

*Milestones of American policy under  
the Bush Presidency in Palestine and  
the Gulf and its destructive effects  
upon the Islamic Ummah*



**Al-Khilafah Publications  
Suite 298  
56 Gloucester Road  
London SW7 4UB**

e-mail: [info@khilafah.com](mailto:info@khilafah.com)  
website: <http://www.khilafah.com>



**Al-Khilafah Publications**  
**Suite 298**  
**56 Gloucester Road**  
**London SW7 4UB**

e-mail: [info@khilafah.com](mailto:info@khilafah.com)  
website: <http://www.khilafah.com>

Hizb-ut Tahrir  
15th Safar, 1422 Hijri  
8th May, 2001 CE

**ISBN: 1 899 57413 1**

---

سُبْحَانَكَ - subhanahu wa ta'ala  
سَلَامٌ عَلَيْكَ - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam



Bismillah Ar-Rahmaan Ar-Raheem

**T**he new Bush administration has not announced a detailed clear plan for its policies related to the Middle East, nor even for the remaining regions of the world at the time these lines were written. That is because it is undertaking a comprehensive review, study and planning of these policies. Colin Powell, the secretary of state, said commenting on this subject: *"I have started to take off everything from its roots. Then, if we see it suitable, we will re-plant it."* He also stated on 19/3/2001 *"The age of Bush government is only two months hence reviewing of where we go in our dealing with these issues (the Middle East) is somehow premature. However, some of the principal aspects of our foreign policy are still evolving..."* Bush said in a press conference he held with Tony Blair in Camp David on 23/2/2001: *"We carry out review of all policies in all regions of the world. One of the places which we will give a large amount of time is the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Soon the foreign secretary of state will go there to listen to our allies about drawing the best policy..."* He also said: *"In fact Powell is going (to the Middle East) so as to listen. He will seek the opinion of our friends and people of the Middle East. Before fashioning any policy, we would have listened, then naturally we will consult with the friends and allies like the Prime Minister (Tony Blair) present here during our carrying out of a comprehensive study of the policy which we hope and know will be more practical."* And Colin Powell (the secretary of state) said while on his trip to Cairo on 23/2/2001: *"We have to arrange work about three things: Stabilising the situation, reducing the level of violence and returning economic activity. After we mobilise these three things once more and it will take some time...then we will begin to look at where we are. Then there will be a new Israeli government in place. Then we will begin to see from where we will begin discussions for a second time, upon what basis on this government will be ready for discussion. It is not clear from where we will begin that. Some of them see the beginning from Taba and others see the beginning from another place. We will see how we can begin these negotiations."*

Edward Walker (undersecretary for near Eastern affairs) said in his speech at the Washington Center for Near Eastern Policy on 21/3/2001: *"...It is a frustrating task to come here sixty days after the government (of Bush) has taken the reigns of power, where we indulge in a condensed way in reviewing and refashioning policy towards the Middle East then attempting to place it in its proper place and prospective, and particularly when we have not completed this process (review) yet...We hold meetings every two days regarding policy facing the Middle East to discuss the Palestinian-Israeli problems and the question of Iraq. These meetings are nothing but the beginning because we are expecting more debates in this period regarding questions like Iran and other regions which concern us. Therefore, this is an effort in many ways seeking to asses policy from its basis, from zero, and taking a profound look at the situation of each of these cases then deciding what we truly endeavour to achieve, and how we can realize results in the best manner."* Condoleeza Rice (Bush's National Security Advisor) said on 22/2/2001: *"I believe that we are actively engaged in reviewing everything at this moment."* *In this way, the present period in which the Bush government is passing, is a period of laying down the policies for all regions of the world including the heart of the Islamic world or what they call the Middle East."*

This delay in laying down the policies returns to the nature of the work, its complexity and breadth since it includes all regions of the world. It also returns to the infancy of the government and the delay in the taking of its duties in accordance with the constitutional rules due to the comedy which occurred in counting the votes in the state of Florida (a matter that the Democrats emphasized at the time) and what resulted from that delay of deferring the choice and appointment of the officials and the taking up of their positions. Colin Powell said at a press conference on 9/2/2001: *"I am the only person approved-by Congress-in the administration,"* referring to the heaviness of the work and the scarcity of officials. It also returns , to a great extent , to the distraction and pre-occupation of the president with the domestic policy , particularly as he is working from this moment to win the coming presidency, and his attention with the issues of the western hemisphere of the world , giving them priority over the remaining international issues. Another reason for the delay is the administration's over-occupation in confronting the economic recession which the American economy suffers of at the present time, and which naturally is reflected upon the world economy. This is beside the work to decide the budget for 2002 by the two assemblies of the congress which took a long time debating to decide it by the two Houses (the Representatives and Senators) due to what it included of large tax cuts in accordance with the usual views of the Republican party in its serving of the interests of the owners of capital, particularly as this reduction was unprecedented in American history, just as the delay relates to the concern in the energy crisis

which America suffers at the present time. Bush said on 29/3/2001: *"We need to face the challenge of the energy crisis which is a reality in California and it appears in other parts of the country if we do not move quickly."*

This preoccupation of the new American administration with the domestic affairs, and the resulting delay in putting into place its policies, made it stumble on its course until now . So it proceeds aimlessly or on the foot steps of the previous administration, contrary to what it pretends or announces to the masses. This stumbling is clear in the contradictory statements of officials over a single issue which pushes journalists to publish these contradictions giving them biting criticism.

The result of this stumbling and delay manifested itself to many observers and rulers of the region, as if America has withdrawn her hand from the Palestinian issue or has just about done so. However this is naturally contrary to the reality and it does not even come to the mind of anyone with the least knowledge of the objective of American policy. Bush said in a press conference with Mubarak at the White House on 4/1/2001: *"We are extremely preoccupied in the Middle East and will remain like that. In fact the foreign secretary made phone contact with Sharon this morning, and I made phone contacts with some leaders in the Middle East. I will continue actively preoccupied in consolidating a peaceful solution to the question. On top of all that, most of our talks today were around the discussion of how to bring about peace to the Middle East...However we will remain extremely involved, and we are hopeful that there will be positive results."* He also said in a press conference on 29/3/2001: *"We are completely involved in the Middle East. We are on the phone all the time with the leaders."* Powell said on 23/2/2001: *"There will be negotiations, and there is no choice except to move forward ultimately...America will play its role, we will play our role with strength. President Bush will be pre-occupied, I will be involved, however some matters must be achieved first."* Wocker said in a hearing session before a House of Representatives subcommittee on 29/3/2001: *"The members of the sub-committee realise profoundly the importance of the Middle East and the reason for the bold devotion of this administration to follow our interests there and consolidating them. Throwing an examining glance upon the first two months (of the current government in power) emphasizes this fact clearly. In his first trip outside the country, the (foreign) secretary went to the Middle East where he met the leaders of Egypt and...And during the coming two weeks Mubarak...and Abdullah will make a visit to the White House. The secretary aspires to make consultations with both of them and seek their views about the situation in the region while we are reviewing our policies there...We will engage and remain engaged in the affairs of the Middle East; and the press predictions that we will withdraw from the region are completely wrong The interests and concerns of the American people require nothing less than that. We have*

to proceed forward and link that with undertaking reliable consultations with our friends and allies in the region while we are developing new policies that take in consideration the extremely troubled situation we see there.” This is beside other numerous statements which emphasise the continuation of American policy in its concern and involvement with the affairs of the Middle East.

Despite the fact that the foreign policy of the administration of the new president Bush was not completed, the milestones of this destructive policy to the Islamic Ummah have appeared in the statements of officials on numerous occasions, in press conferences, declarations, meetings, public sessions, in Congress etc. Though these statements differ in style from the previous ones, they are no less dangerous in their crude challenge and open enmity to the Islamic Ummah, trying assiduously to harm Muslims and attempting to humiliate them. This is beside their disgraceful bias to the side of our most vehement enemies, the Jews.

