We continue to view Saudi Arabia as a valued friend; and our security assistance policy, based on a long history of mutual trust and cooperation, is to continue to provide assistance to the Saudi Government in a number of areas. The assistance provided can be placed in three general categories. These are: Construction assistance, foreign military sales, and commercial sales.”

NATIONAL OIL SECURITY POLICY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Subcommittee on Energy Regulation and Conservation. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 2 June 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 546p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. EN 2: S.HRG.100-173

“Far from decreasing, the commentary continues to wax eloquent about our neglect of the global implications of America’s addiction to importing so substantial a portion of its domestic energy needs. The most graphic illustration of the national crisis we face with regard to foreign oil dependence is the recent tragedy involving the U.S.S. Stark in the Persian Gulf. This needless loss of life occurred in part because we have reached a point in our national life whereby it is necessary to take military action—no matter how well-intentioned and peaceful—to protect our interests ... It is fraught with danger and uncertainty, and it is a painful and embarrassing indictment of our national energy policy. Clearly, a new course must be charted.”

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia. 93rd Congress, 1st Session, 6 June; 17, 23 & 24 July; 28 November 1973. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973. 227p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/4

“If the Persian Gulf appeared to some Americans to be a remote, and perhaps inconsequential, part of the world at the beginning of 1973, it was, by the end of the year, an area of major interest and speculation for many Americans. The region’s oil wealth and resultant political clout in a world sellers’ market for oil are recognized

facts of the day, and the United States longstanding close ties with most Persian Gulf countries remain, even if our ties with some states are impaired by the October 1973 oil embargo. This region clearly needs greater scrutiny by policymakers and by Congress ... Sales of weapons, military equipment and aircraft to Iran and Saudi Arabia have been running into the billions of dollars in recent years, and the net impression given is that our political strategy in this region is based largely on maintaining an arms supply relationship ... It is evident that if, as we all hope, current Arab oil embargoes and production cutbacks are soon removed and production is increased, the United States will face an enormous economic challenge in the Persian Gulf—the challenge of trying to create an economic interdependence that can solve our needs and the needs of the states in the area to the mutual benefit of everyone.”

OIL DIPLOMACY: FACTS AND MYTHS BEHIND FOREIGN OIL DEPENDENCY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 20 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 89p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: OI 5/3

“...today America’s dwindling oil reserves provide less than half of the oil our economy uses. This leaves us heavily dependent on the Middle Eastern regimes that control the vast majority of the world’s known oil reserves. Many of these regimes are either actively hostile to the United States, as is the case with Iran, Iraq, and Libya, or unsteady, autocratic regimes beholden to Islamic fundamentalists like Saudi Arabia. Not surprisingly, many of these same regimes funnel oil revenues into support for global terrorist organizations. The Saudi royal family, for instance, pumps millions of dollars into radical religious schools and mosques across the Middle East that spread the puritanical teachings of the Wahabbi sect of Islam. These schools preach hate toward America. Many of these schools trained the very al Qaeda terrorists who struck America on September 11th ... our dependence on Middle East oil severely undermines our ability to combat international terrorism.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42855> (PDF)

http://www.house.gov/international_relations/107/80291.pdf (PDF)

OIL PRICES AND SUPPLIES IN THE WAKE OF THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 25 & 31 October; 1 November 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 550p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.101-1294

“The invasion of Kuwait by Iraq on August 2nd sent retail prices for gasoline and heating oil skyrocketing overnight. Within a week of the invasion, gas prices had

increased nationwide by an average of 18 cents a gallon ... The impact on our economy has obviously been severe as oil price hikes have reverberated throughout every nook and cranny of commerce in America.”

OVERVIEW OF GLOBAL ENERGY SECURITY ISSUES. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 8 April 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2003. 73p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.108-98

“America needs a comprehensive energy policy that recognizes the realities of our inter-connected world. We cannot develop our energy policies under the false assumption that energy independence is achievable in the short-term. Our dependence on OPEC oil, including and especially Middle Eastern Gulf crude oil, is more likely to increase than decrease in the foreseeable future. America’s demand for natural gas will continue to exceed its supply. This imbalance will continue to grow. The interdependence of global energy markets requires that America and her allies must work with Persian Gulf and Middle Eastern energy suppliers regardless of the political risks associated with the region. The United States presently depends on Middle Eastern Gulf oil for 25 percent of its crude oil imports. Middle Eastern Gulf oil provides 26 percent of Europe’s crude oil imports and 67 percent of Asia’s imports. Russia and oil-producing countries in the Caspian, Latin America and West Africa will all continue to play important roles as global supplies of crude oil. But the Persian Gulf will remain the choke point of the global economy.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS39307> (PDF)

OVERVIEW OF U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 2 August 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 154p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: M 58/9

“The United States continues its active involvement in promoting peace in the Middle East. On the Israeli-Palestinian track we are supporting intensive efforts by the parties to conclude an agreement to implement the next phase of the Declaration of Principles. This involves a sensitive three-part negotiation. On transferring additional areas of authority to the Palestinians, redeployment of Israeli forces in the West Bank, and the holding of Palestinian elections. The issues are complex...”

PAKISTAN AND UNITED STATES NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION POLICY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International

Security, and Science; Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs; Subcommittee on Economic Policy and Trade. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 22 October 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 172p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/9

“Pakistan has repeatedly assured us that its program is exclusively devoted to peaceful purposes and that it will not acquire nuclear explosives of any kind, but we cannot be complacent about Pakistan’s continuing effort to operate unsafeguarded nuclear activities. Nor are we. The unsafeguarded enrichment facility is obvious cause for concern, and our concerns persist ... Nevertheless, while we agree with the importance of ensuring Pakistan’s compliance ... we think it would be extremely risky to legislate language between Pakistan and continuation of United States assistance. Pakistan would regard such an action by the United States as a discriminatory public ultimatum that it would be compelled by domestic public opinion to resist. We should also keep in mind the likely Indian reaction. If the United States were to cut off assistance to Pakistan, because of inability to meet a particular nuclear certification, many Indians will see this both as confirmation that Pakistan has crossed the nuclear threshold, and as removing any external restraint on Pakistan’s nuclear program.”

PAKISTAN—U.S. RELATIONS. Library of Congress. K. Alan Kronstadt. 24 September 2002. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2002. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: IB94041

“The major areas of U.S. concern in Pakistan include nuclear nonproliferation; counterterrorism; regional stability; democratization and human rights; and economic reform and development.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/13851.pdf> (PDF)

PAKISTAN’S DOMESTIC POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS: ISSUES FOR CONGRESS. Library of Congress. K. Alan Kronstadt. 23 September 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 6p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RS21299

“The September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States and Musharraf’s ensuing decision to withdraw support for the Afghan Taliban regime ... had the effect of greatly reducing Pakistan’s international isolation. Direct U.S. aid to the country began flowing again in the final months of 2001, rising from about \$10 million in FY2001 to more than \$1 billion in FY2002. The United States considers Pakistan to be a crucial ally in the international anti-terrorism coalition and has refrained from expressing any strong public criticisms of the country’s internal political practices,

while still asserting ‘it is of vital importance that full democratic, civilian rule be restored in Pakistan.’”

Online

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RS21299.pdf> (PDF)

PAKISTAN’S ILLEGAL NUCLEAR PROCUREMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 22 July 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 39p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/10

“According to accounts that have reached our two subcommittees an individual, acting on behalf of the government of Pakistan, has recently been arrested on charges he attempted to export large quantities of a special steel alloy and stocks of beryllium for use in Pakistan’s Kahuta enrichment plant. Make no mistake about it, these accounts, assuming they are true, represent a flagrant and provocative challenge to U.S. nonproliferation policy. They suggest, in addition, an arrogant contempt for the promises Pakistani officials have repeatedly given concerning their nuclear program and procurement policy. Finally, now that American law has apparently been violated, this entire issue and most particularly the manner in which the Administration responds, has profound implications for the viability of our nonproliferation policy and the integrity of our legal system.”

THE PERSIAN GULF: ISSUES FOR U.S. POLICY, 2003. Library of Congress. Kenneth Katzman. 3 February 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 34p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: RL31533

“The September 11 attacks have shaken U.S. relations with some of the Gulf states, particularly Saudi Arabia. Fifteen of the nineteen September 11 hijackers were of Saudi origin, as is Al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden himself. Some of the funding for the September 11 attacks apparently was transferred from financial institutions in the United Arab Emirates, and several Islamic charities operating in the Gulf and the broader Islamic world have been accused of providing funds to Al Qaeda and other terrorist movements.”

