Order Number 9016205

Foreign policy-making in Jordan: The role of King Hussein's leadership in decision-making

Rashdan, Abdelfattah Ali, Ph.D.

University of North Texas, 1989

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Rashdan, Abdelfattah A., Foreign Policy-Making in Jordan: The Role of King Hussein's Leadership in the Decision-Making Process. Doctor of Philosophy (Political Science), December, 1989, 228 pp., 1 table, bibliography, 223 titles.

In this study I analyze foreign policy in Jordan and the role of King Hussein in the decision-making process. The operational code is used to assess the impact of the king's beliefs on his policy preferences and choices.

The purpose of this study is to identify King Hussein's belief system, or operational code as it is called by George and Holsti, and to test its influence on foreign policy-making in Jordan. The research has three related goals: to identify King Hussein's operational code through analysis of his writings and speeches during the period between 1967 and 1980, to review four major foreign policy decisions in an attempt to understand the factors affecting the decision-making process in Jordan, and to analyze these decisions to ascertain the impact of the king's personality and beliefs on them in order to discover whether the operational code construct can be used to predict or explain Jordan's foreign policy behavior.

The study reveals that foreign policy in Jordan is, to a large degree, the king's unfettered sphere of action

because he operates in the foreign policy arena under minimal constraints from organizational, bureaucratic, or parliamentary interference.

Since King Hussein is the dominant figure in foreign policy-making, potentially the most fruitful way to explain Jordan's foreign policy is by studying his fundamental beliefs. This approach is particularly appropriate where individual leader variables, as opposed to system attributes, are likely to be most important in explaining foreign policy behavior.

The four decisions analyzed in this study indicate that King Hussein's decisional calculations were greatly influenced by his operational code. The major conclusion is that the operational code is a useful tool for analyzing foreign policy in the Third World, particularly in Jordan, but it should not be considered as the sole or ultimate approach to studying foreign policy in Third World nations.

FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING IN JORDAN: THE ROLE OF KING HUSSEIN'S LEADERSHIP IN DECISION-MAKING

Abdelfattah A. Rashdan, B.S., M.A.

APPROVED:

Major Professor

Minor Professor

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Chairman of the Department of Political Science

Dean of the Graduate School

FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING IN JORDAN: THE ROLE OF KING HUSSEIN'S LEADERSHIP IN DECISION-MAKING

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Abdelfattah A. Rashdan, B.S., M.A.
Denton, Texas

December, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is growing recognition among scholars today that the approaches for studying foreign policy decision-making used in the developed countries are not entirely applicable to most developing nations. In the last few decades most foreign policy studies have focused on decision-making in developed countries and have relied on such theoretical frameworks as the power (Morgenthau, 1967), decision-making, (Frankel, 1963; Snyder, Bruch and Sapin, 1962), input-output analysis (Almond, 1960; Macridis, 1967; Modelsky, 1962), organizational, bureaucratic, and rational decision-making approaches (Allison, 1969, 1972; Neustadt, 1970). For a number of reasons, most of these approaches have limited use for analyzing foreign policy decision-making in developing countries. For one thing, the relative lack of sophisticated and crucial data about developing countries makes it difficult to use these approaches. Even more importantly, most of the developing countries do not have strong political institutions such as political parties, interest groups, mass media, legislatures, and bureaucracies which normally help to shape decisions in developed countries. Since political institutions are relatively weak

or non-existent in many developing countries, a single political leader tends to dominate the decision-making process, particularly in the area of foreign policy.

Approaches emphasizing personality and cognitive variables have been proposed (Dawisha, 1977; Hermann, 1974; Kelman, 1970; Rosenau, 1971; Selim, 1979) as a means for studying foreign policy decision-making in developing countries, as a result of dominance of the leader in these countries. One of these approaches, the operational code, examines the value and the belief system of decision-makers and the influence of their beliefs on foreign policy choices. The rationale for using this method rests on the belief that, since there is a single dominant decision-maker in the nation, if one explicates the personal traits and beliefs of this individual, one can understand foreign policy decisions.

Many scholars have noted that the beliefs of the leader are a vital part of foreign policy decision-making, as may be seen in the following chapter (Boulding, 1971; Sprout and Sprout, 1965; Wright, 1955). Most agree that the perceptual and cognitive systems of decision-makers are crucial in the making of decisions. Scholars argue that, to understand the interactive behavior among states, it is important to focus on the forces that affect decision-makers, those whose authoritative acts are, to all intents and purposes, acts of the state (Snyder, Bruch, and Sapin, 1962). Writers such as

George (1969), Holsti (1970), Walker (1977), and others have also attempted to develop means for measuring leaders' value or belief systems.

In this study I attempt to analyze the foreign policy-making process in Jordan and the role of King Hussein in this decision-making process. The operational code construct will be used to assess the impact of the king's beliefs on his policy preferences and choices.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify King Hussein's belief system, or operational code as it is called by George and Holsti, and to test its influence on foreign policy-making in Jordan in order to enrich our ability to understand and explain Jordan's foreign policy-making. The research has three related goals: 1) to identify King Hussein's operational code through analysis of his writings and speeches during the period between 1967 and 1980, 2) to review four major foreign policy decisions in an attempt to understand the factors affecting the decision-making process in Jordan, and 3) to analyze these decisions to ascertain the impact of the king's personality and beliefs on them in an attempt to discover whether the operational code construct can be used to predict or explain Jordan's foreign policy behavior. To date, this method has not been used to study foreign policy in Jordan.

Existing literature on Jordan's foreign policy may be classified into three categories.

1. Studies which mainly seek to explain Jordan's foreign policy in terms of the country's dependence on the west, in particular Great Britain and the United States. According to this view, Jordan has generally followed a pro-Western foreign policy since its formative years because it is dependent on the West for financial and other aid. After World War II, Jordan's pro-Western orientation and anti-communist and anti-radical Arab nationalism prompted Western countries to support the government of King Hussein (Aruri, 1972; Glubb, 1959; Hiro, 1982; Hurewitz, 1969; Kaplan, 1975; Polk, 1975; Sands, 1970; Snow, 1972).

2. Studies contending that Jordan's foreign policy is mainly influenced by the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian dilemma. According to these writers, Jordan's foreign policy has been forced to react to environmental forces in the region since Jordan, more than any other Arab country, is intimately involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Palestinian issue is dominant in Jordan because half of Jordan's population is Palestinian. Moreover, Israel and Jordan have vital interests in the development of regional water resources in the Jordan River (Dodd and Sales, 1970; Faddah, 1974; Kiernan, 1978; Mansfield, 1983; Shwadran, 1959).

3. Studies emphasizing threats to the regime arising from several internal and external conditions which are aggravated by Jordan's geostrategic location. The kingdom is strategically located in the Arab world, it has few economic resources, and its social fabric has been seriously strained by repeated waves of refugees from Palestine. Absorption of these new immigrants has created a host of serious domestic problems which, at times, have threatened the Jordanian regime. Despite its strategic position, Jordan does not have the military capability to confront all potential external threats, which are compounded by the Palestinian issue. The problems of the military are exacerbated by the rather small population of native Jordanians, who alone are fully trusted by the regime to serve in the military. These conditions are major determinants shaping Jordan's foreign policy (Dann, 1973; Dawisha, 1983; Mishal, 1978; Shwadran, 1959).

No one has yet examined the foreign policy-making process in Jordan by studying the basic beliefs of the king using the operational code. Since King Hussein is the dominant and ultimate figure in the foreign policy-making process in Jordan, potentially the most fruitful way to explain Jordan's foreign policy behavior is by studying the fundamental beliefs of the king. This approach is particularly appropriate where individual leader variables, as opposed to system attributes, are likely to be important

in explaining foreign policy behavior (Rosenau, 1971; Verba, 1961).

The choice to study the central decision-maker in a developing country such as Jordan which has not yet fully developed its political institutions is further justified by Migdal (1974, 520) as follows.

> Any conceptual model attempting to explain . . . decisions must focus on the behavior of these leaders, whether on an individual or collegial basis. In essence, we can turn to a view of politics in the area of foreign policy which places a much greater stress on the concept of statesmanship than a geopolitical organization process, or bargaining model would allow.

In Jordan, the king is the nation's principal decision-maker. He is not limited by a complex of strong political and administrative institutions. Thus, he is able largely to prevail over all institutions, including the legislature, the bureaucracy, interest groups, and the mass media. His decisions are synonymous with state policy. As Rosenau (1971) and others proposed, idiosyncratic factors would be important in underdeveloped state-societies that are generally new and small and lack establishment roles and highly structured bureaucracies (Hermann, 1974).

King Hussein has been the head and the chief executive of Jordan since 1952. During his long reign he has faced a host of problems, including civil and international wars, assassination attempts, and an abortive coup. Despite these challenges, he has been able to establish himself as the regional ruler with the longest uninterrupted tenure.

According to Jureidini and McLaurin (1984), Jordan's stability has rested not principally upon force, but upon King Hussein's political astuteness. This success is based, among other things, on the genuine widespread popularity of the king and support for the monarchy among the Jordanian people.

I contend, therefore, that in order to understand fully the substance and the direction of Jordan's foreign policy since the 1950s, it is essential to analyze the basic beliefs and values that help to frame the thoughts and policies of the king.

Method of Analysis

The operational code approach that will be used in this research is a method of studying the belief systems of political leaders. An operational code is defined as a system of fundamental beliefs about political life which enables the individual to perform certain functions related to information-processing and decision-making (George, 1969; Leites, 1951; Walker, 1977).

The perceptions, images, and beliefs of foreign policy-makers are crucial to an understanding of their decisions. The people whose decisions determine the policies and actions of nations, according to the proponents of the operational code approach, "do not respond to the objective facts of the situation, but to their images of the

situation" (Boulding, 1971, 91). Supporters of the operational code argue that the perception and cognitive system of the decision-maker are crucial in the making of decisions.

This is a study of King Hussein's decision-making behavior. It will attempt to assess the impact of his operational code beliefs on his policy preferences and choices of actions with regard to four of Jordan's key foreign policy decisions, namely 1) the decision to enter the June 1967 War, 2) the decision on the October 1973 War, 3) the decision on representation of the Palestinians at the Rabat Summit in 1974, and 4) the rejection of the Camp David agreements.

These decisions were chosen for analysis because of their importance in Jordan's history. They represent major episodes in Jordan's inter-Arab, Arab-Israeli, and global foreign relations, and they all occurred in the period from 1967 to 1980.

The year 1967 is important because Jordan's foreign policy took new directions after the 1967 War, and that year marks the establishment of the king's position as supreme decision-maker. Before the departure of the British from Jordan, the king's role in the formulation of policy had been limited. Even after the withdrawal of the British, power was not concentrated in the hands of the king since the cabinet had a constraining effect on the decision-making

process during this period. The struggle between King Hussein and the cabinet ended by the mid-1960s, with the reins of power finally firmly in the grip of the king. The year 1980 is also important because it represents the beginning of a new era after Camp David.

The operational code approach will be used to identify the philosophical and instrumental beliefs held by the king in order to evaluate the fundamental beliefs affecting the four major decisions under discussion. To identify the king's fundamental beliefs about the nature of politics and political conflict, the research will utilize the ten questions of the operational code as formulated by George (1969).

Over the years, the king has made numerous speeches and addresses on foreign policy, written three books, and addressed the nation and the press numerous times on a host of policy issues. These materials constitute a sizable data base of materials that may be studied through content analysis in an attempt to identify the fundamental beliefs of the king during this period.

In this research content analysis will be used in an attempt to reveal the belief system of King Hussein. Content analysis as defined by Holsti (1969, 14) is "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages." This technique involves the coding of all major

political beliefs appearing in written and spoken messages into meaningful categories. Content analysis may employ either quantitative or qualitative analysis. Quantitative content analysis involves 1) measuring the amount of material assigned to a set of categories and 2) assuming that someone else using the same rules and materials could arrive at the same result. Qualitative content analysis, on the other hand, involves a thorough examination of a body of material without the counting process. George (1959, 8) maintains that one mention of a topic or characteristic may be as important as twenty-five others, depending on its salience to the political leader. Moreover, some characteristics can only be inferred from what is spoken or written where there is no explicit mention of them to count (Hermann, 1977). George (1959) further argues that qualitative content analysis, drawing on the analyst's experience and intuitive inferences, has often proven accurate in the sense of leading to important predictions of actions that could not have been made by quantitative techniques. George (1959) also contends plausibly that this kind of inference made without regard to counting frequencies often reveals an impressive record of accuracy.

The methods used in this study will follow the lead of most operational code researchers. A qualitative or a non-frequency content analysis will be used to analyze the fundamental beliefs of King Hussein.

This research utilizes Holsti's (1977) Coding Guidelines. Holsti (1977, 42) developed systematic coding rules that can be adopted by researchers using the operational code approach for dealing with documentary and other evidence. The rules and coding forms described in Holsti's manual may be used to undertake a qualitative analysis recording only the appearance of relevant themes. Holsti (1977, 42) pointed out, "Qualitative non-frequency content analysis is not, as is sometimes asserted, a contradiction in terms or need it imply the absence of systematic and rigorous methodology." Holsti's coding manual provides a series of subsidiary questions that have been subsumed under each of the basic categories that comprise George's version of the operational code. One method that may be employed to assess the impact of a policy-maker's operational code beliefs on his decisional choices, according to George (1979, 105), is the "congruence procedure." The procedure first establishes the subject's political beliefs on the basis of relevant behavioral data from his prior political experiences. The investigator then considers whether the subject's policy preferences and decisions are consistent with those beliefs. If the characteristics of a decision are consistent with the actor's beliefs, there is at least a presumption that those beliefs may have played a causal role in this particular instance of decision-making.

Unlike the quantitative analyst, the qualitative content analyst is not adverse to assigning supplementary information if it can help to provide a basis for its conjectures (Johnson, 1977). As proponents of qualitative content analysis argue, the frequency with which something is said does not always indicate its importance to the speaker, particularly the political leader who must be actively aware of what his audience wants to hear (Hermann, 1977). Therefore, in addition to searching for the king's fundamental beliefs through qualitative content analysis, I interviewed the king's key foreign policy advisors about the same issues (see Appendix A). These interviews were semi-structured and evolved questions about the decision-making process in Jordan generally and other key decisions of the king in the period under study.

After the king's fundamental beliefs were determined according to these techniques, the actions in the four key decisions were examined to determine whether the king's beliefs and the decisions were consistent. If they were not found to be consistent, it may be assumed that other factors than the king's belief system had intervened in helping to shape the decisions. In other words, it is hypothesized that the king holds a set of beliefs and values that have largely affected and may continue to affect his foreign policy choices.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of seven chapters. Chapter I includes an explanation of the problem, the purpose of the study, and the methodology employed in its preparation. In Chapter II the literature of foreign policy decision-making approaches in general is surveyed, as is the literature relating to the Third World in particular. Reservations are also presented concerning the applicability of theoretical approaches to Third World countries such as Jordan. In Chapter III I examine the personal role and the dominant influence of the leader upon foreign policy-making in the Arab world in general and in Jordan in particular. Variations of the operational code construct in decision-making are discussed in Chapter IV, and the operational code of King Hussein is investigated in detail. A detailed background and description of the pre-decisional periods as well as the decisional period for the four foreign policy decisions under study comprise Chapter V. In Chapter VI I analyze the four decisions under study within the framework of the king's belief system, and in Chapter VII I present a general summary and the conclusions of the study.

CHAPTER II

FOREIGN POLICY DECISION-MAKING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter I review theoretical writings on foreign policy decisions. In addition, I examine specific studies on the foreign policy of developing countries in an attempt to identify the shortcomings prevalent in the field of foreign policy analysis for developing nations. Emphasis is given to those writings which advance the understanding of foreign policy-making in countries with less developed institutional structures.

General Foreign Policy Studies of Decision-Making

In the early 1950s, Richard Snyder and his colleagues developed a framework to advance the study of foreign policy-making. Their seminal monograph provided an alternative to the power school approach, as exemplified by the work of Morgenthau, which was dominant at that time and presented a framework permitting a systemic study of the many complex variables affecting the foreign policy process.

Snyder's monograph was an early work concerned with the process of foreign policy decision-making. Decision-making, which was being studied in several fields of social science, was defined by Snyder (1962, 365) as a process of selection

from socially defined alternative courses of action intended primarily to bring about a particular state of affairs as envisaged by decision-makers. Three main factors were considered to determine foreign policy decisions:

1. Spheres of competence, the activities of decision-makers in achieving national objectives;
2. Communications and information available at the time of the decision, including meanings, values, and perceptions of the decision-makers; and
3. The motivation of the actors in the decision process, including psychological and personality factors that influence the actors and affect policy outcomes (Snyder, 1962, 5-9).

Snyder's framework had merit in that it provided uniform and comparable categories for the collection of data, allowing feasible comparative foreign policy research. Major emphasis was placed on the decision-makers, their perceptions, and how they defined their roles. It was suggested that empirical research could be conducted and an assessment made of the psychological and sociological aspects of decision-makers.

There were several limitations, however, to Snyder's approach. The number of variables was simply overwhelming since it called for analyzing the actors and their perceptions, motivations, values, and goals, as well as the

various forms and interpretations of communications. How all of the variables were to be related was not fully explained, and no means were provided to analyze the relationship among the variables. Critics have argued that the quantity of data to be considered was so enormous that it was unmanageable (Brecher et al., 1969, 77; McClosky, 1956, 287). These difficulties perhaps explain, in part, why for nearly two decades only Paige's (1968) study of the Korean decision used this approach. Obtaining the vast amount of information required by Snyder's model in Third World countries is even more difficult than in the developed world because of a shortage of documentary materials and inadequate archival facilities (Weinstein, 1972, 359). As a result, scholars have chosen to study foreign policy through a variety of other approaches.

For example, Graham Allison (1971) studied the decision process in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 by identifying three popular models frequently employed in foreign policy research, namely, the organizational process model, the bureaucratic politics model, and the rational actor model.

The organizational process model, according to Allison (1971), focuses on the organizations in which foreign policy decisions are made. Governmental organizations tend to take on a life of their own as they attempt to control their environment through regularized operating procedures. Government's action is the output of the various groups

working and functioning within all governmental organizations. In the organizational environment individuals function within a hierarchical structure, occupying specific roles in pursuit of organizational goals. Personal goals and preferences are to be subordinated to those of the organization, and rules and regulations dictate the means of undertaking various actions (Allison, 1969). Since the well-being of individuals depends on how well the organization in which they work succeeds, individuals tend to see their personal success in terms of the organization's success. Also, the goals of individuals are influenced by and tend to reflect the organization's interests.

Each organization within the government has a narrow range of interests and priorities, and each must seek legal authorization and resources from the state. Organizations, therefore, have to struggle for power to influence those decisions that distribute new programs, responsibilities, and resources (Allison, 1969). The struggle for programs and budgets is the essence of organizational politics.

The organizational process model is most useful to explain foreign policy-making in the United States and other western countries. For example, in the U.S. the organizations dealing with policy-making, such as the Pentagon, the State Department, the President's Executive Staff on Foreign Policy, and the Central Intelligence Agency, specialize in particular aspects of foreign

affairs, and each tends to see its own role as the most significant. Conflicts for power between these organizations, therefore, are unavoidable (Spainer and Uslaner, 1974).

In the case of the Third World, this organizational model does not seem to apply (Varma and Misra, 1969, 37). These countries do not have administrative organizations as complex as those in the United States. The organizations are also not as differentiated and are not as able to control their environments. Power tends to be concentrated in the national leader, and administrative organizations are not as important in policy-making as they are in the West. Thus, one can conclude that leaders in the developing countries have more influence and are less constrained by the process of countervailing organizational power than are their counterparts in the developed nations. Migdal (1974, 516) agreed with this assessment:

> Third world governments are much less likely to contain interlocking fiefdoms within their bureaucracies which are autonomous and coherent enough to have a sustained systematic and substantial effect on foreign policy. Thus, the kinds of stakes in specific courses of action do not develop as deeply in the bureaucracy of the third world states as in that of the world powers. Also, the organizations have usually not developed the regularized kinds of patterns and routines that characterize the large powers' organizations in that the kinds of choices that top leaders have do not become delineated as nearly as systematically or consistently.

The bureaucratic politics model, the second considered by Allison (1971), focuses on the compromises and bargains

that take place in government. Allison states that each bureaucratic unit formulates and pursues its own utility and that foreign policy thus rarely reflects a coordinated strategy. Actually, foreign policy consists of a number of pieces that emerge from the bargains made between various parts of the bureaucracy. This model stresses the influence of the bureaucratic participants, their interests, their positions, and their interaction (Allison, 1971). The focus is not on the environment or procedures of the bureaucratic organizations but, rather, on the power interactions of the leaders of various organizations. In one sense, it is the process of interorganizational contacts which determines foreign policy. What government does in any particular situation is largely the result of bargaining among bureaucratic players in the various agencies. The power of these players comes in part from their hierarchical positions within government and in part from their skills in playing the politics game. The process of bureaucratic bargaining tends to follow regularized circuits (Allison and Halperin, 1972; Neustadt, 1970) because of the nature of the governmental organization and their environments. As Allison (1969, 709) states,

> How each man manages to stand the heat in his kitchen, each player's basic operating style and the complementarity or contradiction among personalities and styles in the inner circles are irreducible pieces of the policy blend.

As is the case for the organizational process model, the bureaucratic politics model assumptions are not fully applicable in Third World countries because these countries do not have the differentiated political and social institutions found in the developed nations. Bureaucrats lack an autonomous, coherent governmental organization that can provide them with a base of power. Since bureaucrats do not necessarily derive power from relationships within an organization, they must seek power from other sources, such as from the political leadership or from the dominant groups within the country. Because regularized organizational procedures such as those found in the West are not present to help deal with issues facing the country, each crisis must be dealt with individually and the bureaucratic politics model does not help to explain the decision-making process. Migdal (1974, 519) pointed out that this politics model is of little help in Third World countries:

> Where leaders are not significantly differentiated on basis of the power of their organizations, where leaders receive common information, rather than separate flows of information through various organizations, and where leaders cannot draw on segments of a differentiated and organized public, then there is little to be gained by the researcher in employing the bargaining model.

The rational actor model, the third suggested by Allison (1971), assumes that nations seek to maximize their strategic goals and objectives and that decisions reflect a careful assessment of the alternatives and opportunities presented by the international environment (Allison, 1971).

The rational actor model has pervaded much of the literature of diplomatic history, as well as social science generally, since the early 1950s (Hoffman, 1960). In the use of the rational model, as Hoffman (1960), stated, "The analyst starts by reconstructing the values of governments and its leadership." Although it is extremely difficult to find explicit statements of goals and values, the assumption of the rational actor model is that there is a direct relationship of means and ends requiring one to ask the question, "what is the goal or what is leadership trying to achieve with a particular policy decision?" (Migdal, 1974, 503).

Three types of goals, according to Migdal (1974), should be considered in foreign policy research in Third World countries. First, consideration must be given to the goals pertaining to national stability and security. How policy actions change or affect the nation's internal stability must be considered. Second, the researcher must consider how policy actions affect region-wide stability. How will these actions affect the nation's position in comparison to its neighbors in the region? Third, consideration must be given to how the state's goals relate to the major powers. How will the policy affect relations with the great powers? Developing countries usually do not attempt to make significant changes in the international system itself because they lack the power and maneuverability

to make such changes; however, sometimes unintentionally they may affect regional and world-wide politics (Migdal, 1974, 523).

Although the rational actor model approach has merit, it has a number of deficiencies which are particularly evident in the Third World. The lack of accurate data and applicable statistical information, as well as an agreed-upon body of knowledge applicable to Third World countries, makes it difficult, if not impossible, to follow the rational actor model (Braybrooke & Lindblom, 1963, p. 117-119). Further, most developing states suffer from limited resources and liabilities of geographic position, which may be compounded by poverty, poor health, and illiteracy of its citizenry, all of which limit the country's ability to follow rational choice decision-making in their political processes (Almond and Powell, 1966; Migdal, 1974). The great powers and their potential action also limit the range of alternatives of choices that small states may consider (Migdal, 1974, 523). Such limitations make the rational actor model of little utility in studying Third World foreign policies.

The Importance of Studying Third World Politics

Brecher (1972) has elaborated on the inadequacies of the various approaches to examining foreign policy in Third World countries. He criticizes foreign policy studies for being theoretically inadequate, lacking vigor in their

analysis, and failing to link the international behavior of new nation-states to the social-psychological variables affecting nations' foreign policy (Brecher, 1972, p. 1).

During the last three decades political science scholars have focused mainly on development and modernization processes and have largely ignored the foreign policy behavior of developing societies. Michael Laifer (1977, 37) for instance, suggested "that in the main, the states of South-East Asia either individually or collectively have not attracted the attention of authors concerned specifically with testing theoretical propositions about foreign policy." Similarly, Adeed Dawisha (1977, 70) contended that the vast majority of scholarly works dealing with the Middle Eastern region have been primarily concerned with domestic politics of the Middle East states and many of these have been essentially biographical essays on the various leaders of these countries. Only in the last few years have academics undertaken true foreign policy study of Middle East states. Similarly, Kaufman (1977) criticized studies of Latin American foreign policies for focusing on the United States' influence in Latin America and to a lesser extent on the influence of other outside powers on Latin American policies. Contributions of writers on Latin American foreign policy have for many years utilized either a legalistic or historical method although, in recent years, more emphasis has been placed on economic factors. Very few

scholars have linked internal and external conditions in the study of foreign policy in Latin America (Kaufman, 1977).

There are few, if any, foreign policy models fully relevant to Third World countries, as can be seen from this review. The lack of knowledge about Third World countries is remarkable in view of the fact that most of the major wars in recent decades have taken place in developing societies of the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeastern Asia. The key and most affected participants of these wars, with the exception of the Vietnam war, have been small and less developed countries.

Despite the significance of Third World countries, little literature on international relations has dealt with the states in these turbulent peripheries of the international system. Instead, attention has been given either implicitly or explicitly to the problems of the major powers as the significant actors in the international system (Hill, 1977). Students of foreign policy behavior are still explaining foreign policy-making in small, underdeveloped states with the frameworks used to explain the foreign policy of powerful and developed states. For example, the foreign policy of Ghana or Indonesia has been studied as if the assumptions applying to developed countries such as Sweden or West Germany are interchangeable (Korany, 1974, 70).

With the exception of a very few studies that recently have discussed the issue of foreign policy-making in developing countries (Dawisha, 1977; Korany, 1986; Korany & Dessouki, 1984), one finds that existing literature on the foreign policy of Third World states is descriptive and historical and lacks a theoretical orientation capable of showing the differences in the foreign policy processes of the less developed states (Korany and Dessouki, 1984, 1).

Several factors may account for these differences in the analysis of developing nations' foreign policy. Scholars in many developing countries, according to Holsti (1985), work under conditions that militate against quality research. Some are forced to hold two or more jobs to support themselves and their families, and, if they write, it is often to earn extra money from newspapers or magazines. Such essentials for conducting research as sabbaticals, grants, travel expenses, or personal assistance, or even having adequate library support or the freedom to criticize are normally not available for Third World scholars (Holsti, 1985, 84). Furthermore, the serious problems endemic to Third World countries, the lack of data available to all researchers, and the cult of secrecy practiced by many of the ruling authorities, prevent scholars from undertaking research on many political topics (Korany, 1986, p. 40). Students of the Middle East, in particular, tend to focus attention on regional dynamics

rather than on behavior of specific actors in the various countries. For instance, much attention is focused on Arab-Israeli conflict or inter-Arab relations (Korany and Dessouki, 1984, 2), but few studies have been undertaken on foreign policy processes in individual countries. As a result of the limitations on native scholars, most theoretical work on the Third World has been done by Western scholars.

The dominant perception of many Western scholars is that the foreign policy of Third World countries is dominated by the great powers and that these countries are constrained in making foreign policy decisions on their own. As a result, the foreign policy of Third World countries is often analyzed as an offshoot of actions of the superpowers.

Approaches to the Study of Third World Foreign Policy

Several approaches have been advanced as means for studying foreign policy in developing countries, namely, the geopolitical, the psychological, the reductionist, and the dependency approaches.

The proponents of the geopolitical approach attempt to explain foreign policy in terms of relevant geopolitical factors. For example, Seale (1965, 2) argued that international politics in the Middle East during the period from 1945 to 1958 is best understood in terms of the rivalry between Iraq, Egypt, and Syria. He viewed Iraqi-Egyptian

rivalry as growing out of the historical rivalries which ebb and flow at different periods but are always the central factor influencing Middle Eastern politics. The geographic location of these nations and their effort to dominate other nations in the region are explained purely by geopolitical factors. Other possible factors such as changes in regimes, ideologies, and relations with the superpowers are largely ignored.

According to Seale (1965), Egypt, Iraq, and Syria were part of an international sub-system whose character was determined by strategic location more than by internal factors in any of the states. In his analysis Seale (1965, 23) attempted to minimize the impact of internal changes in regimes or ideology as factors determining the relationships among these countries.

Another advocate of the geopolitical approach, Malcolm Kerr (1971), attempted to explain Arab inter-state policies in the period from 1958 to 1967. According to Kerr (1971), Syria is the center of the contest for influence in the Arab world, and the principal antagonists are Iraq and Egypt. The competition between these powers began well before the Egyptian revolution of 1952, and has little or nothing to do with ideology. It was a renewal of a geopolitical struggle, reminiscent of past occasions when rulers of the Nile and Mesopotamian valleys disputed over the control of the area lying between them (Kerr, 1971, 2). Although the

monarchical regime of Iraq was changed in 1958 by a military coup, Iraqi-Egyptian rivalry continued as a result of dominant geopolitical factors. Kerr (1971) attempted to show that the various Arab leaders and factions operate within the constraints of geopolitical considerations (Kerr, 1967, 56). In the last part of his book, however, he seemed to recognize the limitations of the geopolitical model and discussed other factors that may help to explain inter-Arab politics, such as regime changes, shifting alliances, and a restructuring of the international sub-system.

The geopolitical approach fails to recognize the importance of either the internal or external factors influencing foreign policy-making in the Arab world. Critics argue that, without taking into account such factors as ideologies, political regimes, and the influence of the great powers, the politics of the Arab world cannot be fully understood. The geopolitical model by itself is inadequate to explain foreign policy in developing countries.