One of the features of this destructive policy against Muslims and their interests is making available strong and unlimited political, financial and military protection to the Jewish entity existing in Palestine, supplying it with new advanced lethal weapons, and maintaining the superiority of this entity through the high quality of its weapons over all the Islamic peoples. This is considered one of the pillars of the hostile policy towards Muslims related to the Middle East. Bush said in his reception to Sharon, the Jewish prime minister, in the White House on 20/3/2001: *“It is an honour for me to welcome the prime minister of a friendly state and close ally to us here in the oval office....”* He also said on the occasion of his congratulations to him for his success in the elections, on 6/2/2001: *“The US worked with every Israeli leader since its establishment in the year 1948 and our bilateral relations are as strong as a rock , and likewise is the US commitment to Israeli security. I have great confidence in Prime Minister Sharon.”* His foreign secretary, Colin Powell, said before the budgetary committee of the House of Representatives on 15/3/2001: *“Israel is a friend and strong ally to us , and Israeli security will always remain a great priority to the American people and American government; a matter which will remain the same in relation to the present government.”* In his speech at the American-Israeli Political Action Committee (AIPAC) in Washington on 19/3/2001, he said: *“Today while I have these thoughts in my mind, I would like to return to the past for a period of ten years, to 19th March, 1991, when I was given the last opportunity to address this prominent organization. At that point I said the following: ‘We stood with Israel the day it was founded; and we stood with Israel throughout its history. We have demonstrated time and time again that our roots are entwined as it is the case with all nations who share our belief in openness and democracy. Therefore there must be no doubt here in*

regards to our commitment towards Israel; and that America will stand on the side of Israel today, and on Israel's side in the future; Today I am proud to say that these words remain true.”

He also said: *“There is a special friendship linking America with Israel, just as George Bush said before your conference one year ago when he was a governor of the state of Texas. I stand here today to emphasise this friendship another time. It includes all sides of life. This strong relationship ranges from areas of politics and economics to areas of security and culture. This relationship between two democratic systems will continue strong like a rock. It represents an unconditional relationship, deep-rooted and broad, a link built upon history, interests, values and ideologies. We are resolved on maintaining this special relationship with Israel and the Israeli people. We realise that Israel exists in a region of extreme danger. Therefore we will work and examine means to consolidate our valuable strategic co-operation with Israel in order to protect its military superiority.”* This is a sample of what officials in the new Bush administration declared, when only two months had passed in office. They have been preceded thereupon by the previous, president Clinton, and other presidents and officials with similar hostile statements provoking Muslims' emotions. Clinton said in Los Angeles on 14/8/2000: *“...We have to continue standing with Israel as we did throughout my ruling as president and during the previous fifty two years. We will assist Israel in preserving its security....”* He said in his speech on 7/1/2001: *“I said what I said (in a speech in which he praised the Jews) setting out from a deep commitment and love throughout the life of the state of Israel.”* He also said, *“I think America will be permanently there (in the Middle East) so as to protect the security of Israel.”* He added, *“and to the citizens of Israel, who returned to their homeland after 2000 years, and who were about to lose their hopes and dreams in the fire of the holocaust...The people of Israel had a dream one day to have a homeland, and that dream has been realised..”* *“...There will never be permanent peace or stability in the region without Israel enjoying strength and security, security sufficient to achieve peace and strength sufficient to repel adversaries who will remain (active) there even if peace was achieved with complete good intentions. It is clear that this is the reason that calls the United States to necessarily continue its commitment to maintain the characteristic Israeli supremacy in terms of its military supremacy.”* This is but a brief overview at the abundant statements made by US officials over the past few decades. We believe that they are sufficient to make Muslims reconsider their affairs with these agent rulers who betrayed them and left to them this legacy of burden, which will cost millions of martyrs. These rulers insist to continue as agents for this wicked covetous enemy, thus neglecting the interests of the Ummah. It is obligatory upon all the sons of the Ummah to take the stance of war as the firm basis for dealing with this enemy (and to view it from this angle). This is because any position different to this is to neglect her future and a betrayal to Allah ﷻ, His Messenger ﷺ and the Muslim community. It is a duty upon the armies lying in wait in the army barracks to move to protect this Ummah and seize the initiative from the hand of this enemy and

its agents. They are not allowed to remain protecting the palaces of the tyrants which have become nests of conspiracy against them, in exchange for some dirhams to fill a belly, for rank and medals which have no weight with Allah ﷻ in the least.

The government of Bush reveals their sinister designs exercised against the interests of the Ummah by their agent Mubarak (the chief broker) and the British agent Abdullah (the child of treachery) which the US government uses in return for a handful of dollars. Colin Powell said in his press conference with Amru Mousa in Cairo on 24/2/2001: *“President Bush requested me to make Egypt the first station in my trip to the Middle East, so as to obtain advice and consultation from President Mubarak over the many critical questions....”* Mubarak said in the press conference with Bush at the White House on 4/2/2001: *“I strongly desire to work with him (Bush) on all issues related to the Middle East and particularly the Middle East problem-the Palestinian problem...We will work with (all) our efforts and we will co-operate with the two main players, together with the United States of America....”* Astonishingly demonstrating of Mubarak's faithful subordination (to his US masters), is that he repeated Bush's very words at the press conference in the English language when he said: *“We are not going to impose any solution upon the parties. We will facilitate the situation so that they will be able to sit together to discuss....”* Wocker said before the House of Representatives committee on 29/3/2001: *“We value our reliable relations with Egypt and our co-operation in political, military and economic issues. The President (Bush) continues his complete support to the (financial) aid which we offer to Egypt to assist it enact reforms in its economic system and build its military strength so as to be an effective ally for the United States. Egypt's leading role in the Middle East became evident in an ample way when it (Egypt) became the first Arab country to enter into a peace treaty with Israel more than twenty years ago. This appeared again in 1991 when we formed an international coalition to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi aggression. Today Mubarak plays a core role among those who call for peace in the region and he condemns openly the calls for violence against Israel-calls to fight the Jews-and to use oil as a weapon. He spoke opposing the economic boycott of American goods and recently he supported our efforts to preserve balance in the Security Council...”* He said: *“Jordan and Egypt are two key players in the search for peace just as they are vital partners for the United States and Jordan is a principal moderate ally and supporter of peace.”* On 11/4/2001, a senior official (whose name was not mentioned) convened a press conference at the White House (on the occasion of the visit of Abdullah) wherein he said: *“Jordan is a very important ally to the United States in the region, and it has a decisive role in the efforts to build peace in the Middle East...and he (President Bush) values highly the very strong support which Jordan offered for many years in efforts for peace”* He also said: *“...the President expressed a readiness for (giving) strong support and assistance, and expressed his*

*gratitude for the assistance Jordan offered in the area in terms of the measures to confront terrorism.”*

In this interval in which American policy passes through a stage of review, study and comprehensive planning, it appears that it is undertaking the study of the region (Middle East) through a comprehensive regional viewpoint. Colin Powell said before the Senate foreign affairs committee on 17/1/2001: *“We intend to consolidate our efforts on the region as a whole, not simply on the peace process alone. We are preparing to work with all parties in the region to achieve a comprehensive solution. Peace for Israel means peace with all its neighbours including Syria, where we need to build upon the opportunity that presented itself with the Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon.”* He explicitly stated in an interview with American television networks (CBS & CNN) on 11/2/2001: *“We will try to view the peace process in the Middle East, as it is called, being placed in a wider regional context.”* Also, during his trip to Cairo on 23/1/2001: *“The most important thing is to emphasise that all our actions, whether they relate to the United Nations, or what occurs in Israel or Gaza and the West Bank, and all our regional activity and bilateral relations with Egypt, Saudi Arabia and everyone else, we will link them together in a regional framework.”* Wocker said before the House of Representatives subcommittee: *“This administration will interact with the region as one complete whole. It is clear that there are individual issues that must be dealt with subjectively as they appear. However, everything we do and everything we say about any particular issue, usually has implications and consequences upon our other interests in the region....”* And he said in the speech he gave at the Washington Centre for Near Eastern Policy on 21/3/2001: *“...of great importance is to understand the general direction of the government, that is we have to look to the region as a whole. We cannot isolate an issue (a place) and deal with another. This is because each problem has effects on every other problem. Due to this reason, we try in our study of these issues (related to the Middle East) to adopt a comprehensive approach if this expression is correct.”* The chief official in the White House said in his press conference on 11/4/2001: *“I believe we understand the explosive situation in the region at this time, and the complexities of all relations between these issues. For this reason, the American administration attempts to put into place general guidelines for its policy in the region as a comprehensive regional policy, while realising all the complexities and intricacies between them.”*