Online

<http://www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govern/crs-rl31533.pdf> (PDF)

THE PERSIAN GULF, 1974: MONEY, POLITICS, ARMS, AND POWER. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia. 93rd

Congress, 2nd Session, 30 July; 5, 7 & 12 August 1974. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. 267p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/5

“In 1974, the Persian Gulf became a major foreign policy concern for the United States. The oil embargo against the United States following the October 1973 Middle East war, the fivefold increase in oil prices, the burgeoning arms sales business throughout the gulf, the enormous amounts of money flowing into the region, and the resulting economic and political power and prestige of states and leaders who had heretofore received relatively little attention—all these factors helped to push the Persian Gulf onto the center stage of American foreign policy ... The absorptive capacity of the states in the area for the volume of arms we are selling and the nature of U.S. policy on arms sales remain unclear. Is it our policy to sell just about everything they want? ... Efforts to bring oil prices down, create a consumer-country solidarity, and to talk about the possible use of force in the Middle East should Western states face economic strangulation due to oil prices, we are told, must be juxtaposed with sincere efforts to better bilateral ties and understanding with many states in the area, especially Iran and Saudi Arabia.”

PETROLEUM AND SECURITY: THE LIMITATIONS OF MILITARY POWER IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Department of Defense. Bard E. O'Neill. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1977. 22p. [Report].

SuDoc# D 5.409: 77-4

“The official and grandly phrased goal of US policy in the Middle East since 1973 has been the creation of a ‘region of peace,’ composed of a number of healthy, independent nations, cooperating among themselves, free of external interference, and welcoming the constructive participation of outside powers. To accomplish this goal, the United States identified a number of short-term objectives: (1) settling the Arab-Israeli dispute through a process of negotiation that would result in an interim agreement and the staged implementation of a settlement of all issues ... (2) strengthening ties with traditional friends such as Iran, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, and restoring relations with the Arab states that severed them in 1967; (3) maintaining the flow of Persian Gulf oil at reasonable prices and in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of the United States and its allies, which necessitates US concern for the stability of the region; (4) aiding in development, improving trade, cooperating with oil-producing areas in the sound investment of their large foreign exchange balances ... While all four objectives are related, the most significant, as far as security policy in the region is concerned, is the need to maintain the flow of oil at reasonable prices and in sufficient quantity to meet the demands of the United States and its allies.”

PLANNING FOR TRILATERAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL COOPERATION BY EGYPT, ISRAEL, AND THE UNITED STATES. U.S. Congress. Committee on Foreign Affairs.

96th Congress, 2nd Session, 31 October 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: SCI 2/17

“The Middle East wars have left a legacy of mutual suspicion that will require time to eradicate. Although we may encourage both countries on the question of trilateral cooperation, we should not attempt to force the parties into relationships which they cannot sustain ... Science and technology, the basic means for increasing the productivity of land and people, have an importance for the countries of the Middle East second only to security. Neither Egypt nor Israel has an abundance of natural resources on which to base its living standards; both must husband what they have with increasing skill. It would be difficult to find an area in which successful interaction would forge more binding links than science and technology.”

POSSIBLE DEFENSE ROLES FOR THE ARABIAN GULF COOPERATION COUNCIL. U.S. Department of Defense. Abdulaziz bin Khalid Alsudairy. *International Essays: I.* Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1986. [Collection].

SuDoc# D 5.402: ES 7

“The perception is widely held throughout the world that the strategic importance of the Middle East is inextricably joined to access to the energy resources of the area by the West. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the strategic importance of the region and to suggest some defense arrangements acceptable to the nations of the region. The paper is not intended to be a detailed defense plan nor the outline of a scenario for future hostilities. Instead, it highlights the dynamics of the region and the implications of a collective defense arrangement.”

POST-WAR POLICY ISSUES IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 31 January; 21 & 28 February; 11 April 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 270p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 84/3

“We could see the possible rise of anti-Western Islamic fundamentalism which threatens the monarchies today. You could describe this as the second phase of the Iran revolution. Imams use the demise of Saddam Hussein as proof for the contention that secular governments within the Arab world, secular despots have been gods that failed. The thing to do is return to fundamentalism. This could pose as many problems for us as despotism ... As for the U.S. military position at the end of this, it is clearly in our interest to withdraw, insofar as we can, and maintain a low profile. However, we are the guarantor of the security within the region which almost makes inevitable a significant American presence. How should that presence manifest itself? I think it

would be in the interests of the countries in the region and the United States if we go back to the policy that existed before the war; that is minimal land presence.”

PRICE IMPACT OF OIL SHORTAGES AND U.S. ENERGY PLANNING. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 28 February 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 314p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: OI 5

“The revolution in Iran, with a subsequent cutoff of 5 million barrels a day of total oil exports from that country, is a stark reminder of the vulnerability of our national security and that of other western nations to shifts in political fortunes in the Middle East.”

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING AMERICAN BUSINESSMEN IN SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 15 June 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 275p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: SA 8/4

“Our constituents have approached us about human rights violations in Saudi Arabia, violations including beatings, torture, abduction of both children and adults, false imprisonment and threats of assassination. In these turbulent and lawless times, we have seen hostage takings and imprisonment usually by sado-terrorist groups often relying on governments for their arms, their financing, their physical protection and their logistical support. The cases we are considering today are not perpetrated by terrorist gangs but by prison and police officers of a government which enjoys the closest diplomatic commercial and military ties with our country. “

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING U.S. BUSINESSPERSONS IN SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 19 May 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 122p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: SA 8/8

“This hearing is held today in part because little has happened in the last 5 years to resolve existing problems and establish better vehicles for addressing commercial grievances. Despite the extensive commercial relations we have with Saudi Arabia and the close bilateral ties we have developed, many American companies have suffered and continue to suffer because of inaction, delay, and the absence of an effective dispute resolution mechanism. We want to explore options for developing a better, quicker and more fair dispute resolution mechanism. We want to put the plight of several American companies higher on the bilateral agenda we have with

Saudi Arabia. These goals are in the national interest of the United States. They are also essential to if mutual understanding and trust are to exist in our bilateral relationship with Saudi Arabia.”

PROMOTING PLURALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 11 August 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 71p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 74/3

“Efforts to introduce the full panoply of democratic institutions that end in failure are very costly, for they leave a residue of cynicism and disillusionment that make subsequent efforts more difficult ... the transition from the highly centralized, highly subsidized economies of the Middle East to market-based economic systems will be difficult. There may be significant sectors of the society that are—at least in the short run—palpable worse-off than they had been under the old regime. These are less likely to be the truly poor, who were in any event ill-served by the incumbent regime, than the beneficiaries of the authoritarian regime’s spoils system of patronage and corruption. Since painful economic adjustments will have to be made whether the political atmosphere is relaxed or repressive, the solution is not to avoid making the difficult choices but to ensure that the necessary debates be openly waged in an atmosphere of freedom of belief and expression, and that government decision-making be as transparent as possible.”

PROPOSED ARMS SALES FOR COUNTRIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 1 August 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 45p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/18

“Among the more prominent cases we wish to discuss today are the following: For Saudi Arabia, the second phase of a modernization program for the Saudi Arabian National Guard totaling \$1.23 billion. For Egypt, the sale of 35 F-4E aircraft, 70 Sparrow and 500 Maverick missiles totaling \$594 million; 12 Improved-Hawk missile batteries and missiles totaling \$560 million; and 700 armored personnel carriers and other military vehicles totaling \$134 million. For Jordan, the sale of M-60A3 tanks totaling over \$300 million. Several arms sales cases to Israel are also pending before Congress, including 14 Phalanx close-in weapon systems, Improved-Hawk missiles, Dragon missiles, 200 155-millimeter self-propelled howitzers, 800 armored personnel carriers in various configurations, and 200 M-06A3 tanks for an amount totaling close to \$700 million.”

PROPOSED ARMS SALES TO JORDAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 30 October 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 71p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/30

“The conventional threat to Jordan comes from a vastly more powerful Syria. And our proposed arms sale addresses Jordan’s most serious military deficiency, its air defense system. Advanced fighter aircraft, and improved air to air, and surface to air missiles upgrade Jordan’s increasingly obsolete equipment. The kingdom’s defensive posture has been put under increased pressure by the King’s peace initiative. The kingdom has been subjected to an escalating campaign of terror ... A strong stable Jordan able to defend itself against radical pressures enhances the prospects for regional peace.”

PROPOSED ARMS SALES TO KUWAIT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security, and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 7 July 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 90p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/35

“...there was another naval confrontation between the United States and Iran over the weekend which culminated in the tragic downing of Iran Air Flight 655 en route from Bandar Abbas in Iran Dubai in the United Arab Emirates. Given the situation, this hearing will focus on four principal issues: The proposed F-18 sale to Kuwait; the implications of all arms sales to the Gulf on the military balance in the region; United States policy in the Gulf and toward Kuwait; and the downing of the Iran Air Flight 655.”

PROPOSED ARMS SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 10 May 1988. 56p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/31/988

“...these notifications are part of our longstanding military sales program to a key, pro-Western friend. They support and continue programs previously approved by Congress. They will not alter the balance of power in the region and do not pose an offensive threat. They add to the capability Saudi Arabia needs for the defense of its sparsely populated country in a region of more populous and aggressive neighbors. They send a signal to all states in the Gulf that we will continue to help our friends defend themselves in the face of Iranian aggression. The state of relations between Saudi Arabia and Iran for example has deteriorated to the point that on April 26 the Saudis broke relations. Helping to meet the legitimate security needs of friendly Arab states also fosters the kind of trust needed for progress on our overall Arab-Israel peace effort.”

