The Origins of the American–Israeli Alliance

The Jordanian factor

Abraham Ben-Zvi

Israeli History, Politics and Society

The Origins of the American–Israeli Alliance

The Origins of the American–Israeli Alliance: the Jordanian factor examines the birth of the American–Israeli alliance as inherent in the regional processes which preceded the Six-Day War of June 1967.

The book argues that the alliance between Washington and Jerusalem developed as a direct response to the growing Egyptian and Syrian threat to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which ultimately resulted in the emergence of Israel as a "regional balancer" – a power determined to confront this growing threat by becoming irrevocably committed to the survival of Jordan.

Not only did this threat repeatedly underscore Israel's strategic value to American interests as a guardian and protector of the embattled Hashemite regime, but it resulted in the conclusion of new arms deals between Washington and Jerusalem and thus in the upgrading of the strategic components of the relationship.

Based upon a most comprehensive review of numerous primary sources, the book reconstructs the origins and early evolution of the American–Israeli alliance as it unfolded during the years 1957–1970. In addition to an introductory theoretical chapter, it contains four case studies, which represent four distinctive phases in the formation and consolidation of the alliance. These phases, in turn, are linked to Jordan's growing security dilemma in the face of the mounting Egyptian and Syrian threat.

This exciting new book will be of great interest to a diverse readership as it provides a new perspective for explaining the regional root-causes of the American–Israeli partnership as they started to unfold during the second term of the Eisenhower presidency.

Abraham Ben-Zvi is Professor Emeritus at Tel-Aviv University, who is teaching in the Department of International Relations at the University of Haifa. Between 2004 and 2006, he was the Goldman Visiting Professor in the Department of Government at Georgetown University.

Israeli history, politics and society

Series editor: Efraim Karsh
King's College London

This series provides a multidisciplinary examination of all aspects of Israeli history, politics and society, and serves as a means of communication between the various communities interested in Israel: academics, policy-makers, practitioners, journalists and the informed public.

1. Peace in the Middle East: The Challenge for Israel
Edited by Efraim Karsh

2. The Shaping of Israeli Identity
Myth, memory and trauma
Edited by Robert Wistrich and David Ohana

3. Between War and Peace
Dilemmas of Israeli security
Edited by Efraim Karsh

4. US–Israeli Relations at the Crossroads
Edited by Gabriel Sheffer

5. Revisiting the Yom Kippur War
Edited by P R Kumaraswamy

6. Israel
The dynamics of change and continuity
Edited by David Levi-Faur, Gabriel Sheffer and David Vogel

7. In Search of Identity
Jewish aspects in Israeli culture
Edited by Dan Urian and Efraim Karsh

8. Israel at the Polls, 1996
Edited by Daniel J Elazar and Shmuel Sandler

9. From Rabin to Netanyahu
Israel's troubled agenda
Edited by Efraim Karsh

10. Fabricating Israeli History
The 'New Historians', second revised edition
Efraim Karsh

11. Divided against Zion
Anti-Zionist opposition in Britain to a Jewish state in Palestine, 1945–1948
Rory Miller

12. Peacemaking in a Divided Society
Israel after Rabin
Edited by Sasson Sofer

13. A Twenty-Year Retrospective of Egyptian–Israeli Relations
Peace in spite of everything
Ephraim Dowek

14. Global Politics
Essays in honor of David Vital
Edited by Abraham Ben-Zvi and Aharon Klieman

15. Parties, Elections and Cleavages
Israel in comparative and theoretical perspective
Edited by Reuven Y Hazan and Moshe Maor

16. Israel and the Polls 1999
Edited by Daniel J Elazar and M Ben Mollov

17. Public Policy in Israel
Edited by David Nachmias and Gila Menahem

18. Developments in Israeli Public Administration
Edited by Moshe Maor

19. Israeli Diplomacy and the Quest for Peace
Mordechai Gazit

20. Israeli–Romanian Relations at the End of Ceauceşcu's Era
Yosef Govrin

21. John F Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel
Abraham Ben-Zvi

22. Green Crescent over Nazareth
The displacement of Christians by Muslims in the Holy Land
Raphael Israeli

23. Jerusalem Divided
The armistice region, 1947–1967
Raphael Israeli

24. Decision on Palestine Deferred
America, Britain and wartime diplomacy, 1939–1945
Monty Noam Penkower

25. A Dissenting Democracy
The case of 'Peace now', an Israeli peace movement
Magnus Norell

26. British, Israel and Anglo-Jewry 1947–1957
Natan Aridan

27. Israeli Identity
In search of a successor to the pioneer, tsabar and settler
Lilly Weissbrod

28. The Israeli Palestinians
An Arab minority in the Jewish state
Edited by Alexander Bligh

29. Israel, the Hashemites and the Palestinians
The fateful triangle
Edited by Efraim Karsh and P R Kumaraswamy

30. Last Days in Israel
Abraham Diskin

31. War in Palestine, 1948
Strategy and diplomacy
David Tal

32. Rethinking the Middle East
Efraim Karsh

33. Ben-Gurion against the Knesset
Giora Goldberg

34. Trapped Fools
Thirty years of Israeli policy in the territories
Schlomo Gazit

35. Israel's Quest for Recognition and Acceptance in Asia
Garrison state diplomacy
Jacob Abadi

36. The Harp and Shield of David
Ireland, Zionism and the state of Israel, 1937–1963
Eliash Shulamit

37. H V Evatt and the Establishment of Israel
The undercover Zionist
Daniel Mandel

38. Navigating Perilous Waters
An Israeli strategy for peace and security
Ephraim Sneh

39. Lyndon B. Johnson and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel
In the shadow of the hawk
Abraham Ben-Zvi