In this way, the devils of the White House, in their new administration, prepare plans and styles to mobilise all their agents in the region and other regions, as well as using the service of the agents of others to bring the region into a whirlpool of numerous and successive conspiracies which all revolve around achieving their interests. What follows this are calamities and terrible costs that the Muslims suffer of, in terms of blood-spilling, destruction of property and

squandering of wealth; precisely as Bush-the father-did when he gathered the world's armies in the second Gulf War in 1991, thus extending American dominance and influence over the Gulf, and made its puppet-like agent states bases for rapid intervention forces, training grounds for their regular live manoeuvres overseas and an arsenal for weapons. This enabled them to achieve a goal they sought to achieve seriously from the beginning of the seventies of the last century, which was to consolidate their grasp on the oil wells and facilitate their plunder smoothly and easily. Just as they destroyed the Iraqi military industrial projects which cost billions of dollars and consolidate their control over them to prevent their return once more. Just as they opened wide the door for the treacherous peace projects in the Middle East beginning with the ominous Madrid conference of 1991. They also planted division and opposition between the Islamic peoples in the region and kept them occupied with each other instead of occupying themselves with opposing the Americans and uprooting the Jewish entity which the disbelieving Western states planted in the heart of the Muslim lands. These people still suffer from this wicked conspiracy to this day. Anthony Cordesman described these activities before the Senate foreign affairs committee on 1/3/2001 saying: *"Since one decade, and under the rule of a president whose surname was Bush, we came out of a serious crisis in the foreign policy in the Middle East with a situation where we achieved therein the greatest gains since World War Two."*

In regards to the Palestinian problem, the Clinton administration endeavoured to resolve it comprehensively and finally, and that is via a solution called *"Permanent Status Issues"* i.e. Jerusalem, borders, security, refuges, settlements and the like, as stated in the two treacherous accords of Oslo and Wye River in the years 1993 and 1997 respectively. Clinton made desperate efforts in the last days of his rule to conclude an agreement between the Jews and their helpers of the Palestinian traitors but he did not succeed. This was due to the opposition stance of the Jews led by the Likud Party that rejected what was reached to in Camp David. Similarly there was limited time and Clinton's inability to stop the intifada that he started in agreement with Arafat had a great effect in obstructing signatures. Though he exercised great pressure and strong influence to stop it, and he appointed George Tenet, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, to fulfil this important mission in association with the director of Egyptian intelligence, together with the Jewish delegate and their Palestinian helpers, he was unable to stop it. Clinton said in his famous long speech in New York on 8/1/01: *"Today, what action is proposed? It is clear that our first priority is to reduce and in a serious way the current violence."* Dennis Ross- President Clinton's special ambassador to the Middle East and the politician most aware of the details of the discussions-said in a press interview on 16/1/01:

*"In reality the violence created conditions making it difficult to sign an agreement."* He also said: *"...from the Israeli side there exists a feeling that they have gone too far and that their government has given themselves free reign, and they do not agree with this stance."* Barak (the former Jewish prime minister) was receptive to Clinton's policy to a great extent and was serious in his endeavour to reach an accord and sign the deal with the Palestinian traitors. Ross said in the same interview: *"Barak placed himself on Rabin's footsteps and was ready to take historic decisions...this was not easy for him...Barak believed that it (referring to the Camp David meetings) was a moment in which he was able to finish the dispute, and we believed it was a moment in which we were able to finish the dispute. And I believe President Arafat believed that (also)."* However, the Jews after the ominous Camp David conference confronted Barak with severe criticism that reached the extent of accusing him of treason for neglecting the Jewish interests. So he was unable to mobilise the Jews behind him and failed to form a government of national unity including Likud. Thus his position weakened in the face of the attack of public opinion which forced him to carry out general elections for electing prime minister to strengthen his position that started to collapse rapidly and hastily; but he lost and suffered a sharp defeat from Sharon with a large difference in votes of nearly 25%, a margin never achieved by any prime minister before him. It should be noted that this was the least proportion of votes in the history of the Jewish entity. Barak visited Europe and particularly the great powers, France and Britain, and they assisted him in his endeavours and saw him as the right person for such an important mission. Tony Blair said in a press conference which he convened with Barak in London on 21/7/99 i.e. two months after his election: *"I would like to record my admiration of with what he achieved as Israeli Prime Minister and my support to everything he does...It is clear that we are in a difficult and extremely important situation, but someone with the sort of leadership and vision of Barak is absolutely the right person who can move forward in the peace process...I view our role in this regard as giving the complete support to it...and I believe that he left an impression among all people in the world...of his desire to accomplish progress as fast as possible."* It was not noticed that the European states or the European Union placed obstacles in front of the American efforts in Camp David, and their public position was that their role was a complementary one. This is despite the knowledge that these states burned with desire to be partners and remain close to the parties, but they were content with a role complementary to the American one, even with reluctance in that period.

When President Bush took power at the beginning of this year (2001), the officials in his government announced in the early days of taking their positions that they would not be restricted by what the previous administration achieved in regards to the Middle East, and that President Clinton's proposals in this matter

are not incumbent upon them. Powell said explicitly on 11/2/2001 on television networks regarding what President Clinton had offered of proposals: *"They represent his personal view. The viewpoint of the administration is that we should work with the region's leaders. Instead of our telling them of what they must do, we must assist them to reach a position enabling them to discuss among themselves. Ultimately the position of President Clinton must be decided via the peoples of the region: Jerusalem, the right of return, whether the refugees will go to another place in the world. Ultimately these (matters) are not American positions to be forced upon the peoples but rather positions they must reach to via the negotiations process."* In a similar vein, he responded to a question he was asked by the same network: Does the government of the United States of America consider the positions of the previous Israeli government as fixed positions for the (current) Israeli government? He responded saying: *"No, it is clear that the matter is not like that. Prime Minister Barak withdrew those compromises from the negotiating table. They were negotiating positions proposed by the former President, Clinton. When his rule ended he withdrew them, they have gone away with him, for they were his personal thoughts; and he made that clear. Accordingly the only existing positions are those offered by the two sides."* Despite these officials having announced their positions towards Clinton's proposals, they have not yet announced alternative ones. This despite many official statements about the Middle East, including those of President Bush, just as their discussion of detailed matters with a number of presidents and prime ministers of other states who visited Washington on the occasion of the new administration assuming authority, these joint statements and declarations about the discussions and press interviews appeared empty of involvement into these important questions which were the first subject of concern for Clinton and his administration. For example, neither the joint declaration nor the joint press conference between President Bush and Tony Blair-the British Prime Minister-on 23/2/2001 included anything in this respect. Rather the Middle East was not even mentioned with the exception of Iraq; even though both of them, as Blair said to journalists: *"Studied a wide range of issues, and I believe we considered all issues which you expected and even more."* Naturally the reason for this, as is implied from the statements of officials, is that the administration is in the process of re-assessing what was accomplished in the time of Clinton and developing a new policy that goes along with the new developments which have taken place in the region and particularly a new Jewish government taking power in occupied Palestine.