PROPOSED ARMS SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 22 & 23 April 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 90p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/31

“Simply stated, we oppose this sale of more than 2,500 new missiles to Saudi Arabia because of the antipathy Saudi Arabia has shown for fundamental American national security interests in the Middle East. We do not believe this sale would further American interests in the region. The United States has several vital national security interests in the Middle East, in addition to securing access to oil. These interests include broadening the Camp David peace process, combating terrorism while denying terrorists any base of support, and helping our allies Egypt and Israel to maintain their military and economic security. Saudi Arabia has not only failed to support the United States in each of these crucial areas but has actively opposed us. Examples of this abound. For instance, the Saudis continue to isolate Egypt for its willingness to pursue peace with Israel, and to this date have not reestablished diplomatic relations with Egypt. The Saudis have bankrolled the Palestine Liberation Organization and Syria, the protectors of terrorists implicated in the murder of hundreds of Americans, including the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut.”

PROPOSED ARMS SALES TO THE KINGDOM OF JORDAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 99th Congress, 1st Session, 10 October 1985. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 33p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.99-548

“In 1970, Syria invaded Jordan. In 1980, Syria massed its troops along the border with Jordan. Syria holds major quantitative advantages over Jordan in personnel—5 to 1; tanks—4 to 1; armored personnel carriers—2.5 to 1; artillery—4 to 1; and combat aircraft—5 to 1. Further, since King Hussein announced his peace initiative last November, Jordan has been subjected to an escalating campaign of terror. A Jordanian diplomat in Turkey was assassinated, and the Jordanian Embassy in Rome attacked by rocket. Three Jordanian airliners have been either bombed or hijacked. And Jordanian airline offices were attacked in Athens and Madrid. Without any doubt, the enemies of peace are trying to stop King Hussein from reaching a settlement with Israel, and there is every reason to believe they will intensify their efforts ... Jordan’s most serious military deficiency is its inability to provide adequate air defense against an external attack ... The package of arms that we propose to sell to Jordan, therefore, focuses on air defense. It contains advanced fighter aircraft and improved air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles, to upgrade Jordan’s increasingly obsolete equipment.”

PROPOSED ARMS TRANSFERS TO THE YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 12 March 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 62p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/17

“Today the Subcommittee ... is holding a hearing on the proposed transfer of 12 F-5E aircraft, 50 APC’s, and 64 M-60 tanks to the Yemen Arab Republic, or North Yemen, with 50 additional APC’s to be transferred from Saudi Arabia. This equipment, like previous military hardware sold to North Yemen, is to be financed by Saudi Arabia. The Chair wishes to note that the Yemen Arab Republic is a friendly state and has consistently sought, despite changes in political leadership, better relations with the United States over the last 4 years ...”

THE PROPOSED AWACS/F-15 ENHANCEMENT SALE TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 1st Session, September 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 63p. [Committee Print].

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

“Some observers believe that the Saudis will be more supportive of the Middle East peace effort if Congress approves the sales. The Saudis, however, are more likely to continue to be wary of aligning themselves with the United States on issues which seem to place the United States and Israel on one side and other Arab nations on the other. Saudi Arabia can be expected to seek U.S. cooperation on many issues but to follow an independent course when it believes its relations with other Arab states make that necessary. Observers in Saudi Arabia suggest that the adverse effects of a disapproval of the sales might not necessarily be abrupt. It is more likely, they say, that it would have a gradual impact on decisions and attitudes down the road ... U.S. observers believe that a disapproval of the sales would be seen as indicating a lack of U.S. support for the Saudi regime and could thereby undercut Saudi prestige and leadership in the region.”

PROPOSED SALE OF AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEMS (AWACS) AND F-15 ENHANCEMENTS TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 28 September; 1, 6 & 7 October 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 196p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AI 7

“...is questionable that the Saudi ruling family will be forever able to resist the internal pressures developing there, and should the unfortunate befall the regime, precious U.S. military secrets should not be part of the bounty for that regime’s successors. Let us not forget that the Shah of Iran was considered an immutable

power in the Middle East, and a strong ally of the U.S. before his government was overthrown. Throughout the long friendship between the U.S. and Iran, the U.S. consented to sell the Shah numerous accoutrements of war, as a sign of our friendship. Several items which were sold to the Shah fell into enemy hands when he departed. Advanced technologies such as the Phoenix long-range air-to-air missile, the F-14 fighter plane and several radar systems, have now been dissected by the adversaries of America.”

PROPOSED SALE OF F-15 AIRCRAFT TO SAUDI ARABIA AND U.S. -SAUDI COMMERCIAL DISPUTES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Europe; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, 23 September 1992. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 99p. [Joint Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AI 7/4

“In a decade-long exercise of mutual self-interest, the United States has enabled the Saudis to build up a network of state-of-the-art military bases and helped to equip them ... The utility of this policy supposedly was demonstrated during the Gulf War, when these facilities played an important role in supporting the operations of the coalition forces ... The proposed sale of F-15XPs, AGM-65 D/G Maverick air-to-ground missiles, and AIM-9S and AIM-7M air-to-air missiles is designed to further implement this shared buildup. It was also conceived as a way to enhance the credibility of the U.S.-Saudi alliance and to reinforce Saudi Arabia’s image as a state with an independent military capability ... Saudi Arabia is a textbook example of the failure of democratic development in the Middle East. By selling our most advanced weapons to such a regime, we will send an unambiguous signal of America’s unconcern for democracy in the region. To the peoples of the Middle East, no pontifications will obscure the symbolic impact of this transaction.”

PROPOSED SALE OF F-16’S TO PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 2 August 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 49p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/13

“Why does Pakistan wish to obtain 60 F-16s? To what extent will such an acquisition enhance Pakistani security? How does Pakistan plan to pay for these aircraft? How will a sale of this magnitude affect Pakistan’s ability to meet its other pressing social, economic, and security needs? ... Certainly, it is in the American interest to promote an Indo-Pakistani relationship that acknowledges the common problems and challenges faced by India and Pakistan and also seeks to build on the shared interest of the two countries.”

PROPOSED SALE TO EGYPT OF C-130 AIRCRAFT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs. 94th Congress, 2nd Session, 6 & 12 April 1976. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. 76p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: EG 9

“Six propeller-driven transport planes will not alter the balance of power in the Near East. But this sale opens up a new relationship between the United States and Egypt, a relationship we already have with Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iran, and other Near Eastern states: namely, the relationship between an arms supplier and its client. Such a relationship could help stabilize President Sadat’s moderate regime and give the United States more influence over Egyptian policy. In this case, the symbolic sale of six C-130’s could be in our interest. But the Administration reportedly has been contemplating further military sales, sales which in no sense could be considered ‘symbolic.’”

PROPOSED SALE TO KUWAIT OF AIR-TO-AIR MISSILES. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs. 94th Congress, 1st Session, 24 October 1975. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976. 55p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: K 96

“The Chair shares the concern of many in Congress over the dramatic increase in the level of military sales to the nations of the Persian Gulf area. Examination of this sale proposal provides an excellent opportunity for the subcommittee to examine not only the rationale behind this specific sale but the entire pattern of our growing military relationships with Kuwait and other countries in the area ... This escalation is indicated by ... worldwide total going from \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1972 to almost \$11 billion in fiscal year 1974, and almost \$10 billion worldwide total going from \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1972 to almost \$11 billion in fiscal year 1974, and almost \$10 billion in 1975.”

PROPOSED SALES AND UPGRADES OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 19 June 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 65p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: SA 8/6

“Transmittal No. 90-35 of June 5th notified the Congress of a proposed \$600 million sale for the modification and system integration of five AWACS E-3 and eight tanker KE-3 aircraft in the applicable areas of mission, navigation, engine and aircraft

protection systems. Transmittal No. 90-36 of June 5th notified the Congress of a proposed \$3.4 billion sale for continuation of the United States-supported effort to modernize the Saudi Arabian National Guard to include 1,117 vehicles of the family of light armored vehicles with associated weapons and equipment, TOW missiles and launchers, howitzers, ammunition and other support equipment and training. Finally, Transmittal No. 90-37 of June 5th notified the Congress of a proposed \$26 million sale of 12 M88A1 recovery vehicles with ancillary weapons and equipment.”

PROPOSED SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE CONDUCT OF OPERATION DESERT STORM. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 31 October 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 97p. [Hearing].

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

“We seek through this sale to help build an increased capability to deter and defend against potential aggressors in the area; to buy more time in the event deterrence fails allowing for the mobilization of support from friendly governments; to enhance the interoperability that will allow the United States and other friendly forces to reinforce the Saudis and others more effectively in the region; and to help contribute not only to the resolution of this crisis but also to the development of stronger and more stable post-crisis security arrangements.”