Proponents of the psychological approach explain foreign policy of states as a function of the psychological perception and beliefs of the leaders of a country and views kings and presidents as the main leaders affecting foreign policy. For example, in his study on the foreign policy of Ghana, 1957-1966, W. Scott Thompson (1969, 415) focused on the role of Nkrumah in Ghana's foreign policy. Ghana's foreign policy, he stated, reflected the character and stamp

of the man. His beliefs and perceptions of how the international system worked plus his personal reactions to events were the main determinant of the policies Ghana would follow (Thompson, 1969, 415). In this instance, Nkrumah's significance in foreign policy-making may be valid, but Thompson (1969) did not consider the internal and external settings which may have influenced Nkrumah in these foreign policy decisions.

Another proponent of this approach, Zartman (1966), has examined the foreign relations and conflicts among the African countries of the Ivory Coast (1957-1963), Ghana and Togo (1957 to 1963), upper Volta and Ivory Coast (1961), and Mali and Senegal (1960 to 1963). Zartman (1966, 54) concluded that relations among these states were basically dependent on personal relations among their leaders. This emphasis on the relationships between leaders differs slightly from Thompson's (1969) use of the psychological model, but it still emphasizes the personal characteristics of the leader. This approach does not consider such matters as the domestic, regional, and global factors within which foreign policy is formulated and implemented or acknowledge that leaders sometimes may be constrained by other factors.

The reductionist or model-builders approach views the foreign policy of developing countries as being determined by the same processes that shape the foreign policy of all countries. The basic differences in foreign policy,

according to this view, are only quantitative in nature because developing countries have fewer resources and capabilities and conduct foreign policy on a smaller scale. This view is based on the assumption that the behavior of all states, large and small, rich and poor, developed and developing, follows rational calculation in making decisions, and that all states seek to enhance their power and are motivated by security considerations (Korany and Dessouki, 1984). James Rosenau (1966) and Michael Brecher (1972) are two scholars who have followed this approach.

Rosenau (1966) attempted to develop a model to serve as a basis for comparison of the foreign policy and behavior of various countries in various situations. This pre-theory, as he called it, is based on a set of five independent variables which are considered as determinants shaping foreign policy: 1) idiosyncratic factors, including values, perceptions, and experiences of the political leaders; 2) role factors, that is, the influences of roles on the behavior of officials holding office; 3) the governmental factor, that is, the influence of government's structure on foreign policy choices; 4) the societal factor, that is, the influence of non-governmental aspects of the society affecting policies; and 5) the systematic factor, that is, the influence of the external environment on policy choices. Rosenau (1966, 17-92) attempted to measure the relative influence of each of these independent variables by ranking

them on three criteria, namely, size of the country (large or small), state of the economy (developed or developing), and type of political system (open or closed).

Rosenau's (1966) foreign policy variables are not operationalized, and other scholars such as Brecher et al. (1969), Hanrieder (1968), and Weinstein (1972) have criticized them for being ambiguous and overlapping. Moreover, because Rosenau (1966) assumed that any foreign policy behavior can be explained on the basis of the five sets of variables, his critics argued that some important distinctions are missed. For example, comparative politics scholars emphasize the importance of problems of social change and modernization among developing nations. Yet, in the Rosenau model, these issues are buried amidst a host of other non-governmental sets of variables. Rosenau (1966) made little distinction between Third World actors, where the issues of development and change are basic, and those from developed nations, where these issues are not entirely applicable (Korany, 1974). Neither Rosenau's (1966) effort nor the reductionist model in general accounts for specific characteristics of developing nations, such as social change, modernization, the low level of political institutionalization, and dependency status in the global system.

The dependency perspective was singled out by Hill (1977) as the most useful approach for studying the problems of international stratification and inequality in developing

countries. In the late 1960s, political scientists and politicians from Third World countries, Latin America in particular, developed the dependency perspective to explain the characteristics and roles of less developed countries and to help formulate new strategies for development. Proponents of this approach contend that the problems of Third World under development cannot be studied in isolation from the global context. The economics and politics of Third World states are ultimately shaped by the influence of the world-wide capitalist system, which penetrates the less developed parts of the world through the trading system in commodities and multi national corporations (Brown, 1974; Galtung, 1971).

Korany and Dessouki (1984) suggested that the dependency approach has three advantages in explaining Third World foreign policy. First, it emphasizes the role of structural factors, such as the patterns of social organizations, more than the traditional approaches. Second, it is a dynamic perspective that emphasizes both the role of social change in a global context and the linkage between the different levels of analysis from the global to sub-national, through the hierarchical network of different social groups. The state is no longer seen as the only basic actor in the international arena, as traditionalists assumed. Third, the advocates of the dependency approach are not bound to rigid boundaries of academic disciplines,

and they can emphasize the close relationship between political, economic, sociological, and historical phenomena (Korany and Dessouki, 1984, 24).

The dependency approach, however, has two main problems regarding foreign policy. First, it is more concerned with the general problems of under development and development than with the systematic analysis of a dependent country's foreign policy. Second, the theory assumes a common Third World position in the global system, notwithstanding variations among developing nations in areas such as social organization and phases of development (Korany and Dessouki, 1984).

Studies Based on Belief Systems

Many years ago, Walter Lippmann (1913, 2) observed that "to talk about politics without reference to human beings . . . is just the deepest error in our political thinking." Greenstein (1969, 7) emphasized the same idea, stating that "politics is a matter of human behavior and behavior . . . is a function of both the environmental situations in which actors find themselves and the psychological predispositions they bring to those situations." He also stated that, even though we recognize that behavior is dependent on outside stimuli, we need to consider that the behavior of an individual cannot be accounted for on the basis of external situations alone because it is affected partly by personal characteristics (Greenstein, 1969, 7).

Lippmann's (1913) basic assumption was that individual behavior is to a large degree influenced by the way individuals perceive, diagnose, and evaluate the situation. According to this view, foreign policy-makers' perceptions, images, and beliefs are crucial in understanding their behavior in the foreign policy process. Lippmann (1965, 10) pointed out that, in attempting to understand the massive and complex environment, an individual develops a way of looking at things or making sense of that environment. According to those following this approach, we perceive the world through our senses, but it is our minds that interpret what reality is. Our perceptions of external situations are, therefore, always partially made up of the stimuli from the environment which are transposed through the cognitive maps in our minds to interpret the situation.

Jervis (1976, 28), for instance, stressed that "It is often impossible to explain crucial decisions and policies without reference to the decision-makers' beliefs about the world and their images of others." Other scholars like Bonham and Shapiro (1973) have proposed a decision-making model relying on the investigation of the policy-maker's cognitive maps. In the decision-making process, they argued that beliefs act like conductors for channeling information and for relating possible policy options to their perceptions of the policy environment (Bonham and Shapiro, 1973, 61).

More recently the belief systems of national leaders have become the focus of research in the approach known as the operational code. The operational code of the leader is defined by George (1975, 2) in a manner reminiscent of Lippmann as

> A prism or filter that influences the actor's perception and diagnosis of political situations, and that provides norms and standards to guide and channelize his choices of action in specific situations. The function of an operational code belief system in decision-making, then is to provide the actor with diagnostic propensities and choice propensities.

The importance of beliefs in the operational code approach to foreign policy-making is that the belief system serves as a set of general guidelines--heuristical aids for the researcher to determine decisional choices of the leadership in the foreign policy arena. Such an approach enhances the study of the foreign policy of developing nations since the leader tends to dominate the policy-making process.

In Third World politics, where the leader is most important, one cannot fully comprehend public policies without understanding the leader. This point has been made by Brecher, Steinberg, and Stein, (1969), who contended that the way decision-making elites perceive information does not necessarily reflect objective reality. Information from the outside environment is perceived through the cognitive processes of decision elites. How leaders will react to an outside stimulus depends upon their psychological makeup.

Brecher, Steinberg and Stein (1969, 75-101) clearly gave preeminence to the importance of the individual's cognitive processes and psychology in foreign policy-making.

The concept of the operational code was first introduced by Nathan Leites in his 1951 study of the Soviet Politburo. Leites (1951) used the concept of the operational code to refer to those instrumental aspects of Bolshevik beliefs that influenced Soviet foreign policy behavior during the Cold War. Later, in 1953, in A Study of Bolshevism, Leites explored the philosophical components of the Bolshevik code and attempted to relate the features of individual personalities to politics. Neither of Leites' studies was fully applicable to the study of foreign policy decision-making since they were not undertaken in a systematic manner. Nevertheless, despite these initial shortcomings, this approach has come to be a major method of investigating foreign policy-making.

Nearly two decades after Leites' pioneering work, other scholars began to use the operational code approach to study policy decision-makers. Since that time, it has been used extensively to assess the relationship between the belief system of policy-makers and their policy choices in various political contests.

In 1969, Alexander George modified and restructured Leites' concept of the operational code in a systematic fashion to make it more applicable to the study of foreign

policy behavior. To determine the nature of the fundamental belief system and the psychological state of an individual, which is called an individual's "cognitive map," George (1969) devised ten questions to guide researchers. The utility of the operational code construct, therefore, lies in its ability to provide the analyst with a set of categories that can be employed and tested in order to determine their relations to policy outcomes (McClellan, 1971, 75). After the operational code of the leader is determined through this set of questions, one can better predict the types of decisions the leader will make.

The first five questions of the operational code developed by George (1969, 197) are means of determining significant portions of a decision-maker's beliefs about the nature of politics and political conflict, and his views regarding the extent to which historical developments can be shaped. The second set of five questions focuses more on techniques for dealing with environmental change and conflict and the psychology of the decision-maker.

These first five questions in George's (1969) formulation are as follows.

1. What is the essential nature of political life? Is the political universe essentially one of harmony or conflict? What is the fundamental character of one's political opponents?

2. What are the prospects for the eventual realization of one's fundamental political values and aspirations? Can one be optimistic or must one be pessimistic on this score, and in what respect one or the other?
3. Is the political universe predictable? In what sense and to what extent?
4. How much control or mastery can one have over historical development? What is one's role in moving and shaping history in the desired direction?
5. What is the role of chance in human affairs and in historical development?

The second five questions investigate the instrumental beliefs of the leader. Instrumental beliefs have to do with questions of correct strategies and tactics.

1. What is the best approach for selecting goals and objectives for political actions?
2. How are the goals of action pursued most effectively?
3. How are the risks of political action calculated, controlled, and accepted?
4. What is the best timing of action to advance one's interest?
5. What are the utility and role of different means for advancing one's interest? What resources can

one draw upon in the effort to advance one's interest?

Through these questions, it is argued that a leader's basic beliefs can be determined and that these beliefs, in turn, influence his decisions. One proponent of this approach, Ole Holsti (1971, 33), discussed the relations between beliefs in the ruler's system and his decisions. Holsti's (1971) model is based on the premise of a dual connection between the decision-maker's belief system and his action. A direct relationship is found in that aspect of belief systems which tells us what ought to be acting as a direct guide in the establishment of goals. The indirect link lies in the role that belief systems play in the processes of scanning, selecting, filtering, linking, organizing, and reporting.

More recent studies have employed variations of the operational code construct to analyze the belief systems of historical and contemporary leaders. Some exploratory investigations such as Dennis Kavanagh's (1971) study of the role of Ramsay MacDonald's operational code in his handling of the British depression crisis of 1913 and Ned Ashby's (1970) comparison of K. Schumacher and W. Brandt have utilized the operational code as an independent or intervening variable for tentatively explaining their subject's decision-making choices. However, the most systematic study of the latter kind was Stephen Walker's

(1977) study of Henry Kissinger's approach to peacemaking in Vietnam. Walker (1977, 129-168) presented plausible grounds for the thesis that Kissinger's operational code beliefs played an important causal role in the way in which he negotiated and used available policy instruments to work towards a peace agreement with North Vietnamese leaders.

In his study of John F. Kennedy's operational code, Stuart (1978) utilized the operational code approach to examine the influence of the leader's cognitive predispositions on policy-making. The operational code approach is designed to tap such beliefs and place them within a belief system framework. Stuart's (1978) study sought to improve the potential of the operational code approach by considering the interrelations between elements of the code. Under certain circumstances, he suggested, one particular operational code belief (such as a subject's image of his opponent) will perform the role of master belief, structuring other aspects of his overall world view.

In his dissertation study of Gamal Abdel Nasser (1979), Mohammed Selim presented an empirically supportable and systematically constructed configuration of President Nasser's belief system. He asserted that an individual's beliefs are crucial to the understanding of his decision choices. The individual's decision-making process is a result of the interaction between that individual's belief system and his information system. In the absence of full

information, the individual is usually compelled to rely only upon his belief system to make judgments. This study made a methodological contribution in that Selim (1979) explored the operational code, but limited his study to those beliefs of Nasser found in his speeches or writings during the periods in which key foreign policy decisions were being made.

Daniel Heradstveit (1981) also used the operational code approach in an attempt to study conflict resolution in the Arab-Israeli war by considering beliefs and attitudes held by both sides. Such research provides an additional insight into psychological mechanisms by developing an analytical framework to examine the influence of beliefs in relationships, as well as their influence upon the individual policy-makers.

In another dissertation, Schlaghech (1985) focused upon two related questions in the study of foreign policy decision-making at the individual level: 1) how does a decision-maker define the situation he confronts, and 2) how

can the researcher reliably establish that definition? The problem of context and how decision-makers define a situation is shown to have a common thread running throughout the foreign policy literature. Schlaghech (1985) used the operational code to guide the application of new, contextual, and conceptual content analysis in a case study

of Henry Kissinger's definition of the situations he faced in the Vietnam and arms control negotiations.

Utility of the Operational Code Approach

The operational code approach may be employed to supplement research using other decision-making models of environmental factors affecting foreign policy, or it may be utilized to compare findings from other approaches in international politics. It may be especially useful in providing the content and background data for what is called the cognitive map of a leader (Axelrod, 1976; Bonham, 1976).

The operational code is a set of "master" beliefs that play a central role in the individual leader's cognitive processing of information about politics. According to Holsti, (1977A, p. 40), these master beliefs satisfy a number of important requirements.

1. They are relatively few in number and should thus prove manageable from a research viewpoint.
2. They are sufficiently large in scope and they are likely to be salient in any decision-making situation.
3. They are capable of being further differentiated and elaborated.
4. They are likely to be relatively stable over time.

These master beliefs are multi dimensional in nature. Consequently, the operational code construct facilitates the

comparative study of decisions within one political system, as well as over different national and cross-cultural settings. Scholars using the operational code construct have applied this method to various cases in both developed and developing nations (Table I). Defending the explanatory power of the operational code, Heradstveit and Narveser (1978, 91) argued,

> In principle the operational code offers us a guide as to how to increase the possibility of predicting and explaining the person's political behavior. The relevance criterion offers an analytical tool for isolating, cheaply, the essential elements of the person's belief system. It makes sense out of wilderness of beliefs and suggests both how they may be related to each other and how this in turn determines political choice.

In general, students of the operational code use it as one of several independent variables that help to explain foreign policy behavior. It provides an idea of how decision-makers "perceive, diagnose, and make choices in specific situations" (Holsti, 1970, p. 153).

George (1979) argued that the code has two theoretical premises. The first is that beliefs of this kind affect decision-making indirectly by influencing the information processing tasks that precede and accompany the decision-maker's choice of action. By performing certain functional and substantive tasks in information processing, the actor's operational code beliefs introduce two types of propensities, not determinants, into his decision-making:

Table I

Representative Studies Using a Variation of the Operational Code

Author	Subject	Nation	Role
Ashby (1973)	Brandt & Schumacher	Germany	Chancellor Party Head
Heradstveit (1981)	Elites	Israel Egypt	Opinion Leaders
Holsti (1970)	Dulles	U.S.	Sec./State
Johnson (1977)	Church	U.S.	Senator
Selim (1979)	Nasser	Egypt	President
Anderson (1973)	Vandenberg	U.S.	Senator
Kavanaugh (1971)	MacDonald	U.K.	Party Head
McClellan	Acheson	U.S.	Sec./State
Walker (1977)	Kissinger	U.S.	Sec./State
Schlaghech (1985)	Kissinger	U.S.	Sec./State
Cummins	Lenin & Nycrene	U.S.S.R. Tanzania	Chairman President
Stuart (1977)	DeGaulle & Pompidou	France	Presidents
White (1970)	Mao Tse-Tung & Liu Shao-Chi	China	President Prime/Min.
Gutierrez (1973)	Rusk &	U.S.	Sec./State
Stuart (1978)	Kennedy	U.S.	President

Table compiled from information gleaned from the literature.

1. Diagnostic propensities, which extend or restrict the scope of search and evaluation and influence his diagnosis of the situation in certain directions.
2. Choice propensities, which lead him to favor certain types of actions. Thus, the conception of the role of operational code beliefs in decision-making is that they serve as a set of general guidelines--heuristic aids to decision, not a set of mathematical algorithims that are applied by the actor in a mechanical way in his decision-making. A person's cognitive map channels the way in which he copes and deals with cognitive limits on rationality; it serves to define his particular type of bounded rationality.

The second theoretical premise is that the operational code does not unilaterally determine individual choices of action. The code occupies a position of centrality in a person's entire set of beliefs and attitudes, but it represents only one variable-cluster within a complex causal framework for explaining decision-making. As is well known in making foreign policy decisions, a policy-maker may be influenced by personal considerations, domestic politics, and/or organizational interests as well as by his conception of the national interest (George, 1979, 102-104).

The cognitive map is derived from basic tenets which distinguish it from other approaches to study of foreign policy. It differs from other research approaches in the following ways.

1. The individual decision-maker (whether he acts alone or with a few colleagues) is the basic unit of analysis.
2. The environment in which the individual functions is not a vertical one from which perfect information can be obtained. The real world is complex and relative. It is dependent upon how we perceive it.
3. In order to function, the individual must be related in some way or other to his environment. This is usually achieved by acquiring, during the course of his development, a set of beliefs about his environment. These beliefs provide him with a relatively coherent way of making sense of what otherwise would be a confusing array of sensory signals.
4. Individuals, and certainly all political leaders, short-circuit rational choice by relying on their beliefs and cognitive mechanisms to produce the necessary decisions.
5. A decision process or behavior is provoked when the decision-maker organizes his environment into

> a pattern that suggests to him that a decision or behavior is appropriate (Bonham, 1976, 478-500; Stein, 1977, 433).

The operational code approach, however, like any other theoretical and conceptual approach, cannot and should not be considered as an ultimate paradigm. Taking into consideration the complexity of human behavior, especially in the field of international relations, one cannot claim that cognitive factors are the most powerful variables in accounting for foreign policy behavior. Nevertheless, they are certainly important ones (Heradstveit, 1981). As Bonham (1976, 505) suggested, "A theory of foreign policy is adequate to the extent that it accounts for the outcomes it seeks to explain."

Several scholars using the operational code approach indicate that cognitive variables do help to explain human choice and perception and that, to understand human decision-making, one must take these processes into account. According to Stuart (1978, 19-21),

> . . . in the current pre-paradigmatic situation of international relations theory on any approach which generates more than one or two studies is something of a phenomenon. By these standards the operational code method is already a success.

The question a researcher must ask is when one should use the operational code construct. According to Holsti (1976), certain factors in some situations call for research at the individual level:

1. Situations that contain highly ambiguous components and are thus open to a variety of interpretations;
2. Non-routine situations that require more than the application of standard operating procedures and decisions (for example, decisions to initiate or terminate wars, interventions, alliances, etc.);
3. Situations that require decisions at the pinnacle of the government hierarchy by leaders who are relatively free from organizational and other constraints or who may at least define their roles in ways that enhance their latitude for choice;
4. Events that are unanticipated and contain an element of surprise to which the decision-maker's initial reactions are likely to reflect his cognitive map;
5. Long-range policy planning, a task that inherently involves considerable uncertainty and in which policy-makers are likely to differ in their perception of uncertainties and in their preferred resolution of them.

In these situations, there is no simple decision-making criterion or pattern to follow. The decision-maker is forced to rely upon his own pre-established beliefs in order to define the situation. Direnzo (1974, 25) and Hermann (1976, 331) suggested that in ambiguous situations the

response of the decision-maker is more likely to involve personality elements and beliefs. Jervis (1976) similarly asserted that, the more ambiguous the information, the greater is the impact of an individual's belief system on his interpretation of the information.

One obvious difficulty of using the operational code approach is the accessibility of data. Such measures as GNP per capita, arms budgets, trade figures, votes in the UN General Assembly, public opinion polls, and the like that may be used in other studies are not available to those interested in the beliefs of decision-makers. Another difficulty concerns transformation of available biographical, documentary, and other evidence of belief systems into data that are both replicable and directly relevant to the theoretical question at hand (Holsti, 1977B). Yet, despite these difficulties, the operational code construct offers perhaps the most useful approach for gathering information pertaining to a leader's belief system.

Given the limited opportunities for employing research designs of an experimental or statistical character in this kind of investigation, the methodology of the single case study must be employed. The methodology of explanation in single case (George, 1979) analysis--a problem of long-standing interest to historians--is beginning to receive more attention from those interested in the operational code construct, as well as from other social scientists. The

reason for this is that, in the last decade or so, scholars identified with a variety of disciplines and different research areas have independently come to adopt a more positive view of the contribution that single case studies and "controlled comparisons" of a few cases can make to theory development (Eckstein, 1975; George and Smoke, 1974; Lijphart, 1971; Russett, 1970; Verba, 1967).

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING AND THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES: THE CASE OF JORDAN

The making of foreign policy in all states is influenced to a large degree by the political, economic, and social institutions and the role of leadership in the country. These factors, therefore, must be assessed before turning to the study of the belief system of the leaders. In this chapter, each of them will be discussed. The institutional characteristics of Third World countries generally will be examined first, and then attention will be given to Jordan's political system and the role of King Hussein in foreign policy-making.

General Characteristics of Third World Countries

A popularly held view that all Third World countries are alike obviously is not true. Although many of these states are extremely poor and suffer a plethora of problems such as poverty, ill health, poor education, a maldistribution of wealth and income, and the like, others do not suffer these problems. Third World countries are, in fact, dissimilar with respect to their political, social, and economic conditions (Gendzier, 1985). The oil-rich Arab countries, for example, are anything but poor, and countries

like Jordan or Lebanon do not have the problems of huge illiterate masses of people. The similarity in all of the Third World countries is not in economic and social aspects, but, as pointed out by Huntington and others, developing nations have in common weak and ineffective political institutions such as a low level of political participation, controlled mass media and public opinion, an ineffective parliament (if any at all), and a lack of competitive political parties and interest groups (Almond and Verda, 1963; Huntington, 1968; Pye, 1958).

Although the institutional weaknesses of all developing nations are not identical, they all suffer from problems in this area as is evident by such factors as the inability of government to act effectively on real problems, the lack of freedom of the people, the number of military coups, the ever-present threat of violence, and a host of other problems caused by instability. Clifford Geertz (1977, 245-261) states that the distinctive phenomenon in the developing countries of the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America is the lack of democratic institutions, i.e. parliaments, competitive parties, free elections, and other pluralistic institutions. Autocratic rule is the norm in these countries; many are plagued with instability in the form of coups, rebellions, and wars, and violence often wrecks the society. For instance, in the Middle East alone there have been five major wars since World War II, several

revolutions and coups that have entirely changed the political profile of the regions, and almost continuing violence in the form of civil war, riots, and rebellions. In short, instability is still the dominant characteristic of political systems in the Middle East.

Developing necessary political institutions for a country is extremely difficult, since the people of the Third World have limited experience with democratic institutions. Stable democratic institutions, according to Myron Weiner (1987), require certain social, cultural, and economic preconditions and an "appropriate" fit between those institutions and the society. Weiner points out that social scientists argue that the transfer of institutions from one society to another will result in either their total transformation or their rejection. If institutions are to be successfully transferred from one state to another, they must be adapted to fit the cultural environment of the recipient state.

In his recent book Search for Peace, Prince El Hassan (1984, 45-51) of Jordan demonstrates the difficulty of transferring institutions from one culture to another and states,

> Today, everywhere in the Arab East the experiment with liberal constitutional system of government appears to have failed. Democratic institutions have been abandoned in many of the Arab states in favor of a more totalitarian system of government. The collapse of the liberal constitutional system of government in the Arab East could not be blamed entirely on the selfishness or heavy-handedness of imperial and mandatory powers.

> There are other more crucial reasons which made it unworkable at the time. The indigenous political leaders had insufficient familiarity and little training, as well as inadequate support, for the task of operating the system. It was, in all practical terms, an alien system transferred ready made, not only from another country, but from another civilization. It was imported by western or westernized leadership and imposed on states whose societies had not evolved independently into mature political communities.

Acceptance and loyalty to new institutions are most difficult to develop in those societies where loyalty has traditionally been to the individual political leader. Developing political institutions is the most difficult task facing these nations since they do not have the social, cultural, and economic preconditions required for democratic institutions. Few, if any, constitutional restraints limit the powers of the political leaders in many of the developing countries. There is no history of popular participation, and participation does not serve as a limiting force on the political leader. Neither is there a history of competitive parties. Elections are not permitted in most of these countries, and political parties or any organizations which might cause opposition to the government are prohibited since they threaten the regime. Furthermore, these governments normally attempt to develop only institutions which support the regime (Huntington, 1987, 44-45).

As a result of the lack of competitive parties and elections, there are no competing political elites

representing different interests in the government. M.C.T., Kahin, Pauker, and Pye (1955, 1027) point out that cabinet appointments frequently are made as a form of patronage and that cabinets and parliaments, therefore, do not perform a representative role. Rather, they serve as a device for facilitating the personal politics of elites and providing a sense of legitimacy to the regime.

In developing states in Middle Eastern societies, political position and power are largely determined by the patterns of social and personal relationships (Bill and Leidin, 1984). Elections, if held, give only a poor reflection of the popular will since there are no strong institutions to focus public opinion, such as parties, interest groups, national press, and the like, and public opinion is vague and incoherent unless mobilized by the ruling regime for its own support. The function of those interest-groups which are allowed to operate, such as labor unions, religious groups, and professional associations, with few exceptions are mobilized to support the political elites or the government. Bill and Leidin (1984, 164) concur in the finding that leaders in the Middle East rarely permit political institutions such as parliaments or parties to exist and fully function unless they support or do not threaten the ruling regime.

Centrality of the Leader in the Decision-Making Process

Leaders in Third World countries are the major decision-makers, and in many instances they hold themselves up as a patriarchal rulers of the people in an attempt to legitimize their positions. Since they often acquired power through military coups or manipulated elections, they are forced to seek legitimacy of their leadership through personality and charisma (Ake, 1973).

In the Arab world, especially in the Arab monarchies, according to Michael Hudson (1977), the main source of legitimacy comes from the personality of the leader. Other legitimizing sources identified by David Easton (1965), such as ideological and structural factors, are not as important. The leader whose legitimacy depends on personality may largely ignore the norms and prescribed procedures of the society's dominant ideology and may even violate the constitutional and structural provisions with immunity as long as his personality or appeal holds (Easton, 1965; Sharabi, 1963).

The inherent weakness of charisma as a legitimizing source, however, forces these leaders to attempt to dominate all institutions of governments by appointing personal supporters to various offices. Key positions in the government are given to those with whom they have close relations and to those who are fully loyal to the leader. Authorities tend to use available information and channels

of communication to promote the leader's image and to favorably shape the news in order always to show the ruler in a good light. Pictures of the leader, slogans of the regime, and the leader's name are used in all kinds of public facilities and events to give a favorable image to the leader (Riggs, 1963, 162). An example of how the leader is glorified is reflected in the following statement by Korany: (1986, xii)

> For instance in downtown Tunis the main street is called--naturally--Bourguiba Street. When taking the metro downtown I asked a local fellow passenger which stop was nearest Bourguiba Street. He did not seem to understand, and it took some discussion before I grasped the fact that in almost every small town there was probably a Bourguiba Street. Indeed, Bourguiba is omnipresent; as an imposing statue on horseback in the center of the capital, or on the currency, in the press, on the radio, and in official political culture.

There are several reasons, according to Pye and others (1956, 1025) why charismatic leaders are likely to appear in Third World countries. The lack of cohesive forces in these societies, with the exceptions of the nationalist movement, often requires a charismatic leader who can pull the country together. The process of breaking from a traditional past where ruling forces and aristocracies were sanctioned by supernatural beliefs also leaves positive attitudes toward obedience to the new leaders. Also, the withering of the deeply held emotional roots of respect for traditional authority leaves habits of obedience which continue toward the new leaders. A new sense of national character is slow

to develop since the media are not free to help educate the populace and the educational level hinders an awareness of the situation among the general public. Under these circumstances, the charismatic leader tends to fill the political vacuum. The leader in the Middle East certainly meets the pattern described by Dawisha (1977, 627) as principal decision-maker. In part this is due to the political culture of the region. Traditionally, tribal life bestowed power on one person, the tribal chief. Also, the Arab family supported the patriarchal leader and the father figure dominated. According to Hudson (1977, 84),

> The family is an important political as well as social structure. Political actors are frequently distinguished by their family identity, and political authority even outside the family is often paternalistic. At the national level, too, the family still bulks large among the various actors, even though it has lost ground in the last quarter century.

Although urbanization and social change have influenced the traditional structure somewhat, the influence of these cultural values is still dominant.

The Islamic religion also supports the belief that power should be concentrated in the hands of one man. Since the Prophet Muhammad, political power in the region has been centered in the caliph as his successor (Dawisha, 1977, 63). Although Islam calls for obedience to the ruler, the leader is to obey God and govern the state according to Islamic law, including consultation with the people. The imperative of justice is pressed upon the leader, and Islam calls for

the people to denounce injustice and intemperate behavior by the ruler. The Quran declares, "And those who hearken to their Lord, observe prayer, and whose affairs are decided by mutual consultation, and who spend out of what we have provided for them (The Holy Quran, 1042, 42:39).

Despite the limitations called for by Islam, leaders in the Middle East often do not follow these precepts and rule in an authoritarian manner. In foreign policy, especially, the leader seems to be able to operate with very few, if any, domestic constraints. Control of foreign policy by the leader is used to help maintain the power of the regime (Clapham, 1977, 169). No other political institutions, other than perhaps the military, have power to challenge the actions of the leader. Even the military may not be able to influence foreign policy because of the loyalty of its commanders to the leader. The lack of pluralism in the society further weakens the development of countervailing forces which could challenge his actions. Other political institutions and actors, which potentially could challenge or restrain the regime, usually are not allowed to operate freely so they play only a marginal role--if any--in the politics of the state. The leader, therefore, acts alone with little or no consultation other than a small number of close subordinate personnel on his staff in most decisions (Hermann, 1978, 80).