However, what the new government announced of abandoning Clinton's proposals is not new, but it does not indicate in itself a new policy. This is because Clinton himself and his administration had announced the very same, before Bush and his administration had announced it and by some time. Clinton stated on the

day the Camp David summit finished on 25/7/2000 saying: *"...according to the principles of action there is no agreement on anything without agreement on everything. Naturally they (the two sides) are not bound by any proposal discussed at this summit. Though we did not reach an accord here, however tangible progress over the fundamental problem was realised."* When he was asked on 11/1/2000 about the proposals that he offered to the parties, he responded saying: *"Today, it is clear that as long as there is no agreement the United States government is not restricted by the positions it takes, and any coming Israeli government will not be restricted...I believe that it is very important that we maintain some continuity in foreign policy and our commitment to other countries, except in the very exceptional situations...However President-elect is not restricted by the positions that I took in what is related to the Middle East issue, in form or content, unless there is an agreement."* Sandy Berger (Clinton's National Security Advisor) decided on 3/8/2000 after the summit: *"...the President defined some principles of action from the first day. We will not speak to the media...Secondly, nothing is agreed upon unless everything is agreed. This was clearly understood by all sides. During the negotiations, one party would offer something at a time then it would withdraw it at another time. Hence I believe that neither Israel nor Palestinians are bound in any way, legally or morally, by any position they took at Camp David."* Dennis Ross said in a press interview on 19/1/2001: *"The new administration is not obliged at all, in form or content, by these thoughts proposed by Clinton."* Barak had announced following the summit in the press conference he had: *"It is not possible to agree upon anything except if agreement is reached upon everything."*

It appears that the Bush government started to deal with the events of the region through its ideological evaluation expressed by Powell and Wocker as the most important officials in the State Department when Powell said in his speech before AIPAC on 19/3/2001: *"This (American) government inherited a situation in the Middle East in which the chance for peace became bleak in a dramatic way in the shadow of what appeared of an endless whirl of violence and virtually a complete loss of mutual confidence and hope which had been cemented in the last years. Bullets and artillery have taken the place of talks, just as incitement and rhetoric bitter words took the place of quiet efforts to strengthen the mutual understanding, and negotiations have become suspended...What is clear is that the effect upon Israelis of the collapse of the Camp David negotiations and what followed that of continuing violent actions, was something not possible to consider of being less than fragile. The feeling of personal safety became markedly weaker and the economy started to suffer noticeably. Just as the effect became tragic upon Palestinians...The Palestinian economy became broken into pieces as unemployment leaped and growth disappeared, and the internal and external measures of blockade has suspended the natural movement. The outcome result has been that Israelis started to doubt the possibility of reaching a peace arrangement with Palestinians, and Palestinians started to have doubt (whether) peaceful co-existence with Israel will comply with*

their specific political expectations.” He said: *“We must not allow the answers to these enquiries to be negative, nor allow the dream of peace to die, for this will be like a catastrophe for the region. I do not have any magic formula, just as it is not possible for me to be able, simply by the movement of a finger, to reverse the course of the current situation. However, what I am able to do is to propose the fundamental ideas with which the approach of the United States in the period of President Bush regarding the Middle East and particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can seek guidance i.e. a handful of thoughts which we consider contributive in the opportunities for peace.”* And Wocker briefly repeated the same evaluation before the House of Representatives subcommittee on 29/3/2001 saying: *“In the period of the past six months, the situation was marked with an increase of violent actions in Israel, the West Bank and Gaza Strip...the violence has demolished the basis of mutual confidence, a fundamental for building the basis upon which peace must be built. Israelis no more believe that Palestinians are prepared to reject violence and live in peace with Israelis. Palestinians no more believe that Israelis will ever be ready to deal with them fairly as a partner they respect.”* Also *“Secretary of State Powell touched on this issue when he met the Israeli and Palestinian leaders, and others, during his travel in the Middle East. President Bush is at this moment reviewing the situation in the Middle East during his meetings and talks with principal leaders in the region, and during all these discussions our approach is built on the following basis.”* He also said at the Washington Centre on 21/3/2001: *“We are, in the government, naturally facing a situation which had not been favourable at all; we are facing a situation dominated by violence. A situation wherein negotiations have failed to reach a successful outcome, a situation where the process of rebuilding was actually required in order to return to the track....”* He said: *“...the President had clarified clearly that we conceive the obligation of anchoring a new basis for successful negotiations, and be reiterated that on numerous occasions.”*

As for the basic thoughts or handful of thoughts which Powell indicated as being the approach of the US during Bush's period towards the Middle East, and the fundamentals mentioned by Wocker as being the approach to be followed by both President Bush and Secretary Powell, they are almost the same. They came in their mentioned speeches, and they are:-

1. “Firstly and most importantly, to have the violent actions stopped.”
2. “The obligation to restore the natural economic life.”
3. Incitement to violence must be stopped, whether that was by words or deeds.
4. “The two parties must avoid unilateral actions which could provoke the

other party un-necessarily, particularly at this critical time.”

5. “Israelis and Palestinians have to reconsolidate dialogue on all fronts that will lead to a political, economic and security arrangements agreed upon by both parties.”
6. “The US is prepared to offer its effective support to the two parties in their efforts towards peace. We shall remain engaged except that we will not become a partner in the negotiations for the interest of any of the two parties. Finally, we will not force a solution. The United States is ready to assist but not to compel.”

This is what the government of Bush arrived at in its evaluation of the existing situation pertaining to the Palestinian problem, and what its actions will revolve around in the current stage. It is an evaluation that does not differ from what the Clinton administration arrived to, and was repeated often by its officials. There is not enough space to mention the numerous evidences in this regard. This is obvious for anyone with the minimal pursuance of the course of events. The difference between the two administrations in this context, is that the actions of the new administration revolve around this evaluation, whereas the former administration's actions focused, in its last days, on what it called *“permanent status issues”* laid down in the Oslo and Wye River Accords. So it is clearly noticed that the new administration did not go into the details of the subjects, related to these issues, nor did it present them for discussion. These are the subjects which Europe insists upon the necessity of beginning discussions them without delay, particularly as Europe is the one who laid down Oslo without the knowledge of America. American efforts are currently limited to calming the troubled situation and creating an environment favourable to discuss the issues of the final solution at the time she sees convenient, which will come when she has finished reviewing what Clinton reached to and put in place an advanced policy that befits (with) the new circumstances including the change of the Jewish government and what she (America) wishes to achieve in preparing the peoples of the region, or what she calls *“creating the wide basis for peace”*, to accept the solution she proposes for a permanent situation. Bush said at his press conference on 29/3/2001: *“In order for peace to exist, this country must create what is called a general basis for peace...we have to undertake a great extent of actions for that sake.”* He also said in a press conference with Sharon on 20/3/2001: *“However, one of the things which I will do is to use all persuasive powers that I have to create an environment in which peace can flourish.”* He also said at the same (press) conference: *“I emphasized to the Prime Minister that my government will work*

hard to lay down a basis for peace in the Middle East, and work with other states in the Middle East, and increase the opportunity for peace.” He said in his press conference with Mubarak (the ruler of Egypt) on 2/4/2001: “...and we shall utilize our authority and influence as best we can in order to facilitate reaching peace. A part of this relates to a strong basis for peace in the Middle East. It is very important in the area, in relation to us, that we build strong and robust relations with states like Egypt, Jordan and other countries in the Middle East who have an interest in peace. However we shall remain partners with greater energy...” He said in the press conference he held with Abdullah-the ruler of Jordan-on 10/4/2001: “We discussed numerous subjects. We started with how we can work together better in order to lay down the basis for peace in the Middle East.” The chief official at the White House said on 11/4/2001: “As you know, the President has carried out consultations with a number of our partners in the Middle East including Sharon and...Mubarak. Accordingly our position will crystallise as a result of these consultations. However our objective remains, as the President said, to attempt to build the stronger and broader basis for peace.” Wocker said on 29/3/2001: “This government, since it took power, is attempting to encourage both parties to prepare an environment which provides a framework to settle the differences and restore security and confidence....” Eri Fletcher-the White House press spokesman-said on 19/4/2001: “The President hopes to assist in achieving an environment enabling the parties in the Middle East to reach their agreements by extending a helping hand from the United States.” As a result of this approach the American agents among the rulers, the like of Mubarak, Fahd, Khatami and others will be mobilised and called out, and the agents of other powers like Abdullah bin Hussein-ruler of Jordan-and the Gulf rulers and others will be used to publicly promote the treacherous peace projects and direct their media apparatus, of deception, to undertake intense campaigns of deception to this effect, so as to facilitate bringing the traitors among the Palestinian leaders together with the Jews on the negotiating table. America is not satisfied by keeping the matter confined to the two sides with the agents sitting away and watching. They also use the agents to restrain the Muslim people, preventing them from moving to help their brothers in Palestine. As a response to this policy, Mubarak moved actively after his return from America so he began to roam the countries of the world, east and west, calling for peace! He visited Europe and Russia, and he will undertake numerous regional and international trips for this objective. Regarding this matter Abdul-illah Al-Khatib-minister of Jordan's ruler Abdullah-announced while he was in America and after his meeting with American officials that he intends to visit the Jewish entity. After his return he undertook his shameless visit and he stood to take disgraceful pictures with the Jewish rulers, with hideous broad smiles while the blood flows in the streets of Gaza, Al-Khalil, Nablus and Ramallah!!! In this context also is what the government scholars stated of their false political