PROPOSED U.S. ARMS SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 12 December 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 50p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AR 5/19

“We would like today to explore several issues regarding the sale of these munitions that are of concern to members: The timing of the submission of the sale; how the quantities to be sold were arrived at; the nature of the Saudi war reserves and the balance of forces in the Middle East; the impact of this sale on the Arab-Israeli balance and other military relationships in the region; and a review of United States-Saudi relations and recent developments in Saudi Arabia.”

PROPOSED U.S. ASSISTANCE AND ARMS TRANSFERS TO PAKISTAN: AN ASSESSMENT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 20 November 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 54p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/7

“Given the highly emotionally charged animosity between Pakistan and India and other political factors, the proposed aid package to Pakistan presents the United States with narrow margins of decision and difficult dilemmas. Amid these problems there is no clear and unencumbered foreign policy advantage for the United States ... The 40 F-16 aircraft which are a part of the proposed package loom up in both Pakistani and Indian thinking in symbolic terms far beyond their actual capability. To all concerned the aircraft are the keystone of the new United States-Pakistani relationship embodied in the package ... Although fragile at best, various emerging efforts at détente between Pakistan and India will be seriously set back by the U.S. decision to provide military equipment to Pakistan. As perceived by India, the stunting of this albeit limp process of ‘normalization’ is being caused mainly by the F-16 aircraft component of the U.S. package. The resulting rupture between the two countries will probably persist for several years. In addition, India’s already cool political relations with the United States will clearly worsen and likely remain so for some time.”

THE PROSPECTS FOR DEMOCRACY IN PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 100th Congress, 2nd Session, 29 June 1988. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989. 50p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: D 39/9

“...this relationship is an important one which promotes major American interests in the region and beyond. During the decade of the 80s, the relationship has been a strong and vigorous one ... Pakistan’s stability remains a vital foreign policy concern for the United States and a genuinely democratic government in Pakistan will help such stability.”

PROVISION OF AN AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING SYSTEM FOR PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 21 May; 11 June 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 165p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AI 7/2

“The United States has long recognized the strategic importance of Pakistan. Even before the fall of the Shah of Iran, the U.S. had made Pakistan the second largest recipient of Military Assistance Program (MAP) aid in the Near East and South East Asia, providing some \$650 million in assistance between FY1950 and FY1980 ... The Iran-Iraq war drags on. The best the U.S. can hope for is a quasi-peace that will leave a hostile radical regime in the eastern Gulf. The worst is a victorious Iran whose Islamic fundamentalism will threaten every moderate Arab state and Pakistan. The present ‘oil glut’ will gradually disappear ... The U.S. will be forced to assume even more of the burden of defending the west’s vital oil interests and trade routes ... All of these forces act to increase the importance of Afghanistan ... It shares a common

border with Iran, and a strong and pro-western Pakistan is vital to containing Iranian efforts to expand its form of Islamic fundamentalism to the east of within the Gulf.”

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN NORTH AFRICA. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Africa. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, 28 September 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 109p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AF 8/40

“While a major component of political Islam in the Maghreb is dissatisfaction with socioeconomic conditions, another factor fueling this tendency is a search for a unique identity grounded in tradition. The legacy of colonialism and the rise and fall of intellectual tides that have swept the Arab world, socialism and Pan-Arabism among them, have left some in these societies feeling adrift as they confront the challenges of the modern world ... Islam, one of the world’s great religions, is not our enemy and we are not its enemy. U.S. policy is firmly opposed to fanaticism and extremists, whether religious or secular in nature. We resolutely oppose those who preach intolerance, abuse ... or seek to impose their will on others by violence. While that United States recognizes that each country has its own unique path to both development and identity, we will support the values of democracy, pluralism and respect for individual human rights and the rule of law that are part of who we are as a nation. Though the excesses of some Islamist political movements in North Africa attract a great deal of attention, they should not obscure our many and long-standing common interests with the countries of North Africa.”

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and South 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 Israeli/Palestinian conflict, its climate of terror, and U.S. democratization efforts in the region.

Online

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

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

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 18 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 36p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: D 49/6

The Subcommittee hears testimony and discusses the current situation regarding the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict and the idea of a provisional Palestinian state. Also discusses the governments and policies of Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Egypt.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS42266> (PDF)

http://wwwa.house.gov/international_relations/107/80287.pdf (PDF)

REVIEW OF PERSIAN GULF BURDEN SHARING. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 14 May 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 92p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/18

“The Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group’s (GCFCG) contributions on the economic front have been an important element in the coalition strategy to achieve a satisfactory resolution to the crisis. Key economies in the region, such as Egypt, Turkey, and Jordan, were particularly hard hit by Saddam Hussein’s attack on Kuwait and the imposition by the U.N. of economic sanctions against Iraq. To complement the military and diplomatic leadership of the United States, President Bush announced on September 25 the creation of the Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group to: 1) maintain and support effective implementation of U.N. economic sanctions against Iraq; 2) demonstrate international resolve in mobilizing financial assistance for the front line states; and, 3) establish an informal coordination process to secure appropriate responsibility-sharing among creditors and donors for those countries hardest hit by the crisis.”

RISING OIL PRICES, EXECUTIVE BRANCH POLICY, AND U.S. SECURITY IMPLICATIONS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 24 March 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 165p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. G 74/9: S.HRG.106-650

“The United States is becoming increasingly reliant on foreign oil. This is cause for alarm, given that some of the world’s leading oil producers are politically unstable, face difficult internal issues, or live in tough neighborhoods. We now depend on foreign sources for over half of our oil needs and we are heading to 60 percent within 5 years. It seems few people view our reliance on foreign oil as a problem until prices are raised.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS5648>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS5649> (PDF)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS7696> (Part II)

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS7697> (Part II PDF)

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 22 May 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 44p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/26

“As a political scientist I think it should be a matter of concern to responsible American decisionmakers that the public opinion in this very important part of the world should have turned so profoundly against us. It is—to repeat—particularly ominous that the younger generation of opinionmakers—students, professors, journalists, businessmen, civil servants, and even military officers—should feel that the American Government has become openly and indeed implacably hostile to the deeply held concerns of the Arab people ... In order to deal effectively with Middle East-related terrorisms we must understand the political and social context which nurtures it. Only then can we expect to have any success eliminating it ... It is essential to try and understand this kind of violence as the product of deeply and widely felt political grievances among the people in the region, no matter how distasteful it may be to do so. To understand is not to condone.”

SALE OF AWACS TO IRAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance. 95th Congress, 1st Session, 18 July-19 September 1977. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977. 109p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: AI 7/3

“This morning, the Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance starts 2 days of hearings on a proposed \$1.2 billion sale of seven E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System Aircraft, commonly known as AWACS, to Iran. Our witnesses today, Senators Eagleton and Culver, have introduced resolutions to disapprove this sale under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, better known as the Nelson amendment ... Consistent with its oversight responsibilities over arms transfers, the subcommittee will scrutinize the merits of this sale very carefully, especially in light of the President’s May 29 arms transfer policy statement, a new policy departure which introduced a set of guidelines and controls to govern U.S. arms transfers.”

SAUDI ARABIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 94th Congress, 1st Session, October 1975. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975. 7p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: SA 8 A

“Saudi Arabia is the focus of an energy-hungry world. At the same time, its government is developing into a major holder of the world’s financial reserves. Access to the vast sea of petroleum which underlies the Kingdom and the financial power which it yields is now sought by many nations in many ways. Saudi policies seem to be adjusting to this situation. In any event, these policies appear to be designed to contribute to the creation of political stability and economic progress among the Arab nations in the region and to sustain the efforts of the Egyptians to achieve with the help of the United States a peace settlement with Israel ... Saudi Arabia is also seeking greater diversification in its relationships abroad. In this connection, there is, of course, their cooperation with other oil producing states in O.P.E.C. In addition, Western Europeans and the Japanese are being involved in increasing numbers in development projects inside Saudi Arabia.”

SAUDI ARABIA AND THE UNITED STATES: THE NEW CONTEXT IN AN EVOLVING “SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP.” U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 1st Session, August 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 70p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: UN 35/34

“The main portion of this report is divided into three sections: First, a description of Saudi perceptions of the threats to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; second, an assessment of internal stability within the Kingdom; and third, an evaluation of shared interests between the United States and Saudi Arabia. A final section of the report seeks to identify significant issues in the United States-Saudi relationship that may require further examination by Congress.”

SAUDI ARABIA: CURRENT ISSUES AND U.S. RELATIONS. Library of Congress. Alfred B. Prados. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2002. 16p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: IB93113

“...issues of bilateral interest include the Saudi position on the Arab-Israeli conflict, security in the post-war Gulf region, arms transfers to Saudi Arabia, Saudi external aid programs, bilateral trade relationships, and Saudi policies involving human rights and democracy.”

Online

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/14826.pdf> (PDF)

SAUDI ARABIA: CURRENT ISSUES AND U.S. RELATIONS. Library of Congress. Alfred B. Prados. 15 September 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 16p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: IB93113

“U.S. officials have cited Saudi support in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks, including intelligence sharing, law enforcement activities, and tracking of terrorist financing. Some commentators maintain that Saudi domestic and foreign policies have created a climate that may have contributed to terrorist acts by Islamic radicals. Saudi officials reject this viewpoint and maintain that they are working with the United States to combat terrorism.”