Other actors that normally are considered significant in foreign policy-making, such as foreign ministers or cabinet officials and military advisors, do not have the major impact that their counterparts in developed Western nations have. In many cases, the foreign ministers in a Third World country serve only as executors of foreign policy decisions, or as administrators carrying out a large number of essentially non-policy or non-substantive activities (East, 1973). They are often brought into the government primarily to balance the country's political forces (Modelski, 1970), or because they are close personal friends or relatives of the leader, and the extent to which the leader is influenced by their advice remains solely a matter of the leader's personal choice. Most of the studies on foreign policy-making in Third World countries show that foreign ministers are actually marginal players in setting foreign policy. Even a talented foreign minister can at best under these circumstances have only a marginal role in the formulation of foreign policy (Varma and Misra, 1969, 37). Similarly, the role of the cabinet is usually confined to discussing decisions after they have been promulgated by the leader. In part this is due to the fact that the leader controls sources of information, which makes his advisors rely upon him.

In the Camp David negotiations between Egypt and Israel mediated by former United States President Jimmy Carter, for

example, Anwar Sadat of Egypt acted independently of the Egyptian foreign minister or any regularized foreign policy process. Two Egyptian foreign ministers, Ismael Fahmy and Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil, and the editor of a leading Egyptian daily newspaper, Al-Ahram Muhammed Heykal, all reported on Sadat's personalized approach to foreign policy decisions. This one-man decision process happened in Egypt, a state with perhaps the most professional foreign policy bureaucracy in the Arab world. Kamil mentions that Sadat surprised his security council and foreign minister and gave only verbal notice of his plan just twenty-four hours before departing for Camp David (Ismael, 1986, 36-37).

Control of foreign policy by the leader in Third World countries is especially significant since their hope of escaping from poverty and low international status depends upon success in getting foreign aid. These nations are searching for sources of economic and military and technical skills from the developed countries, as well as markets for their products. Since their well-being and survival depend upon success in acquiring the economic, military and technical assistance from other countries, foreign policy-making becomes the primary concern of leaders.

The Case of Jordan

Jordan is a small country with a total area of approximately 96,089 square kilometers. The occupied West

Bank encompasses about 5,440 square kilometers. The country is landlocked, with the exception of shoreline along the Gulf of Agaba which provides access to the Red Sea.

As a new nation Jordan was established in March, 1921, when Great Britain agreed to back a national government under Amir Abdullah, the son of Sharif Hussein Ibn Ali of Hajaz, over territories east of the Jordan River. Sharif Hussein Ibn Ali was the ruler of Mecca. As Sharif of Mecca, he was contacted in 1915 by the British representative in Egypt, Sir Henry McMahon, who sought Arab support in an attempt to overthrow the Ottomans and their German allies. In exchange for a promise by the British of recognition of Arab independence, Sharif Hussein declared an Arab Revolt against the Ottomans in 1916, and led the struggle to rid the Arab countries of Ottoman influence. His son, Amir Faisal, coordinated the Arab forces with the British army during 1917 and 1918, in a series of attacks which succeeded in conquering most of the Middle Eastern countries. By the end of World War I, in 1919, the last British forces were withdrawn from Damascus, leaving effective control of Syria to Amir Faisal and his forces. Iraq and Palestine came under direct British control while direct French control was imposed on Lebanon (Patai, 1958, 33-35). The Arabs had relied on Great Britain, their ally, to execute its promise to support achieving unity and independence, but the British were bound by the terms of the secret Sykes-Picot agreement

rather than by their promise to the Arabs. As a result, France objected to Faisal's control over Syria and in July 1920 the French army marched from Lebanon to defeat Faisal's army, forcing him to leave Damascus and consolidated their power over Syria (Musa, 1983, 76).

Another agreement in San Remo in 1920 between Britain and France awarded a mandate over Syria and Lebanon to France, and Britain was assigned a mandate to rule Palestine, Jordan, and Iraq (Patai, 1958, 33-36). Sharif Hussein was very concerned about the turn of events in Syria, and he instructed his son Amir Abdullah to support his brother Faisal with additional forces in an attempt to reinstall Faisal as king of Syria. In the face of this continuing conflict the British offered Faisal the kingship of Iraq and his brother Abdullah the rule of Trans Jordan in exchange for their renunciation of claims to Syria. As a result of these agreements, Iraq and Jordan came under the control of the Hashemite family (Musa, 1983, 77-79).

On the eve of the establishment of Jordan, the country's treasury depended on British financial support on an annual basis. British officials resumed the responsibility for handling Jordan's defense, finance, and foreign policy issues and left the internal affairs to Amir Abdullah. A further step toward self-government was taken in 1928, when Britain and Trans Jordan agreed to a new treaty that lessened British controls although the British

continued to oversee financial and foreign policy issues. The first constitution was promulgated in the same year, and in 1929 a new legislative council was appointed (Nyrop, 1980, 22-23).

In March 1946, Transjordan and Britain concluded the treaty of London, under which another major step was taken to grant full independence to the state. As a result, Transjordan was proclaimed a kingdom, and a new constitution replaced the old one of 1928. After the Arab-Israeli War in 1948 and the establishment of an Israeli state in Palestine, the remaining part of Palestine in the hands of the Arabs--the West Bank--was unified with East Jordan. In December 1948, Amir Abdullah took the title of King of Jordan, and the country's name became the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. In April 1950, elections were held on the East and West Banks and the West Bank was formally integrated with Jordan. This unification, however, was recognized by only two countries, Britain and Pakistan (Musa, 1983; Nyrop, 1980).

Economically, Jordan is quite poor and has few natural resources. Most of its land is desert, and it has little water. Phosphates and, to a lesser degree, potash are the kingdom's sole natural resources. Thus, the country depends heavily upon foreign and economic aid from the rich Arab countries, the United States, and, to some extent, the European community. Jordan has traditionally been faced with three deficits, as Day (1986, 95) points out: a budget

deficit, a balance of payments deficit, and a gap between needed investment funds and available savings. The country has been able to bridge these gaps, but doing so has required continuing foreign subsidies which have inevitably come with a political price tag. Jordan is far from being self-sufficient. In fact, today the kingdom is facing serious economic problems, especially the deficit in the budget, around seven billion dollars in debts and inflation. All of these economic problems create a threat to Jordan's stability. The kingdom's foreign policy at the present time has to absorb and overcome such threats.

The Primacy of the King in Jordan's Foreign Policy-Making

Jordan, like many developing countries, is faced with the challenges of political, economic, and social development, and has had to deal with many challenges and upheavals in the region since the kingdom became independent in 1946. Generally speaking, Jordan's foreign policy has been directed toward three main challenges: 1) those related to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the occupation of the West Bank, and the large number of Palestinian refugees; 2) how to promote the survival of the state in view of its limited natural and economic resources; and 3) how Jordan is to protect itself and maintain stability and security in the face of the numerous internal and external threats in the region.

The king is forced to give his primary attention to the survival of the state in view of these challenges. Foreign policy decisions are ultimately made by him. He is the dominant figure in international affairs; and subordinate institutions, such as the legislature, cabinet, and foreign ministry play only marginal roles, such as gathering information and giving advice in the pre-decision stage of policy-making.

To analyze the foreign policy process in Jordan, one must focus on the king. The importance of such a focus was asserted by one of the king's close political advisors recently when he wrote,

> The formulation of Jordan's foreign policy is the main responsibility of King Hussein. He is the most important actor in carrying out and implementing these policies. He accomplishes this through his personal relations with other leaders of the world. His personality is rational and moderate as a result of his long reign in office and his expertise in international affairs. This facilitates his efforts in establishing strong relations between Jordan and other countries. These relations are the country's most important resource in foreign policy at both the regional and international level (Abu Odeh, 1986, 21).

Other scholars agree that King Hussein's foreign policy skills have contributed greatly to the improvement of the country's economy and helped to preserve Jordan's stability as well as to enhance his own personal prestige. The throne in Jordan has become a crucial symbol and the center for building and holding the country together. In addition to the king's personal qualities and qualifications, his

success in domestic and foreign affairs may be attributed partly to his ability to induce other leaders to support him and his country (Khadduri, 1981, 112).

King Hussein's primacy in foreign policy affairs, however, did not emerge until the mid-1960s. In the early days of his reign and before the dismissal of General John Glubb, the British Commander-in-Chief of the Arab Legion, the British government had in effect de facto control of the state's affairs. The young king had to consult either General Glubb or the British ambassador in Amman before any actions could be taken. Even after the dismissal of General Glubb in 1956, the king's power was severely constrained by the cabinet, which had been formed after free elections in 1956 (Aruri, 1972, 107). In 1956, the new Prime Minister Sulieman Al-Nubulsi and his cabinet immediately set about shifting Jordan's orientation from its traditional British ties to support Egypt and Syria. Al-Nubulsi rejected several of the policies proposed by the king in an intense struggle between the king and the parliament. Despite the king's opposition, the cabinet under Al-Nabulsi's leadership passed a resolution allowing the publication of the Communist newspaper Al-Jamabeer, and permitted the Soviet agency Tass to establish a bureau and operate in Jordan (Hussein, 1962). Furthermore, the prime minister broke diplomatic relations with France in support of Algeria and abrogated the Anglo-Jordanian treaty, which could have

resulted in an end to the Western aid which was vital to Jordan's well being. He even proposed recognition of Communist China during this power struggle (Aruri, 1972, 96).

The king's authority and influence in the decision-making process during this period were also seriously challenged and weakened by newly created political parties in Jordan which favored the nationalist movement led by President Gamel Abdel-Nasser of Egypt. At this time the two influential political figures contesting with the king were Prime Minister Al-Nabulsi and Army Chief of Staff Ali Abu-Nuwar. These political opponents to the king dominated the political scene and attempted but failed to overthrow the monarchy in 1957 (Khadduri, 1981, 95).

After the abortive coup, the king dismissed the disloyal commandos, dissolved the government, ordered the dissolution of all political parties, and assumed full power to rule the state (Aruri, 1972, 147). Not only was the system changed by these events, but the king emerged as a strong leader. He was more devoted to the challenges of governing and more sensitive to the problems facing the nation. His expertise developed as he assumed the role of principal decision-maker and defender of the nation in the international arena. As a result of these developments, the king came to rule as well as reign.

The king's increased interest in foreign policy may be seen from his efforts to be personally informed about international developments. It has become his custom to assign personal foreign policy advisors within the royal court such as the chief of the royal court and the king's political advisor in addition to having advisors within the foreign ministry. His most loyal personal advisors are usually given the responsibility to undertake certain foreign policy tasks. In a sense, they keep the king informed, conduct preliminary discussions, and give the king an assessment independent from the foreign ministry. The king then makes and implements foreign policy to a large extent personally.

King Hussein's personal exposure to international affairs during his reign has given him the experience and knowledge that are vital in conducting foreign affairs. Thirty-seven years of leadership experience have helped the king to develop a sensitivity to the international environment and an ability to foresee the consequences of varying actions. Khadduri (1981) has noted that, because of these experiences, King Hussein tends to have an excellent sense of history and a wider repertoire of negotiating skills which serve him well in dealing with other governments.

The king's sensitivity to regional politics also may be seen from the fact that, in seven years after the attempted

coup by the pro-Nasser cabal, he attended the first Arab Summit Conference in Cairo called by President Nasser because he believed that the meeting might help to reduce inter-Arab conflict (Dawisha, 1983, 73). His decision to oppose the Camp David treaty because he anticipated that it would not lead to a comprehensive and just peace, is also sometimes cited as evidence of his understanding of international relations.

The king's success in international affairs has enlarged his domestic support and popularity. Evidence of his popularity is widespread. Statements such as "King Hussein is Jordan and Jordan is King Hussein" are commonly made by all kinds of people in the country. One political figure close to the king, for instance, said, "As for the King, he has become a necessity for the country--its security blanket and protective umbrella" (Day, 1986, 35).

Observers and analysts have long argued that the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as a state maintains its survival beyond King Hussein's personal charisma and control (Miller, 1986, 806). Day contends, "The public generally seems to share this view of the king. The East Bankers feel a sense of loyalty to him as their king. The Palestinians do not identify with him in the same way, but most appreciate and value his leadership, the stability he gives to what has, per force, become their country--a country in

which the majority of them have done fairly well" (Day, 1986, 35).

Several other factors help to give legitimacy to the king. First of all, his ancestors, the Hashemites, have a special claim on the origins of Arab nationalism. King Hussein's great grandfather and his three sons (Sherif Hussein, Ameir Faisal, Amir Abdullah, and Amir Ali, respectively) were founders and leaders of the great Arab revolt against the Ottomans to free Arab lands. The cause of Arab nationalism continues to be carried today by King Hussein. A second factor of legitimacy for King Hussein is that he is a direct descendant of the Prophet Muhammad, which gives him a special position in relation to Islam. Also, the king's domestic successes in achieving socio-economic development, his concern for the welfare of all Jordanians, and the fact that Jordan's citizens enjoy a relatively high degree of personal freedom in comparison to other Arab states have all helped to increase Hussein's popularity and to legitimize his rule (Gubser, 1988, 100). Strong domestic support and popularity, in turn, have given the king greater power and made him truly the primary decision-maker both in domestic and foreign politics.

King Hussein is also legitimized by Jordan's constitution, which was promulgated in 1952. Under this constitution the monarchy, according to Nyrop (1980, 157-158), is the most important institution in the country.

The king is the central policy-maker, maintaining control over key government functions such as national defense, internal security, justice, and foreign affairs. The constitution provides the king with sweeping powers and makes the parliament and cabinet totally subordinate to him. He calls elections for the house of representatives and may dissolve the parliament. He appoints the members of the senate and may also dissolve it or relieve any senator of his membership. The king also holds the power to appoint and/or to dismiss the prime minister and other ministers.

All laws must be ratified and promulgated by the king. He also may enact such regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of laws. The king exercises this formal power by royal decree, which is counter-signed by the prime minister and the minister or ministers concerned.

Finally, the king is entitled by the constitution to be the supreme commander of army, navy, and air force. He declares war, concludes peace, and signs treaties and agreements. The king, under Article 30 of the constitution, is declared to be the head of state and to be immune from any liability and responsibility (The Constitution of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan).

The Role of Other Institutions in Foreign Policy-Making

The Cabinet

In examining the role of the cabinet in Jordan's foreign policy one needs to distinguish between the formative years of the king's reigns and the period after the mid-1960s. In the earlier period, the cabinet played a much larger role in the governance of the state, including foreign affairs. Prime ministers such as Tawfig Abul Huda, Samir Rifai, and Ibrahim Hashim had direct influence in the decision-making process and could initiate policies even without the king's permission. For instance, in 1955 Prime Minister Abul Huda opposed the king's proposal to join the Baghdad Pact and directed the foreign minister to oppose it and to present to the Arab League States a counter-proposal boycotting the pact. During this earlier period, the cabinet functioned as the principal policy-maker. The emergence of the king as a strong leader with a dominant role in the foreign policy decision-making process occurred in the 1960s, after the king consolidated his power. He continued to make policy in consultation with the prime minister and the cabinet, but the roles changed as the king became the prime decision-maker. The prime minister's and cabinet's roles became largely executive or administrative in character. Now they carried out policy decisions made

mainly by the king. "The Cabinet is the top executive arm of the State. Its members serve at the pleasure of the King" (Nyrop, 1980, 162).

Bailey (1977, 102) contends that prime ministers are appointed to carry out policies already decided upon by the king and not to formulate policies of their own. He notes that, of the eighteen men who have held the post of prime minister between April 1950 and early 1977, all, with the exception of Suleiman Al-Nabulsi, were bound to the monarchy either by family ties, by strong vested interests in the maintenance of the regime, or by dint of their personal careers. Only Al-Nubulsi had independent power based upon being popularly elected (Bailey, 1977, 102). This also is true of the other four prime ministers who have held office since 1977.

The cabinet's role in foreign policy is limited because the constitution clearly states that the king is head of state and may make peace and war, sign treaties and agreements, and is required to consult the parliament only when the treaty or agreement involves financial commitments or affects the public or private rights of Jordanians. Although individual members of the cabinet may influence the king on matters pertaining to their own departments, collectively they have little influence on foreign policy matters. An example of how the king operates may be seen, according to Al-Kassem (1988), from the decision to support

Iraq in the Gulf War against Iran. The king brought the idea to the cabinet and, although some of the cabinet members were surprised because of the previous hostility between Jordan and Iraq, they kept silent. There was no challenge to the king's proposal that Iraq is an Arab state and that Jordan should support it. Similarly, according to Obeidat, in 1984, the king decided to renew Jordan's diplomatic relationship with Egypt for the same reasons, and his proposal again went unchallenged (Obeidat, 1988). Not since the 1960s has the prime minister or cabinet attempted to set a course independent from the king. The king may consult with prime minister before announcing a decision, but in any case it is his final decision that determines Jordan's foreign policy.

The Parliament

Jordan's constitution of 1952 created a bicameral legislature with a house of notables (senate), consisting of thirty members, and a house of representatives (deputies), consisting of sixty. The members of the house of notables are appointed by the king, but deputies are elected by the people. Because of its popular base, the house of representatives, at times, has attempted to play a major role in the enactment of legislation. Both houses, however, have been overshadowed by the king and his appointed cabinet (Nyrop, 1980, 163).

Like many Third World constitutions, Jordan's constitution in theory provides for a parliamentary system of government. The prime minister and the cabinet are to propose legislation to the parliament, which has the legislative authority to make or amend laws. Both houses of the legislature must enact legislation, which then must be ratified by the king before it becomes law. The king holds a veto which may be overridden only by a two-thirds vote of both houses. Although Jordan was a constitutional monarchy, the constitution allowed the king to dismiss the national assembly. In reality, as Khoury (1981, 427) has pointed out, the king remains the highest authority in the land and with his government can, if necessary, control or even mold parliament to his own liking. Legislation, in effect, is dominated by the executive.

Jordan's constitution also provides that the cabinet, which is appointed by the king, must resign if it loses the confidence of the parliament in a simple majority vote (Khoury, 1981, 429). Since the 1950s, the parliament has only one time voted lack of confidence in a government. This vote of no confidence in 1963 developed because the populace demonstrated for the Jordanian government to join Syria, Egypt, and Iraq in a unified federal Arab state. Not only did the prime minister reject this proposal, but he sent troops to break up the demonstrations. As a result of these events, the parliament voted for the government to

step down and for a new government to be formed. Prime Minister Samier Rifai's government resigned, and the king then dissolved the parliament and appointed his uncle Sherif Hussein Bin Nasser as the new prime minister. In his announcement, the king stated

> We are firmly confident that the manner in which members of the House withheld confidence in the Rifai government was due to personal motives and attempts to gain private advantage...the members who had voted against Rifai were voting against the national interests of the country (Snow, 1972, 154-155).

In short, the king has the power to dissolve the parliament whenever it resists the government's policies. The parliament has been dissolved six times for lack of cooperation in either voting against the government or refusing to enact a budget (Abu Jaber, 1969, 246). In the absence of a house of representatives, a parliamentary system cannot exist since the senate cannot function by itself.

As a result of the Rabat Summit, which designated the PLO as the sole representative of Palestinians, King Hussein dissolved parliament on November 24, 1974, and an election for a new parliament was to be held a year later on February 7, 1976, however, the old parliament met for an extra-ordinary session, during which the constitution was amended to remove time limits on the king's power to postpone elections, while maintaining his right to call the old parliament whenever necessary. In the period from 1974 to

1984, the old parliament was dismissed "until further notice." In early 1984, the king renewed parliamentary life in Jordan, and the old parliament, which had been elected on April 15, 1967, again began to function, but this did not last very long. Hussein again dissolved the parliament in the light of his decision in 1988 to sever legal and administrative ties with the Occupied West Bank.

Like domestic affairs, foreign affairs under a parliamentary system are made and executed by the cabinet and the parliament. In Jordan, the parliament, according to Masri (1989), does not play a crucial role in foreign policy. Normally, the parliament votes for policies decided by the executive without reservations; a parliament merely acquiesces in executive decisions rather than probing and questioning governmental decisions. Zuatier explains that the parliament serves most of the time as a vehicle for mobilizing and legitimizing executive proposals rather than acting as a decision-making body (Zuatier, 1989). In sum, the parliament does not have an effective role to play in the foreign policy process.

The Foreign Ministry

One result of the fact that the king is the major figure and the primary source of foreign policy initiatives and decisions in Jordan is that the foreign ministry and the foreign minister's role is limited in conducting foreign

affairs. Often the king ignores or does not even ask for the opinion of his foreign minister. According to Obeidat (1988), "The Minister of Foreign Affairs basically advises the King, undertakes special missions assigned to him, assists in the implementation of policy, and manages the ministry." Zuatier, who was foreign minister in 1966, concurs that the foreign minister usually has a limited role in the decision process, and on some occasions, has no role at all (Zuatier, 1988). Still another ex-foreign minister, Masri (1989), contends that most of the foreign policy decisions are formulated by the king and that the role of the foreign ministry is merely to implement these decisions.

The Military

Military forces are very significant in the political life of most Third World countries. In Jordan, the military at various times has played a crucial role in preserving the regime. The fact that the king had to rely upon the military a number of times to keep his throne makes the chief of staff of the army a major actor in the government.

Jordan's armed forces have a history of loyalty to the king, subordination to the government, and non-interference in politics (Jureidini and McLaurin, 1984, 64), but they are a force that must be recognized in the governance of the nation.

The military forces are powerful, but they accept the right of the king to rule and they have not attempted to interfere in the political arena except during the 1957 coup attempt. In a personal interview former information minister, Hani Al Khasawneh stated, "the armed forces are a very important sector in the country but they are very loyal to the king and they have demonstrated their loyalty on several occasions in maintaining the political stability and security, not least in the case of the 1970 civil war (Al-Khasawneh, 1988). Day (1986, 36-37) points out,

> All of this, of course, could change, if any major sector of the population should come to feel seriously disadvantaged, if the military should become convinced that they were losing out in a society growing ever more affluent under their protection, or that unacceptable inequities were developing within the civilian society, the general support for the present moderate social contract could break down.

Awareness of the importance of the army causes the king to be ever vigilant of its loyalty. He normally appoints only the most loyal to the officer corps, and officers from the Bedouin tribes, which have a long history of support of the monarchy, dominate the higher ranks. As supreme commander, the king takes a personal interest in the well-being of the troops. He frequently visits and speaks to the various units, and he gives personal attention to their needs. He acts quickly to rectify any sign of discontent, and often troops' needs are met instantly. For instance, the so-called mutiny in Zarqa in February 1974, where fifty or

so officers and men from the fortieth armored brigade who were discontent with the high cost of living and angry because of corruption in official circles started a demonstration that was dealt with immediately and personally by the king. He not only listened to complaints but announced immediate pay raises for the military personnel (Howard, 1975). As a result of their favored position, army personnel are the most highly paid public servants, and they have an extensive welfare service and provision of general financial allowances.

Public Opinion

The king is also keenly aware that his power ultimately comes from popular support. He attempts to influence public opinion in a host of ways. According to Abu Odeh (1988),

> Since Jordan is a small country with a tribal tradition where the people expect to approach the leader directly, the King regularly holds to the tradition of the Majlis or "desert democracy" where anyone can present their demands or any request or approach him merely or pay their homage. He shows great interest in the welfare of the tribes and pays close attention to their development. He has a close personal relationship with people, which is reciprocated by their loyalty to him.

In effect, he is a good politician doing good for his constituents. He also uses the media to promote good will. Criticism from opponents is kept under control since the press and the mass media are subject to censorship, and political parties and other political groups are prohibited. Despite these limitations on democratic freedoms, however,

Jordan's government is the most free and open political system in the Middle East, and this, too, works to increase the public esteem of the king.

In a personal interview Ahmed-Al-Louzi, Jordan's former prime minister supported the above statement, stating,

> Jordan's political system is no more absolutist than those of neighboring Arab republics, if it is not better. The necessity for periods of strict control was due to crisis situations originating outside Jordan. But Jordan is more thoroughly socially mobilized than the other monarchies; its stock of educated people, its exposure to modern political values, and its political experiences in the maelstrom of conflict and revolution have intensified the salience of democracy as a legitimizing principle (Al-Louzi, 1989).

Summary

In sum; the decision-making process in Jordan may be characterized as being dominated by the king and a small circle of elite officials and personal associates. According to Masri (1989), these are Prince Hassan, the king's brother; the prime minister; the chief of the royal court; the king's political advisor; the foreign ministry, the chief of staff of the army; and the head of intelligence. Second, the system is highly personalized and not institutionalized, according to Abu Odeh (1988). Most communications and decision processes are made face to face and on a personal level (Abu Odeh, 1988). The legally created separation between governmental institutions is largely negated in practice because of the actual way in

which decisions are made. Foreign decision-making may differ slightly from domestic policy since it is widely agreed that the king is responsible for foreign affairs. Domestic affairs, on the other hand, are viewed as the responsibility of the prime minister and the cabinet, and, therefore, they sometimes play a larger role in these decisions.

CHAPTER IV

THE OPERATIONAL CODE OF KING HUSSEIN

King Hussein's Parentage and Formative Years

In 1921, King Hussein's grandfather Abdullah established the Kingdom of Jordan, and he ruled for thirty years. After his assassination in 1951, Talal, his oldest son, ascended the throne but because of illness was removed by the parliament shortly thereafter on August 11, 1952. As a result, the seventeen-year-old Crown Prince Hussein inherited the throne from his father and became the third leader of this new nation of Jordan. His thirty-seven-year reign since 1952 makes him today the longest ruling monarch and national leader in the world.

Hussein, the grandson of the founder of Jordan, was born on November 14, 1935, in Amman, the capital of Jordan. His parents were first cousins, both from the Hashemite family. In his autobiography, King Hussein described his early childhood. He was reared in a modest house consisting of five rooms located in Jebel Amman, one of the capital city's seven hills. The king emphasizes that he was brought up rather modestly and was far from wealthy. This upbringing left a deep imprint upon the king's life; he always felt motivated to come quickly to the aid of those in

need (Hussein, 1962, 14). His father, Talal, was a man as gentle as Abdullah, Talal's father, was forceful. To those who knew him, Talal was a warm, highly intelligent, and cultivated friend. To his father King Abdullah, however, he was a failure, totally unfit to assume the tough job of ruling a kingdom. To Hussein, Talal was a devoted parent, much loved as a family man (Snow, 1972, 22-23). As King Hussein narrated in his autobiography:

> My grandfather was so healthy and tough he could not appreciate what illness was. We in the family knew, we watched our father with loving care, but my grandfather, who lived partly in the heroic past, saw him from outside. He had wanted a brave, intrepid Bedouin son to carry on the great tradition of the Arab Revolt (Hussein, 1962, 14).

King Hussein was the oldest of four children. He had two brothers, Muhammad and Hassan, and one sister, Basma. Their mother, Queen Zein was a woman of power and intelligence, strong enough to be a central figure in the family and smart enough to play a major role in shaping political events in Jordan after Abdullah's death (Snow, 1972, 23). Family life was warm and affectionate, and ties were close between the parents and their children. King Hussein describes these relationships in his autobiography in the following manner.

> I was, of course, deeply attached to my parents. Throughout my early days our family lived simply but happily. My mother, Queen Zein, who has remained by my side all my life, watched me grow up with tenderness and love. She is a remarkable woman, not only beautiful but very wise.... Her wisdom, her courage,

> her never-failing advice, and encouragement to me made her a major factor in my life (Hussein, 1962, 14).

The close family circle of a father and mother, brothers and sister was marred by the mental illness of the father. As the eldest son, Hussein was perhaps most affected by his father's illness. He loved his father dearly and found it painful that his grandfather was not more sympathetic to his suffering. Like his father, Hussein was deeply sensitive, and because of his close and intimate relationship with his parents, he shared personally the pain and shame of his father's schizophrenia. Only this debilitating mental illness prevented him from reigning long and wisely. As a result of his father's illness, his mother played a major role in influencing his upbringing in his formative years. In his autobiography King Hussein (1962, 14) says,

> All through my life with its crisis after crisis, her encouragement has given me strength. And it is certainly true that had it not been for my mother's patience and devotion, my father would never have been able to rule Jordan, even for the short period that he did. And if my father, with my mother by his side, had not stepped in after the murder of my grandfather, the history of Jordan might have been vastly different.

King Hussein also was greatly affected by his grandfather, King Abdullah. This is obvious from the King's memoirs, where he writes,

> I have decided to start these memoirs with the murder of my grandfather since he above all men, had the most profound influence on my life, so, too, had the manner of his death.... Looking back now, I can see how and why toward the end of his life my grandfather lavished

> such affection on me as he grew older. I had possibly become the son he had always wanted (Hussein, 1962, 13, 20).

Due to the circumstances of his father's illness, King Hussein was urged by his mother to be close to his grandfather for advice and experience. Hussein as a young boy spent most of his time after school in his grandfather's office in the palace listening and learning the ways his grandfather dealt with political issues and the way he spoke to political actors. Sometimes he even acted as translator in these meetings. In a sense, the grandfather was teaching his heir the skills of ruling. In his memoirs, Hussein (1962, 21) states,

> It was this part of my education that has served me so well since for most days, I returned to the palace before evening prayers and dined with him so that over the evening meal I would listen to him talking about the subtleties and pitfalls of the hazardous profession of being a King.

King Abdullah evidently gave Hussein special care and attention since he recognized that his sons were incapable of following in his steps. King Abdullah told his grandson, as reported in Hussein's (1962, 20-21) memoirs, "This is the cruelest blow of my life. One son is ill (Talal) and other (Naif) who can't even stand still in a crisis." Three days before his assassination, King Abdullah, told his grandson,

> I hope you realize, my son, that one day you will have to assume responsibility. I look to you to do your very best to see that my work is not lost. I look to you to continue it in the service of our people (Hussein, 1962, 6).

Hussein's formal education was often interrupted by responsibilities placed upon him because of the position of his family and because of the differences between his father and grandfather, which were reflected in his training. For instance, after Hussein was installed in a school his grandfather decided that he needed special courses in religion, so the boy had to return to his house to take extra private lessons. Then his father decided that Hussein needed more courses in Arabic and he had to change again (Hussein, 1962, 16).

Despite his royal background, King Hussein was treated like other students in his school, but he complained that he did not have any close friends because he changed schools frequently (Hussein, 1962, 16).

When Hussein reached the age of fifteen, his grandfather King Abdullah decided to send him to Victoria College in Alexandria, Egypt. There he felt more happy and interested in his school life.

> Finally, . . . I managed to go to boarding school and I was enrolled at Victoria College in Alexandria, a school with excellent instruction in Arabic and English. A whole new world opened up for me. Football, cricket, books, companionship--how I loved my days at Victoria College . . . my two years at Victoria College were among the happiest in my life. As well as learning the routine lessons and sports, I took some courses in Arabic and religion and became increasingly proficient at fencing, always the subjects my grandfather first looked for when scrutinizing my reports (Hussein, 1962, 16-17).