fatwas forbidding Muslims to carry out actions they called suicidal, to kill the Jews. Bush said in his press conference on 29/3/2001: “We are in a process of attempting to bring calm to the region. This requires more than one voice. It is obvious that our voice is an important voice, and likewise with other nations. I look forward to the visit of...Mubarak and...Abdullah to mobilise them for the attempt of persuading, and in particular Arafat, to speak openly against violence in a language Palestinians are able to understand.” Powell said on 19/3/2001: “The states in the region and beyond has a role to play in spreading stability in this environment for Israelis and Palestinians. The voices of these other states must be moderate voices calling for pragmatism and realistic position, and to provide support for the positions taken by statesmen. Just as it is important for their actions to match their words. I indicate here, for example, that there does not exist among any Arab state a resident ambassador in Israel, a matter which is very regretable....” And he said on 23/2/2001: “The matter requires leaders and statesmen to come forward and bear the responsibility and speak with everyone in their part of the world and call openly for stopping the violence. We have to return to that type of numerous bilateral security.”

As for what the Americans call violence, it takes a great amount of their efforts and discussions at the present time with the rulers of the region or the rulers of other states outside it, particularly after they failed to stop the Intifada in the last days of Clinton and these days with the coming of new government. This is despite that they save no effort in exercising their strong influence, continuing regional pressure and international efforts to stop it. The reason in the first place is not their fear over the souls of children nor the blood of the innocent as they claim; rather their fear is only over their interests, demonstrated by in their great concern over the future destiny of their agents in the region among the ruling class, and their influence in their region, because of the competition of other colonial states that became active and cheered up after the collapse of the Soviet Union. These competing states are represented by the European Union in general, and the covetous Britain and France in particular. Hence the “absence of regional stability” became one of the matters that worries her, so the new Bush government is striving rapidly attempting to restore stability and calmness to the region. Wocker said, comment, on the Intifada: “What that carries in regards to the future is a cause of extreme anxiety. The conventional concepts of ruling in the Middle East will be difficult to preserve.” The chief official in the White House said on 11/4/2001 in a press conference: “I believe that we understand that the situation in the region at this time is susceptible for explosion.” Powell said in the House of Representatives: “It is a dangerous region (the Middle East). In order to truly begin to revive stability there, we must undertake two things: Reverse the direction of the circle of violence and security for the Israeli people...I feel with anxiety regarding the hostile emotions against America. You will witness this government

directing its utmost ability and concern for the issues related to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf....” He said on 19/3/2001: “Violence contributes in the eroding of everything the parties hoped to achieve in the region...The responsibility of condemning the violence, stripping it of its legitimacy and stopping it falls on the leaders.” And he said: “...the fact of the matter is that we can not turn our back to this part of the world even if we wanted to. There are American interests put for critical test. The United States has a vital interest in the security of Israel. Similarly there are economic and vital strategic interests in the region...We understood very well that these interests and concerns will be ideally realised via a peace accepted by both Israelis and Palestinians.” Clinton said on 11/1/2001: “...The absence of an agreement with the Palestinians and the absence of a stable situation between Israel and Palestinians, will affect other countries and their ability to have ties with us on the long run. Particularly that in these countries there are many many youth who are strongly driven to show their sympathy, and they are driven with sympathising ears to Palestinian demands. They have demonstrations and troubles more than in other regions....”

America desires to silence each Palestinian opposing the arrogance of the Jews and their occupation of his land, and they charge the Palestinian authority (Arafat and his cronies) whom the West together with the Jews created, to reduce the burden of carrying out this type of horrible and criminal action. They insist on Arafat and his cronies to resume the role of executioners against the Palestinian people, the role that they exercised when Israel opened for them the doors of Gaza, Jericho and gave them authority over the necks of Palestinians. They seek from Palestinians to eliminate Palestinians to protect the Jews in hope of gaining the pleasure of the Western states that stand behind them. It is as if they are not satisfied with what these Kuffar criminals have done to the Palestinians until today; as if the Palestinians are in need of more disasters after a century of oppression and injustice at the hands of the Jews and the disbelieving Western states! Bush said in the press conference he held at the White House on 29/3/2001: “The Palestinian Authority must speak frankly and openly to the public as well as strongly and with language the Palestinian people understand in condemnation of violence and terrorism. They must arrest those who have committed terrorist actions. They must resume security cooperation with Israel.” And on 28/3/2001, Richard Boucher (State Department official spokesman) answered a question regarding the Jews undertaking a strike against Gaza and Jericho saying: “The Palestinian Authority must do everything within its ability to fight against terrorism by pre-emptive campaigns and arrest of those responsible and bringing them to justice.” At the same time, he rudely and arrogantly consented with what the Jews practice of killing and destruction, when he said in a press conference on 28/3/2001 this statement: “...we agree with the need of Israel to guarantee its security....” and when he was asked: “Does the United

States pay a diplomatic price due to its relations with Israel in the face of the prevalent opinion that says that Israel is evil? He responded saying: “We do not have an apology to offer due to our relationship with Israel. There is nothing we have to apologise for regarding our relationship with Israel.” On the following day i.e. on 29/3/2001, he repeated the same position and added this is the position of the President, when he (Boucher) said: “We mentioned that we believe that Israel has the right to act for the sake of its security and to protect itself; and we said at the same time that they have to practise self-restraint. The President repeated likewise this morning and indicated that the Israeli government must practise self-restraint at the time where steps are taken to return to the normal situation.” This is the official position of the United States of America, and it consents in an unambiguous way to the actions of Sharon, the enemy of Allah ﷻ, of destruction and killing of Muslims.

As for restoring the economic life, this does not aim at improving the situation of Palestinians. This is because difficult life, oppression and deprivation are deliberate styles to impose the solution viewed by the disbelieving West; and it is a style as old as the Palestinian issue. Hence the allusion to this matter in this context does not go beyond keeping what is barely sufficient for life and preventing any outbreak, inside and outside Palestine, which would foil the plans of kufr. What is meant by restoring the economic life is preserving the existence of the institutions of the authority and preventing it from collapse so as to be able to preserve the security of Jews and the Jewish entity. It is the duty which the traitors pledged to the enemies in the Oslo and Wye River Accords. Romano Prodi, president of the European Commission, said on 27/2/2001 after his meeting with Powell in Brussels: “We will work together with the United States in what relates to the efforts of the donors to secure the Palestinian Authority's ability to do what is obligatory upon it within a dismal budget and international supervision. The collapse of the Authority which will result in increased lack of stability in the Middle East is not in anyone's interest.” Chris Patten, the British external affairs commissioner of the European Union, said after his meeting with Arafat in Gaza: “The collapse of the Palestinian Authority under economic pressure does not carry good for the benefit of peace. We believe that it would be extremely bad for the future of peace that the Palestinian Authority is broken into pieces in the coming few months.”

Patten also said on 19/3/2001: “It does not require for one to be a genius to understand that if people lost their work and sustenance, and they do not see any hope, that this would make them more extremist.” He also said in a speech in Brussels on 31/1/2001: “In fact, the European Union and the international community have an interest in preserving the economic and institutional structure of the Palestinian Authority which we helped to create and finance.