Online

http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf/saudi_arabia.pdf (PDF)

SECURITY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO PAKISTAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs; Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade; Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 27 April; 16, 22 & 23 September; 17 & 19 November 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 382p. [Hearing & Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 17/8

“Aid to Pakistan is now prohibited under U.S. legislation because of Pakistan’s nuclear development program. We must examine carefully the implications of changing U.S. legislation concerning nuclear proliferation in order to make possible aid to Pakistan. Will a U.S. aid program give Pakistan a greater sense of security, and thus reduce the likelihood of its developing nuclear weapons? What does the administration plan to do if Pakistan proceeds down the nuclear path after we have commenced providing aid irrespective of our opposition?”

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: DOCUMENTS AND STATEMENTS, 1967-79. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 1979. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1979. 366p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 31/13

“This report is designed to serve as a useful compendium of key documents and statements relating to the Middle East peace efforts since the 1967 Middle East war. The study does not contain all statements that have been made concerning the peace process but it does seek to provide the statements and documents which are often referred to as the peace process in the Middle East proceeds. The work is divided into five sections covering the 1967-79 period and chronological and subject indexes of the documents are provided in order to enhance the utility of the compilation. It is our intent that this volume serve as a useful and concise reference document for Members of Congress and interested individuals to assist in their assessment of the U.S. role in the Middle East and of the ongoing peace process.”

SEARCHING FOR STABLE PEACE IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Department of Defense. Kenneth Katzman. 2 February 1998. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1998. 35p. [Online Monograph].

SuDoc# D 101.146: 2001037129

Congressional Staffer Kenneth Katzman “reviews the history of dual containment, and shows how adherence to the policy has eroded. He suggests it is time for Washington to change course in the Gulf, and lays out a course of action the United States should follow to maintain its leadership role in this vital region.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS12549> (PDF)

<http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/1998/stable/stable.pdf> (PDF)

SITUATION IN LEBANON. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 1 December 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 36p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: L 49/3

“...a peaceful Lebanon, free of all foreign forces and sovereign over all its territory, will make a major contribution to Israeli security. To achieve this objective, we and the responsible international community support a three-part strategy in Lebanon: First, withdrawal forthwith of all foreign forces from Lebanon; Second, restoration of Lebanese Government sovereignty and strengthening of the Lebanese Armed Forces; And third, re-establishment of a Lebanese national consensus and reconstruction of the Lebanese economy. This strategy in support of the Lebanese Government is designed to achieve peace and security for both Lebanon and Israel. The withdrawal of all foreign forces will remove a threat to Israel’s border. Restoring Lebanon’s sovereignty and strength and rebuilding its economy will prevent that threat from returning. The United States is moving now to implement all three parts of this strategy.”

THE SITUATION IN LEBANON: U.S. ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 9 September 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982. 57p. [Hearing].

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

“With the successful evacuation of the PLO from Beirut, we have turned our attention to the next steps necessary for peace: The withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and the restoration of central authority in that country and, of prime importance, the reinvigoration of the Camp David peace process, designed to fairly

resolve the underlying Arab-Israeli dispute ... As the President announced, the U.S. Marine contingent of the multinational force will begin withdrawing from Beirut tomorrow. The Government of Lebanon, meanwhile, is working carefully but surely to reestablish authority over all parts of Beirut, with the Lebanese army and police increasingly assuming security responsibilities in the city.”

SOMALIA: U.S. POLICY OPTIONS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 6 February 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 45p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-416

“This hearing asks the question, what are the prospects and options for a coherent, long-term Somalia policy that aims to strengthen state capacity and curtail opportunities for terrorists and other international criminals within Somalia’s border ... In other words, how can we strengthen the law enforcement capacity of weak states, and then also avoid the mistakes of the cold war, when in the name of resisting and containing communism this country sometimes assisted some truly appalling regimes in Africa...”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19718>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS19719> (PDF)

THE STATES OF NORTH AFRICA IN THE 1970'S. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Africa; Subcommittee on the Near East. 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 18 & 19 July; 2 August 1972. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972. 244p. [Joint Hearings].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: AF 8/12

“The purpose of these hearings is threefold. First, to examine the varying U.S. economic, military, and political relations with Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya. Second, to delineate the significant political features of these countries and the trends of economic, political, and social development in the coming decade; and third, to discuss the orientations of these North African states, individually and collectively, toward the states and political issues of the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa and their relations with Europe.”

STRATEGIC GEOGRAPHY AND THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Department of Defense. Robert Harkavy. *Naval War College Review.* Vol. 54, No. 4, 2001. p.36-53. [Article].

SuDoc# D 208.209: 54/4

“Occupying a pivotal position at the juncture of Europe, Africa, and Asia, the ‘Greater Middle East’—here defined as the sum of the core Middle East, North Africa, the African Horn, South Asia, and ex-Soviet Central Asia—likewise occupies a crucial position with respect to some of the major issues areas of the contemporary era. Those issue areas are energy resources and availability; the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their delivery systems; and the dangerous pairings involving Israel and the Arabs, Iran and Iraq, and India and Pakistan. Surely, this region in its aggregate has come to be viewed by the contending and aspiring world powers—the United States, Russia, a united Europe, China—as a strategic prize, maybe *the* strategic prize.”

Online

<http://www.nwc.navy.mil/press/Review/2001/Autumn/art2-au1.htm>

SUDAN AND TERRORISM. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 15 May 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 92p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.105-223

“Osama bin Laden’s call for a jihad against the U.S., and particularly against U.S. soldiers in Saudi Arabia, will also be featured. Bin Laden was harbored by Sudan for almost 5 years, and was involved in attacks on U.S. soldiers in Somalia, Saudi Arabia, specifically in Riyadh and Dhahran.”

SUDAN: HUMANITARIAN CRISIS, PEACE TALKS, TERRORISM, AND U.S. POLICY. Library of Congress. Ted Dagne. 23 April 2003. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2003. 14p. [Online Report].

SuDoc# LC 14.19/3: IB98043

“Relations between the United States and Sudan are poor in part because of Khartoum’s human rights violations, its war policy in the south, and its support of international terrorism, although in recent months relations have improved somewhat.”

Online

<http://www.fas.org/man/crs/IB98043.pdf> (PDF)

SURVEY OF PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND EUROPE. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 103rd Congress, 2nd Session, March 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 27p. [Committee Print].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 31/18

“The MFO [Multinational Force and Observers] was established in 1982 to implement the 1979 Treaty and Protocol of the Israel/Egypt Peace Accords ... Until now, Egypt has pushed for continuing reductions in Sinai MFO personnel levels due to sensitivities about Egyptian sovereignty over the Sinai. Israel has always been particularly sensitive to any U.S. combat troop reductions. Whether or not, as some observers suggest, such troops serve as a potential ‘tripwire,’ they have provided a psychological, but not military, security blanket for Israel. Accordingly, Israel is less sensitive to the MFO’s financial costs than Egypt.”

SYRIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. SECURITY AND REGIONAL STABILITY. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia. 108th Congress, 1st Session, 16 September 2003. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004. 27p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SY 8/5

“Syria has reportedly manufactured varieties of aerial bombs containing chemical agents, such as sarin gas. According to Russian intelligence, Syria has stockpiles of thousands of chemical aerial bombs that are carried by various types of planes. Syria also has several thousand tactical munitions, including rockets and artillery shells containing sarin gas. Syria reportedly has three production facilities for chemical weapons, but more disturbing are reports that Syria is amassing chemical warheads for Scud missiles ... Syria reportedly produces 30 Scud C missiles per year at an underground facility, and many Western analysts agree that these Syrian Scud Cs, originally purchased from North Korea, are being armed for long-range chemical weapons delivery. Syrian sources have publicly confirmed the test firing of Scud B, and Scud C missiles with weaponized chemical agents. Further, recent public reports indicate that Syria has purchased and already processes ballistic cruise missiles that can carry warheads with clusters of chemical and biological agents.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS44173> (PDF)

http://wwwc.house.gov/international_relations/108/89406.pdf (PDF)

SYRIA: PEACE PARTNER OR ROGUE REGIME? U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 26 July 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 61p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SY 8/2

“The State Department’s terrorism report retained Syria on the terrorism list for yet another year, noting that Syria allows Iran to resupply Hizballah and that it provides safe haven and support for the Palestinian rejectionist groups, including Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command.”

TERRORISM AND THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 104th Congress, 2nd Session, 19 March 1996. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 47p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-706

The interconnected issues of terrorism and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.
Background concerning the use of terrorism to undermine the ongoing peace process.

TERRORISM AND THREATS TO U.S. INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 13 July 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 55p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. AR 5/2 A: 999-2000/59

“The present and future course of terrorism in the Middle East”, nations in the Middle East that sponsor or promote terrorism or harbor terrorists. Usama Bin Laden and his al-Qaeda terrorism network.