Upon his return to Jordan on a vacation in 1951, he accompanied his grandfather to Jerusalem, where he endured the horror of witnessing his assassination. This tragedy ended Hussein's education in Egypt because Egypt was suspected of supporting, if not directly assisting in, the plot to murder King Abdullah. As the crown prince, Hussein now was sent to England to study. He attended Harrow, a public school, for a year, only to be called back by the government because of the illness of his father, King Talal (Khadduri, 1981, 85).

Even as Hussein was being called to return to his homeland, events were to forever change his life. On August 11, 1952, the parliament removed King Talal from office due to mental illness, and the seventeen-year-old Hussein succeeded to the throne. Since he was a minor, a regency council was appointed by the Jordanian parliament to act on his behalf until he reached his majority. The new king soon returned to England to attend Sandhurst, a military academy. His training at Sandhurst provided him with new and needed experiences. As Snow (1972, 49-51) points out,

> King Hussein took to Sandhurst as everyone expected he would. He enjoyed the discipline, the adventure of the night exercises, the thrill of handling modern weapons. He had to absorb all the training they could cram into him in six months. The British educational establishment had produced a young leader it could be proud of: he had all the qualities that Harrow and Sandhurst were built to foster--courage, resolution, enterprise, a measure of self-assertiveness, a good practical judgement, and the best public school manners.

After six months, King Hussein returned to Jordan and assumed full constitutional power on May 2, 1953, since he had reached eighteen, the legal age of maturity.

Despite opposition from his family and his friends, King Hussein decided to learn how to fly. He had expressed the desire to join the Jordanian Air Force Command in 1953. Colonel Jock Dalyleish taught him how to fly (Hussein, 1962, 73-75).

Snow (1972, 115) described King Hussein's early years of rulings in the 1950s as follows.

> Hussein had firmly established himself as a formidable Arab leader; the resolution and judgement he had shown throughout the crisis were derived almost entirely from his own strength of character, not from the advice or moral support he got from anyone else. His family had certainly supported him; his mother was very close to him, his uncle Sherif Nasser and his cousin Sherif Zeid--present Prime Minister of Jordan--were always in attendance.

King Hussein's Philosophical Beliefs

Once in office, the new king was faced with challenges for which neither his experience nor his education had fully prepared him. His decisions in these situations were shaped largely by his values and beliefs as well as the environmental situation. To explain the king's values and beliefs I examined his writings and his speeches for the period from 1967 to 1980. The king has written three books: his autobiography, Uneasy Lies the Head, 1962; My War with Israel, 1969; and My Profession as a King, 1978.

In Uneasy Lies the Head (1962), which Hussein wrote ten years after he assumed the throne, he presented his recollections of his childhood and major events which occurred before and after he came to the throne. In addition, he explained his experiences as a young monarch and how he faced the many problems of Middle Eastern politics in his early days.

In My War with Israel (1969), the king told the story of the 1967 War. He expressed the Arab position and that of Jordan in particular because his country was more geographically, humanly, politically, and economically involved in the conflict than other Arab states. King Hussein's evidence is of primary importance, for he was the only Arab leader to participate personally in the battle. He expressed his experience and the pain that he and his country suffered because of this war.

In My Profession as a King (1978), Hussein offered his views about the political events in Jordan since he became king in 1952, and the role that he played as a leader to protect and maintain the survival of his country. In addition, the king gave special attention to the Palestinian problem and he tried to explain the roots of the problem and the justice of the Arab cause.

These books and the multitude of public speeches--published by the Ministry of Information in Jordan--which he has given over the years were analyzed in an attempt to

identify the king's basic values and beliefs. A series of philosophical questions, following George and Holsti's concepts of the operational code, was raised and answers gleaned from the king's statements and writings.

Nature of Politics

What is the essential nature of politics? Is it one of harmony or conflict? What is the role of the adversary?

Although King Hussein was young and had little experience in politics when he first assumed the throne, he was thrown into a hostile political environment and forced to deal with politics. Even before King Hussein assumed the throne in Jordan, tension between West Bank Palestinians and East Jordan had erupted in public. The Palestinians did not believe that the Hashemite regime was sincere in its desire to restore Arab Palestine rights. This tension culminated in the assassination of King Abdullah by a Palestinian. This exposed King Hussein to the bitter reality of the struggle for power within his country, which was also reinforced by similar struggles and political conflict at both the regional and international levels. As a result King Hussein witnessed politics as a struggle for power. The murder of his grandfather and the competition for power during the time his father reigned presented him with hard lessons which he described in his memoirs as follows:

> Within a matter of hours the politicians were starting to fight. There were those who whispered, was my father well enough to succeed to the throne? They were the ones who hoped he would never reign, simply because they themselves wanted power. Powerless for the moment, I was forced to watch how some of his former friends changed without a thought for our country. I saw his great work jeopardized by weakness on the part of those around him, by the way they permitted opportunists to step in, even if it meant the ruin of little Jordan (Hussein, 1962, 25).

In the 1950s and early 1960s, the Middle East was an arena for bitter cold war between the progressive Arab regimes, led by President Nasser of Egypt and the Bath Party in Syria, and the conservative pro-Western monarchical regimes. Jordan found itself in the middle of this struggle.

Upon taking the throne, Hussein found the ideological conflict between the United States and Soviet Union dominating the political scene and influencing the politics of inter-Arab relations. World affairs were developing in a conflictual bi-polar system divided by the struggle between East and West. The Soviet Union was attempting to gain influence in the Middle East and to recruit the Arab states to its side in the East-West conflict. Hussein describes the conditions as follows:

> Very soon after my ascension to the throne, I was plunged into traps and hazards of Middle Eastern politics that lay ahead.... Almost unceasingly enemies sought to destroy our small country because of our unswerving and uncompromising stand for freedom against communism, and our struggle to serve the principles and objectives of the Arab peoples and the great Arab revolt (Hussein, 1962, 83).

This situation was further compounded and complicated by the struggle dominating relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

In the face of this ideological conflict, the new king either had to be part of the Soviet led system or to stand as a free state on the side of the West. Jordan could not remain neutral in the global conflict between the East and West. As a result the King declared that

> In the great struggle between communism and freedom, there can be no neutrality. How, then, can we be neutral in our attitude towards two systems of government, two philosophies--one of which challenges these concepts and the other which denies and stifles them? In taking our stand with the free world, however, we do not forget our long struggle for liberation. Nor could we support existing injustices being committed by some members of the free world; but in the setting sun of the old imperialism we are not blinded to the new imperialism of communism, one far more brutal, far more tyrannical and far more dangerous to the ideas of free people, to the concept of nationalism, than this world has ever known.
>
> While we reject the doctrine of neutralism for ourselves, we respect the right of any nation to choose its own course of action, but we are wary of the use of neutralism to exploit the division between communism and the free world. And we are also wary of the danger of Communist expansion under the guise of neutralism (Hussein, 1962, 267).

King Hussein's idea of Arab nationalism stems first from Islam--a force, he says, which embraces tolerance, love of God, love of good deeds, and a deep-rooted sense of justice--which led to the establishment of the Islamic world. The King contends that "the force of Islam was embodied in the world of tagwa which combined a moral and

political content. Morally it was based on faith in God and politically on the concept of equality among individuals, irrespective of ethnic or social differentials (Hussein, 1960, 30).

The king believed that Islamic and Arabic tradition are opposed to communism (Khadduri, 1981, 111), and therefore, he chose freedom. His decision was to stand with the West. He explained his stance in this fashion before the United Nations:

> And may I say at once, with all the strength and conviction at my command, that Jordan has made its choice, we have given our answer in our actions, and I am here to reaffirm our stand to the nations of the world. We reject communism. The Arab people will never bow to communism, no matter what guise it may use to force itself upon us (Hussein, 1962, 266).

Based on his experience and values, King Hussein objected to the revolutionary method for reform and development which radical parties were attempting to use. In his view, modernization, development, and social reform should be carried out by peaceful and non violent means. He denounced the parties and groups that identified themselves with communism and the Bath Party, which were based on vague slogans of freedom, socialism and Arab unity but did not develop a realistic reform program. King Hussein attempted to apply this peaceful method in Jordan--he still holds these values today--hoping that his country could become a model state of reform for other Arab states. He wrote in his autobiography

> Jordan seeks to play one role, that of a model state. It is our aim to set an example for our Arab brethren, not one that they need follow but one that will inspire them to seek a higher, happier destiny within their own borders. We propose to devote, without ever losing sight of the ultimate goal of a united Arab nation, our full time and energy of a way of life that we hope in time all Arabs will achieve. We are under developed in those attributes that will eventually make us great--pride, dignity, determination, courage, confidence, and the knowledge that nothing can be achieved without work (Hussein, 1962, 98-99).

These events at the national, regional, and international levels shaped King Hussein's views of the nature of politics. Prior to 1967, his perception of politics was full of tension, conflict, hostility, suspicion, and uncertainty. The events of 1967 and after, however, altered his vision of politics.

After fifteen years on the throne and after experiencing a serious defeat in the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, Hussein's views toward world politics seem to be more pragmatic and less confrontational and conflictual. His new image of politics was predicated upon the need to overcome the bitterness of past divisions and cleavages among Arab and replace them with a search for Arab solidarity. This new way of looking at politics was necessitated by the magnitude of the 1967 defeat and the need to recover the occupied territories. If one reads King Hussein's statements before and after the 1967 War, one can conclude that his world view underwent a qualitative change after the War. In an attempt to recover the occupied territories of

the West Bank, he sought to build close relations with other Arab countries, especially Egypt, and he called for national and Arab unity. On national unity he said,

> As I see it, there is no effective Jordanian life without real national unity. I see also that it is impossible to build a strong national path without love and cooperation among all Arabs. We should eliminate hate and enmity from our lives. We should fulfill ourselves with good work and should be devoted and loyal to our beloved people. In our country there should be only one camp, no matter which of the four parts of the country one comes from, and all people should stand and work together to achieve our national goals and our ambitions (Hussein, February 5, 1971).

On the subject of Arab unity, the king stated,

> If there was doubt before June 1967 about Arab cooperation and solidarity, that doubt has been dispelled by the lesson of June 1967. It is evident that the Arab nation is one nation; whether we are in the East or West, we face the same threats which can be met only in unity and cooperation (Hussein, June 5, 1986).

In still another speech, the king said:

> We must never consider our domestic or Arab conflicts as real conflicts but only as differences in our way of thinking. We must never hold hostility against any of our Arab brothers (Hussein, September 16, 1970).

The king's view of international politics also appeared to undergo a transformation after 1967. No longer did he see the international system solely in terms of the Cold War conflict. He realized that the world became more multi-polar. He now saw the possibility of solving the world problems through international cooperation. He actively sought the support of the major western powers and made numerous trips to the United States and European countries.

He even visited the Soviet Union during this period and stressed cooperation as the means of reducing tension and pulling down barriers between nations. He explained his mission in these international visits thus:

> As I travel throughout the world, the Palestinian problem weighs heavy in my thoughts, and I suffer the pain of my people as I discuss with leaders of the West and East means of reducing the conflict and solving the problems in the Middle East. I have found that all powers generally are in agreement that political efforts should be made to establish a just peace in the region (Hussein, March 8, 1968).

Evidence of the king's growing belief in the ability of international politics to solve the Middle Eastern problem also may be seen in statements he made in 1973:

> Some major powers in today's international environment are attempting to lessen tensions and to establish fruitful cooperation in an effort to limit the arms race and to promote peace and economic prosperity. Washington met with Moscow and Beijing in the Summit Conference, and agreements were reached lessening world tensions. They also established a means of promoting communications to follow up on these agreements. The results are evidenced in Europe and the world.... Since these developments have helped to eliminate the danger to world peace, which is the ultimate goal of the major powers and is the objective longed for by the majority of people and countries in the world, we expect that problems of the Middle Eastern region now will receive greater and more effective attention since it is vital to the major powers and the rest of the world because of its geostrategic position and its richness in the essential resource of oil (Hussein, February 3, 1973).

King Hussein's perception of the world politics changed after 1967. The crisis which flared up in the Middle East in June of this year was the major turning point in the position of the Arab states and in the direction of Jordan's

foreign policy for the following decades. Before 1967, he had seen the international environment almost entirely in light of the ideological conflict of the Cold War. After 1967, he not only saw the Soviet Union and the West attempting to remove the danger of war but he had greater hope in the operation of the United Nations' attempts to cooperate on economic issues. For the king, maintenance of peace, like economic advancement, was to be accomplished by the principles of the United Nations charter and rooted in international justice, world peace, and international cooperation, based on the preservation of the dignity of humanity and the rule of law. King Hussein expressed the belief, "The world cannot hope for stability, prosperity, or a better standard of living for all nations without a just world peace, and Jordan and other Arab nations seek peace based upon justice" (Hussein, October 16, 1967).

> I will not speak to you only about peace. For the precondition of peace is justice. When we have achieved justice we will have achieved peace in the Middle East. There has been much talk in these chambers about peace. There has been little talk about justice. Israel has stated that what its people want is peace and security. This has always been the cry of the successful aggressor: peace by submission of the victim and security for what she has stolen (Hussein, June 26, 1967).

Even on the intractable problem of the Palestinians, the king seemingly believed that a political settlement was possible. But he stressed again, "For peace to be lasting and stable, the settlement of the Palestinian problem must

be just and fair for all. This is the just basis on which the search for peace must proceed" (Hussein, April 27, 1977).

Some twelve years later the king reaffirmed his belief in the United Nations and world politics in this fashion:

> The non-aligned countries, together with the Third World, have succeeded in placing the United Nations in an adversarial relationship to colonialism, racism, and foreign domination of whatever kind. The values governing international relations have thus shifted in favor of overwhelming equality.... There is a growing international conviction, even among the industry and technologically advanced nations, that the world must rectify existing interaction based on equity, cooperation, and equal opportunity (Hussein, September 25, 1979).

Thus, it is evident that Jordan's humiliating defeat in 1967 and the loss of the West Bank, particularly East Jerusalem to Israel, profoundly affected the king's view of politics. The dismemberment of Jordan, its loss of revenue from the West Bank, the massive influx of Palestinians to the East Bank, Jordan's economic hardships, and the king's profound feelings of insecurity and military vulnerability with regard to Israel all accounted for the shift of King Hussein's perception of the nature of politics. In view of these economic, military, political, and psychological vulnerabilities, it was not surprising that the king began to focus upon the notion of peace, justice, Arab solidarity and detente between the two superpowers. Such concepts have characterized Hussein's perception of politics since 1967 to present.

The shock of the events of 1967 and their aftermath also reshaped the king's image of his adversary. In the early days of King Hussein's reign, communism was seen as being the adversary which caused conflict within the Arab world, particularly between Hussein and Nasser. Israel was a second adversary which dominated much of the King's attention. Fear of communism has lessened in recent years, however, and today the king's statements about adversaries concern Israel.

Hussein strongly rejected the idea of communism and the idea that domestic communism and international communism could differ. He viewed communism as being a godless, irreligious system opposed to the concept of morality and behavior of Islam and, thus, antagonistic to Arab nationalism. He also believed that Moslems should stand resolutely against communism (Khadduri, 1981, 112). Because of inter-Arab differences toward communism, Hussein said,

> There was a time when we could unite, in spirit at least, against the imperialist enemy. But we have as yet been unable to unite properly against our two most potent enemies: communism and Zionism (Hussein, 1962, 93).

> We do not believe for a moment that U.S.S.R. or communist China is helping us simply out of kindness. To attack the countries of Islam who oppose communism is to attack Islam's interests. First and foremost, we hold that we are Arabs and that Arab nationalism makes sense only within its religious framework, meaning Islam (Hussein, 1969, 23-24).

King Hussein's opposition to the Soviet Union as the fount of communism, however, appeared to become more

conditional after 1967. No longer did the king hold the Cold War view of the Soviet Union as the eternal opponent of the Arab world. Evidence of his more pragmatic approach to world politics and to the Soviet Union may be seen during the King's visit to Moscow in 1967. On this occasion he said,

> I wish I could limit my speech to only an expression of my admiration and respect for the Soviet Union and my desire for improved relations with your country.... Although the Soviet Union has not had close relations with Jordan, the Soviet Union from the beginning of Israel's attack on Arab countries has reaffirmed its friendship and support toward Egypt, Syria, and Jordan. I look with hope and confidence toward building a durable and strong relationship between our countries and trust that this relationship will grow economically, technologically, culturally, artistically, and in all aspects of international cooperation (Hussein, October 2, 1967).

Late in 1976, the king again spoke to Soviet leaders and expressed his pleasure in the fact that the U.S.S.R. had continued its support of a just settlement of the Palestinian issue. He said,

> Since 1967, I have carefully reviewed the relationships between the Soviet Union and the Arab world. I am pleased to say that these relationships have always supported a just and honorable settlement of these problems. Soviet leaders have consistently had the wisdom to support peace and freedom for Palestinians (Hussein, June 18, 1976).

Zionist leaders and Israel have been consistent opponents in King Hussein's view since 1948. According to the King, Israel is essentially a divisive, aggressive, and expansionist state. Zionist interests are intent on keeping the Arab world weak and disunited in order to maintain the

lands taken by aggression. In his memoirs, Hussein expressed these ideas thus:

> Israel, governed by the present expansionist policies of Zionism, can only spell injustice, danger, and disaster. It behooves the world to become used to this fact: that without a just solution to the Palestine tragedy, there can be no stable peace in the Middle East.... So long as Zionism is the dominating political force in Israel, the friendship between Arabs and Jews can never be rekindled (Hussein, 1962, 91).

In almost every speech after 1967, King Hussein discussed the Palestinian problem as a matter of life or death to Jordan. He considered the problem to be costly and dangerous to everyone and contrary to everyone's interests, threatening international economic chaos and a third world war. He said,

> The cost of the thirty-year conflict in men, money, and misery has been staggering. Since conquest usually spawns further conquest, the period was predictably punctuated and aggravated by three major wars. In 1956, Israel invaded Egypt in an attempt to overthrow the regime but retreated under United States injunctions. In 1967, Israel invaded Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, forcing 200,000 more Palestinians to flee their homes and placing 800,000 others, and a territory ten times Israel's original size under military occupation. In 1973, the Arabs attacked Israeli positions in the occupied territories in an effort to recover their land. Although militarily inconclusive, that twenty-day conflict cost more in terms of equipment and equivalent casualties than any other ever fought, anywhere, at any time.... The thirty-year struggle has taken 40,000 lives, over 30,000 of whom were Arab, and cost one-quarter of a trillion dollars (Hussein, April 6, 1976).

In light of this suffering, King Hussein has expressed his views of Israel as follows:

> (1) Israel is an expression of international Zionism which works as an imperialistic agent and tool in her continuing struggle to take more land and to control

> the oil resources in the region (Hussein, October 1, 1968).
>
> (2) Israel's objective, after the occupation of Palestine, is to weaken the Arab nations, so that Arabs will be powerless and unable to resist Israeli occupation (Hussein, September 23, 1969).
>
> (3) Israel is trying to convince the world that a general war in the Middle East is not expected since the Arab nations are too weak and the great powers will not intervene to force a solution (Hussein, November 4, 1968).
>
> (4) Israel's policy is to hold the territory and buy time, but to make no substantive concessions, no serious negotiations, and give no quarter. Israel's policy has been simply to wait until the Arabs either give in or give up (Hussein, April 6, 1976).

These remarks clearly indicate that King Hussein's image of his adversary has experienced some significant change. In particular, he no longer viewed the Soviet Union as his primary adversary. After 1967, the Soviet Union was seen by the King as an indispensable partner in bringing about a settlement in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The pro-Arab stand of the Soviet Union, compared to the strong pro-Israeli attitude of the United States, was certainly functional in King Hussein's new opinion of the Soviet Union. Although Hussein's view of Israel remained essentially consistent with the pre-1967 period, nevertheless he expressed some flexibility and willingness to reach a diplomatic solution on the ground of total Israeli withdrawal from the Arab occupied territories. The King, however, was very skeptical about Israel's willingness to do this.

Optimism and Pessimism

What are the prospects for the eventual realization of one's fundamental political values and aspirations? Can one be optimistic or must one be pessimistic on this score, and in what respects one or the other?

Basically, the King Hussein's views seem relatively optimistic in view of the intractability of the conflict in the Middle East.

His optimism was primarily related to his long-term goals rather than specific policy. Specific policies may be achieved or not, depending upon present circumstances, but the ultimate result is always positive. Hussein believes that his goals are likely to be achieved because they are right, correct, and just. His deeply religious background and his faith in God influence his belief in the eventual success of the Arab cause. He is confident of victory in the long run, as he said, "The victory is coming if we utilize the resources of victory and work together as one nation" (Hussein, July 3, 1967).

King Hussein's optimistic faith and confidence are in part based on his pride in the history of the Arabs, who led civilization and enriched the world in earlier times. He believes that one day the Arabs again will unite and again become leaders in civilization, enriching the world as they did in its golden past. Despite a series of setbacks, King Hussein remains optimistic and believes that Jordan and the

Arab world will win in the future, declaring, "I have no doubt that the victory will happen if we utilize our effort and if all of us unite and work in one direction" (Hussein, August 10, 1967); "I am confident that victory will be for the right and justice and that peace will come to our land" (Hussein, March 14, 1970); and "I live with hope, which always motivates me and encourages me, that Arabs should move to organize and utilize their effort to achieve unity" (Hussein, December 29, 1968).

This optimistic attitude, in face of the serious defeat suffered by Arab forces, may perhaps be explained by the fact that, as leader, King Hussein has to keep the faith of ultimate victory alive in the people he is attempting to lead. These pronouncements also reflect, in part, the optimistic personal views of the king.

In an interview with Al-Mustaqbal magazine on June 16, 1979, Hussein expressed a positive opinion about the liberation of Jerusalem. He said, "I am optimistic. The lives of nations are not measured by years or months. 'Omar's Jerusalem' is accustomed to facing enemies and being patient. Jerusalem is bound to return to us. With every sunrise, 6 million faces turn toward Jerusalem, the Kiblah of all Muslims and site of one of their holiest mosques."

These preceding statements of the king suggest that he is an optimistic man. The economic and military weakness of his country left him with no other option except to appear

confident and optimistic about the future. His beliefs about the nature of the Arab cause and the inevitability of victory, as history has shown throughout the years, have reinforced his sense of optimism.

The vast economic resources of the Arab World, from Hussein's perspective, could certainly be helpful in realizing Jordanian objectives. The King's optimism was not absolute. He knew that wishes are not decisions; and he was aware of the complexities and difficulties inherent in inter-state relations, the reality of inter-Arab conflict, the intransigence of the Israeli government and its unwillingness to relinquish the occupied territories, and the reluctance of the United States to exert pressure upon Israel.

Predictability of the Future

Is the political future predictable? In what sense and to what extent?

King Hussein, as can be seen from his statements, obviously believes in careful planning and preparation for the future. President Jimmy Carter commented on King Hussein, "My impression is that his fellow world leaders respect his opinions because they are carefully considered before being expressed. Hussein has much more personal strength than his weak Kingdom permits him to exhibit" (Carter, 1985, 141). Hussein also believes that the

political future is relatively predictable. Speaking about the Palestinian problem and the defeat of June 1967, he said,

> It was only natural that Jordan should rise up to confront the impending tragedy. The challenge was faced by the stand of the unique combination of its people: the Muhajereen (Palestinians) and the Ansars (Jordanians). This evil subversion was shattered on the rock of firm national unity.... During all that period, and especially after the June War of 1967, or even before it, the leadership of Jordan has been thinking of the future of the state and planning for it. The leadership based its thinking on faith in the message of Jordan, which found its roots in the great Arab revolt" (Hussein, March 15, 1972).

In an earlier speech the king called for careful planning in this fashion,

> It is imperative that we utilize our minds to analyze the causes of crisis; we should assess the mistakes of the past and attempt to avoid them again in the future. To avoid being overcome by our enemies, we must devote ourselves to building and preparing for the coming battles that our nation may have to face (Hussein, August 24, 1967).

Ultimate victory in the future dominates the king's beliefs. He always emphasizes that attacks and assaults against the country will "fail to weaken the belief in ultimate victory in liberating our lands and peoples" (Hussein, July 15, 1972).

King Hussein's views of his adversary's goals are that Israel is attempting to weaken the Arab nation and to establish its power forcefully in the heart of the Middle East. Thus, he stated in 1968,

> Today we live in the most dangerous stage of our struggle with our enemy, and thus it is our duty to make sure that our plans and strategies are sound. We

> must examine the areas of our weaknesses and failures and consider alternatives which will turn them into strengths and successes (Hussein, February 10, 1968).

He also said, "We must plan so that we can succeed in the future and maintain our confidence that we shall win because of our faith in the rightness of our cause" (Hussein, November 1, 1967).

In regard to his adversary's goals Hussein observed,

> There is also the Zionist danger represented by Israel and the world movement backing it. This danger is based on aggression and expansion at the expense of Arab land, rights, and men. Israel is trying to exploit these opportunities to change the facts and present new conditions to the world. Israel is doing this within the framework of a scheme that serves its aims (Hussein, June 14, 1978).

King Hussein's opposition to a partial settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, such as Camp David, was based on his belief that the outcome of a partial settlement would not work to bring about a comprehensive and a just solution. In refusing to join the agreement, he said,

> Since 1967, Jordan has been the most active Arab country in pursuit of a just and comprehensive peace. The Arab-Israeli conflict is a major confrontation which must be addressed totally and from the roots...the link between the component parts cannot be cut off...the problem will not disappear if Egypt alone regains its occupied land...a separate peace between Egypt and Israel will not advance the cause of a comprehensive and lasting settlement, particularly when the Israeli leadership uses it, as it does, to intensify its activities in settling other occupied areas, fragmenting their demographic composition, and systematically destroying their leadership (Hussein, June 19, 1980).

King Hussein's ability to predict the future course of events was significantly enhanced in the aftermath of the

1967 defeat. His long experience in office and the lessons drawn from history made him believe that political life evolves and changes in certain patterns that can be anticipated and understood. One can predict the outcomes of present situations and project policy outcomes and long-term policies by analyzing past historical events. The King learned this the hard way.

The net effect of Hussein's long experience has been an increasing trend toward pragmatism. This pragmatism is evident in his attitude toward specific events. He predicted that the Camp David agreement would not solve the Palestinian problem and, further, that it would divide the Arab world. He also felt that the likud government in Israel would continue its effort to frustrate the peace effort in the Middle East. This was clear from Israel's aggressive policies after Camp David, such as its military intervention in south Lebanon, the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor, the bombing of PLO targets in Beirut, and the annexation of the Golan Heights. All of these actions showed that Israel was seeking to attain regional hegemony.

Control or Mastery of Historical Development

How much control or mastery can one have over historical development, and what is the role of the leadership in shaping historical development?

Based on his statements, King Hussein apparently believes that a leader is expected to play a major role in shaping the course of historical development of his nation. Because King Hussein is a descendant from the Hashemite family and his greatgrandfather Hussein Ibn Ali was a leader of the Arab revolt, he believes that it is his duty to serve and guide the Arab nation.

In this context Miller (1986, 786) argued that

> It is the motive that has driven Hashemite policies for nearly sixty years--a strong desire to play a major role in the Arab world and in the Arab-Israeli arena. This ambition, which can be traced to Hussein's great grandfather Sherif Hussein of Mecca, was linked to the Hashemites' own sense of their historical importance as direct descendants of the prophet Mohammed, rulers of Mecca and Haijaz districts since the tenth century and later, standard bearers of the Arab nationalist uprising against Ottoman Turks. This sense of mission and destiny was most evident in the policies of Hussein's grandfather Abdullah. It is also clear in Hussein's self-image aspirations.

In view of the patriarchal nature of the political system in Jordan the King considers himself as the head of the Jordanian family who is directly responsible for the welfare of its members.

In his memoirs King Hussein (1962, 99-100) wrote about his family duty,

> When I think of my family, I think with pride of everyone in Jordan who standing by me as we faced the storms, inspired me in serving them. When I think of the tribe to which I belong, I look upon the whole Arab nation. My life is dedicated to a cause just as the Hashemites have been throughout history. That cause is to be an Arab worthy of Arab trust and Arab support. I fear only God.

The King's role goes beyond that of Jordan, despite the limited natural resources of his country, Hussein ascribes to himself a leading role in the Arab world, derived from the prominence of his Hashemite family throughout history.

In another passage of his memoirs he defined the family mission in terms of all Arabs. He wrote,

> I must attempt to define Arab nationalism as it really is, and explain its development and aims. In doing so, I present as well, the case of the people of the Arab world. I present it as a person who has inherited the responsibility of serving a proud people on the long, rough journey toward its objectives.... Arab nationalism is a potential force for good. It binds Arabs together even when they are split into many factions. It drives them toward a more cohesive Arab world, regardless of explosive changes in rulers or regimes (Hussein, 1962, 85-86).

Later, in a speech he continued this theme.

> I do not hesitate to go to every Arab state seeking Arab unity and cooperation to save the Arab existence and will not hesitate to go to any Arab country to continue what I have started. I will never tire; I cannot relax in this life until we recover our rights and lands (Hussein, June 5, 1968).

In still another speech, the king said:

> I belong to a family that God has determined should struggle for the sake of their nation and religion and sacrifice themselves for the Arab and Islam integrity . . . , and we who are believers are committed to that goal (Hussein, June 8, 1967).

In conclusion, King Hussein's perception of his role as a leader is primarily derived from his position as a monarch and his paternalistic role. Historical preeminence reinforces his sense of mission, which went beyond the confines of his country to include the larger Arab and

Islamic world. King Hussein believed that Jordan must actively help to shape the future of the Arab world and the region; although a small country, it could not ignore its responsibilities to the Arab world. Hussein's policy of supporting Iraq in its war with Iran was remarkable evidence of his beliefs.

The king's problem, however, was that his perception of his role was not supported by sufficient resources and capabilities within Jordan. Such limitations did not allow him to play the kind of role that he wanted to occupy.

The Role of Chance

What is the role of chance in human affairs and historical developments?

King Hussein's strong religious orientation that God has destined that he and his family should serve the Arab people and his belief in ultimate victory for the Arab nation, leave little room for chance in his scheme of thinking. He has expressed this in a number of statements pertaining to the rightness of the Arab cause and the certainty of ultimate victory. "We work to build a strong and cohesive Jordan; we are performing a great, historic role for our nation. A strong Jordan is one of the supports of our Arab homeland and a guarantee of its steadfastness and capability to live freely and with 'dignity'" (Hussein, May 1, 1979). He has also stated, "We look to our future

filled with confidence in the inevitability of our triumph. We will defend this soil with our hearts and lives; we will defend the nations' right and that of coming generations, to enable them to live freely and proudly" (Hussein, May 22, 1978).