*If the Palestinian Authority collapsed it would be a great blow to the future of peace in the region and would threaten the security of Israel and would destroy our efforts to strengthen cooperation and stability in the Middle East.*” Thus, it is not expected to have near relief for the difficult situation that the people of Palestine suffer of for about one century due to the calamities brought against them by the West and Muslim rulers including the Arab rulers.

The Bush government claims and pretends, just as the Clinton government claimed and pretended to be honest and working towards, rather than imposing solutions. This is a baseless and false claim that is not hidden from even the simple or naïve people. However, there is a filthy intention and dishonourable foresight which is granting legitimacy to what the traitors of Palestine are doing by giving the Jews possession and authority of Palestine just as they wasted, with ultimate treachery and recklessness, the part that the English gave to them in the year 1948. Their intention is that this becomes a strong argument in the hands of the Jews on which they depend to arouse the States of the world and seek their support against the Khilafah State when it rises to restore it from the Jews and the claws of kufr as a whole. For they know definitely that the traitors of Palestine, and beyond them the rulers of the Islamic world including the Arab rulers, are reforming a great treason, the likes of which neither ancient nor modern history has recorded. They also know that these actions have no basis whatsoever of legitimacy regardless of whatever they signed of false covenants and fabricated artificial plays to grant legitimacy upon them. This treacherous band and behind them the Jewish entity and disbelieving Western states, together with their agents from the rulers of the Islamic world and particularly the rulers of the Arab countries, must know with certainty that the Palestinian issue is greater than all of them, and that it is an issue for all Muslims. In relation to Muslims, it is an issue of life and death, its solution is a military one that is not decided except in a battlefield, whatever time it might take.

Bush said in his press conference on 29/3/2001 at the White House: *“I said at all times that this nation will not impose a peace settlement in the Middle East, but it will facilitate a peace settlement. This requires two parties eager to come to the negotiating table to put in place a peace agreement. That is what will live and this administration will not attempt to impose peace upon the parties.”* Bush continued in the his press conference saying that he convened with Sharon on 20/3/2001: *“...I told him (Sharon) that our nation will not attempt to impose peace but we will facilitate peace and we will work with those responsible for peace.”*

This is the outline of the American position currently in relation to what they call the Middle East issue or the Palestinian issue. As for Iraq, the new Bush government plans to aggravate the situation in the Gulf and incite agitations therein under the pretext that Iraq did not abide by the ceasefire conditions of the Second Gulf War related to the removal of weapons of mass destruction. She depends upon United Nations reports, reports emanating by the Ministry of Defence or the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) or press reports published by the press, which are all of her making. She started rigorously and actively, from the first day, to assemble what she calls *“allied states”* to review the regime of sanctions which collapsed or nearly did in the last days of the previous administration, but with a new outfit which they call *“smart sanctions”* that permits the entry of consumer goods and prevents military goods or those with dual usage. Many states, including the Arab ones, have agreed and she is now in the stage of putting down the details.

It is noticed that the subject of Iraq occupies a large space in the thinking of the new administration. It became clear that this was planned since the previous administration. On 11/1/2001 Clinton responded to questions related to the concerns of the Bush administration saying: *“...their attention will be a little more towards the Gulf and oil-producing nations... Our real interests are in the political geography of the oil-producing nations....”* On 9/1/2001 Albright said: *“The United States will continue putting pressure on Iraq even after the period of President Clinton. I believe that there is no room for much joy in Baghdad due to the change of government.”* And on 12/1/2001 Holbrooke-former American ambassador to the United Nations-said: *“Iraq will be one of the principal issues that the coming Bush presidency will face in the United Nations.”* Accordingly Bush announced his policy in the early days when he said in his press conference on 22/2/2001: *“...We will review the current sanctions policy and will review the options about how the sanctions will be effective...and we expect from him (Saddam) not to develop weapons of mass destruction. If it appeared to me that he is doing that, then there will be consequences.”* And he said in his press conference with Blair on 23/2/2001: *“We spent a large amount of time discussing our common interests in Iraq and the Persian Gulf. My own viewpoint, you know; I gave my famous statement that our sanctions are like Swiss cheese, meaning that they are not effective to a very great extent. We have resolved to work together to achieve a method that makes them effective in a greater way.”* He said in the same conference: *“However both of us, myself and the Prime Minister, know that it is more important for us to build a consensus in the region to make the sanctions more effective....”* The National Security Advisor said on 22/2/2001 in her press conference: *“The policy goal right now must be to restore the initiative in what relates to Saddam...and have conviction that what we do will be effective... There is an existing sanctions*

*regime, and we fundamentally believe that the regime is currently inflicted with some problems. There is no doubt in that. However the aim of the review is how to consolidate this regime and guarantee that it realises its aims....”*

Wocker revealed Bush's policy towards Iraq after the review took place, and it will accordingly be reflected on the Gulf region as a whole, in the speech he delivered at the Washington Centre for Near Eastern Affairs on 21/3/2001 saying: *“Today I would like to move to the subject of policy towards Iraq. This is a very important issue for the United States government. When this government received its tasks, the review of the situation clearly revealed that the sanctions policy over which almost ten years has passed, despite the fact it had been effective for a long time and preserved control over Saddam, it started to collapse and was tumbling down...Our approach calls to remove those sanctions which relate in a limited fashion to humanitarian and civilian goods or needs, and at the same time tighten controls over weapons of mass destruction...This requires the support of neighbouring countries. One of the goals of the Secretary's trip to the Middle East is gathering this support. I can say that this was realised in a complete way. There was a very receptive response from each country we dealt with...We are now working to place the last touches in regards to what this process will be and over the types of changes which must be completed in the United Nations and similar matters...On the same matter, we have had very productive discussions with Britain, France and Russia regarding how to carry out this work. We see the existence of a broad agreement about the course we wish to proceed along. Clearly we will carry out more discussions not only regarding these arrangements, which will be implemented, but also regarding the consequences of these arrangements on UN Resolution number 1842 and questions related to the suspension of some of its rules and questions of this type. These measures are still the subject of work with the parties. However, we have a clear impression that the direction we proceed along enjoys a great deal of international support....”* And he said on 29/3 before the House of Representative committee: *“We are in the process of carrying out a comprehensive review of all aspect of policy towards Iraq...We have undertaken consultations with some leaders in the region and with the member states in the Security Council. We felt a broad agreement that the current Iraqi regime will represent a dangerous threat if left completely free to develop programs for weapons of mass destruction and its military institution, scenario, in the scenario of the United States abandoning, its military position in the Gulf. Just as there was great support for the need to confront that threat...If we do not take immediate steps to do all that we can to remove the suffering from the shoulders of the Iraqi people, international concern over the effect of civilian sanctions will continue in obstructing the co-operation with which we wish to tighten our grip over Iraq's capability to possess supplies and needs related to weapons of mass destruction and other weapons...We remain committed to the surveillance operations on the weapons that were delegated to the United Nations.”*

When we know that America suffers a crisis in energy which begins looming in the horizon, we understand its goal of inciting problems and troubles in the Gulf region under the name of punishing Iraq and removing its weapons so that it does not threaten its neighbours. She concentrates on Iraq to divert attention from what she is doing in the Gulf region of consolidating her influence and extending her dominance over it to bring in the American investment companies in the oil sector as is taking place currently in Kuwait, to restrain the increase of oil prices, and to plunder its oil wealth in return for nominal and insignificant prices. She regains what she pays as price for oil through weapons deals (to the region) worth billions of dollars exceeding in many times the ability of the armies in absorbing them. Thus they sell them in weight as scrap iron to industrial states like Japan and others. These are deals that America is anxious to make in order to remove the stores of the ministry of defence so that she can develop other new weapons.