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS8839>

http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/security/has195240.000/has195240_of.htm

TERRORIST ATTACK IN DHAHRAN: PRESIDENT CLINTON—REMARKS BY PRESIDENT CLINTON, RELEASED BY THE WHITE HOUSE, OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY, WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 25, 1996. U.S. Department of State. William J. Clinton. *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. 347. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/27

“An explosion occurred this afternoon at the United States Military Housing Complex near Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. Our best information at this time is that there are many injured. There have been fatalities; we do not yet know how many. The explosion appears to be the work of terrorists, and, if that is the case, as with all Americans, I am outraged by it. The cowards who committed this murderous act must not go unpunished. Within a few hours, an FBI team will be on its way to Saudi Arabia to assist in the investigation. Our condolences and our prayers go out to the victims’ families and their friends. We’re grateful for the professionalism shown by the Saudi authorities in their reaction to this emergency. We are ready to work with them to make sure those responsible are brought to justice. Let me say again: We will pursue this. America takes care of its own. Those who did this must not go unpunished.”

Online

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

UNITED STATES ARMS SALE POLICY AND RECENT SALES TO EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 95th Congress, 2nd Session, 5 October 1978. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 204p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: EU 7/11

“Our ongoing military supply relationship with Saudi Arabia is a central aspect of our overall relationship. This relationship has been extremely important to major U.S. interests, including the search for peace in the Middle East, the fostering of political stability in the Persian Gulf/Arabian Peninsula, and an array of economic concerns, with particular reference to world energy and finance. The Saudis look to the U.S. as the primary force for world peace and security. They are concerned about radical threats to the Peninsula supported by outside powers. They regard the constancy of our military supply relationship as critical evidence of continued U.S. support for Saudi Arabia’s integrity and welfare.”

THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN SOMALIA, 1992-1994. U.S. Department of Defense. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2002. 27p. [Monograph].

SuDoc# D 114.2: SO 5

“The United States Army has a long tradition of humanitarian relief. No such operation has proven as costly or shocking, however, as that undertaken in Somalia from August 1992 to March 1994. Greeted initially by Somalis happy to be saved from starvation, U.S. troops were slowly drawn into interclan power struggles and ill-defined ‘nation-building’ missions.”

UNITED STATES DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 27 March 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 66p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-21

“Implicit, perhaps explicit, will be the question of whether policies in this area are placing America at a dangerous economic and national security risk.”

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT AND SUDAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 30 December 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 95p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: EG 9/4

“...plus for the Egyptian economy over the last several years has been the growth in assistance flows to Egypt, principally from the United States, but also from other bilateral donors and multilateral organizations. The United States provided Egypt from 1974 through fiscal year 1982 with just over \$7.6 billion in economic and food assistance ... Against the background of economic achievements and challenges, the United States has been providing Egypt with roughly \$1 billion a year in economic and food assistance. The level of U.S. aid to Egypt since 1974 has been politically determined in the context of U.S. efforts to promote a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.”

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD IRAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 105th Congress, 2nd Session, 14 May 1998. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. 44p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.105-611

“The new leader of Iran seems to have some good intentions, but ... the United States foreign policy is not about intentions, it is about actions, and in terms of actions there has been no change. Iran remains a sponsor of terrorism. It is still pursuing weapons of mass destruction, and ... it still stands as one of the United States’ implacable enemies.”

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD IRAN. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 1987. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 14, 16, 23 & 28 January 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 137p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.100-243

“Since the fall of the Shah in early 1979, Iran, under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini, has become the source of another kind of threat to Western interests in the Middle East. The combination of Iran’s religious zeal and determination to undermine governments pursuing orderly change has raised the specter of a fundamental shift in the political coloration of the Middle East as one generation gives way to another. While the immediacy of that possibility seems less than it did in late 1979 and early 1980, the acts of violence nurtured by Iran and the continuing appeal of religious extremism to neighboring politicized groups in the region keep the threat alive and serious.”

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD THE MIDDLE EAST AND PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 102nd Congress, 1st Session, 17 & 26 June 1991. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992. 159p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: M 58/32

“As a general statement, conditions in the occupied territories are bad, and are getting worse. Unemployment is reaching new high levels. It is in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 percent ... The Intifada continues. There has been an upsurge ... of killing of Palestinians by other Palestinians ... there is an atmosphere of extreme privation and apprehension and interest in the possibility of negotiations in the peace process ...”

U.S. ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN THE MIDDLE EAST. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 11 May 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 123p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-120

“The purpose of our hearing today is not only to review these important programs, but to evaluate them, to see what kind of improvements and what kind of adjustments can be made. We will be looking particularly to make sure that the funds are as well used and as highly targeted as possible.”

U.S. DEFENSIVE OPERATIONS AGAINST LIBYA AND THE NUCLEAR ACCIDENT AT CHERNOBYL. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 1 May 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 18p. [Markup].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: D 36/2

“...Mu’ammar Qadhafi’s prestige, if anything, was elevated certainly within his own country and probably within the Arab world, at least to the extent that they felt more of a requirement to be publicly supportive of him than they were before our attack ... the intention was to try to provide greater protection for American citizens and civilians of all nationalities from acts of terrorism. But it seems ... that with probably at least a half million Americans abroad at any one time, in and out of uniform, this kind of action toward a head of government, who is irrational in his behavior by our own description, is likely to make our citizens much more vulnerable to additional acts of terrorism.”

U.S. ENERGY SECURITY: OPTIONS TO DECREASE PETROLEUM USE IN THE TRANSPORTATION SECTOR. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science. Subcommittee on Energy. 107th Congress, 1st Session, 1 November 2001. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 127p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. SCI 2: 107-43

“The attacks of September 11th underline the Nation’s vulnerability to terror attacks; the economic repercussions of the attacks will be felt for some time. The U.S. economy is highly dependent on imported oil; around 56 percent of U.S. petroleum demand comes from overseas with around 20 percent coming from the Middle East. A

disruption of petroleum supplies, as witnessed after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, could have a devastating effect on the already weakened worldwide economy.”

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—A PRINCIPLED AND PURPOSEFUL ROLE IN THE WORLD: STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 1, 1996. U.S. Department of State. Secretary of State Warren Christopher. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 32, 5 August 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. p.405-410. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/32

“We are now working with the new government of Israel and our Arab partners to preserve the gains of the last few years and to build upon them. Since the prime minister’s meeting with President Clinton in Washington, we have seen positive developments. Israel completed a round of diplomacy with Egypt, Jordan, and Oman. It reaffirmed its commitment to the Oslo agreements, including redeployment from Hebron. Israeli Foreign Minister Levy met with Chairman Arafat. This week in Washington, President Mubarak assured President Clinton and me that Egypt will remain a strong pillar for peace. On his recent trip, my envoy Dennis Ross found the parties dedicated to pursuing peace and finding ways to move forward. Of course, many difficult decisions and issues lie ahead. But the President and I are determined to stay engaged because pursuing a comprehensive peace remains in the interest of the United States, Israel, and our Arab partners.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no32.html>

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD LIBYA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, 4 May 2000. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000. 35p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.106-740

“U.S. policy and policy goals vis-à-vis Libya have remained consistent through three administrations. Our goals have been to end Libyan support for terrorism, prevent Tripoli’s ability to obtain weapons of mass destruction, and contain Qadhafi’s regional ambitions. Since Lockerbie, we have added additional aims, including bringing the persons responsible to justice.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS8720>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS8444> (PDF)

U.S. INTERESTS IN, AND POLICIES TOWARD, THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 24 March; 2 April; 5 May; 1 & 28 July; 3 September 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 471p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/2/980

“The United States and its allies have important national interests in the Persian Gulf. For the next decade or two, we and our allies will have to depend on this oil-rich area for considerable portions of our energy requirements. The stability, balanced economic, political, and social growth, and independence of the States in this region become essential for the promotion of both our interests and those of our allies. It is critical in this process that our political policies and those of our friends and our unilateral military policies proceed apace and form a coherent whole.”

U.S. INTERESTS IN AND POLICY TOWARD THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on the Near East. 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 2 February; 7 June; 8 & 15 August 1972. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972. 212p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/2

“The Arabian Peninsula and the Persian Gulf form a unique area of the world. Economically, this uniqueness is due to the increasing dependence of many industrialized societies on petroleum products to run their economies and the existence of over two-thirds of the world’s proven oil reserves in the area. Politically and socially, this uniqueness is due, in part, to the nature of those Arab and Iranian societies that exist among these petroleum deposits. Some societies, with populations under half a million, today have annual oil revenues close to a billion dollars and, almost inevitably, will have higher revenues tomorrow ... The United States confronts this region now at a time when there are strong indications that by 1980 the United States will have to import almost one-half of its domestic fuel needs and half of those imports will have to come from the Persian Gulf.”