In an interview King Hussein's former chief of the Royal Court and present foreign minister stated, "Chances are limited, in King Hussein's view. For instance, he believes that Israel was not established by historical accident but by the Zionist movement's planning and the United Nations decision in 1948, with support from the United States, the Soviet Union, and Europe. He believes that, in order for the Palestinian problem to be solved, all of these partners should play a role in the solution (Al-Kassem, December 31, 1988).

Despite the almost dogmatic certainty in his thought pattern, in international politics King Hussein is known to be a pragmatic player. Repeatedly he has negotiated and bargained over issues vital to the Middle East when he did not have the power to accomplish his goals in their entirety. His readiness to enter into pragmatic compromises, especially with the superpowers in the Middle East and with his Arab neighbors, is evidence that he recognizes the influences of power in international politics. In his words,

> Jordan can perform its part within the Arab community and with the Arab parties concerned in an atmosphere

> that could be created by the United Nations within the participation of both East and West and some European states which can influence the peace making process.... We will continue in the same vein and try to explain further our issue to the others in the world, including the United States, whose role and importance in this world cannot be denied by anyone (Hussein, June 6, 1980).

In conclusion, the king's religiosity and his view of his family's historical mission did not leave too much room for belief in the role of chance. As a result of the 1967 defeat, he has been careful to plan his subsequent move and policies; this, together with his preference for pragmatism and diplomacy, has served to enhance his capability to control events. The military and economic weakness of Jordan certainly does not lead the king to take risks.

Instrumental Beliefs

Selecting Goals for Political Action

Statements about King Hussein's national goals are plentiful. Four goals figure prominently in King Hussein's statements:

1. Essential and foremost, the survival of the regime and Jordan's independence and sovereignty;
2. Jordan's economic development;
3. The achievement of Arab unity and solidarity and the development of a pan-Arab system based on cooperation and common interest;
4. The resolution of the Palestinian question and the restoration of the Arab lands.

As for his views of national goals, King Hussein is committed to achieving full independence and sovereignty for Jordan. This he has often expressed, as in his speeches to the nation. For instance, he said,

> When I first assumed the responsibility of king, . . . I sought to fulfill the ambitions of my people. I removed foreign control from my country's military, which attempted to frustrate the goal of the great Arab revolution. I Arabized the army and made it the instrument of my country on Arab issues and the Palestinian problem. Thus, I completed the goals of the great Arab revolution headed by my great-grandfather in achieving unity, freedom, and a better life (Hussein, September 16, 1970).

Again and again Hussein stressed the need for internal unity in Jordan in order to demonstrate to the Israelis and to the world that Jordan would not renege on its commitments. The enemy must be shown that the Jordanian people will not weaken in the face of a protracted struggle. A spirit of internal unity is a prerequisite for this resolution.

With regard to relations between Arab countries, King Hussein always emphasized brotherhood and cooperation among all Arabs but also stressed national independence.

King Hussein's belief in Arab unity and cooperation is also central to his thought. As he expresses it, "Our message is determined by the great Arab revolution to be three goals: Arab freedom, Arab unity, and a better life for all our people" (Hussein, November 1, 1972). He added to these sentiments at another time in this way:

> Our policy toward Arabs is built always on our beliefs in the unity of Arab people and that Jordan's government will attempt to establish close relations with other Arab and Islamic countries. Our country will always be a part of the Arab world, and the Jordanian people on the two Banks are part of the Arab nation and have the same ambitions and future (Hussein, October 1, 1968).

In a Pan-Arab speech on October 6, 1980, the king said,

> We Jordanians have always been heirs to the principles of the great Arab revolution. We have worked to safeguard these principles through serious commitment, which never changes or falters, based on our Pan-Arab perspective and a firm altruism in the service of the nations' higher interest. In this we have been inspired by the principles of right, freedom, justice, and peace (Hussein, October 7, 1980).

Along the same line, Hussein had said earlier,

> We in Jordan seek Arab solidarity as the simplest form of our inevitable unity; our belief in our duty on the issue of Palestine is part of our belief in the unity of the Arab destiny. We have to achieve true social renaissance and thus reach a genuine civilized and human maturity (Hussein, April 25, 1978).

Perhaps there is some difficulty in reconciling King Hussein's pragmatic understanding of, and commitment to, Arab solidarity. Yorke (1988, 11) explains that

> Arab nationalism (which in the King's view, should preserve existing Arab borders) while the more revolutionary Nasserite or Baathist band of Arab nationalism, then favored by many of his people which threatened to eliminate borders. While he recognized that unity between Arab States would enable the Arabs better to confront the threat from Israel, he wanted this in the form of regime of inter-Arab State cooperation which would not endanger Jordan's independence.

The king feels a personal responsibility for the restoration of the holy places--Jerusalem--in Palestine and

believes that Jordan is affected by the Palestinian problems more than other Arab countries. As a result, since 1967 Jordan has taken the most active role of any Arab country in pursuit of a just and comprehensive peace. With regard to the Palestinian problem, King Hussein is committed to restoring the occupied lands and freeing the Palestinian people. As he has often said,

> In the midst of this sea of suffering created by the June calamity, the aims of the Jordanian government...were to stand in the face of continuous and unceasing aggression against the East Bank and...to liberate the occupied lands and free our kin and brethren on the West Bank (Hussein, March 15, 1972).

In an interview with an Australian reporter, King Hussein expressed his view of the Palestinian problem thus,

> The endeavor to achieve a just and lasting peace in the region has always been Jordan's main objective. Jordan is doing its utmost to achieve a just and lasting peace in the region on the basis of Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the recognition of the legal rights of the Palestinian people, including the right of self determination (Hussein, March 8, 1978).

In a speech before the United Nations in 1979, King Hussein summarized his dominant goals in this way.

> Every day the world moves closer towards new values. My country's active participation in this movement is prompted by several factors. As a part of the Third World, Jordan seeks renewal and progress, be it economic, social, cultural, or political. As an Arab country, it has an unquestioned obligation to Arab history, to Arab unity, and to the ultimate triumph of the Arab struggle for liberty and progress. Jordan has also been inextricably linked with the sufferings and aspirations of the Palestinian Arabs, whose recent history is a living symbol of the just struggle of all nations against colonialism, racism, and oppressive foreign rule and whose aspirations are a true reflection of the desire of the entire Arab nation for

> stability, security, a just peace, and continued progress (Hussein, September 25, 1979).

In conclusion, the regime's survival and Jordanian territorial independence and stability over the years have remained the primary objectives of Jordanian foreign policy. Economic development as a precondition for internal security was also elevated by the King to the position of being a core objective of Jordan's foreign policy. The other two goals of achieving Arab unity and resolving the Palestinian problem were intermediate goals to which, from the King's perspective, were essential instrumental means to achieve the Jordanian core objectives of independence and economic prosperity. In Hussein's view, all of these goals were compatible; there was no contradiction in his mind between his primary objectives and his ideological commitment to Arab unity and the Palestinians.

Pursuit of Goals

How are the goals of action pursued most effectively?

As noted above, in King Hussein's view Jordan's goals are compatible, and one must pursue them by means of a contingency approach after careful preparation. Nevertheless, one cannot always feel certain about decisions. Although all of Jordan's goals are compatible, one may be forced to establish a schedule of priority and attempt to achieve one goal before another. In an interview the king's political advisor, Abu Odeh explained,

> King Hussein is a dynamic person who does not believe in one best approach to achieve his goals because change could occur in policies and conditions. Not only that, but the king attempts to investigate and understand the goals and strategies of the other state actors (Abu Odeh, December 19, 1988).

Glimpses of the king's thought patterns can be seen from how he approaches domestic and world problems. With regard to the Palestinians, King Hussein proposed a diplomatic approach to solve the problem and achieve a just and comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. From Hussein's perspective, the foreign policy goals of Jordan can best be achieved through non military means; the disastrous outcome of the 1967 War had persuaded him of the inefficiency of the military option.

Another of King Hussein's beliefs is that Arabs should seek to solve their problem jointly and achieve their goals. In one of his speeches he declared,

> Of all Arab states, Jordan is most aware of the importance of placing the tremendous Arab resources in the service of our nation and of building our strength.... We also know the value of strong Arab solidarity, joint Arab action, collective international moves, and the effective force which comes through the feeling of unity and through knowledge that the Arab resources, if put into the service of the common cause and unified action, will confront the enemy's strength in one stage after another (Hussein, March 17, 1978).

In an interview with Al-Aqsa magazine on May 30, 1978, King Hussein said,

> We are endeavoring, with our Arab brothers, to build intrinsic Arab power in the military, political, economic, and information domains so that the nation can confront its enemies abroad and overcome its domestic problems (Hussein, May 30, 1978).

Joint actions, according to the king, require Arab leaders to communicate with one another frequently about their problems and how to build better relations between themselves and other world powers. For instance, Hussein said,

> For over two decades, I have been one of the Arab leaders who believed in a continuing and constructive dialogue between my own country and the rest of the Arabs and the United States. It is a dialogue that I believe can overcome inevitable political differences and divergent approaches to international problems. It is a dialogue that can overcome the tensions that arise from the Arab-Israeli conflict and from what appeared, at times, as American partisanship to only one party (Hussein, April 27, 1977).

On other occasions he said, "Nothing like steady and frank communication between my region and your country [the United States] can build bridges and correct perceptions on both sides" (Hussein, June 19, 1980); "Jordan believes in an open-mind toward the world. We have avoided narrow ideological positions. We believe in deep and constructive interaction with the world" (Hussein, April 27, 1977).

In conclusion, King Hussein is bound to look after his country's interest because Jordan forms the basis of his operation and the source of his power. He always searches for solutions compatible with the kingdom's domestic and external pressures, a fact that leads, as Miller (1986, 797) put it, "not to bold and decisive action but to a more ambiguous and tentative decision-making style."

On more than one occasion King Hussein has found himself in the unenviable position of having to opt for policy unpopular with his Palestinian subjects to protect the security of the State. Unable to reconcile Jordan's security requirements with PLO demands, the king felt compelled at last to expel the PLO from Jordan in 1970. On other occasions, he was obliged to follow a policy which aggravated external danger to the State but helped to shore up declining domestic and regional support for the Hashemite regime, such as his decision to join the other Arab States in the 1967 War.

King Hussein's insistence on flexibility in his pursuit of goals was clearly reflected in his cautious approach. His extreme caution and rejection of risk were articulated during the Rabat Arab Summit held in 1974, when Hussein justified his position in the 1973 War; again when he agreed with the Arab leaders' decision in the same summit to designate the PLO as the sole representative for Palestinians and in 1988, in his decision, fifteen years later, to sever legal and administrative ties with the occupied West Bank, when he felt that Arab leaders were insisting on this action.

His foreign minister, Marwan Al-Kassem, expresses this idea as follows. "King Hussein's caution, flexibility, patience, and his long-range policy helped him to overcome

several difficulties he faced in Jordan and Middle East politics" (Al-Kassem, December 31, 1988).

The result of King Hussein's effort to attain many goals was a decisional style that was, for the most part, flexible and issue contingent. To attain a rational answer King Hussein relied upon his own experience; the advice of a limited circle, and, above all, the specific characteristics of the event in question and the circumstances surrounding it.

Calculation and Control of Risks

How are the risks of political action calculated, controlled, and accepted?

King Hussein believed that, in approaching the task of determining political goals and strategies, one ought to be realistic and cautious, and risks should not be accepted unless they are well calculated. Miller (1978, 796) stated,

> Hussein's staying in power--thirty seven years--flows primarily from the king's recognition of Jordan's limitations and from a keen understanding of the domestic and external constraints on Jordan's options. What is striking about Hussein's world view is his recognition of one elemental fact: any strategy that exceeds the resources on hand to achieve it is a prescription for a disaster.

Careful planning, caution, and pragmatism have always characterized King Hussein's decisions and treatments of the major crises confronting Jordan. Several ideas seem to predominate in the king's thinking. He is cautious,

insisting on the thorough planning. According to Yorke (1988, 5),

> ...King Hussein is a pragmatist and caution has been the trademark of his rule. Although driven by ambition, he has appreciated not only how the constraints working on Jordan limit the policies available to him in the pursuit of a regional role but also circumstances under which these can combine to threaten the Hashemite Monarchy.

King Hussein does not take risks without carefully considering the possible consequences. In a press conference pertaining to the Camp David agreements and why Jordan did not join in them, Hussein demonstrated this cautiousness. He explained, "...I can only say that out of a sense of responsibility and awareness of the sensitivity of this point in time, we examined everything very, very carefully and very thoroughly before outlining our course" (Hussein, September 27, 1978) On another occasion the king said,

> With God's help and our determination to be logical and reasonable rather than emotional, and to weigh matters, particularly where these matters are closely linked to the nation's and homeland's interest. We were protected from evil, from harm to the honor of our Arabism, and deviation from the principle of loyalty to our nation, in order that we might preserve this nation's rights and struggle to regain these rights, wherever they may be and whoever their usurper may be (Hussein, June 10, 1980).

King Hussein's careful calculation is obvious in his relations with other Arab states. He never took an extreme position on any foreign policy issue. If he felt that he was being drawn into an alliance with one neighbor or

joining one bloc against another in the Arab World, he sooner or later reverted to Jordan's traditional neutrality or friendly relations with all Arabs (Khadduri, 1981, 79).

President Carter's perception of King Hussein concurs with this assessment of his attitude. He said,

> In diplomacy Hussein does not take many big chances. His actions have indicated that without clear backing from both the moderate Arab nations and the PLO and a relatively assured chance of success, he will not embark on an isolated effort to bring peace to the region (Carter, 1985, 140).

The king also expresses the belief that one must at times courageously stand against evil, even if it means defeat. He states this idea as follows.

> We have been in a situation in which our prestige and dignity have been humiliated, and we have been attacked in our home; thus, we have to make a decisive decision either to accept a humiliated life or to prefer to die protecting our dignity, rights, principles, and our existence as a whole (Hussein, January 29, 1968).

On another occasion he said,

> Like Ali Ibn Abi Talib [Fourth Caliph in Islam, the cousin of the Prophet Mohammed, and married to his daughter Fatimah]--may God's blessing be upon him and his Sons--the martyrs of justice, principles, and values, the grandsons also--and I have the honor to be one of them--do not fear anything in defense of justice. Glory is created by the believers in God and the life hereafter, and by the defense of right, justice, and well-being everywhere. This is my clear and frank position. History will have no mercy on those who slacken, hesitate, renege, and conspire. The nation is more powerful and lasting than individuals, regardless of their characteristics, posts, and the positions they adopt (Hussein, June 10, 1980).

As can be seen from this discussion, one of the king's characteristics is precise calculation of risk during

crisis. Although Hussein was prepared to control the risks of war by delineating minor goals and means, he believed that certain values were non-negotiable when these essential values were put in jeopardy. His action to dismiss the PLO from Jordan in 1970-71 when it threatened the stability of the State is evidence of such beliefs. Also, King Hussein has weighed the prospects for peace negotiations over the past years, and, with a keen understanding of Jordan's limitations and weaknesses, he has attempted to find the least risky course to prepare the ground for possible peace negotiations.

Timing

What is the best "timing" of action to advance one's interest?

The king's cautious nature affects his views about timing. He believes in the importance of the right time of action and that one should act from a position of strength. He has stated that "we believe in preparing to confront the crisis" (Hussein, July 31, 1967), and further,

> Our homeland [the Arab world] possesses enormous material resources and massive manpower. The Arabs must pool these factors to give them hope for the future and the strength and ability to confront the dangers and change the balance of power with the adversary (Hussein, April 24, 1978).

Describing King Hussein's sense of timing, Ahmed Obiedat, former Jordanian prime minister, explains

> King Hussein's keen understanding of world politics, and especially the Middle East, has helped him to avoid several crises. For instance, on the eve of Sadat's visit to Jerusalem to set a new trend for the settlement of the Middle East conflict, this would remove Egypt, the most important country militarily and politically at the Arab level. In addition to the Jordanian environment at that time in terms of economic difficulties, sensitive relations with PLO, and the international atmosphere which was encouraging Jordan to join Egypt in direct negotiations with Israel, unstable Arab relations had negative impact on Jordan's position. All these factors made observers think that Jordan was going to join Camp David, but King Hussein was patient and did not rush any action. Suddenly, Iraq called for an Arab Summit to evaluate Sadat's initiatives, and King Hussein surprised everyone when he was the first one to accept the invitation to Baghdad Summit in 1978. The outcome of the Summit had a positive impact on Jordan and may have rescued Jordan from a political and economic dilemma (Obeidat, December 29, 1988).

In an interview with Al-Mustaqbal magazine Hussein said,

> It is incumbent on us to organize ourselves in the Arab homeland and maintain solidarity in the face of the danger menacing our religion and Arabism. We must increase our preparedness, armaments, and strength, and work diligently to marshall all our tremendous human and material resources despite all that has occurred will make the world realize that what has been achieved so far by the ineffective peace will remain incapable of restoring peace and stability to the area (Hussein, June 20, 1979).

Although not clearly stated, these observations of the king seem to suggest that he does not believe in rash and precipitous action, but that one's moves should be carefully planned and timed.

King Hussein believes in the importance of the right of action; resources should be committed to action at the proper time. He argued that in making decisions and taking

action one should avoid emotion and rationally calculate possible consequences in advance in order to be successful. In both the October War of 1973 and the Camp David negotiations King Hussein avoided the risk of immediate action. He adopted a "wait and see" policy, calculating the possible consequences. As a result, he saved his country from the possible danger of defeat in 1973, and in 1978 he joined the Arab leaders in the Baghdad Summit, rejecting Sadat's peace initiatives and gaining tremendous economic support from the Arab states. In personal interview his political advisor, Abu Odeh stated, "King Hussein is patient and does not treat any problem or issue unless he clearly sees the whole picture of any event and comprehends the conditions of the event (Abu Odeh, December 19, 1988).

Role of Utility of Different Means

What are the utility and role of different means for advancing one's interests?

King Hussein's statements seem to demonstrate that he prefers peaceful and diplomatic measures to advance his interests. In fact, he has openly said that he

> considers the challenges of peace more demanding than the challenges of war. It has been and is, our policy to advocate moderation and peaceful solutions rather than violence and war. We firmly believe that force is not an answer to the problem. It has not worked in the past, and it will not work in the future. Our course of moderation has been pursued with patience and perseverance, often in solitude and criticism and with considerable sacrifice, but it has been vindicated and is in some measure responsible for the more positive

> conditions for peace which now prevail (Hussein, April 27, 1977).

In his actions, King Hussein has consistently supported international initiatives to bring a just and lasting peace between the Arabs and the Israelis. In several speeches he has pointed out,

> We are for total peace and lasting peace based on the total Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories occupied in June of 1967, on the return of Arab sovereignty over the Arab part of the city of Jerusalem, on the Palestinians' exercise of their right to self-determination under conditions of freedom, on a recovery of their rights, and on the return of Arab territories lost in the war of 1967, wherever they be, in return for the establishment of peace in this area (Hussein, September 27, 1978).

King Hussein does not believe that war alone can be used to settle differences between nations. He was an advocate of policies such as cultural exchange, economic agreements, and scientific cooperation between Jordan, the Arab world, and other countries. He believed that the best method to promote peace was to develop communication among nations.

His desire not to use war as a means a measure for obtaining national goals was stated on another occasion in this fashion

> Jordan is for world peace, without which the world cannot hope for stability, prosperity or a better standard of living for all nations. For this reason, we stand against international tension and the Cold War mentality. We are for complete and comprehensive disarmament based on reciprocal guarantees. We are for an honest and fruitful dialogue between the South and North as well as between the industrialized world and the less fortunate countries which are seeking to achieve comparable progress. We are for the New

> International Economic Order in all its manifestations: equitable interaction among all nations; a new basis for international trade; the transfer of resources from developed to developing countries; the implantation of technology in the developing countries where it is most needed; the effective supply of food to the poorer countries and the wherewithal to produce more of their own food; the dissemination of knowledge and education; the construction of houses; the provision of medical care; and the promotion of individual dignity. We are for viewing the entire world as an individual unit with regard to resources, aspirations, peace, and the solution of problems. We are for placing the resources of humanity at the service of progress and enlightenment for all mankind (Hussein, September 25, 1979).

Based upon his propensity for caution, planning, and risk avoidance, the king's preferred means for achieving Jordan's objectives have been realistic. Jordan's limited economic and military capability and its geopolitical vulnerability to its neighbors forced Hussein to give preference to political means and diplomacy and avoid confrontation and military forces in settling disputes with his opponents.

Summary

An overview of King Hussein's basic beliefs, derived from an analysis of his writings and speeches, lead to a greater understanding of his personality and values. Furthermore, the ten questions by which the political beliefs of King Hussein were categorized were useful because they addressed the fundamental beliefs of the king rather than his peripheral beliefs.

From the preceding analysis, one can summarize the characteristics of King Hussein's operational code as follows. 1) King Hussein perceived the nature of politics as conflictual in his early years, but more recently he has regarded it as more peaceful and less conflictual. 2) He is optimistic about long-term goals and believes that their ultimate results will be positive. 3) He perceives the future as relatively predictable. 4) He recognizes his role as a leader to master the control of historical development. 5) He believes that the role of chance is minimized in human affairs and historical development. 6) He has defined his goals in terms of the survival and sovereignty of his country, Arab unity, and the restoration of Palestine. 7) He prefers diplomatic and political means to military action in order to attain his goals. 8) He avoids risk taking and believes in careful planning. 9) He believes in the importance of timing. 10) He wishes to use communication and non-military means to solve problems.

These sets of beliefs together define the essential characteristics of the operational code of King Hussein. In the next chapter I will analyze some actual policy choices and decisions taken by the king and then make comparative analysis between those decisions and the king's operational code.

CHAPTER V

FOUR FOREIGN POLICY DECISIONS: AN ANALYSIS

In this chapter, four important foreign policy decisions from Jordan's recent political history are reviewed in the hope of gaining an understanding of the major factors influencing them. The first of these decisions pertains to the June 1967 War, the second to the October 1973 War, the third to the Rabat Summit of 1974, and the fourth to the Camp David agreement of 1978.

Jordan's Decision to Enter the June 1967 War

On May 14, 1948, Great Britain terminated its mandate over Palestine, and on the same day the Jews in Palestine announced the establishment of the state of Israel. Arabs universally objected. In the ensuing crisis Jordan joined Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon to prevent the taking of Palestinian lands. The first Arab-Israel war in 1948 resulted in the defeat of the Arab forces and the establishment of the state of Israel, consisting of a large part of Palestine. That portion of Palestine on the West Bank of the Jordan River, however, remained in the hands of the Arab legion and was not included in the original state of Israel (Gubser, 1983, 85; The Middle East, 1979, 134).

Palestinian notables from the West Bank, meeting in Jericho in December 1948, called for a political union between the West Bank and Jordan, with Abdullah as the monarch of the kingdom. The Jordanian government accepted the Jericho resolution, and the union between the East and West Bank was officially declared on April 24, 1950. An election was held to choose a new parliament from both the East and West Banks to represent the newly merged kingdom (Mansfield, 1983, 30). This unification with the Palestinians has caused Jordan to be intimately involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict, which has become the central issue in Jordan's policy.

To the Arabs, the Israeli issue is not only a military and economic problem but a political and psychological one as well. Israel's ambitions to expand its state over all of Palestine and the region continues to threaten Jordan and other Arab states. In June 1967, King Hussein said, describing Israeli ambitions, "The enemy's present objective is the West Bank; after that it will expand throughout the Arab homeland" (Hussein, 1969, 36). The view that Israel is an expansionist state is commonly held among Arabs, and this perception is a major factor affecting their behavior.

To prepare for resisting the Israeli challenge, Arab leaders met during 1964 and 1965 in three summit conferences, in the cities of Cairo, Alexandria, and Casablanca. One of the major decisions resulting from these

meetings was to establish a unified Arab military command and to make Lieutenant General Abdel Hakim Amer, the Egyptian Chief of Staff, Supreme Commander of all Arab forces. Contributions to the Arab forces from various nations were increased at this time in an effort to overcome Israel's superiority in numbers (Hussein, 1969, 12-16; Kosut, 1968, 12-13).

By autumn of 1966, the tension between Israel and the Arab front states was on the verge of open warfare. On November 13, 1966, Israeli forces crossed the border between Israel and Jordan and attacked Es Samu, a small Jordanian village. Israeli soldiers forced the residents of the village out of their houses, killing some and destroying many of the homes (Snow, 1972). This Israeli attack fueled the call for war. During the next five months the situation between Arabs and Israelis progressively deteriorated and in April 1966, open aerial warfare broke out, pitting Israeli Mirages against Syrian MIGs. This engagement in the skies over Syria was followed by a massive concentration of Israeli forces along the Syrian border, and from this point events moved inexorably toward war (Hussein, 1969, 32).

In Egypt, President Nasser issued an order sending troops toward the Sinai Peninsula as a means of relieving the pressure on the Syrian front. The United Nations Emergency Forces in the demilitarized zone in the Sinai were instructed to withdraw from the line of demarcation, where

they had been stationed since February 26, 1957 (Hussein, 1969). The Egyptian forces then moved to close the Straits of Tiran at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba to all Israeli shipping.

On the Israeli side, preparations for the attack moved into high gear. Israel turned up its propaganda campaign to win worldwide opinion, while at the same time brandishing its sword toward the Arab world. The ultimate factors which induced Israel to go to war in 1967, according to Faddah (1974, 52), were the blockade of the Suez Canal and the closing of the Straits of Tiran, plus the increasing number of Arab commando raids across the ceasefire line and the policy of the Zionists to dispose of the Palestinian people and their national liberation resistance.

During the immediate period before war broke out and while the Arabs were still greeting Nasser's warlike gestures with delight, "Hussein made his decision. If there was to be a war, he would fight.... There was no keeping Jordan out this time.... For Hussein, it was not just a matter of expediency, it was a claim on his honour" (Snow, 1972, 73). Since coming to power he had joined the Arab cause, and, unlike his grandfather in 1948 who acted alone in the war with Israel, Hussein felt that Jordan's destiny was eternally connected with the entire Arab nation (Faddah, 1974).

Although King Hussein did not want to go to war and believed that it was the worst possible option open to the Arabs, by the end of May he was certain that the Arabs had gone beyond the point of no return and that war was inevitable. He concluded that Jordan's most logical and wisest course was to act in union with the other nations (Mutawi, 1987).

In the face of impending war, King Hussein traveled to Egypt to confer and reconsider the differences between Egypt and Jordan which had alienated them from one another since the mid-1950s, when Nasser supported attempts to overthrow the Jordanian regime. Despite differences, which included exhortations on Radio Cairo to overthrow the Hashemite monarchy almost up to the time Hussein left for Egypt, the ties of Arab brotherhood prevailed. On May 30, Egypt and Jordan signed a mutual defense pact, and the Jordanian armed forces were placed under the Egyptian command (Dawisha, 1983, 56-66).

Nasser is reported to have said to Hussein after signing the agreement, "The initiative you have taken today affirms that Arabs, no matter how divided they may be, forget everything when the issue is that of the Arab destiny" (Kosut, 1968, 54). King Hussein (1969, 35-36) later explained this reconciliation.

> If the Arab world was threatened, this threat included us Jordanians, too, and for two reasons. First, it was true that up to then, Israel had directly threatened only Syria and Egypt. Jordan could not have stayed out

> of the conflict, ... We were all bound by the Pan Arab Defense Pact signed in Cairo during the first Summit Conference.... But even without this agreement, should war break out it would involve us all. We knew this from experience.... The conclusion was obvious. The differences among the Arabs were significant only to the Arab camp. To the Israelis, we were all alike. We were all Arabs! My second reason was a moral one. Even though serious disturbances had broken out in Jordan in November, 1966, following Es Samu--disturbances clearly provoked by my allies to embarrass me--I could under no pretext behave toward them as I had accused them of behaving toward me, so there was never a question of my breaking away from the Arab camp and standing aside from a conflict that threatened us all. Especially since I thought our unity was essential to the mutual security and Arab survival. Since no Arab country was capable of meeting the Israelis alone, it seemed essential that we coordinate every one's capabilities before the battle was joined, and so I decided to communicate with Nasser.

Furthermore, King Hussein reasoned that, if Jordan joined with Egypt and Syria, Israel would be forced to fight on three fronts, thus weakening its position (Mutawi, 1987, 101).

On June 5, 1967, the third Arab-Israeli war broke out with a devastating, preemptive attack on Egypt by Israel. The Egyptian air force was destroyed on the ground in the first attacks, and Arab arms could not withstand Israel's onslaught. Six days later, the United Nations initiated a ceasefire command. The Israeli armed forces occupied approximately four times as much Arab territory as Israel had previously held. All of the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula up to and including most of the East Bank of the Suez Canal were seized from Egypt. The West Bank of the Jordan River, including Jerusalem, was taken from the

Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and Syria lost the strategic Golan Heights (Laqueur, 1968).

Despite Israel's overwhelming victory, no Arab leader was in a position to enter into direct peace talks. In a summit conference which was convened at the Sudanese capital of Khartoum in August and September following the war, Arab leaders insisted that they had been united by the setback and resolved to eliminate the effects of the aggression at any cost. In alliance with Nasser, King Hussein supported plans for a political solution. The conference reiterated that the main principles of Arab policy toward the common enemy were based upon "no peace with Israel, no recognition of Israel, no negotiations with Israel, and insistence on the rights of the Palestinian people in their own country" (Al-Marayti, 1984, 3110).

This overwhelming defeat at the hands of Israel, shook all Arabs psychologically in a very fundamental way. Their much-vaunted rhetoric now seemed inane and vainglorious. Jordan, of all of the Arab nations, perhaps suffered the most. The loss of the West Bank, which included one-third of its people, its richest agricultural lands, valuable tourist sites, and the religious symbol of Jerusalem, devastated its people and wrecked its economy. In addition, 300,000 refugees fled to the East Bank and had to be absorbed in the already weakened Jordanian economy. Perhaps even more important psychologically, the Palestinians were

devastated and lost faith in the Arab leaders. The Palestinians' hope that the Arab states, especially Jordan, would regain their homeland for them appeared lost. Many of the disgruntled Palestinians now turned to their own resources and quickly built up the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and other guerrilla groups to fight Israel. In the process, they became a challenge to all Arab leaders but especially to King Hussein. The disenchantment between East Jordanians and Palestinians became more pronounced after the war of 1967, partly because the PLO used Jordan as a base for its periodic raids into Israel, and partly because the PLO was attempting to establish a state within a state, thus threatening the stability and the security of the country. Unable to reconcile Jordan's security requirements with the PLO's demands, the king finally had to fight and dismiss the PLO from Jordan (Gubser, 1983, 101; Khadduri, 1981, 81).