In accordance with her policy of creating problems in the Gulf region, she pushed her agent Khatami in the last few years to open the Iranian market for building nuclear plants and to Russian weapons (whose poor type has been proven on many occasions) so as to initiate an arms race in the Gulf. This covers her own deals with these states that bleed their wealth. She forged hostility with Iran and showed it as a terrorist state hostile to her so as to realise this objective. [She recently induced her agents to hold a conference to support the Palestinian intifada on 24/2/2001 so that the conference bears testimony to the validity of what the American government publicises via the CIA and trumpets of propaganda regarding Iran's involvement in terrorism], according to the approaches of the long term American policy. On 13/3/2001, President Bush extended the decree of emergency state related to Iran that was issued on 15/3/95 as Number 12957 when President Clinton announced a state of national emergency in relation to Iran's, so as to confront the threat directed against the national security of the United States and its foreign policy and economy, represented by actions and policies of the Iranian government including support for international terrorism and its effort directed to destroy the Middle East peace process, its possession of weapons of mass destruction and the means of firing them *“...Since the actions and policies of the Iranian government remain a threat to United States national security, its foreign policy and its economy, it became necessary to extend the state of national emergency announced on 15th March, 1995 to what is beyond 15th March, 2001.”* It is clear that the justifications that the American government provided have no validity because Iran's threat to United States national security contradicts the reality, and Iran is too weak to threaten the United States as they claim. Similarly the rulers of Iran

are deeply involved as agents to American colonisation under the cover of “forced enmity”. Moreover the policy of its agents in Iran go along with the treacherous peace plans taking place in the region. In this way the United States started a long time ago to prepare an alternative to Iraq and an international pretext for its presence in the Gulf. She will remain creating agitations and problems in this region of the world as long as there is a drop of oil therein.

These are the milestones of the American policy in the Middle East in what relates to the Palestinian issue and Iraq. As for the European position in this region represented by the position of the European Union and the positions of the great powers therein, Britain and France; even though they accept a complementary role to the American role as was indicated by the Vice President of the European Commission, Manuel Marin, in his affirmation of the role of the European Union on 26/11/98 when he said: “*The European Union agreed upon a complementary diplomatic and political role to the American role...*” However, its states endeavored over a long time to be partners in the Middle East discussions that America monopolised with the assistance of Russia and the former Soviet Union. Chris Patten, an Englishman, said: “*The European Union has an important role to play in the peace process and all parties acknowledge that. Our role is not restricted to the role of bankers...*” Patten said this because EU grants reached more than 600 million euros between 1994 and 1998. Europe does play an important role and she realized success in penetrating the American monopoly when it arranged Oslo in America's absence. Were it not for this monopoly, America would not have been able to cut short this long journey in breaking up the Palestinian issue and its criminal peace would not have reached this limit in consolidating the Jewish entity. Despite the American position, the European states have not stopped expressing and announcing their positions; sometimes through the collective European Union statements which number more than twenty since the Copenhagen declaration in the year 1973 to the Copenhagen declaration of 23/3/2001, and sometimes in an individual fashion by the tongues of its officials. So they continued trying to intervene by expressing opinions and advice to the parties, and announcing their positions on occasions but in a fashion that does not put them in confrontation with America or a fashion that foils her plans as a whole even though they might complicate them sometimes. In the presence of a new American administration and its preparation to widen the role of consultation with those whom it calls allies and friends, the Union strives seriously to be on equal footing with America in her endeavor to resolve the issues of the Middle East. Bush said in the congregation where Secretary Powell gave the oath of his post on 26/1/2001: “*...He is a leader who understands that America must work closely with our friends in times*

*of peace if we wish to be able to call them at times of crisis...*” Powell said in his press conference on 2/1/2001: “*I also intend to work closely with our European allies and our friends in Asia as well.*” Romano Prodi said after his meeting with Powell in Brussels on 27/2/2001: “*...In following the successful model of European Union-United States cooperation in the Balkans, the Middle East must become a principal article in European Union-United States cooperation in foreign policy. We were pleased to see the message of the United States to the Israeli leadership is compliant with our message....*” Robin Cook said in his press conference which he convened with Powell on 6/2/2001: “*If we wish to preserve the Middle East peace process, it will only succeed in one situation that is on the basis that they (the disputing parties) receive the same message from both sides of the Atlantic and from the rest of the international community.*”

As for the position of the European Union, it is clear from the last declaration issued in Copenhagen on 24/4/2001, and the following statements issued from therein: “*The European assembly, recalls what came in the Berlin declaration of March 1999, emphasizing the perseverance of the Union to assist in making peace, stability in flourishing future of the Middle East.*” The following came in the Berlin declaration: “*The European Union calls the parties to emphasise their commitment to the fundamental principles which were agreed upon within the framework of Madrid and Oslo and the succeeding agreements, according to United Nations resolutions numbers 242, 338...The European Union calls particularly for the early resumption of the final status talks in the coming months speedily to reach a quick conclusion without unlimited extensions. The European Union believes in the possibility of finalising discussions within a period measured in one year, and expresses its readiness to facilitate an early result of the discussions. The European Union urges both parties to refrain from practices which grant premature induction for the discussions of the final solution and any practice contradictory to the international law including all activities related to settlements and opposing incitement and violence...it calls upon the parties to expend their maximum effort with sincere intention for the sake of achieving a negotiated solution based upon existing agreements...The European Union is convinced that creating a democratic Palestinian state capable of peaceful survival upon the basis of existing agreements through discussion will be the best guarantee for Israeli security and Israel's acceptance as a partner on equal footing in the region...*” The following came also in the declaration of the Union presidency on the date 7/2/2001 on the occasion of congratulating Sharon after his success in the leadership elections: “*...The European Union believes that the progress achieved in all major questions (final solution issues) during previous negotiations (with Barak) must be a basis for future discussions about the 'final solution'...and the European Union calls all parties to emphasise their commitment to the fundamental principles within the framework of Madrid and Oslo and the accords that followed in accordance with the Resolutions 242 and 338.*” The European Commission commenting at the meeting of the European

commission president Romano Prodi and Chris Patten, together with Sharon's ambassador to them, Aphado Safir, said: "...It was expressed of the hope that the parties will follow their course on the basis of the progress that has been achieved." There is no dispute between the Union states over the necessity of resuming negotiations, related to what they call "permanent status issues". Rather they strive to consider what has been achieved of bilateral understandings in Camp David and others as a basis for any future negotiation.

Thus the European Union policy contradicts fundamentally and obviously with what the new American government has reached regarding the Middle East. However, the matter did not stop at this point of complexity in the situation but rather exceeded it when Sharon announced in the early days of his election of the death of the Oslo agreement. He stated in this regard saying: "I would like to put this as clearly as possible. The Oslo agreement no longer exist." Thus he announced a viewpoint contradicting the Union's viewpoint (and there is nothing to indicate that America agreed with him upon it) which is:-

1. Termination of the Oslo agreements.
2. Temporary agreement for a long periods in stages e.g. a non-aggression agreement not limited with a timespan or specific dates. However they are limited to realizing goals agreed upon by the two parties.
3. Security cooperation to fight terrorism and attack its bases in the regions of the Palestinian authority and abroad.
4. Economic cooperation with emphasis upon developing joint projects that would create mutual dependency and where the two parties share in the benefits of successful projects and the loss of the two parties (in unsuccessful projects) like the projects of water desalination.
5. Developing peace projects between peoples. This includes stopping incitement in books and media apparatus, strengthening the cultural programs to teach peace to both sides beginning with school children.
6. Co-operation to create a Palestinian entity with agreed upon security restrictions that include disarmament, control over borders, crossing points, freedom to enter and control of airspace and not allowing the Palestinians entry into agreements with enemy states.

7. Israel preserves overall control over the eastern and western security regions, most of the vital underground waters and over the strategic roads linking the coastal plain with the Jordan valley.
8. Withdrawing from 42% of the West Bank and Gaza Strip but within the long-term gradual agreement that is not limited by time.
9. Absolutely not removing the settlements in any circumstance.