U.S. MIDDLE EAST POLICY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 96th Congress, 2nd Session, 20 March 1980. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. 55p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: M 58/20

“Over the years, the United States has been forthright in stating its position on these issues. We have made clear the following: Our unwavering support for Israel’s security and well-being; Our longstanding commitment to the independence and territorial integrity of all the states of the Middle East, including Israel’s right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries; ... Our conviction, shared by Egypt and Israel, that a comprehensive peace must include a resolution of the

Palestinian problem in all its aspects; Our firm position that we will not recognize or negotiate with the PLO [Palestinian Liberation Organization] so long as the PLO does not recognize Israel's right to exist ...; Our unswerving commitment to the negotiating process laid out at Camp David; and our strong view that in the interim the parties should conduct themselves in accordance with international law and commonsense restraint so as to build trust that a sequence of successful negotiations can bring about a just, honorable, and lasting peace for all.”

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN SOMALIA PEACEKEEPING. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 19 & 20 October 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993. 119p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.103-318

“Unnecessary confrontations with General Aideed cost the lives of many U.N. peacekeepers, including over 25 Americans ... Many questions remain concerning the perceived inconsistencies of our mission there and the events leading up to and including the October 3, 1993, raid which cost so many lives.”

U.S. POLICIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST: REMARKS BY THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR POLITICAL AFFAIRS AT THE MIDDLE EAST INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, DC, OCTOBER 16, 1998. U.S. Department of State. Thomas R. Pickering. *Dispatch*. Vol. 9, No. 10, November 1998. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998. p.13-17. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 9/10

“The Middle East thus presents unique challenges. Many of its more intractable problems have their roots in the region's long history and require special consideration. Foremost among these, of course, is the Arab-Israeli dispute. Its antecedents date back thousands of years ... Saddam Hussein uses history by invoking the legacy of the Babylonians to legitimize his aggressions and Iraq's persistent refusal to rejoin the family of nations. Across the Middle East, radical movements exploit religion for political ends, positing a false dichotomy between Islam and the West. Even moderates in the region speak of a 'clash of cultures,' when discussing relations with the U.S., and chastise us for what they perceive as double standards and an anti-Islamic bias.”

Online

http://www.state.gov/www/policy_remarks/1998/981016_pickering_policies.html

<http://www.state.gov/www/publications/dispatch/Nov1998.pdf> (PDF)

U.S. POLICY IN SOMALIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 103rd Congress, 1st Session, 29 July 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994. 22p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.103-355

“Current and anticipated role of U.S. forces within the larger peacekeeping operation ... it must be made clear to this body and to the American people what direction the UNOSOM II operation is going to take.”

U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST: STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 2, 1995. U.S. Department of State. Robert H. Pelletreau. *Dispatch.* Vol. 6, No. 33, 14 August 1995. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. p.638-642. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 6/33

“We know that for peace in the Middle East to take root and spread, it must be accompanied by tangible change in the lives of people in the region. The Administration is making a major effort to spread the benefits of peace by bringing private sector resources to bear on the region’s pressing economic needs. We are committed first and foremost to promoting U.S. business in the region, not only by helping U.S. companies secure contracts, but also by reducing barriers to trade and investment and ensuring that the rights of American businesses are not infringed. The Administration is also sponsoring the second Middle East/North Africa economic summit, to be held in Amman, Jordan, in October. Last year’s inaugural economic summit in Casablanca brought together representatives of 61 countries and more than 1,000 businesspeople to discuss economic development needs and commercial prospects of the region. Participants at Casablanca endorsed the concept of a public-private partnership—a concept which underlies our objectives for Amman. At the summit, we hope to be in a position to announce the creation of a regional bank, as well as regional councils for business and for tourism.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1995/html/Dispatchv6no33.html>

U.S. POLICY IN THE MUSLIM WORLD. U.S. Institute of Peace. *Peace Watch.* Vol. 1, No. 3, April 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1995. p. 1. [Article].

SuDoc# Y 3. P 31: 15-2/V.1/NO.3

“Sound U.S. policy needs to distinguish between violent extremism in Muslim countries and genuine concern for political acceptance and social reform ... Western governments, like the United States, must deal with this challenge in the broader

context of their relations with diverse Islamic states with contrasting histories, geographies, and peoples.”

U.S. POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 4 & 5 December 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 201p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.101-1128/PT.1

“Today the United States stands ready to engage in military conflict in the Persian Gulf, a risk of many, many lives, our own, Arab, others. A war could leave the oilfields of the Middle East in ruin, could alter the balance of power in that region, and also could have catastrophic consequences for the economies of the West and the emerging democracies in Eastern Europe.”

U.S. POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 101st Congress, 2nd Session, 6, 12 & 13 December 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. 277p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.101-1128/PT.2

“This morning, we will hear from a distinguished panel of public witnesses who will address a number of critical issues, including the administration’s contention that Iraq is close to developing a nuclear weapon and the prospects for a negotiated solution to the conflict.”

U.S. POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 101st Congress, 1st Session, 5 & 20 September; 17 October 1990. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990. 124p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.101-1019

“Will opinion in the Arab world support a major American presence in defense of the Saudi monarchy and Saudi oil? Will American opinion support such a presence for such a purpose? Is there an all-Arab approach that produce long-term stability in the Gulf region by bringing the military strength of countries such as Egypt to bear in defense of Saudi oil in exchange for a greater sharing within the Arab world of the proceeds from that oil wealth?”

U.S. POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 15 December 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1988. 62p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/9

“The recent missile attacks against Kuwait illustrate that Iran continues to seek to intimidate small moderate Gulf States. Iran has publicized its plan to launch a winter offensive and has a degree of mobilization already underway to that end. As the Arab summit illustrated when it met in Amman, Jordan, last month, the number of voices calling for an end to the War is growing. However, some states do not yet share our sense of urgency. Some have maintained that Iran needs more time ... Meanwhile on our own Operation Staunch, we continue to make real progress. Our effort to stem the flow of arms to Iran through bilateral consultations with other countries, wide ranging across the globe, is in full force ... In sum, we will stay the course in the Gulf. Peace is not going to come there over night. The task of American diplomacy is to end this tragic war as quickly as possible. Both sides have suffered too long and paid a horribly high price in human lives and economic devastation.”

U.S. POLICY TOWARD EGYPT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 105th Congress, 1st Session, 10 April 1997. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997. 164p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: EG 9/2

“Today’s hearing is also occasioned by the regrettable widespread perception that the United States and Egypt appear to be moving further apart on a range of critical issues. The latest example of discord occurred most recently when, under Egyptian leadership, the Arab League recommended that its member States ceased normalizing relations with Israel and to restore the old economic boycott. Egypt’s leadership role in that vote puzzles and dismays many of its friends in the United States ... but the Arab League vote is only the latest in a series of other moves by Egypt in recent years ... Egypt has repeatedly called for easing sanctions against Libya and has refused to support even mild antiterrorism resolutions against Sudan. Egypt has opposed U.S. initiatives to compel Iraqi compliance with U.N. resolutions and advocated the reintegration of Iraq into the Arab fold ... Many of our colleagues are also concerned that Egypt has abdicated its leadership role for peace and is gradually adopting a more hostile posture toward Israel.”

U.S. POLICY TOWARD IRAN. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 9 November 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. 124p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IR 1/2

“Our hearing today will focus on Iran’s conventional military buildup, its programs for mass destruction and our nation’s response. We will also review the Iran-Russia relationship regarding nuclear cooperation. We also want to explore Iran’s bilateral relationship with states in the Middle East and gulf regions; its opposition to the Middle East process; its active support for terrorist groups; and its efforts to subvert governments by manipulating its diplomatic immunity through its embassies and

diplomatic personnel. We also want to assess Iran's efforts in neutralizing opposition at home and abroad."

U.S. POLICY TOWARD IRAN, JANUARY 1979. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 17 January 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 69p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: IR 1/979

"...there is a widespread feeling on the part of many people in our own country that this man is a kind of religious fanatic whose determination to establish an Islamic Republic in Iran is fundamentally incompatible with our own interests ... He is talking now about a foreign policy for Iran which carries with it the implication that it might be overtly hostile to Western interests in the Persian Gulf ... if Khomeini had his way Iran would stop selling oil to any other countries around the world because in Khomeini's view, according to the Shah, this represented a kind of rape of Iran's natural resources, and he pointed out that to the extent the whole economy and social structure of Iran was dependent upon its oil revenues, this would constitute a formula for catastrophe in his country."

U.S. POLICY TOWARD IRAN AND IRAQ. U.S. Congress. Senate Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 2 March; 3 August 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 174p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.104-280

"Our policy, therefore, is aimed at pressuring Tehran to halt its pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, its sponsorship of terrorism and violence, designed to undermine the Middle East peace process, its attempts to destabilize countries in the region, and its record on human rights abuses."

U.S. POLICY TOWARD SYRIA AND THE SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 18 September 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 107p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: SY 8/3

"...Syria has demonstrated that it continues to actively undermine the basis for our campaigning against terrorism and our initiatives aimed at ending the violence in Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza. According to the State Department's report on Patterns of Global Terrorism—2001, Syria continued to provide 'safe haven and logistics support to Hezbollah, HAMAS, Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine—General Command, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and other terrorist organizations.'"