Although King Hussein had been deeply unhappy at the prospect of the 1967 war, the pressures on him to join the war were overwhelming. Jordan was in grave danger, whether it joined the war or not. If hostilities opened between Israel and either Syria or Egypt, Israel would probably have invaded the West Bank no matter what actions Jordan took. The king recognized his perilous position as shown in his statement to the New York Times a few days before the war, when he said, "Our position is finished; if war results in

the defeat of Egypt, Jordan inevitably will be attacked because Israel views the Arab world as one" (New York Times, May 27, 1967). Similarly, Ahmed Al-Louzi pointed out that

> all of Palestine, including the holy city of Jerusalem, was the target of Israel, so Jordan could not fail to participate with other Arab countries. He argued also that, even if Jordan did not participate in the war, Israel would have attacked Jordan and the results would have been the same. We in Jordan know from experience how they think and act and their real objectives. The King and all of the people of the country strongly believed that Jordan has to cooperate with Arab nations to protect Arab rights (Al-Louzi, 1989).

In explaining King Hussein's position in the 1967 war Yorke (1988, 14) pointed out,

> The Hashemites' tough treatment of opposition and Jordan's consequent isolation in the Arab world provided the background for Jordan's decision to participate in the Six Day--1967--War. King Hussein now found it increasingly difficult to reconcile the Arab self-image of the Hashemites with Jordan's security requirements. In this weak position, the king's calculation was that there was now an urgent necessity to align Jordan with Arab nationalist mainstream as a means to ward off the challenge from the Palestinians and to protect Hashemite rule.

After the defeat, all that King Hussein could say was,

> We have fought with heroism and honour. One day the Arabs will recognize the role Jordan played in this war. Our soldiers have defended every inch of our earth with their precious blood. It is not yet dry, but our country honours the stain. They were not afraid in the face of the total superiority of the enemy's air power, which surprised and destroyed the Egyptian air force, on which we were relying. My brothers, I seem to belong to a family which, according to the will of Allah, must suffer and make sacrifices for its country without end. Our calamity is greater than anyone could have imagined. But, whatever its size, we must not let it weaken our resolve to regain what we have lost. If in the end you were not rewarded with glory, it was not because you were without courage but because it was the will of God (Hussein, June 8, 1967).

After the war had ended, King Hussein came to realize that the use of military weapons was not a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Consequently, he called for an Arab summit in order to discuss this problem. On June 17, he sent a cable to all Arab leaders inviting them to a meeting to be held in the near future. Hussein visited several Arab states and presented a proposal to solve the Arab-Israeli conflict which he intended to put forward at the forthcoming summit in Khartoum. The grounds for his proposal were based on an offer of peace to Israel in return for the West Bank and Arab Jerusalem. This did not imply, however, that the king would recognize Israel, sign a peace treaty with Israel, or internationalize Jerusalem (Farid, 1983).

In August the Arab summit was held at Khartoum, the capital of Sudan. The Arab leaders, in particular President Nasser, provided the king with support to enhance his peace efforts with the United States. The summit asserted Arab unity and willingness to seek a political solution at the international level that would eliminate aggression and ensure Israel withdrawal from the Arab territories. The Arab leaders affirmed at the summit that they would consent to no peace, no negotiation, and no recognition of Israel (Gubser, 1983; Riad, 1981).

The Khartoum Summit was viewed as a victory for King 2Hussein since it supported his proposal to seek a political

solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. This change in policy toward the conflict, which was accepted by President Nasser and some other Arab leaders, coincided with United Nations resolution 242 (see Appendix B). This United Nations action on November 22, 1967, established the principle of the exchange of territory for peace, providing that the lands seized by Israel in the recent conflict would be returned and Israeli armed forces withdrawn as a peace returned. It also called for an acknowledgment by all parties of the sovereignty and independence of every state in the region within secure and recognized boundaries. Jordan and Egypt, the two countries most seriously injured by the war, publicly accepted the resolution. Some other Arab states vigorously rejected Israel's claims of sovereignty. They continued to claim Arab lands seized by the Zionists, and they vowed to fight until death to recover their homeland. As a result of these differences the foreign policy of Arab states diverged with that of Jordan and Egypt. These two countries were attempting to work for a political settlement, while other Arab states continued to prepare for the ultimate showdown with Israel.

King Hussein visited Cairo after the Khartoum Summit and discussed with Nasser how to pursue the new political effort in the West. They agreed on general principles, including the rights of all states in the Middle East to exist in peace and security. The withdrawal of Israel to

its pre-1967 war borders and restoration of the Palestinian people's rights and self-determination were called for, in accordance with U.N. Resolution 242 (Raid, 1981). Then King Hussein began his political efforts by visiting several western states in an attempt to achieve a better understanding of the Palestinian problem and the Arab cause at the international level.

Jordan's Decision on the October 1973 War

A period of relative tranquility in the Arab-Israeli conflict followed the June 1967 war. During this hiatus in the conflict, the Arab nations were generally in disarray. The leaders had lost credibility with a large portion of the populace. The militant rhetoric and bombastic promises of victory of the past boomeranged against these leaders and some, like Nasser, were even forced to formally submit resignations as an act of contrition.

Conditions in Jordan after the defeat were even more serious. Economic, social, and political problems threatened the stability of the state. The Palestinians, augmented by over 300,000 new refugees, were destitute, and the undeveloped economy of Jordan was unable to absorb them. Tension grew between these newcomers and the natives of Jordan. Even more important was the fact that the Palestinians had lost confidence in the Arab regimes. Whereas formerly they had believed that the leaders of the

Arab states would recover their homeland, now they felt betrayed and abandoned. Increasingly they viewed their own organizations, such as the PLO, as their only hope and the only entities to which they owed their allegiance. They began to operate as a state within a state, attacking Israel from Jordanian positions and even challenging the legitimacy of the Jordanian government. By 1970 the struggle with the PLO broke out into open warfare and King Hussein had to fight to retain his position. The expulsion of the PLO and the destruction of its power in Jordan were to poison Jordan's relations with other Arab states throughout the region, and most Arab states severed diplomatic relations with the kingdom (Saunders, 1985).

During the years after the 1967 war, Egypt and Israel increased their military and political attacks against each other, and these attrition attacks continued until Nasser's death in 1970 (Ovendale, 1984). During this period, the perennial instability and social unrest among quarreling ethnic, religious, and national groups again dominated the region, and there was little realistic hope of a permanent settlement of these differences despite U.S. efforts to bring the parties together (Al-Marayti, 1984, 312-313).

Increasing tensions mounted after this hiatus in the Arab-Israeli conflict. At this stage King Hussein, in an attempt to rebuild his relations with the Palestinians and to open a new diplomatic dialogue, proposed the creation of

a federated Arab kingdom, composed of the two autonomous regions of the East and West Bank of Jordan, with himself as the head of state. This initiative was soundly denounced by the Arab states, Palestinian organizations, and Israel. Egypt even severed diplomatic relations with Jordan because of this proposal (Garfinkle, 1981; Sahliyeh, 1988, 36; Soble, 1974, 59-82).

In September 1973, the leaders of Egypt and Syria, Anwar al-Sadat and Hafiz al-Assad, invited King Hussein to Cairo for a meeting of reconciliation, supposedly to end the "no peace, no war" stalemate. They did not confide to Hussein that their main purpose was to prepare for war and that they wanted to make sure of Jordan's support if hostilities began (Bailey, 1984). As a result of this illusory reconciliation, diplomatic relations were restored on September 23 between Cairo and Amman, and with Syria on October 4, just one day preceding the outbreak of war (Bailey, 1984).

King Hussein was as shocked as the Israelis when he heard of the Egyptian and Syrian attacks. He immediately called Presidents Sadat and Assad to confirm that war had started. At this point, Sadat and Assad asked Hussein to open a third front. Caught off guard, the king delayed his response until his military commanders could assess the situation. Two days later, on October 11, he placed the Jordanian fortieth armored brigade under combined

Syrian-Iraqi-Jordanian command, to attack Israel from the Syrian front.

Initially the attacks surprised the Israelis but did not recapture any of the lost territory, and the Israeli air force inflicted serious injury on Syria. Additional Jordanian forces were sent to Syria to augment the Arab forces, but before they could enter the fray, the United Nations issued a ceasefire resolution. The ceasefire resolution basically called for a return to the positions stipulated in the 1967 U.N. resolution and the withdrawal of troops beyond this line (see Appendix C). The Arab states faced another stalemate, but, in the face of a potential defeat, they accepted the resolution and the Jordanian troops returned home (Howard, 1974, 86).

The 1973 war was caused by Arab frustrations arising from the no peace, no war situation and was, in a sense, a continuation of the three previous wars with Israel. The Arabs were fighting to restore the rights of Palestinians to the lands seized by Israel in the previous war (Sobel, 1974, 1), but the restoration of the lands seemed as far away as ever after this fourth unsuccessful Arab-Israeli war.

Jordan did not take the full brunt of the 1973 war as it had in 1967, mainly because King Hussein avoided opening a direct front with Israel in a war which he predicted could bring disaster to Jordan (Heykal, 1975; Mansfield, 1983, 36). If he had attempted to penetrate the West Bank, as he

was urged to do by Sadat and Assad, without preparations and without superiority in air power, he would have again suffered more heavy losses and perhaps lost more territory. Instead, he chose to join in the Syrian offensive, and thus, he came out of the war with martial honor and territorial integrity despite the defeat (Sinai and Pollack, 1977).

The Arab nations emerged from the war with a psychological boost for their people, despite the fact that the Arab forces failed in their ultimate objective to recapture the occupied territories. They had fought well and inflicted damage on the Israeli forces, unlike the shameful rout that occurred in 1967. The outcome proved that the Arabs could fight.

Arab leaders, on the other hand, were much less satisfied with the outcome of the war and blamed King Hussein for not opening a third front. Such criticism of Jordan, King Hussein believed, was unjustified, and he defended his country's action in this fashion:

> We, in Jordan, weren't aware of the operation in time, and we did not prepare for such a war. We lost the opportunity to surprise our enemy; in addition, Jordan has the longest front with Israel, but we did not have essential weapons, especially in the air force. We felt that, if we opened a front from Jordan, we would put ourselves in great danger and perhaps lose more than what the Arabs might gain on the other two fronts. So we decided to use defensive strategy and not to attack (Hussein, October 27, 1974).

Jordan's former prime minister, Al-Louzi, also criticized the lack of close coordination between the

military forces of Jordan and those of Syria and Egypt. Syria and Egypt had jointly planned the action; Jordan was not included in any of this planning and learned about the action only after the initial attack took place. In spite of the failure of Syria and Egypt to coordinate their actions with Jordan, King Hussein sent troops to fight on the Syrian front because he strongly believed in the Arab cause and Arab unity. If he had opened a third front without adequate preparation, it would have resulted in devastating losses (Al-Louzi, 1989).

Khadduri (1981, 98, 110) explained King Hussein's position in the 1967 and 1973 wars as follows:

> Hussein did not shrink from supporting the Arab forces directly or indirectly whenever they were involved in fighting with Israel, as the conflicts of 1967 and 1973 demonstrated, even though he realized the Arab forces were not adequately equipped militarily . . . he felt that inaction, when other Arab rulers were at war with Israel, would weigh very heavily on his conscience. No government in Jordan, perhaps not even King Hussein himself, could remain in power if Jordan failed to support an Arab country that became the subject of an attack by Israel.

Dann (1973) suggested that Jordanian foreign policy decisions resulted from attempts at developing and maintaining a popular image of Jordan; the Hashemite monarchy as rulers of the country defined this image. According to Dann (1973), several politico-military actions between Jordan and other nations helped to complete this image.

Jordan's Decision on Representation of the Palestinians at the Rabat Summit of 1974

The persistent enmity between Jordan and other Arab states because of Jordan's failure to open a third front in the 1973 war was reflected in subsequent negotiations. The question of who was to represent the Palestinians became a major point of contention in the Arab camp. Jordan felt that it was the legitimate spokesman for the Palestinians since the West Bank had been merged with Jordan since 1950. The PLO, on the other hand, challenged Jordan's legitimacy to represent Palestinian causes in future peace talks. Furthermore, the PLO proposed the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip following the withdrawal of Israeli forces. (Al-Marayti, 1984, 370).

The question of who was to represent the Palestinians in the peace negotiations first arose publicly immediately after the 1973 war at the summit meeting in Algeria where Arab leaders met to prepare for the peace negotiations. King Hussein did not personally attend this meeting because he knew this issue of representation for the Palestinians was on the agenda. With full knowledge of Hussein's objections, the participants nevertheless discussed the issue. King Hussein's representative, Bahjat Al-Talhouni, Chief of the Royal Court, explained that, although Jordan believed in the right of self-determination for the

Palestinians, it did not believe that the PLO should be the sole representative for the Palestinians in the peace conference. He also argued that Arab leaders were not supposed to interfere in another Arab country's internal affairs. He asserted that half of Jordan's population was Palestinian as a result of the 1950 merger and the Palestinians were Jordanian citizens. Thus, Jordan should speak for its own people (Al-Talhouni, 1989). Despite Al-Talhouni's objection, the PLO, which had prospered and gained regional and international recognition during the period from 1967 to 1973, was named by these Arab leaders as the sole representative for the Palestinians (Nyrop, 1980; Sheehan, 1976), much to the chagrin of Jordan.

After the Algerian summit, the debate about representation of the Palestinians shifted to the Palestinian camp. In June 1974, at a meeting of the Palestinian National Council in Cairo, this group affirmed that the PLO was the sole representative of the Palestinian people, fighting to liberate Palestine and to establish an independent national authority of Palestinian people in every part of Palestinian territory after liberation (Mansfield, 1983, 36-37). The designation of the PLO as the representative for the Palestinians presented the Arab leaders, who were to meet in Rabat, Morocco in October, 1974, with a fait accompli on this divisive issue.

At the summit conference held in Rabat on October 26-29, 1974, the most important issue on the agenda was the future representation of the Palestinians and the future of the West Bank (see Appendix D). For the first time, the PLO was invited to participate in the summit equally with the national delegations. The Arab leaders, in effect, were coming to the summit to decide whether to divest Jordan of its claim to sovereignty over the West Bank and to grant to the PLO the responsibility for creating an independent state (Bailey, 1984, 76).

Despite serious reservations, King Hussein did not agree with the timing of discussing the issue of representation before the liberation of the occupied territories. He did not agree with the statement to consider the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinians because this would contradict the presence of Palestinians in Jordan, all of whom had Jordanian citizenship. King Hussein attended the summit, and in his speech on October 27 asked the Arab leaders to retract their decision taken the previous year in Algeria pertaining to representation of the Palestinians. Again he pointed out that, although Jordan did not oppose self-determination for the Palestinians or making the PLO their legitimate representative, he could not agree to the designation of sole representative because over half of Jordan's population were Palestinians and the PLO could not represent them.

Furthermore, he pointed out, the 1948 merger with the West Bank had been approved by the Palestinian people themselves in a popular referendum (Nyrop, 1980).

King Hussein's elegant appeal went for naught. On October 29, the Arab leaders passed a resolution stating that the PLO was the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians and that it had the right to establish an independent state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Bailey (1984, 77) described King Hussein's response in this fashion

> King Hussein's reaction, despite the humiliation, was dignified and restrained. He even pledged his country to adopt the same national position as its brothers and carry out its duties to support, assist, back, and cooperate in order to enable the PLO to carry out its responsibilities and great burden.

King Hussein was greatly disturbed. In trying to justify his position he stressed that the subject taken up by the summit was inappropriate. Instead of discussing the means by which to liberate the occupied territories, the summit had focused upon the question of who would rule after the liberation. The king asserted that Jordan was not motivated by any desire to impose a trusteeship on anyone but, rather, by the belief that Palestinian issues belonged to all Arab nations and were not the responsibility of a single state or organization (Hussein, October 27, 1974).

Despite the fact that the decision stripped Jordan of its claim to the West Bank, Hussein sought to minimize uncertainty among Transjordanian and Palestinian

constituencies in Jordan. He continued to take responsibility for supplying financial and administrative services to the West Bank, and kept the bridges across the Jordan River open to commerce and travel. The rights and privileges of all Jordanian citizens, including those of Palestinian background, continued to be protected. Within the government, the king took a number of actions. He dissolved the parliament, which had had an equal number of members from both Banks, and he formed a new cabinet, reducing the number of Palestinians. He also granted amnesty to many of those Palestinians convicted during the period of unrest in 1970 and 1971 (Yorke, 1988, 41).

The fact that the king accepted what he considered to be an unwise and disingenuous decision and that he did not make dramatic changes in the direction of his country's domestic and foreign policy can be attributed, perhaps, to his own sense of personal responsibility for the loss of Jerusalem and his self-image as a Hashemite, loyal above all to the Arab cause.

Jordan's Rejection of the Camp David Agreement

In November 1977, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat took a dramatic initiative by making an unprecedented visit to Jerusalem, where he stood before the Israeli parliament and outlined a peace formula which he described as acceptable to the Arab world. The major points in Sadat's formula, which

he had not discussed with leaders from any of the other Arab countries, included an Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied the since 1967 war; Israel's recognition of the right of self-determination by the Palestinians, including the right to establish their own homeland; and the rights of states in the region to live in peace within secure borders (Nyrop, 1980, 184).

The immediate reaction from the Arab world was a stunned silence as they watched a leader from a dominant Arab country speaking before the Israeli Knesset. Frustration followed immediately as the Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin strongly rejected the proposal, long held by most Arabs as the only possible path for peaceful settlement. An outcry arose throughout the Arab world, criticizing Sadat for his arrogance in going to the enemy without so much as a note to other Arab leaders, and proposing a peace treaty. Most Arab leaders strongly condemned Sadat for these actions, and some called for an Arab summit for the purpose of rejecting his proposal.

King Hussein responded to Sadat's initiative cautiously, preferring to wait before taking sides between two opposing views (Garfinkle, 1981, 863-877). While expressing mild concern that Sadat's unilateral actions might undermine Arab solidarity, he also struck an optimistic note by saying that perhaps the initiative would herald the beginning of the peace process. He attempted not

to alienate Jordan from either Egypt or other Arab countries by describing Sadat's presentation of pro-Arab demands as an act of moral courage (Newsweek, December 12, 1977), while at the same time criticizing him for not consulting with other Arab leaders.

Some have interpreted the cautiousness of King Hussein as realism. Sahliyeh, (1988b, 286), for instance, says,

> The Jordanians were realistic in assessing their situations as they did not anticipate immediate benefits for their country from Sadat's initiative. They were hoping that Egypt's moves would facilitate the convening of an international peace conference for the resolution of all aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of U.N. resolution 242.

President Carter was encouraged by Sadat's initiative, which previously had been suggested by U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. After Begin returned Sadat's trip and visited Cairo, Carter invited both Sadat and Begin to join him in a search for a peace solution to the Middle East problem. The three chiefs of government met at the President's retreat at Camp David, Maryland, in September 1978, and worked out a proposed framework for peace in the Middle East (see Appendix E). In this framework, despite its non-participation in the talks, Jordan was designated to play a key role in the peace process (Nyrop, 1980, 185).

It was proposed in the framework at Camp David that future negotiations pertaining to self-governing authority for the West Bank and Gaza were to be formulated and agreed upon by Egypt, Israel, and Jordan. In these future

negotiations, the Egyptian and Jordanian delegations could include Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza or other Palestinians, as mutually agreed (Day, 1987, 127).

On hearing of this proposal, Jordan refused to be a party to any such agreement, which in its view weakened the Arab position, and expressed surprise that its name was mentioned in the Camp David agreement. The Jordanian cabinet held a meeting headed by the king to assert that it did not consider itself morally or legally obligated to this agreement. It further declared the Egyptian-Israeli treaty was only a separate pact between Egypt and Israel, with no hope of bringing comprehensive peace to the region (Al-Dustur, September 10, 1978).

Despite this statements of rejection, King Hussein attempted to keep the door open for further negotiations and submitted questions to President Carter about the meeting and whether his administration planned to insist on Israel's withdrawal from the West Bank and east Jerusalem. The American reply, made by Assistant Secretary of State for the Middle East Harold Saunders, asserted that the Carter administration would be energetically involved in the next round of diplomacy and it would support the right of the Palestinians to vote on self-government (Quandt, 1986, 388-396). Even after these assertions from the American President, however, King Hussein still was not willing to support the Camp David agreements.

In November 1978, just a month after rejecting the treaty, King Hussein participated in an Arab summit in Baghdad, where all Arab states except Egypt were in attendance. The participants in this summit strongly condemned the Camp David agreements and Egypt's diplomatic moves, calling on Sadat to change his policy (Al-Marayti, 1984, 382-383). The comprehensive approach to peace was supported.

> Having examined the situation in the Arab world and abroad, the conference reaffirmed the adherence of the Arab nation to a just peace based upon total Israeli withdrawal from all Arab lands occupied in 1967, including Arab Jerusalem, and reaffirmed the maintenance of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to return to the establishment of an independent state on their national soil (Journal of Palestine Studies, 1979, 204).

The summit conference awarded Jordan $1.25 billion annually in economic aid to keep the kingdom from signing the Camp David Accords, which it did not plan to do in any case.

Commenting on Camp David, Crown Prince El-Hassan (1984, 108) said,

> Jordan disapproved of the Camp David Accords of 1978, principally because the formula devised pushed the Palestine question aside and aimed at a partial peace between Israel and Egypt..., the framework for the settlement of the Palestine question provided by the Accords has already proved unworkable, since the projected talks on autonomy for the occupied territories have been abandoned. The conclusion of a partial peace has meant the neutralization of Egypt and as a consequence shifted the strategic balance in Israel's favour.

Prince El-Hassan (1982, 803) wrote earlier,

> Camp David was designed to remove Egypt from Arab coalition and thereby eliminate at one time both the largest Arab army and second front that forces Israel to divide its forces and efforts, illustrates this approach too, without Egypt, there is no credible military threat to Israeli security, so goes the argument.

King Hussein has not stopped working for a comprehensive peace because of his rejection of the Camp David agreements. He ultimately seeks a reasonable and comprehensive alternative. According to Abu Odeh (1981, 12-13),

> Jordan continues to believe in the necessity of reaching a peaceful settlement to the Middle East crisis. Such a solution must be based on the total withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab lands, especially Arab Jerusalem. In return, reasonable security guarantees acceptable to Israel and the other Arab states must be provided.... Any peaceful solution must be comprehensive. All immediate parties to the conflict, including Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and the PLO, along with the United States, the Soviet Union, and the European Community, must participate in any such solution within the framework of the United Nations.

Summary

Four key foreign policy decisions in Jordan have been discussed so that an analysis may be made of the factors shaping these decisions. Jordan's foreign policy-maker does not work in a vacuum and should take several factors into consideration prior to making any decision. Miller (1986, 789) points out that "Hussein is no sentimentalist, neither is he a reckless visionary. The legacy of the past and the long-term risks and pay offs of the future have to be

weighed carefully against the short term consequences." King Hussein was able to create and maintain support at the regional and international levels. Economic advancement and the selection of foreign policy choices were highly correlated for Jordan because of its poor resources and its dependence on external support. In the next chapter King Hussein's basic belief system is compared with the decisions he made in these cases.

CHAPTER VI

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN KING HUSSEIN'S BELIEF SYSTEMS AND HIS ACTIONS IN FOUR FOREIGN POLICY DECISIONS

King Hussein, as previously demonstrated, is the dominant foreign policy-maker in Jordan; his beliefs and values are perhaps the most important components in the Jordanian decision-making processes. The purpose of this chapter is to consider whether the actions taken by the king were congruent with the premises of his operational code. Does the operational code concept help to explain foreign policy-making in Jordan? An analysis is made by considering the king's philosophical and instrumental beliefs with his actions in each of the four foreign policy decisions under study.

Jordan's Foreign Policy Decision in the 1967 War

During the 1967 war and prior to it, King Hussein perceived Israel as the principal and constant enemy threatening Jordan and all Arabs generally. He consistently argued that Israel's territorial designs do not distinguish between Arab states, and, as a result, all Arabs are threatened. Israel is seen as being motivated by the

Zionist global ambition to dominate the Middle East region. He called for Arab states to meet the threats as follows.

> We have a challenge to meet, we must combat the general lack of understanding about the Arab-Israeli conflict. At the beginning of this century, the Israelis had had a definite objective; they wanted to get to this area and install themselves in Palestine. They were particularly clever at influencing world opinion to accept their aspirations (Hussein, 1969, 113).

The king's malevolent image of Israel was intensified during the year preceding the 1967 crisis, when Israel attacked Jordan. Although some of Hussein's advisors recommended not entering the war since his military forces were not capable of launching a successful assault, he felt that he had to fight. According to his pattern of perceptions, Jordan could not stay out of the impending conflict. After the attack on Syria in April 1967, and Nasser's decision to remove the United Nations forces from the Sinai and close the Gulf of Aqaba, the die was cast. King Hussein felt that he had no option but to join the other Arabs in their war with Israel. The King believed that, if Jordan stayed out of the fray, Israel would better be able to deal a deadly blow against the Arab nation because of the lack of unity. As the king stated (1969, 34-35),

> In any event, I was convinced that it was no longer possible to pull back or to put out the smoldering fire. Israel was already beating the drums and preparing its psychological campaign to win over world opinion, all the while brandishing its sword.

King Hussein wanted no one to be in any doubt that Jordan would fight with her Arab neighbors against the common enemy, however hopeless the struggle might be (Snow, 1972, 176). Not only did he give diplomatic support to the other Arab states but he was prepared to go to war, even if it resulted in defeat at the hands of the enemy. King Hussein (1978, 209) stated later,

> In my heart of hearts, I felt that I was deeply committed to the Arab Joint Defense Treaty signed in Cairo in 1964. It was totally incomprehensible for my country not to adhere to its commitments or to respect its signature when she had always been at the vanguard of the Arab forces' wars of liberation throughout the last 50 years.

King Hussein's perception of Israel's aims and objectives also affected his actions. He saw Israel's political objectives as being predictable, that it would continue attacks on Jordan and other Arab states in its pursuit of control over the Middle East. He described his views in this way. "I was well aware that Tel Aviv's principal objective was to occupy the West Bank of the Jordan where our presence was a permanent danger so long as the Palestinian question was unresolved (Hussein, 1969, 36).

The king's views of the destiny of the Hashemite family and his feeling of noblesse oblige also helped to shape his decision to join in the war against Israel. He felt responsible for helping to restore the glories of the past for the entire Arab nation. Hence, it was only natural that King Hussein was not going to sit back and watch Israel

attack other Arab states. He felt it his duty to participate with other Arabs in the war. He later wrote,

> The Hashemite family has fought for four generations for the Palestinian cause. Sharif Hussein of Mecca was the first who carried the flag, after him my grandfather Abdullah, and then my father. I am the fourth generation who has fought for the same cause and objective, although the wars and battles were not similar and the means used were different (Hussein, 1978, 225).

King Hussein's perception about Israel's expansionist aims strengthened his resolve to build Arab solidarity. "Now more than ever, I believed that personal differences had to give away to national interests" (Hussein, 1969, 36). His belief in Arab unity was so dominant that the king was even willing to sacrifice national goals for the sake of the Arab cause and restoration of the Palestinian homeland. In the face of eminent danger of war in 1967, but before the fighting actually began, in a sudden reversal of Jordan's position, King Hussein flew to Cairo and put his small army under the command of the United Arab Forces. As Dawisha (1983, 73) describes it,

> Arab Solidarity, with its emphasis on cooperation between sovereign Arab states, has always genuinely been seen by the King as the best means of serving the interests of the Arab people. And in process of providing this, he and Jordan have made great sacrifices, not least being Jordan's entry into 1967 war.

Zaid Al-Rifai, the King's secretary at that time, described Hussein's motives as follows.

> The desire to meet with Nasser may well seem strange in view of the insults broadcast by Radio Cairo over the past year. But on no account had we any right or

> reason to evade an affair which the Arab world was unquestionably going to be involved (Hussein, 1969, 40-41).

Although King Hussein prefers peaceful settlement to resolve conflicts, he saw that war was the only means in 1967, since Israel and the Arabs had gone beyond the point of peaceful negotiations. By joining the war against Israel and opening a third front, he hoped that the Jordanian army could make a contribution and weaken the Israeli military and psychological position. By opening this front, the king believed that the Arabs would be able to engage the Israelis long enough to allow international pressures to mount, causing the great powers to force a negotiated end to the war.

Joint action with Arab countries also coincided with the king's belief that joint action by Arab states was the only effective way for Arabs to protect themselves against Israel. In 1967, he reasoned that Jordan would be attacked even if it attempted to stay out of the war; therefore, joining in the joint military action was seen as the best means of "minimizing the dangers" (Mutawi, 1987, 101).

King Hussein's cautious nature and his habit of carefully considering all possible consequences were evident in the 1967 decision to join the Arab cause. He was aware that Arabs were embarking on an extremely dangerous path, and he had no illusions that they could defeat Israel. He found himself in the position, on one hand, of being advised

by his closest adviser, Wash Al-Tall, that Jordan was not ready for war and that entrance into the war would result in defeat and possible loss of additional territory. On the other hand, his personal assessment of the situation within Jordan led him to accept the full dangers of entering the war. The risk of civil war and the overthrow of his regime by angry public opinion faced him if he did not fight for the Arab cause. Furthermore, he felt bound in honor to defend the homeland of the Arab nations (Khadduri, 1981, 114).

King Hussein described his choice in an interview with Mutawi (1987, 103).

> The atmosphere that I found in Jordan, particularly in the West Bank, was one where frankly, we had the following choice: either to act at the right time with no illusion of what the results might be but with a chance to do better than we would otherwise, or not to act and to have an eruption occur within which would cause us to collapse and which would obviously immediately result in an Israeli occupation of probably the West Bank or even more than the West Bank, and we never separated the West Bank from the rest of Jordan or the Arab World in anticipating such action. That was really the reason why I went to Egypt to meet Nasser to his surprise.

The king's cautious nature and his belief about the importance of timing his actions so as to act from a position of strength were offended by the apparent rashness of Nasser. As the king wrote upon hearing about Nasser's actions,

> I felt that disaster was sure to occur. On the morning of 22 May I was stunned by the news. For such a measure, lacking in thought and consideration, would

> only lead to disaster because the Arabs were not ready for war. There was no coordination, no cooperation, no common plan amongst them (Hussein, 1978, 208-209).