This is an overview of Sharon's proposals which he deems appropriate for the present time. Most likely they are the ones which he presented to Powell when he visited occupied Palestine and presented to Bush when he met with him on 20/3/2001. Clearly they differ from the proposals offered by Barak before him. Sharon said in an interview with CNN: "Barak offered many compromises, more than necessary, so Israel became weaker and weaker." They also differ from the views of the European Union including France, Britain and other remaining European states. It is extremely unexpected that he got the approval upon them from the American approval, though he did get agreement on partial issues like freeing his hand in taking measures he sees appropriate to preserve what they call security by chasing Palestinians, destroying their houses and expelling them as a provision for continuing co-ordination with America and not undertaking sudden actions which she does not accept. This partial agreement agrees with her policy in her efforts to terminate the Intifada that she was unable to stop till this day. Sharon said in his press conference with Bush on 20/3/2001: "...we studied the peace process, what is possible to be achieved and how...but naturally the first thing and most important is security for Israeli citizens. This is what I committed myself to, with your excellency the President, and that is the first thing we must accomplish, once we have achieved security there will be calm in the Middle East and at that point I believe we will begin our discussions to reach a peace agreement." And he said: "I believe that what I understand from this great democracy, the United States, is that a man should not surrender to terrorism or pressure or violence...I value this method in which a man should never surrender to terrorism. It is a duty upon the free world to fight against local, regional and international terrorism. I am sure that the United States leads in such fight and we are partners in it. I believe this is in the interest of every democratic state, because it is for the sake of maintaining stability. I am among the greatest supporters of the President's policy in preserving Middle Eastern stability, and the principal danger to this stability is terrorism. This is what I believe will be and it must be the common goal for each democratic country in the free world." And he said following his return from America to Israeli radio: "There is a complete agreement and understanding from America that we cannot surrender to violence and terrorism." This is the part in which Sharon

received explicit approval from the new Bush government. This explains his arrogance and quarrelsome tyranny in occupied Palestine, and this demonstrates clearly the level of America's enmity towards Muslims. As for the remaining thoughts that he proposed, the stance of the Bush administration in relation to them has not yet appeared. This is the regional and international situation regarding occupied Palestine, and it is necessary to take that into consideration so as to understand the events taking place therein.

America gives priority to preparing a favourable environment and laying down a broad basis for what they call peace, and she has deferred discussion of permanent status issues. Powell said while he was on the way to Kuwait: *"There will be a long time before both parties return to the negotiations."* Europe, led by Britain and France, views the need to resume negotiations related to permanent status issues in pursuance of the Oslo agreement and others or from what has been achieved, without delay. The Jews have a prime minister elected by an overwhelming majority carrying thoughts and proposals that Europe does not agree with and which America has not stated her position concerning most of them, but has given him approval on killing, destruction and devastation. The position is thus confined to these three parties. As for Palestinians, they are the victims and upon them falls the black Jewish oppression and hatred. As for the Muslim rulers, including the Arab ones, they are tools of American and European policy. There does not exist an Egyptian-Jordanian initiative as they claim because it is a European initiative which has been secretly passed through Abdullah, Jordan's ruler. It is destined for failure because America is not pleased with it and it does not go along with current American policies.

In light of this, America supports Sharon and it is she who enabled him to form a coalition government, as it is not a matter of coincidence that the Labour Party agreed to enter a national coalition government one day after Powell's departure from the Jewish entity after his visit to it, at a time when Labour leaders were furious about entering the government with Sharon. America had struggled to form this type of government—a coalition government—under Barak's leadership but she could not. She views in Sharon the person with whom the Jews agree with what he agrees upon. So if he agreed to their plan—even under pressure like she applied with Begin—in that case it is all right, otherwise the Labour party in the coalition is capable to overthrow him. There is also a harsh relationship between Sharon and Europe as the European states do not view him as a person capable to proceed with their plans of peace. European leaders have criticised his policies on many occasions and the European press similarly attacked him. Chris Patten,

on behalf of the British, directed to Sharon's government a severe criticism several times during his trip to the region on 19/3/2001 when he said: *"We understand that there is a security problem for Israel, but tell me for God's sake what does destroying the Palestinian economy and increasing poverty do with security?"* The Jerusalem Post newspaper attacked him in a long article under the title *"Patten's stupidities."* And on 18/4/2001, Robin Cook directed a severe criticism to Sharon's government where he declared in a statement by him: *"...the situation is horrible and I do not see any close hope in serious discussions...it is more difficult to secure an end to violence without hope of returning to the peace discussions. The international community must practice pressure for self-restraint and return to the table of discussions...therefore I felt frustrated and worried because of the destruction of homes in Gaza...a matter which is expected to create greater enmity between the civilian residents. This reduces rather than increase the possibility of resuming meaningful discussions. I call upon the Israeli government to consider where they would like to be after three months from today..."* On 28/4/2001, Hubert Vedrine—the French foreign minister, attacked Sharon during his visit to Syria saying: *"...Israel forms an obstacle in front of peace..."* On 27/3/2001 the Danish foreign minister attacked him saying: *"Israel's building of new settlements and expanding the existing settlements form one of the most dangerous obstacles before Middle East peace. The new settlement activity forms a violation to the Geneva conventions..."* He also attacked Sharon on another occasion saying: *"This tragic dispute is difficult to solve because of the settlement policy, and the illegal settlements in the occupied territories which Israel, backed by Sharon and his friends has built, makes the possibility of the Palestinians establishing their state very difficult."* The Belgian and Swedish foreign ministers attacked him as well. On 4/1/2001, the newspaper Haaretz published an article under the title, *"Peres presses on discussions to stop violence and he will attempt to contain the pressure from Europe during his visit to it."* Written in the article: *"Peres left on his trip to Europe and will meet therein leaders of Sweden, Norway and France...and he will attempt to contain the momentum against Israel that has occurred in Europe."* Barry Rubin wrote on 10/4/2001 in the Jerusalem Post an article in which he wrote: *"There exists an inclination in Israel to ignore Europe...the European positions are very tough."* Many European politicians pressed for adopting economic sanctions against the Jewish entity, knowing that more than 30% of all its exports are to the Union and nearly 50% of its imports are from the Union.

Generally, European public opinion and European governments have a position of suspicion and doubt regarding Sharon and they do not see him the person able to fulfill the peace plans. Thus they work to overthrow him and bring back the Labour party, so they climbed aboard the Intifada's wave for this purpose. Anthony Cordesman said in his testimony before the American foreign affairs committee on 3/1/2001: *"...it is possible for nations outside the region to play the cards of peace and*

*the second Intifada against us, such as France, China and Russia.*” At the same time that Europe works to overthrow Sharon, they also put pressure on the American government to bring negotiations back to where they were before Sharon.

As for Arafat, it appears that America exerts severe pressure on him to stop the Intifada. There is an opinion circulated by the American political medium, but not yet finalized, that he is incapable of accomplishing the mission. This position towards Arafat contradicts the European position which supports him and views him as the person capable to fulfill the treacherous plans for the settlement of the Palestinian issue, which Europe expects. Robin Cook defended the Authority's position in his statement on 18/4/2001 by saying: *“Sha'ath emphasised to me that those executing attacks are not under the control of the Palestinian Authority, and that the ability to restrain them dwindled due to repeated attacks on Palestinian police. And he emphasised the difficulty of convincing Palestinians to leave violence when there is no alternative to the course of progress in peace discussions.”*

This is the situation in occupied Palestine from all its sides. Therefore we are able to say that the situation is of utmost danger and that the affliction of the people of Palestine is increasing. This is where the Muslims' rulers, including the Arab rulers, take a weak, humiliating and spectator position while Sharon causes havoc with explicit American support. Similarly the call of some Arab rulers for increased European intervention is like the one seeking help in fire from intense heat, it is the call of bankrupt agents. There remains nothing of hope, save the role of sincere people who are capable of seizing the reins of this Ummah from the hands of its disbelieving enemies, rescue her from her treacherous agent rulers, and put an end to their Pharoanic oppression against her by establishing the righteous Khilafah, of which the Sayyed al-Mursaleen (prayers and peace be upon him and his family) gave glad tidings.