U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE MIDDLE EAST: STEERING A STEADY COURSE: ADDRESS BEFORE THE CHAUTAUQUA INSTITUTION, CHAUTAUQUA, NEW YORK, AUGUST 21, 1996. U.S. Department of State. Robert H. Pelletreau. *Dispatch*. Vol. 7, No. 35, 26 August 1996. Washington, DC: Office of Public Communication, Bureau of Public Affairs; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996. p.429-432. [Text of Remarks].

SuDoc# S 1.3/5: 7/35

“Let me be more specific about our interests in the Middle East. They include, first and foremost, achieving a just, comprehensive, secure, and durable Arab-Israeli peace; helping maintain the security and well-being of Israel; preventing regional conflicts and supporting friendly nations; ensuring the free flow of oil from the Gulf upon which we and the other industrial nations depend for our economic security; enhancing business opportunities for our companies and jobs for our citizens; suppressing terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction; containing rogue regimes in Iran, Iraq, and Libya; advancing respect for human rights, the rule of law, and open, and participatory societies; and preserving the deep cultural ties we have to the origins of Western civilization and the birthplace of the great monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. All of these give our nation a concrete and lasting stake in the Middle East.”

Online

<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1996/html/Dispatchv7no35.html>

U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 10 May 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 110p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: P 43/6

“In the last year or so there have been positive developments in the area focusing on the continued orderly development of the six states on the Arabian Peninsula side of the gulf and their progress toward greater cooperation manifested in the formation of a Gulf Council for Cooperation. We have seen general improvements in relations between the Gulf Council states in Iraq, some enhancement of Iraqi relations with Western Europe, and some expansion of our own contacts with the Iraqi Government as well as growth in our commercial ties. Unfortunately, Iran remains gripped in its revolution, at war with Iraq and in an uneasy relationship with other gulf neighbors. We see little prospect for the improvement of our relationship with Iran in the foreseeable future. At the same time, the Iranians know that the United States remains committed to preserve the territorial integrity of all countries in the area, including Iran and Iraq, and is firmly opposed to outside intervention in the internal affairs of Iran and its neighbors.”

U.S. SANCTIONS ON IRAN: NEXT STEPS. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on International Relations. Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade. 104th Congress, 1st Session, 2 May 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995. 115p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. IN 8/16: IR 1

“There seems to be very little in the way of disagreement as to U.S. objectives in regard to Iran. Iran needs to end its support for terrorism, much of which is designed to undermine the Middle East peace process. Iran must cease its development of weapons of mass destruction and missiles by which to deliver them. Iran must significantly alter its abhorrent record on human rights.”

U.S. SECURITY INTERESTS IN THE PERSIAN GULF. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. 97th Congress, 1st Session, 16 March 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981. 102p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: SE 2/9

“Arabian peninsula leaders today are critical of recent American foreign policy. They regard the United States as timid, weak, and inconsistent and worry about the United States being able to keep its security and political commitments ... States in the gulf accept the need for a larger American military presence and activity in the region but they usually want that presence outside their borders and over-the-horizon ... Saudi Arabia, despite its limited military capabilities, remains the key country in the Arabian Peninsula in the sense Saudi views tend to dominate and are usually followed by other, smaller Gulf States ... In its dealings with Saudi Arabia, the United States should avoid two tendencies: (a) Allowing its visiting representatives to confront the Saudis with too many competing and uncoordinated demands thereby straining the small and tightly centralized Saudi decision making system; and (b) overzealous accommodation of Saudi positions.”

U.S. VULNERABILITY TO AN OIL IMPORT CURTAILMENT: THE OIL REPLACEMENT CAPABILITY (SUMMARY). U.S. Congress. 98th Congress. September 1984. Washington, DC: U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1984. 43p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 3. T 22/2: 2 OI 5/6/SUM.

“This is the summary of a report that responds to a request by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for an analysis of the U.S. oil replacement capability in the event of an oil supply shortfall of indefinite duration ... The report analyzes energy supply and demand technologies which can replace large amounts of oil within 5 years after the onset of a major oil supply shortfall, occurring within the next few years and accompanied by a large and enduring increase in oil prices. Emphasis is placed on those technologies that are commercially available now or are likely to be commercial by 1985, and, within this group, attention is given to the least cost alternatives to oil.

In addition, the report analyzes the macroeconomic effects of an oil shortfall and how these effects could be influenced by different rates of investment in oil replacement technologies.”

THE USE OF UNITED STATES SUPPLIED MILITARY EQUIPMENT IN LEBANON. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs; Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. 97th Congress, 2nd Session, 15 July; 4 August 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983. 68p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: L 49/3

“Today we meet to receive complete and detailed information on the use of U.S.-supplied military equipment by Israel in the recent Lebanese incursion. Previously, we the subcommittees have received excellent briefings on the political-military situation in Lebanon from various administration witnesses. However, the specific issue of whether Israel may have violated the Arms Export Control Act by using U.S.-supplied military equipment in Lebanon has yet to be fully and completely explored between the Congress and the administration. As you know, section 4 of the Armed Export Control Act states in part: ‘Defense articles shall be sold under this act to friendly countries solely for internal security, and for legitimate self-defense...’

VISIT TO EASTERN EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST BY THE SENATE DELEGATION TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. 96th Congress, 1st Session, May 1979. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979. 30p. [Report].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: N 81 A/7

“The American interest in the stability and orderly development of Saudi Arabia began 40 years ago with the ARAMCO concession. The 1945 meeting between President Roosevelt and King Abdulaziz Ibn Saud commenced an unbroken manifestation of official U.S. concern for the Kingdom’s welfare, and led to Saudi dependence on the United States as the major power which could be trusted to guide Saudi Arabia into the modern world. For over a quarter century our relationship expanded gradually and soundly, reflecting the measured pace of Saudi development and our important but limited interests in a nation with values quite unlike our own. Our direct interest was in protecting American oil investment and opening promising commercial markets; an equally important indirect concern was the need of our NATO allies and Japan for Saudi oil ... Saudi Arabia is in a position to have a crucial influence on three issues of major importance to the United States: Middle East peace, oil and the dollar. Our responsiveness to Saudi security concerns, as demonstrated in the F-15 sale and the President’s positive response to King Khalid’s request for additional American arms for North Yemen, has strengthened the United States-Saudi relationship.”

WAR POWERS, LIBYA, AND STATE-SPONSORED TERRORISM. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Security and Science. 99th Congress, 2nd Session, 29 April; 1 & 15 May 1986. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986. 382p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/1: W 29/12

“...when we respond with military force to state-sponsored terrorism directed against the United States, should it not be consistent with our own laws and constitutional procedures? We have experienced difficulty defining the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress and the Chief Executive and ensuring compliance with the statutory requirement of the War Powers Resolution.”

WEAK STATES IN AFRICA: U.S. POLICY IN ANGOLA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 16 October 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 34p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-800

“This hearing marks the last in a series of hearings focusing on weak states of Africa and looking at our policy in those states with fresh eyes in the wake of the horrific attacks of September 11, 2001 ... to try to draw attention to some of the manifestations of states’ weaknesses in various parts of Africa, both in terms of humanitarian and economic collapse and in terms of such phenomena as piracy, illicit air transport networks, and trafficking in arms, gemstones, and people. I wanted to call attention to these issues and to explore long-term policy options for changing the context in these states and addressing the relationship between criminal activity, corruption, and humanitarian crisis to help make these states less appealing to criminal opportunists.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS26237>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS26239> (PDF)

WEAK STATES IN AFRICA: U.S. POLICY IN LIBERIA. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on African Affairs. 107th Congress, 2nd Session, 11 June 2002. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002. 58p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. F 76/2: S.HRG.107-676

“...because our post September 11 understanding of security threats must include international criminal networks that operate in Africa, because allowing Liberia to deteriorate further without taking action is to ignore a major human tragedy, and because the success or failure of a major international intervention in the region hangs in the balance—it makes sense to focus on Liberia today.”

Online

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24417>

<http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS24418> (PDF)

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

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

“A positive fall-out of the September 11 attacks and the demise of Afghanistan’s Taliban regime is the sudden global attention to the problems facing women in the Muslim world.”

Online

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

WORLD OIL OUTLOOK. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. 100th Congress, 1st Session, 22 January; 11 March 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987. 188p. [Hearing].

SuDoc# Y 4. EN 2: S.HRG.100-39

“...by the early 1990s we shall see a world oil market dominated by an ‘inner cartel,’ fewer in number than the present OPEC consisting of the principal Persian Gulf producers. Were Iran to crush Iraq in the ongoing conflict, that inner cartel itself might be primarily dominated by Iran. The prestige and power of Iran has been rising of late. We have recently had revealed the willingness of the United States itself, contrary to our professions, to propitiate the Iranian regime ... quite simply American oil dependency means lessened leeway in foreign policy. As the leading Western power, the United States cannot afford to have its freedom of action too constrained ... How easy would it be for some future President to strike at an Arab oil producer under conditions in which the international oil market is tight and the United States were dependent on imported oil for more than 50 percent of its supply?”