This comparison of the king's belief system with action in 1967 war shows that his decisions were basically congruent with his philosophical beliefs. His decisions were influenced by his images of Israel's goals and ambitions and his belief in Arab solidarity and cooperation. These beliefs were major factors in leading him to join in a war he felt was poorly planned and would lead to defeat. The instrumental belief system also reinforced the relevance of the operational code of King Hussein's decision to join the war since his major goals were to restore the Palestinians' homeland, to protect the internal security of his country, to maintain his regime's survival, and not to allow Israel to defeat the Arabs.

The crucial decision to join the war, however, cannot be fully explained by Hussein's operational code alone. The workings of the inter-Arab system and especially the presence of Palestinians in Jordan also played a role in pressuring the king to act when otherwise he would have taken a more cautious approach.

Jordan's Foreign Policy Decision in the 1973 War

An examination of the 1973 war reveals that the belief system of King Hussein remained stable, with minor changes in his philosophical beliefs. The most noticeable change,

however, took place in the instrumental belief King Hussein espoused in political means to find a solution for Jordan's problems.

The defeat of Jordan in the 1967 war and the loss of vital territory on the West Bank left King Hussein with major problems. Israelis now occupied the most productive area of the country, including the holy lands and sites, and Jordan was swamped with a new wave of refugees. The king's main task was to reconstruct his country's economy and provide essential services to the increased population, while at the same time preparing to win back from Israel what Jordan had lost. He sought a peace settlement with Israel that would restore all the Arab lands lost in the 1967 war and "secure peace with justice" (Snow, 1972, 198). The king described the problems facing Jordan after the war in the following statements.

> After reconstructing our economy and military, there was another even more important task to liberate the occupied territories. At that time I did not realize that this task would take years to accomplish. Since we could not liberate these territories by force, I sought diplomatic means. I was shocked when I learned that Nasser also preferred to achieve this liberation by diplomatic means, and I believed that negotiations are the only means of regaining our land (Hussein, 1978, 228).

In contrast to the 1967 war, Hussein devoted much of his effort to trying to create international support for the Arab cause and for a peaceful settlement which would provide justice for all. He traveled throughout the world, to

Europe, the United States, and even the Soviet Union in these efforts in an attempt to build support for the Arab cause (Bailey, 1984, 29). King Hussein was hopeful that the world powers would force Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories: "My hope is that the world will as a whole do all that is possible to insure the swift withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab lands they had captured during the war" (Kosut, 1986, 166).

Israel was still seen as the main opponent because of its expansionist goals, but King Hussein's position toward Israel was modified slightly after the war of 1967. Speaking on the CBS television program "Face the Nation" in New York soon after the war, King Hussein asserted,

> The Arab States had changed their position on Israel and would recognize its right to exist, but as part of an overall Middle East settlement preceded by the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Arab Territory they had occupied in the June War (Kosut, 1968, 167).

He further clarified this statement by saying that this did not necessarily mean Arab diplomatic recognition of Israel.

In the same vein, King Hussein expressed his hope of finding a solution to the Palestinian problem through political means when he stated,

> I am a peaceful man. I told all people I have talked with that peace is possible at any time in our region. Arabs and Jews may live happily under a durable peace. But Israel has to return all the territories that it occupied in June 1967. This condition is essential, and there is no possible alternative. In regard to Jerusalem, it could be place for all three of religions--Christianity, Judaism, Islam--but the

> eastern part of Jerusalem should remain under the Arab sovereignty (Hussein, 1978, 261).

The king's extensive diplomatic efforts after the war of 1967 reflected his belief that careful planning and action are necessary to help shape future events. He saw international diplomacy as the path of ultimate peace. This view of how the Arabs should proceed in their relations with Israel, however, was rejected by Egypt and Syria, whose leaders were planning a military effort against Israel at that time without informing King Hussein of their intentions.

His response to being left out of the preparations was shaped partially by his perceptual view that it was the duty of the leader actively to seek to guide historical development. It was his conviction that, as a descendant from the Hashemite family, he had a mission to restore the glory of the Arab past (Khadduri, 1981, 103). Thus, Hussein felt that he could not stay away from a war that the Arabs were to fight to restore their land, even though he had not been a participant in its planning. He said, "Both the wars of 1967 and 1973 are totally different. The people who attacked and the people who were attacked were reversed. This is normal, but both wars are my wars since Arab lands were attacked" (Hussein, 1978, 225).

His loyalty to the Arab cause was much more cautious than in the 1967 war, and he did not open a direct front

from Jordan, which would almost certainly have caused further territorial losses. This time he seemed to have calculated how far he could go in his actions without risking defeat or endangering the security of his country. It is unlikely that King Hussein will ever again allow himself to become involved in a war with Israel because the very heart of his country would be vulnerable. He did not believe it was the right time to fight Israel without full preparation. King Hussein knew that his forces were not capable of launching a successful assault, but, at worst, he thought that the Jordanians could help forces on the Syrian front and inflict losses on the enemy. For these reasons, he sent Jordan's military to assist in the Syrian assault.

The dualism in the king's loyalty between all Arabs and Jordan is seen in his actions in 1973. He felt compelled to join in the war, even though the other Arab countries had, in a sense, rejected him. Any war against Arab lands was seen as "his war." On the other hand, he felt responsible for not foolhardily attacking Israel directly and thus giving it an opportunity to seize additional Jordanian territory.

Hussein's cautiousness and belief in preparations and proper timing are also evident in his deliberate actions to avoid attacking Israel from a Jordanian front. His decision to send troops to Syria reflects in part his devotion to the Arab cause but also the recognition that his Palestinian

subjects required him to fight or else civil war would break out in Jordan.

In fact, the 1973 decision indicated the shift in the king's beliefs with regard to the means he used to achieve his goals. Rather than emphasizing the military option, King Hussein sought to highlight the importance of diplomacy as a vehicle to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict. Throughout this period he consistently sought to work through international diplomacy to find political solutions.

Jordan's Decision Concerning Representation of the Palestinians in 1974

King Hussein's philosophical and instrumental beliefs were also strongly evident in his handling of the Arab leaders' decision to designate the PLO as the sole and legitimate representative of Palestinians.

A number of events which occurred before 1974 affected his decision regarding representation of Palestinians. For one thing, increased activities by the PLO in Jordan in 1970 led the king to use force to put down this insurrection and to expel the organization from the country. The effect of this action was to create animosity between Jordan and the PLO and many Arab leaders. Then, in the 1973 war, Jordan refused to open a third front against Israel at the request of other Arab leaders. Instead, Jordan contributed armored units that were dispatched to the Syrian front on the Golan

Heights. After the war, Palestinians generally were disenchanted and disillusioned with the Arab states, but especially with Jordan. They felt that they now had to look to their own organization, the PLO, for their solution.

At the Arab summit after the 1973 War, Palestinians demanded that the PLO be their sole and legitimate representative. King Hussein vigorously objected because many of his subjects were Palestinians. This issue of who was to represent the Palestinians presented him with a dilemma; on one hand, his belief system called for him to be pro-Arab, and yet he was the king of Jordan and many of his subjects were Palestinians. How could the PLO represent his subjects? As a Hashemite, he felt a sense of mission to protect the holy places of Jerusalem and to struggle in order to bring them back under Arab sovereignty.

Part of the king's belief was that he was destined to lead the Arab cause, but he was faced with a challenge by both the PLO and other Arab leaders. He wrote later about how he was torn by these events.

> The Hashemites worked honestly all the time for the sake of the Palestinian people and their legitimate rights. They asked me to turn the page, and I did; whatever my personal emotions in this painful issue, my sole objective is to help my Palestinian brothers to restore their homeland in one way or another. Nineteen Arab leaders asked me that, and I accepted it. But I hope that the PLO would be able to carry the responsibility, and I will offer any help to them (Hussein, 1978, 260).

The king's instrumental beliefs were clear in his decision; he was a cautious person, planning and acting only at the proper timing. The probability of a confrontation with other Arab leaders at the Algerian summit caused the king not to attend. Instead he argued through his spokesman that the issue of representation was ill-timed. First the question of how to retake the lost territories from Israel should be considered.

> I believe that Arabs at this time, while they have a strong and powerful enemy, should focus on this issue. Arabs should not weaken their position by becoming involved in an internal conflict which will not bring any useful result (Hussein, 1978, 202).

Although he argued that the question of representation should not be considered, he pointed out that he was not opposed to the Palestinians having their own spokesman. He said to the Arab leaders at the Rabat summit, "I would like to remind you that we never stood against the establishment of Palestinian identity or against independent Palestinian representation" (Hussein, October 27, 1974).

After arguing that the issue of Palestinian representation had been brought up at the wrong time, King Hussein declared that the Palestinians deserved a means of political expression, but he refused to agree that such expression required an independent state carved out of Jordanian territory. He stated,

> While we do not assume the right to impose ourselves on them after the liberation, we do not consider it fair that others should impose any position on them which these residents do not choose or decide from

> themselves. So we support them in respecting the right of self-determination and will give them the chance to exercise this right after the liberation (Hussein, October 27, 1974).

Despite his strong objection to having the PLO designated as the sole representative of Palestinians, King Hussein accepted the decision made against his best judgment and continued his effort to speak for all of the Arab nations. An explanation of why he agreed to this decision, which offended him deeply, may be found in his belief that Arab unity required unamanity within the Arab states. King Hussein has a sense of Arab nationalism that does not allow him to focus solely on parochial Jordanian interests.

As can be seen from this discussion, the king's beliefs alone cannot fully explain his actions. In fact, he was torn between his beliefs and the events and situations in which he was involved. To fully comprehend his decision it is necessary to understand the king's operational code and the environmental conditions impinging on him at that time. Again, it was obvious that as in 1967 and 1973, the relevance of the inter-Arab system and the presence of Palestinians in Jordan affected the King's decision.

As Miller (1986, 775) pointed out, "The King's decision to enter the 1967 War against Israel is a case in point, yet even this move, Hussein's costliest mistake, was doubtless weighed against the risks to his prestige of staying neutral and exposing the Hashemites once again to charges of

profiting at the expense of the Arab and Palestinian cause." King Hussein had to weigh several factors before making any action. His beliefs and image are very important, but the working of foreign policy in Jordan is very complicated. The country's economic difficulties, the ability to satisfy the demands of its rapidly developing society, and the security requirements of the regime and the state all depend on policy which can maintain and develop harmonious political and economic relations among Jordan, its neighbors, the rich Arab states, the United States, and--most recently--the European community.

Jordan's Decision Concerning the Camp David Agreements in 1978

King Hussein believes in Arab unity and solidarity, and his overall cautiousness and planning for the future figured prominently in his attitudes toward the Camp David agreements.

President Sadat's initiative in visiting Jerusalem, as well as his later decision to visit with Israeli Prime Minister Begin and President Carter in Washington, caught King Hussein and all of the Arab world by surprise. Just as he had not been informed about the attack of Egypt in 1973 war, King Hussein was not privy to President Sadat's plan to open a peace initiative. Despite his dismay, he did not immediately join other Arab leaders in their attacks on

Sadat for his brazen actions. His natural cautiousness prevailed, and he asked for clarification from President Sadat, as well as submitting questions about the agreements to the Carter administration. King Hussein said,

> Jordan was not a party to the meeting and agreements concluded at Camp David. Therefore, although Jordan is not committed to these agreements, Jordan has studied them seriously and with an open mind. Meanwhile, Jordan remains committed to the principles it has frequently affirmed (Hussein, September 23, 1978).

From King Hussein's previous positions and his insistence that the Middle Eastern problem could be solved only through a diplomatic solution, one might have expected him to accept the Camp David agreements. But there were a number of factors in his operational code and a number of aspects in the political environment which kept him from doing so.

Undergirding the king's belief system was his loyalty to the Arab cause. First and foremost, he believed that his destiny called on him to promote the Arab nation. He saw bilateral negotiations between Egypt and Israel as being divisive to Arab interests because they isolated Egypt, the strongest of the Arab states, and thus weakened the Arab coalition. He later expressed these views as follows.

> Nothing can impede our movement and our values and principles. We have acted on this premise in both the distant and near past, when we adopted stands of virility and Pan-Arab responsibility, throughout the Arab-Zionist struggle. We also acted on this premise in our stand against foreign hegemony over any part of the Arabs' land (Hussein, December 17, 1980).

King Hussein remembered the lesson he had learned from the assassination of his grandfather, who in the 1948 war had acted individually rather than fighting under the united Arab banner. His beliefs determined him that he would not be isolated from the Arab cause. Furthermore, he did not trust Begin, the Israeli prime minister, to withdraw from the West Bank under any circumstances.

In view of his acceptance of the Rabat Summit decision that the PLO was to be the sole representative of Palestinians, the political reality of having so many Palestinians in Jordan caused Hussein to recognize that no peace negotiations which did not include the Palestinians could succeed. Furthermore, if he engaged in such negotiations or made such an agreement, he would face the possibility of civil violence from the Palestinians. He also recognized that, unless the other Arab confrontation states accepted the negotiations, Jordan would be in danger if it joined in such efforts. The king also was well aware of Jordan's dependency on the oil-rich Arab states for economic aid, which, in all probability, would be cut off if he became involved in the Egyptian-Israeli negotiations.

King Hussein rejected the bilateral Camp David agreements as a result of all of these factors and insisted that a durable peace could be reached only through an international conference called by the United Nations in which Israel, all of the concerned Arab states, and the

Palestinians participated and in which all outstanding issues were addressed. He expressed his position in interview with a French newsman as follows.

> It is not possible for Jordan to join the Camp David march because the search for a just and durable peace should take place under UN auspices and with the participation of all parts concerned. It is important that the UN community should define clearly the nature of just and all-round peace which must be realized in this area (Hussein, March 4, 1980).

He further said about the nature of peace desired by Jordan,

> We aspire to a just and lasting peace based on Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, the return of Arab sovereignty over Arab Jerusalem, and giving the Palestinian people their right to determine their future. These principles constitute our demands for achieving peace (Hussein, September 23, 1978).

Camp David presented King Hussein with hard choices which caused him not to follow his preference for a diplomatic peaceful settlement because of political conditions in the environment. His basic loyalty to the Arab cause permitted him to rationalize his decision to reject a diplomatic agreement made in a bilateral setting. The operational code construct, although useful in promoting an understanding of how Hussein arrived at his decision, could alone have predicted his actions. Both his beliefs and the impact of environmental conditions must be considered in order fully to comprehend the king's decision.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify King Hussein's belief system, or operational code as it is called by George (1969) and Holsti (1977), and to test its influence on foreign policy-making in Jordan. The research has three related objectives: 1) to identify King Hussein's operational code through analysis of his writings and speeches during the period between 1967 and 1980, 2) to review four major foreign policy decisions in an attempt to understand the factors affecting the decision-making process and system in Jordan, and 3) to analyze these decisions to determine the impact of the king's personality and beliefs on them in an attempt to discover whether the operational code construct can be used to predict or explain Jordan's foreign policy behavior.

An investigation of the king's belief system was made by applying content analysis to his speeches and writings in the period under study. The questions developed by George (1969) and Holsti (1977) in their operational code construct pertaining to the king's philosophical and instrumental beliefs were used to guide this investigation. Next I reviewed four key foreign policy decisions in

Jordan and analyzed the decision-making process in order to identify the factors, including the King's belief system, which shaped these decisions.

The king's belief system or operational code was found to consist of three sets of central beliefs which affected his decision behavior. The first set of beliefs revolved around his perceptions of his adversary, Israel, and the Zionist intention of expanding throughout the Middle East, coupled with his belief that he is destined as a Hashemite leader to help regain the former glories of the Arabs and unify the Arab world. The second set of King Hussein's basic beliefs pertains to his perception of being the ruler of Jordan and his duties to protect and develop the country. As king of Jordan, he feels obligated to resolve the Palestinian problem. The third set of beliefs grows out of his instrumental beliefs concerning how to accomplish the goals of his nation. His cautious nature and strong beliefs in careful planning before acting cause him to prefer to cooperate under the Arab nations' banner rather than acting alone. These beliefs are linked also with the belief that the conflicts in the Middle East ultimately can be solved through diplomacy. These basic beliefs shape King Hussein's operational code.

Foreign policy in Jordan, to a large degree, is the unfettered preserve of the king because he operates in the foreign policy arena under minimal constraints from

organizational, bureaucratic, or parliamentary interference. He largely makes foreign policy. Not even the military establishment, which often is very influential in Third World countries, has a major role in foreign policy in Jordan. The military forces are extremely loyal to the king and have never challenged his prerogatives to make policy, with the exception of the early years of his reign. Lack of institutionalization in the decision-making process in Jordan magnifies the significance of the king in foreign policy. Thus, the king's operational code becomes most relevant to the calculations of what shapes or determines Jordan's foreign policy decisions.

The four decisions analyzed in this study reveal that King Hussein's decisional calculations were greatly influenced by his operational code. The king's beliefs that Israel was an expansionist nation attempting to divide the Arab world obviously affected his decision. He joined the Arab cause in the 1967 and 1973 wars, despite the fact that he had been alienated from the leaders of other Arab states and that they had insulted and attempted to injure him in numerous ways. He did not let these internal differences separate him from the Arab cause and its defense against the main enemy, Israel. At the Rabat summit, he accepted the Arab leaders' decision making the PLO the sole representative of the Palestinians, which was very distasteful to him, because to do otherwise would have split

and weakened the Arab community. Similarly, the king's attitude in rejecting the Camp David agreements demonstrated his distrust of Zionist ambitions and his loyalty to Arab unity. In King Hussein's view, no bilateral agreement could serve any cause but to divide the Arab world, to which he owed his first loyalty.

The king's perceptions about the responsibilities of being the ruler of Jordan were also reflected in the four foreign policy decisions under study. His refusal to open a third front from Jordan in the 1973 war, despite the urgings of other Arab leaders, reflects in part his belief that protection of his country was his primary responsibility. His argument at the Rabat summit in 1974 was that, as King of Jordan, he represented his Palestinian citizens and, therefore, the PLO could not serve as the sole representative for the Palestinians in any international conference. His decision to send troops to fight in Syria in the 1973 war reflected both his Pan-Arab beliefs and his recognition that it was necessary to fight in the war if he were to preserve his position with his Palestinian citizens. As can be seen, his strong belief in supporting the unified Arab cause at times conflicted with his more narrow Jordanian loyalty and convictions of what is required to be the king of Jordan.

The third set of King Hussein's basic beliefs showed that he was a very cautious person, acting only after

careful consideration, and that he preferred diplomatic solutions to the conflict in the Middle East. These instrumental beliefs were clearly seen in the four decisions under study. Before the 1967 and 1973 wars, Hussein expressed concern over the lack of joint Arab planning and coordination, and he reiterated his belief that no action should be taken without planning and proper timing. After the 1967 war, the king devoted much effort to building a favorable international climate for solving the Arab-Israeli conflict through diplomacy. His cautiousness was also demonstrated in his response to the Camp David agreements. Although he favored a diplomatic solution, he believed that, without a consensus among all of the Arab states, no one state could bring peace to the region. In addition, his rejection of the Camp David agreements reflected his assessment of the political environment in the inter-Arab system. He recognized that, if he joined in the agreements, that he would be ostracized from the Arab community and that serious civil and economic unrest in his country might result.

As can be seen from these four decisions, although the king's decisions were greatly affected by his belief system, his perception of environmental factors also interacted with his belief. He always seemed to calculate how his actions would affect the national security of Jordan, his political position, and his throne. The pressures of the inter-Arab

and Arab-Israeli system were so strong that they caused him at times to depart from his basic belief system.

Theoretical Observations

The operational code construct as presented by George (1969) and others has been described as a valuable tool for explaining the foreign policy decision-making process of leaders in the Third World countries. Furthermore, it has repeatedly been stated that it is fallacious to evaluate foreign policy in developing countries as if they were developed nations. Unfortunately, there is relatively little literature on the foreign policy-making process in the Third World and almost none which relies on approaches designed for the developing world. In this study I hope modestly to advance the literature in this field by attempting to discover whether the operational code construct is useful in explaining foreign policy-making in Jordan.

The operational code construct enables researchers to identify the basic belief systems of key decision-makers in Third World countries, and, because the decision-making process in these countries is so personalized, a major aspect of decision-making may be identified. In this study, however, I found that the personality and beliefs of the leader cannot be examined in isolation from internal and external environmental factors. Although the personality of the leader and his belief system are major factors shaping

foreign policy making in Third World countries such as Jordan, one cannot fully explain the policy process without also considering the environmental variables influencing the nation.

In the case of Jordan, for example, such factors as its geographic location make the country extremely vulnerable to pressure from its neighbors. King Hussein was bound to keep balance among rival neighbors and to follow a modest and neutralist policy toward them. The inter-Arab system exerts influence on all of Jordan's foreign policy decisions. Also, the Arab-Israeli conflict has been a major factor in placing constraints on Jordan's foreign policy. Jordan is more involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict because half of its population is Palestinian and it has the longest front with Israel of any of the Arab states. The Jordanian decision-maker cannot dissociate himself from the Arab-Israeli conflict, and any attempt to do so might be suicidal to the regime.

Jordan's economic condition is also a major factor affecting its foreign policy making. Jordan is heavily dependent on both the oil-rich Arab states and the United States for foreign economic and military aid. All foreign policy decisions in Jordan, therefore, must weigh the import of their actions on these nations. Internal factors that prevent a common consensus in the communal structure, such as the presence of Palestinians in Jordan, also influence

the kingdom's foreign policy and cause it at times to appear inconsistent. How foreign policy will affect the Palestinians must always be considered by the decision-maker.

The major conclusion that may be drawn from this study is that the operational code is a useful tool for analyzing foreign policy in Third World countries, particularly in Jordan. It helps us to understand and explain some policy choices which might otherwise appear inscrutable. The operational code, however, should not be considered the ultimate or sole approach for studying foreign policy decisions in the Third World. It has limitations and can best advance our understanding if it is used in conjunction with other approaches that study environmental factors which interact with the decision-maker's belief system. Although not proven by this study, it appears that the operational code approach is more useful in studying foreign policy when there is less turbulence in the environment than when there is great volatility. It appears that, the more turbulent the environment, the less influence the leader's individual beliefs have, and the more significant environmental factors are in policy-making. In any case, it seems essential to understand the basic beliefs or premises upon which the leader relies to fully comprehend foreign policy decision-making in Third World countries where a single leader dominates foreign policy.

A Postscript on the Operational Code

The primary lesson to be drawn from this dissertation is that the application of the operational code in Third World foreign policy remains relevant and useful. The utility of this approach lies in the fact that policy-making in the developing states is executive dominated, and the single decision-maker assumes the responsibility for making the country's critical policy decisions. Studying the belief system of the decision-maker, thus, will aid in explaining and understanding foreign policy, because a decision-maker's philosophical perceptions on life, politics, and international affairs will shape, to a large degree, how he will perceive his personal policy-making role as well as the role of his country in the international arena.

Nevertheless, despite the usefulness of the operational code approach to the analysis of decision-making, some of its limitations must be taken into account by future researchers. Studies on the operational code are still not sufficiently standardized, and there is a need for further improvement and refinement. One of the problems relates to the transfer of available biographical, documentary, and other evidence into usable data that are directly pertinent to the operational code questions being asked. Furthermore, some of the operational code questions at times seem to be opaque and vague when a researcher attempts to conduct a

field study or utilize the questions in interviews. This is especially problematic when one is dealing with non-Western cultures. Also, some of the operational code questions appear to overlap.

I believe that the operational code should be refined and modified to gain greater precision and suitability in different cultures.

Finally, it is recommended that the operational code approach might be more useful to the study of foreign policy in the Third World, possibly by the inclusion of some elements of Margaret Hermann's (1978) model. Her approach focuses on the following characteristics of decision-makers: general interest in foreign affairs, training or expertise in foreign affairs, and general sensitivity to one's environment. These factors act as filters in the relationship between a leader's personal characteristics and his nation's foreign policy, and they influence the relationship between four other personal characteristics and foreign policy-making. The four personal characteristics that seem most relevant to foreign policy-making are a political leader's beliefs, motives, decision style and interpersonal style.

In the final analysis, one might assert that it is extremely difficult to avoid the conclusion that, in most decision-makers, personality needs and philosophical perceptions are closely related to the policy choices they

make, as well as the strategies they pursue. The findings of the present investigation could be subjected to further testing and much improvement. On the other hand, however, it is hoped that this dissertation has made some important contributions in the area of foreign policy-making in developing countries.

APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

APPENDIX A

Persons interviewed

Adanun Abu Odeh served as a minister of information and culture several times since 1970. He was appointed chief of the Royal Hashemite Court in 1973, and in 1984 he was appointed Minister of the Royal Court. He now is the political advisor of the king.

Marwan Al-Kassem served as a foreign minister several times since 1976. He was appointed as a chief of the Royal Hashemite Court and is now Jordan's foreign minister.

Hani Al-Khasawneh served as secretary for the king and ambassador to Romania, the Soviet Union, and France. He was appointed as a youth minister and subsequently as information minister.

Ahmed Al-Louzi served as prime minister in 1972-73. He was appointed as president of the National Consultative Council in 1978 and was appointed as a chief of the Hashemite Royal Court. He is currently the president of the senate.

Bahjat Al-Talhouni served as a chief of the Royal Hashemite Court several times. He has also been one of Jordan's longest serving prime ministers, forming six cabinets in the period between 1960 and 1970. In the 1970s,

Talhouni served as president of the senate. He is now a member of the senate.

Taher Masri served as a cabinet minister in 1972 and then as ambassador to Britain, France, and Spain. He was appointed as a foreign minister in 1985 and now is deputy prime minister and cabinet minister for economic affairs.

Ahmed Obeidat served as the director of the department of general intelligence in the 1970s. He was then appointed as an interior minister. In 1984, he became prime minister. He is now a member of the senate.

Akram Zuaiter is a writer of Arab and Palestinian history. He was appointed as a foreign minister in 1966 and was a minister of the Royal Court in 1967. He is now the chairman of the "Save Jerusalem Council."

APPENDIX B

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242, NOVEMBER 22, 1967

APPENDIX B

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242, NOVEMBER 22, 1967

The Security Council,

Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East,

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every State in the area can live in security,

Emphasizing further that all Member States in their acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in accordance with Article 2 of the Charter,

1. Affirms that the fulfillment of Charter principles requires the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles:

(i) Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;

(ii) Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and

recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

2. Affirms further the necessity

(a) For guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;

(b) For achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem;

(c) For guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every State in the area, through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to designate a Special Representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Security Council on the progress of the efforts of the Special Representative as soon as possible.

APPENDIX C

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 338, OCTOBER 22, 1973

APPENDIX C

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 338, OCTOBER 22, 1973

The Security Council

1. Calls upon all parties to the present fighting to cease all firing and terminate all military activity immediately, no later than 12 hours after the moment of the adoption of this decision, in the positions they now occupy;

2. Calls upon the parties concerned to start immediately after the cease-fire the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in all of its parts;

3. Decides that, immediately and concurrently with the cease-fire, negotiations shall start between the parties concerned under appropriate auspices aimed at establishing a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

APPENDIX D

ARAB LEAGUE SUMMIT CONFERENCE COMMUNIQUE, RABAT, MOROCCO, OCTOBER 29, 1974

APPENDIX D

ARAB LEAGUE SUMMIT CONFERENCE COMMUNIQUE, RABAT, MOROCCO, OCTOBER 29, 1974

The Seventh Arab Summit Conference after exhaustive and detailed discussions conducted by their Majesties, Excellencies, and Highnesses, the Kings, Presidents and Amirs on the Arab situation in general and the Palestine problem in particular, within their national and international frameworks; and after hearing the statements submitted by His Majesty King Hussein, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and His Excellency Brother Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and after the statements of their Majesties and Excellencies the Kings and Presidents, in an atmosphere of candour and sincerity and full responsibility; and in view of the Arab leaders' appreciation of the joint national responsibility required of them at present for confronting aggression and performing duties of liberation, enjoined by the unity of the Arab cause and the unity of its struggle; and in view of the fact that all are aware of Zionist schemes still being made to eliminate the Palestinian existence and to obliterate the Palestinian national entity; and in view of the Arab leaders' belief in the necessity to frustrate these attempts

and schemes and to counteract them by supporting and strengthening this Palestinian national entity, by providing all requirements to develop and increase its ability to ensure that the Palestinian people recover their rights in full; and by meeting responsibilities of close cooperation with its brothers within the framework of collective Arab commitment;

And in light of the victories achieved by Palestinian struggle in the confrontation with the Zionist enemy, at the Arab and international levels, at the United Nations, and of the obligation imposed thereby to continue joint Arab action to develop and increase the scope of these victories; and having received the views of all on all the above, and having succeeded in cooling the differences between brethren within the framework of consolidating Arab solidarity, the Seventh Arab Summit Conference resolves the following:

1. To affirm the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to return to their homeland;

2. To affirm the right of the Palestinian people to establish an independent national authority under the command of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people in any Palestinian territory that is liberated. This authority, once it is established, shall enjoy the support of the Arab states in all fields and at all levels;

3. To support the Palestine Liberation Organization in the exercise of its responsibility at the national and international levels within the framework of Arab commitment;

4. To call on the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Palestine Liberation Organization to devise a formula for the regulation of relations between them in the light of these decisions so as to ensure their implementation;

5. That all the Arab states undertake to defend Palestinian national unity and not to interfere in the internal affairs of Palestinian action.

APPENDIX E

A FRAMEWORK FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AGREED AT CAMP DAVID, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 17, 1978

APPENDIX E

A FRAMEWORK FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AGREED AT CAMP DAVID, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 17, 1978

Muhammad Anwar al-Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, and Menachem Begin, Prime Minister of Israel, met with Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America, at Camp David from September 5 to September 17, 1978, and have agreed on the following framework for peace in the Middle East. They invite other parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to adhere to it.

Preamble

The search for peace in the Middle East must be guided by the following:

- The agreed basis for a peaceful settlement of the conflict between Israel and its neighbors is United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, in all its parts.*

- After four wars during thirty years, despite intensive human efforts, the Middle East, which is the cradle of civilization and the birthplace of three great religions, does not yet enjoy the blessings of peace. The people of the Middle East yearn for peace so that the vast human and

*The texts of Resolutions 242 and 338 are annexed to this document.

pursuits of peace and so that this area can become a model for coexistence and cooperation among nations.

- The historic initiative of President Sadat in visiting Jerusalem and the reception accorded to him by the Parliament, government and people of Israel, and the reciprocal visit of Prime Minister Begin to Ismailia, the peace proposals made by both leaders, as well as the warm reception of these missions by the peoples of both countries, have created an unprecedented opportunity for peace which must not be lost if this generation and future generations are to be spared the tragedies of war.

- The provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the other accepted norms of international law and legitimacy now provide accepted standards for the conduct of relations among all states.

- To achieve a relationship of peace, in the spirit of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, future negotiations between Israel and any neighbor prepared to negotiate peace and security with it, are necessary for the purpose of carrying out all the provisions and principles of Resolutions 242 and 338.

- Peace requires respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force. Progress toward that goal can accelerate movement toward a

new era of reconciliation in the Middle East marked by cooperation in promoting economic development, in maintaining stability, and in assuring security.

- Security is enhanced by a relationship of peace and by cooperation between nations which enjoy normal relations. In addition, under the terms of peace treaties, the parties can, on the basis of reciprocity, agree to special security arrangements such as demilitarized zones, limited armaments areas, early warning stations, the presence of international forces, liaison, agreed measures for monitoring, and other arrangements that they agree are useful.

Framework

Taking these factors into account, the parties are determined to reach a just, comprehensive, and durable settlement of the Middle East conflict through the conclusion of peace treaties based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 in all their parts. Their purpose is to achieve peace and good neighborly relations. They recognize that, for peace to endure, it must involve all those who have been most deeply affected by the conflict. They therefore agree that this framework as appropriate is intended by them to constitute a basis for peace not only between Egypt and Israel, but also between Israel and each of its other neighbors which is prepared to negotiate peace with Israel on this basis. With that objective in mind, they have agreed to proceed as follows:

A. West Bank and Gaza

1. Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the representatives of the Palestinian people should participate in negotiations on the resolution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects. To achieve that objective, negotiations relating to the West Bank and Gaza should proceed in three stages.

(a) Egypt and Israel agree that, in order to ensure a peaceful and orderly transfer of authority, and taking into account the security concerns of all the parties, there should be transitional arrangements for the West Bank and Gaza for a period not exceeding five years. In order to provide full autonomy to the inhabitants, under these arrangements the Israeli military government and its civilian administration will be withdrawn as soon as a self-governing authority has been freely elected by the inhabitants of these areas to replace the existing military government. To negotiate the details of a transitional arrangement, the Government of Jordan will be invited to join the negotiations on the basis of this framework. These new arrangements should give due consideration both to the principle of self-government by the inhabitants of these territories and to the legitimate security concerns of the parties involved.

(b) Egypt, Israel, and Jordan will agree on the modalities for establishing the elected self-governing authority in the West Bank and Gaza. The delegations of

Egypt and Jordan may include Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza or other Palestinians as mutually agreed. The parties will negotiate an agreement which will define the powers and responsibilities of the self-governing authority to be exercised in the West Bank and Gaza. A withdrawal of Israeli armed forces will take place and there will be a redeployment of the remaining Israeli forces into specified security locations. The agreement will also include arrangements for assuring internal and external security and public order. A strong local police force will be established, which may include Jordanian citizens. In addition, Israeli and Jordanian forces will participate in joint patrols and in the manning of control posts to assure the security of the borders.

(c) When the self-governing authority (administrative council) in the West Bank and Gaza is established and inaugurated, the transitional period of five years will begin. As soon as possible, but not later than the third year after the beginning of the transitional period, negotiations will take place to determine the final status of the West Bank and Gaza and its relationship with its neighbors, and to conclude a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan by the end of the transitional period. These negotiations will be conducted among Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. Two separate but related committees

will be convened, one committee, consisting of representatives of the four parties which will negotiate and agree on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza, and its relationship with its neighbors, and the second committee, consisting of representatives of Israel and representatives of Jordan to be joined by the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza, to negotiate the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, taking into account the agreement reached on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza. The negotiations shall be based on all the provisions and principles of UN Security Council Resolution 242. The negotiations will resolve, among other matters, the location of the boundaries and the nature of the security arrangements. The solution from the negotiations must also recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements. In this way, the Palestinians will participate in the determination of their own future through:

1) The negotiations among Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza to agree on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza and other outstanding issues by the end of the transitional period.

2) Submitting their agreement to a vote by the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.

3) Providing for the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza to decide how they shall govern themselves consistent with the provisions of their agreement.

4) Participating as stated above in the work of the committee negotiating the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan.

2. All necessary measures will be taken and provisions made to assure the security of Israel and its neighbors during the transitional period and beyond. To assist in providing such security, a strong local police force will be constituted by the self-governing authority. It will be composed of inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. The police will maintain continuing liaison on internal security matters with the designated Israeli, Jordanian, and Egyptian officers.

3. During the transitional period, representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and the self-governing authority will constitute a continuing committee to decide by agreement on the modalities of admission of persons displaced from the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, together with necessary measures to prevent disruption and disorder. Other matters of common concern may also be dealt with by this committee.

4. Egypt and Israel will work with each other and with other interested parties to establish agreed procedures

for a prompt, just and permanent implementation of the resolution of the refugee problem.

B. Egypt-Israel

1. Egypt and Israel undertake not to resort to the threat or the use of force to settle disputes. Any disputes shall be settled by peaceful means in accordance with the provisions of Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. In order to achieve peace between them, the parties agree to negotiate in good faith with a goal of concluding within three months from the signing of this Framework a peace treaty between them, while inviting the other parties to the conflict to proceed simultaneously to negotiate and conclude similar peace treaties with a view to achieving a comprehensive peace in the area. The Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel will govern the peace negotiations between them. The parties will agree on the modalities and the timetable for the implementation of their obligations under the treaty.

C. Associated Principles

1. Egypt and Israel state that the principles and provisions described below should apply to peace treaties between Israel and each of its neighbors--Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon.

2. Signatories shall establish among themselves relationships normal to states at peace with one another. To this end, they should undertake to abide by all the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Steps to be taken in this respect include:

(a) full recognition;

(b) abolishing economic boycotts;

(c) guaranteeing that under their jurisdiction the citizens of the other parties shall enjoy the protection of the due process of law.

3. Signatories should explore possibilities for economic development in the context of final peace treaties, with the objective of contributing to the atmosphere of peace, cooperation and friendship which is their common goal.

4. Claims Commissions may be established for the mutual settlement of all financial claims.

5. The United States shall be invited to participate in the talks on matters related to the modalities of the implementation of the agreements and working out the timetable for the carrying out of the obligations of the parties.

6. The United Nations Security Council shall be requested to endorse the peace treaties and ensure that their provisions shall not be violated. The permanent members of the Security Council shall be requested to

underwrite the peace treaties and ensure respect for their provisions. They shall also be requested to conform their policies and actions with the undertakings contained in this Framework.

For the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt:

A. SADAT

For the Government of Israel:

M. BEGIN

Witnessed by:

JIMMY CARTER

Jimmy Carter, President
of the United States of America

REFERENCES

Abu Jaber, Kamel S. 1969. The Legislature of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan: A Study in Political Development. The Muslim World 3:223-250.

Abu Odeh, Adnan. 1981. Jordan and the Middle East Crisis. AEI Foreign Policy and Defense Review 3:20-24.

Abu Odeh, Adnan. 1985. Jordan's Foreign Policy: Regional and International Conditions. Amman: Unpublished in Arabic.

Abu Odeh, Adnan. 1988, December 19. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

Ake, Clamde. 1973. Explaining Political Instability in the New States. Journal of Modern African Studies 11:3.

Al Dusture. September 10.

Al-Kassem, Marwan. 1988, December 31. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

Al-Khasawneh, Hani. 1988, December 18, interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

Allison, Graham. 1969. Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis. American Political Science Review 63:689-719.

Allison, Graham. 1971. The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown.

Allison, Graham, and M. Halperin. 1972. Bureaucratic Politics. A Paradigm and some Policy Implications. World Politics 24:40-79.

Al-Louzi, Ahmed. 1988, December 25 and January 12, 1989. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

Al Marayti, Abid A. 1984. International Relations in the Middle East and North Africa. Cambridge: Schenkman.

Almond, Gabriel A. 1960. The American People and Foreign Policy. New York, Praeger.

Almond, Gabriel, and Sidney Verba. 1963. The Civic Culture. Boston: Little, Brown.

Almond, Gabriel A., and G. Powell. 1966. Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach. Boston, Little, Brown.

Al-Talhouni, Bahjat. 1989, January 4. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

Anderson, J. E. 1973. The Operational Code Approach: The George Construct and Senator A. Vandenberg's Operational Code Belief Systems. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans.

Aruri, Nasseer. 1972. Jordan: A Study in Political Development, 1921-1965. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Ashby, N. 1970. Schumacher and Brandt: The Divergent Operational Code of two German Socialist Leaders. Paper prepared at a seminar on political leadership. Standford University.

Axelrod, Robert. 1976. The Analysis of Cognitive Maps. In Structure of Decision, ed. R. Axelrod. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bailey, Clinton. 1977. The Formation of the Cabinet in Jordan. In The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the West Bank, ed. Anne Sinai and Allen Pollack. New York: American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East.

Bailey, Clinton. 1984. Jordan's Palestinian Challenge, 1948-1983: A Political History. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Bill, James A., and Carl Leiden. 1984. Politics in the Middle East. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown.

Bonham, M. and Shapiro. 1973. Simulation in the Development of a Theory Decision-making. In Sage International Year Book of Foreign Policy, ed. P. McGowan. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bonham, M. 1976. Cognitive Process Models and the Study of Foreign Policy Decision. In Systems Theory in the Social Sciences, ed. Hartmut Bussell, Sakluezke. Basel and Stuttgart: Birkhauser.

Boulding, Kenneth. 1971. National Images and International Systems. In Comparative Foreign Theoretical Essays, ed. Hanrider. New York: McKay.

Braybrooke, David, and Charles E. Lindblom. 1963. A Strategy of Decision. Glencoe: Free Press.

Brecher, Michael, Steinberg, Blema, and Stein Janice. 1969. A Framework for Research on Foreign Policy Behavior. Journal of Conflict Resolution 13:75-101.

Brecher, Michael. 1972. The Foreign Policy System of Israel: settings, images, and processes. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brown, M. Barratt. 1974. The Economics of Imperialism; Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Carter, Jimmy. 1985. The Blood of Abraham. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Clapham, Christopher. 1977. Foreign Policy-making in Developing States. Westmead, Farrborough Hauts, England: Saxon House.

Cummins, Wallace. 1974. Value Structure and Political Leadership. International Studies Series, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dann, Uriel. 1973. Regime and Opposition in Jordan since '49. In Society and Political Structure in the Arab World, ed. Manaham Mislon. New York: Humanities Press.

Dawisha, Adeed. 1977. The Middle East. In Foreign Policy-making in Developing States, ed. Christopher Clapham. New York: Praeger.

Dawisha, Adeed. 1983. Jordan in the Middle East: The Art of Survival. In The Shaping of an Arab Statesman, ed. Patrick Seal. London: Quartet Books.

Day, Arthur R.. 1986. East Bank/West Bank: Jordan and the Prospects for Peace. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.

Day, Arthur R. 1987. Hussein's Constraints, Jordan's Dilemma. SAIS Review 7, 81-93.

Direnzo, A. 1974. Perspective on Personality and Political Behavior. In Personality and Politics, ed. A. Direnzo. New York: Anchor.

Dodd, C. H., and M. E. Salea. 1970. Israel and the Arab World. New York: Barnes and Noble.

East, Maurice. 1973. Foreign Policy-Making in Small States: Some Theoretical Observations Based on a Study of the Uganda Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Policy Science 6:491-508.

East, Maurice and Stephen Salmore. 1978. Theoretical Perspectives for Comparative Foreign Policy Studies. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Easton, David. 1965. A System Analysis of Political Life. New York: Wiley.

Eckstein, Harry. 1975. Case Study and Theory in Political Science.

El-Hassan, Bin Talal. 1982. Jordan's Quest for Peace. Foreign Affairs 60:804-891.

El-Hassan, Bin Talal. 1984. Search for Peace: The Politics of the Middle East Ground in the Middle East. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Faddah, Mohammed I. 1974. The Middle East in Transition: A Study of Jordanian Foreign Policy. New York: Asia Publishing House.

Farid, Abdul Majeed. 1983. Records, Secrets and Deliberations of Hussein--Nasser Talks: 1967-70. Serialized in Al-Rai in Arabic.

Frankel, Joseph. 1963. The Making of Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Decision-Making. London: Oxford University Press.

Galtung, Johan. 1971. A Structural Theory of Imperialism. Journal of Peace Research 2:81-118.

Garfinkle, Adam M. 1981. Negotiating by Proxy: Jordan, Foreign Policy, and U.S. Options in the Middle East. Orbis 24:847-880.

Geertz, Clifford. 1977. The Judging of Nations: Some Comments on the Assessment of Regimes in the New States: European Journal of Sociology 18:245-261.

Gendzier, Irene L. 1985. Managing Political Change: Social Scientists and the Third World. Boulder, CO: Westview.

George, Alexander. 1959. Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Content Analysis. In Trends in Content Analysis. ed, I. des. pool, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

George, Alexander. 1969. The Operational Code: A Neglected Approach to the Study of Leaders and Decision-making. International Studies Quarterly 13:190-222.

George, Alexander, and R. Shnoke. 1974. Deterrence in American Foreign Policy, Theory and Practice. New York: Columbia University Press.

George, Alexander. 1979. The Causal Nexus Between Cognitive Beliefs and Decision-making Behavior: The Operational Code Belief System. In Psychological Models in International Politics, ed. Lawrence S. Falkowski. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Glubb, John B. 1959. Britain and the Arabs. London: Hodder and Staughton. Chicago.

Greenstein, Fred I. 1969. Personality and Politics: Problems of Evidence, Inference, and Conceptualization. Chicago: Markham.

Gubser, Peter. 1983. Jordan: Crossroads of Middle Eastern Events. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Gubser, Peter. 1988. Jordan: Balancing Pluralism and Authoritarianism. In Ideology and Power in the Middle East, ed. Peter J. Chelkowski and Robert J. Praeger. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Heradstveit, Daniel, and D. Narveson. 1978. Psychological Constraints on Decision-making: A discussion of cognitive approaches, operational code, and cognitive map. Paper presented at the European consortium for political research in international decision-making process, Grenoble, France.

Heradstveit, Daniel. 1981. The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Psychological Obstacles to Peace. Oslo: Universitets for Laget.

Herman, Margaret. 1974. Leader Personality and Foreign Policy Behavior. In Comparing Policies: Theories, Findings and Methods, ed. James Rosenau. New York: Halsted Press.

Herman, Margaret. 1976. When Leader Personality will Affect Foreign Policy: Some Propositions. In In Search of Global Patterns, ed. James Rosenau. New York: Free Press.

Herman, Margaret. 1978. Effects of Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders on Foreign Policy. In Why Nations Act: Theoretical Perspectives for Comparative Foreign Policy Studies, ed. Maurice East, Stephen Salmore, Charles Herman. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Heykal, Mohammed. 1975. The Road to Ramadan. New York: Ballantine.

Hill, Christopher. 1977. Theories of Foreign Policy-making for the Developing Countries. In Foreign Policy-making in Developing States, ed. Christopher Clapham. New York: Praeger.

Hiro, Dilip. 1981. Inside the Middle East. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoffman, Stanley. 1960. Contemporary Theory in International Relations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Holsti, K. J. 1985. The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Hegemony. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Holsti, Ole. 1969. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Philippines: Addison & Wesley.

Holsti, Ole. 1970. The Operational Code Approach to the Study of Political Leaders: John Foster Dulles, Philosophical and Instrumental Beliefs. Canadian Journal of Political Science 3:123-157.

Holsti, Ole. 1971. The Belief Systems and National Images: A Case Study in a Multi-method Introduction to International Politics. Chicago, IL: Markham.

Holsti, Ole. 1976A. Foreign Policy Formation Viewed Cognitively. In Structure of Decision, ed. Robert Axelrod. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Holsti, Ole. 1976B. Operational Code Belief: A Code Book. Mimeo. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Holsti, Ole. 1977A. The Operational Code as an Approach to the Analysis of Belief Systems. Mimeo. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Holsti, Ole. 1977B. A Typology of Operational Code Belief Systems. Mimeo. Durham, NC: Duke University.

Howard, Norman F. 1974. The Uncertain Kingdom of Jordan. Current History 66:62-65.

Howard, Howard F. 1975. Jordan: The Price of Moderation. Current History 68:61-65.

Hudson, Michael. 1977. Arab Politics: The Search for Legitimacy. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. Political Order in Changing Societies. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1987. The Goals of Development. In Understanding Political Development, ed. Myron Weiner and Samuel P. Huntington. Boston: Little, Brown.

Hurewitize, J. C. 1969. Soviet-American Rivalry in the Middle East. New York: Praeger.

Hussein. 1960. How to Unite Arab World. Life International, 80-86.

Hussein. 1962. Uneasy Lies the Head. New York: Bernard Gels Associates.

Hussein. 1967, June 8. Speech to the Jordanian people and Arab Nation on the occasion of the June 1967 War Ceasefire.

Hussein. 1967, June 26. Speech before the United Nations National Assembly meeting.

Hussein. 1967, August 10. Speech on anniversary of his reign.

Hussein. 1967, August 24. Speech on the occasion of his visit to Lebanon.

Hussein. 1967, October 2. Speech on the occasion of his visit to the Soviet Union.

Hussein. 1967, October 16. Speech on the eve of his trip to Algeria and other Arab states.

Hussein. 1967, November 1. Speech on the occasion of the opening of the Jordanian National Assembly.

Hussein. 1968, February 10. Speech and conference with Arab journalists.

Hussein. 1968, March 8. Speech on the occasion of Eid Al-Adha.

Hussein. 1968, June 5. Speech on the anniversary of the June 1967 War.

Hussein. 1968, October 1. Speech on the occasion of the opening of the Jordanian National Assembly.

Hussein. 1968, November 4. Speech on the graduation of military officers.

Hussein. 1968, December 19. Speech to the kings and presidents of the Arab states.

Hussein. 1969. My War with Israel. London: Peter Own.

Hussein. 1969, April 28. Speech to the Jordanian people and Arab nation on the occasion of his return home from the United States and Europe.

Hussein. 1969, July 30. Speech to Palestinian Students' Association Conference.

Hussein. 1969, September 23. Speech in the Islamic Summit Conference in Rabat.

Hussein. 1970, March 14. Speech on the occasion of his visit to Pakistan.

Hussein. 1970, June 16. Speech to the Jordanian community and the Arab nation.

Hussein. 1970, September 16. Speech to the Jordanian people and Arab nation.

Hussein. 1971, February 5. Speech to the people and nation on the eve of Id El-Dha.

Hussein. 1972, March 15. Speech to Jordanian people and the Arab nation.

Hussein. 1972, July 15. Speech to the Jordanian community.

Hussein. 1972, November 1. Speech on the occasion of the opening of the Jordanian National Assembly.

Hussein. 1973, February 3. Speech on the occasion of his trip to the United States.

Hussein. 1974, October 27. Speech on the Rabat Summit.

Hussein. 1976, April 6. Speech before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council.

Hussein. 1976, June 18. Speech on the occasion of his visit to the Soviet Union.

Hussein. 1977, April 27. Speech at a silver jubilee testimonial luncheon hosted by the American-Arab Association.

Hussein. 1978. My Profession as a King. Amman: Ghaleb Toukan. In Arabic.

Hussein. 1978, March 3. Interview with Austrian newsmen.

Hussein. 1978, March 22. Speech to welcome the Federation with the Palestinian State.

Hussein. 1978, April 24. Pan-Arab speech to the opening session of the National Council.

Hussein. 1978, April 25. Interview in the Lebanese newspaper An-Nahar.

Hussein. 1978, May 30. Interview in Al Aqsa magazine.

Hussein. 1978, June 14. Speech to university professors.

Hussein. 1978, September 23. Press conference in Amman.

Hussein. 1978, September 27. Press conference pertaining to Camp David.

Hussein. 1979, May 1. Speech on the occasion of Labor Day.

Hussein. 1979, June 16. Interview in Al-Mustaqbal magazine.

Hussein. 1979, September 25. Speech before the United Nations General Assembly.

Hussein. 1980, March 4. Interview with French newsmen.

Hussein. 1980, June 6. Interview on Camp David in Al-Majallah magazine.

Hussein. 1980, June 10. Pan-Arab speech.

Hussein. 1980, June 19. Speech at the National Press Club in Washington, DC.

Hussein. 1980, October 7. Pan-Arab speech.

Hussein. 1980, December 17. Speech to reserve forces at a cadet school.

Ismael, Tareq. 1986. International Relations of the Contemporary Middle East: A Study in World Politics. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Jervis, Robert. 1976. Perception and Misperception in International Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Johnson, Loch. 1977. Operational Codes and the Prediction of Leadership Behavior: Senator Frank Church at Mid Career. In A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders, ed. Muttermann and T. Milburn. New York: Free Press.

Journal of Palestinian Studies. Statement issued by the Ninth Arab Summit Conference. Baghdad, November 5, 1979.

Jureidini, Paul A., and R. D. McLaurin. 1984. Jordan: The Impact of Social Change on the Role of the Tribes. New York: Praeger.

Kaplan, Stephen. 1973. Cognitive Maps in Perception and Thought. In Images and Environment, ed. Downs and Stein. Chicago: Aldine.

Kaplan, Stephen. 1975. United States and Regime Maintenance in Jordan, 1957-1973. Public Policy, 23:201-220.

Kaufman, Edy. 1977. Latin America. In Foreign Policy-making in Developing States, ed. Christopher Clapham. New York: Praeger.

Kavanagh, D. 1971. The Operational Code of Ramsay MacDonald. Unpublished paper. Standford University.

Kelman, Herbert. 1970. The Role of the Individual in International Relations: Some Conceptual and Methodological Considerations. Journal of International Affairs, 14:1-17.

Kerr, Malcolm H. 1971. The Arab Cold War: Gamal Abd Al-Nasser and His Rivals, 1958-1970. New York: Oxford University Press.

Khadduri, Majid. 1981. Arab Personalities in Politics. Washington, DC: The Middle East Institute.

Khoury, Nabeel A. 1981. The National Consultative Council of Jordan: A Study in Legislative Development. International Journal of Middle East Studies, 13:427-437.

Kiernan, Thomas. 1978. The Arabs: Their History, Arms, and Challenge to the Industrialized World. London: Sphere.

Korany, Bahgat. 1974. Foreign Policy Models and their Empirical Relevance to Third World Actors: A Critique and an Alternative. International Social Science Journal 26:70-97.

Korany, Bahgat. 1986. How Foreign Policy Decisions are made in the Third World: A Comparative Analysis. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Korany, Bahgat, and Ali Dessouki E. 1984. The Foreign Policy of the Arab States. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kosut, Hall. 1968. Israel and the Arabs: The June 1967 War. New York: Facts on File.

Laifer, Michael. 1977. South-east Asia. In Foreign Policy-making in Developing States, ed. Christopher Clapham. New York: Praeger.

Laquer, Walter. 1968. The Road to War, 1967: The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Conflict. Southampton, England: The Camelot.

Leites, Nathan. 1951. The Operational Code of the Politburo. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leites, Nathan. 1953. A Study of Bolshevism. Glencoe: Free Press.

Lijphant, Arend F. 1971. Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. American Political Science Review 65:682-693.

Lippmann, Walter. 1913. Preface to Politics. New York: Mitchell Kennerley.

Lippmann, Walter. 1965. Public Opinion. New York: Free Press.

Mansfield, Peter. 1983. Jordan and Palestine. In The Shaping of an Arab Statesman, ed. Patrick Seale. New York: Quartet.

Macridis, Roy C. 1967. Foreign Policy in World Politics. 3d ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Masri, Taber. 1989, January 4. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

McLellan, Davids. 1971. The Operational Code Approach to the Study of Political Leaders: Dean Acheson's Philosophical and Instrumental Beliefs. Canadian Journal of Political Science 1:52-75.

McClosky, H. 1956. Concerning Strategies for a Science in International Politics. World Politics 8:281-295.

McGrowan, P. and H. Shapiro. 1973. The Comparative Study of Foreign Policy. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

M.C.T., Kahin, Guy Pauker, and Lucian Pye. 1955. Comparative Politics of non-Western countries. American Political Science Review 69:1022-41.

Migdal, Joel S. 1974. International Structure and External Behavior: Explaining Foreign Policies of Third World States. International Relations (London) 5:510-525.

Miller, Aaron D. 1986. Jordan and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: The Hashemite Predicament. Orbis 29:795-820.

Mishal, Shaul. 1978. West Bank/East Bank. The Palestinian in Jordan. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Modelski, George. 1962. A Theory of Foreign Policy. New York: Praeger.

Modelski, George. 1970. The World's Foreign Ministers: A Political Elite. Journal of Conflict Resolution 1:135-175.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1967. Politics among Nations. 4th ed. New York: Knopf.

Musa, Sulieman. 1983. Hashemite Rule and the Emergence of the State. In The Shaping of an Arab Statesman, ed. Patrick Seale. New York: Quartet.

Mutawi, Samir A. 1987. Jordan in the War, 1967. London: Cambridge University Press.

Neustadt, R. 1970. Alliance Politics. New York: Columbia University Press.

Newsweek. December 12, 1977.

New York Times. May 27, 1967.

Nyrop, Richard. 1980. Jordan: A Country Study. Area Handbook series. Washington, DC: The American University.

Obeidat, Ahmed. 1988, December 29. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.

Ovendale, Ritchie. 1984. The Origins of the Arab-Israeli War. New York: Longmean.

Paige, Glenn. 1968. The Korean Decision, June 24-30, 1950. New York: Praeger.

Patai, Raphael. 1958. The Kingdom of Jordan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Polk, William. 1975. The United States and the Arab World. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pye, Lucian. 1958. The Non-western Political Process. Journal of Politics 20:657-664.

Quandt, William B. 1988. Peacemaking and Politics. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Riad, M. 1981. The Struggle for Peace in the Middle East. London: Quartet.

Riggs, Fred W. 1963. Bureaucrats and Political Developments: A Paradoxical View. In Bureaucracy and Political Development, ed. Joseph Lapalombard. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenau, James. 1966. Pre-theories and theories of foreign policy. In Approaches to Comparative and International Politics, ed. B. Farrell. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Rosenau, James. 1971. Pre-theories and Theories in Foreign Policy. In The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy, ed. author. New York: Free Press.

Rosenau, James. 1980. The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy. London: Francis Pinter.

Russett, Bruce M. 1970. International Behavior Research: Case Studies and Cumulation. In Approaches to Study Political Science, ed. M. Hass and Hiskariel. New York: Chandler.

Sahliyeh, Emile. 1988. Jordan and the Palestinians. In The Middle East: Ten Years after Camp David, ed. William Quandt. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Sahliyeh, Emile. 1988. In the Search of Leadership: West Bank Politics since 1967. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Sands, William. 1970. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. In Governments and Politics of the Contemporary Middle East, ed. Tareq Ismael. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Saunders, Harold. 1985. The other Walls: The Politics of the Arab-Israeli Peace Process. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Schlaghech, Donna Marie. 1985. Contextual and conceptual analysis in the study of foreign policy decision-making: Kissinger, Vietnam Arms Control, Unpublished dissertation. University of Minnesota.

Seale, Patrick. 1965. The Struggle for Syria: A Study in Post Was Arab Politics, 1945-1958. London: Oxford University Press.

Selim, Mohammed. 1979. The operational code belief system and foreign policy decision making: The Case G. A. Nasser. Unpublished dissertation. Canada: Carlton University.

Sharabi, H. B. 1963. Power and Leadership in the Arab World. Orbis 3:583-595.

Shaehan, Edward R. F. 1976. The Arabs, Israelis, and Kissinger. New York: Reader's Digest Press.

Shwadran, Benjamin. 1959. Jordan: A State of Tension. New York: Council for Middle Eastern Affairs.

Sinai, Anne, and Allen Pollack. 1977. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the West Bank. New York: American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East.

Snow, Peter. 1972. Hussein: A Biography. New York: David.

Spainer, John, and Eric M. Uslaner. 1974. How American Foreign Policy Is Made. New York: Praeger.

Snyder, R. L., H. W. Bruch, and B. Sapin. 1954. Decision-making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics. Princeton, NJ: Foreign Policy Analysis Series.

Sobel, Laster A. 1974. Israel and the Arabs: The October War. New York: Facts on the File.

Sprout, Harold, and Margaret Sprout. 1965. The Ecological Perspective of Human Affairs with Special Reference to International Politics. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Stein, Janice. 1977. Freud and Descartes: The Paradoxes of Psychological Logic. International Journal 32:429-451.

Stephens, Robert. 1983. Jordan and the Powers. In The Shaping of the Arab Statesman, ed. Patrick Seale. New York: Quartet.

Stuart, Douglas T. 1975. The Relative Potency of Leader Beliefs as a Determinant of Foreign Policy: John F. Kennedy's Operational Code. Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

The Constitution of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. 1952. Amman.

The Holy Quran, ed. Malik Ghulan Farid. 1969. Rabwah, Pakistan: The Oriental and Religious Publishing Corporation.

The Middle East: U.S. Policy, Israel, Oil and the Arabs. 4th ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

Thompson, Scott. 1969. Ghana's Foreign Policy, 1957-1966. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Verba, Sidney. 1961. Assumptions of Rationality and non-rationality in models of the international system. In The International System, ed. K. Knorr and S. Verba. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Verba, Sidney. 1961. Assumptions of Rationality and non-rationality in Models of the International System. World Politics 14:93-117.

Vorman, S. P., and K. P. Misra. 1960. Foreign Policy: South Asia. New Dehli: Orient Longmeans.

Walker, Stephen G. 1977. The Interface between Beliefs and Behavior. Journal of Conflict Resolution 21:129-168.

Weiner, Myron. 1987. Political Change: Asia, Africa and the Middle East. In Understanding Political Development, eds. Myron Weiner, Huntington. Canada: Little, Brown.

Weinstein, F. B. 1972. Uses of Foreign Policy in Indonesia: An Approach to the Analysis of Foreign Policy in Less Developed Countries. World Politics 3:356-382.

Wright, Quincy. 1955. The Study of International Relations. New York: Appleton Century-Crofts.

Yorke, Valerie. 1988. Domestic Politics and Regional Security--Jordan, Syria and Israel: The End of an Era. Brookfield, VT: Gower.

Zartman, I. W. 1966. International Relations in New Africa. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zuaiter, Akram. 1988, December 1988. Interview by author, Amman, Jordan.