40. Israel at the Polls 2003
Edited by Shmeul Sandler, Ben M Mollov and Jonathan Rynhold

41. Between Capital and Land
The Jewish National Fund's finances and land-purchase priorities in Palestine, 1939–1945
Eric Engel Tuten

42. Israeli Democracy at Crossroads
Raphael Cohen-Almagor

43. Israeli Institutions at Crossroads
Raphael Cohen-Almagor

44. The Israeli–Palestine Peace Process Negotiations, 1999–2001
Within reach
Gilead Sher

45. Ben-Gurion's Political Struggles, 1963–67
A lion in winter
Zaki Shalom

46. Ben-Gurion, Zionism and American Jewry, 1948–1963
Ariel Feldestein

47. The Origins of the American–Israeli Alliance
The Jordanian factor
Abraham Ben-Zvi

Israel: The First Hundred Years (Mini Series)
Edited by Efraim Karsh

1. Israel's Transition from Community to State

2. From War to Peace?

3. Politics and Society since 1948

4. Israel in the International Arena

5. Israel in the Next Century

The Origins of the American–Israeli Alliance

The Jordanian factor

Abraham Ben-Zvi

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2007
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2007 Abraham Ben-Zvi

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2007.

"To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk."

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Ben-Zvi, Abraham.
The origins of the American–Israeli alliance: the Jordanian factor / Abraham Ben-Zvi.
p. cm. – (Israeli history, politics, and society; 46)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Israel–Foreign relations–United States. 2. United States–Foreign relations–Israel. 3. Jordan–Politics and government–1952–1999. 4. Jordan–Foreign relations–United States. 5. United States–Foreign relations–Jordan. 6. Jordan–Foreign relations–Israel. 7. Israel–Foreign relations–Jordan. 8. Arab–Israeli conflict. 9. Middle East–Foreign relations. I. Title.

DS119.8.U6B46 2007
327.7305694–dc22 2006028884

ISBN 0–203–33069–2 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN10: 0–415–41045–2 (hbk)
ISBN10: 0–203–33069–2 (ebk)

ISBN13: 978–0–415–41045–8 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978–0–203–33069–2 (ebk)

In memory of Frieda Brison-Kreidstein, who made the ultimate sacrifice and perished in the Holocaust

Contents

Preface and acknowledgments xiii

1 The origins of the American–Israeli alliance: a new perspective 1

2 The road to the July 1958 Jordanian crisis 10

3 The July 1958 Jordanian crisis and its ramifications 31

4 The April 1963 Jordanian crisis and its ramifications 54

5 The alliance in full bloom: the September 1970 Jordanian crisis as a watershed 75

Notes 84
Selected bibliography 103
Index 107

Preface and acknowledgements

The main impetus which led me to focus once again on the issue of the origins of the American–Israeli alliance, which had preoccupied me – in various forms and manifestations – for more than two decades, was the request that I teach a course on the Arab–Israeli conflict in the Department of Government at Georgetown University, where I was scheduled to spend the academic year of 2004–5 as the Goldman Visiting Professor. It was while I was preparing the course that I became increasingly sensitive to the fact that the American–Israeli partnership constituted but one element in an immensely complex and interconnected regional (and not merely a global) context, and could therefore be fully elucidated only as the corollary, or the by-product, of certain regional processes and developments, rather than as the direct and exclusive outcome of the bilateral dynamics of the American–Israeli framework. Not only was the dyadic American–Israeli setting inextricably and invariably linked to the tumultuous Middle Eastern strategic and political landscape, but the root-causes of this alliance originated in a cluster of pure and quintessential regional determinants and factors, which came to affect relations between Washington and Jerusalem only after they had reverberated throughout the area by virtue of exacerbating Jordan's security predicament.

It was against the backdrop of this growing threat (primarily on the part of Egypt) to the existence of the traditionally pro-Western Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the course of the 1950s that Israel's importance to the US as the guardian and protector of the besieged King Hussein came to be recognized and appreciated by the architects of American foreign policy. In other words, the shadow of the Hashemite Kingdom constituted the filter, or the lens, through which Israel's value to American strategic interests in the Middle East came

increasingly to be perceived in Washington during President Dwight D. Eisenhower's second term as president.

This effort to analyze the origins and evolution of the American–Israeli alliance through the Jordanian prism, and as the derivative of the adverse developments which had taken place in the immediate strategic landscape of the Hashemite Kingdom, will focus on the period 1957–70. As the following chapters will seek to demonstrate, it was the repeated Egyptian (and occasionally Syrian) challenge to the Jordanian monarchy during these years which underscored Israel's usefulness to the US as an effective bulwark against the recalcitrant and militant forces of pan-Arabism and nationalism and thus laid the groundwork for the establishment of the American–Israeli alliance.

I wish to thank most sincerely Robert Lieber, Uri Bar-Joseph, Chris Dittmeier, Alan Dowty, Efraim Karsh, Aharon Klieman, Anat Kurz, Zach Levey, Benny Miller and David Tal for their support and most thoughtful and insightful suggestions on various aspects of this work. I am also indebted to the Romulo Betancourt Chair in Political Science at Tel Aviv University for supporting the research for the book. I similarly wish to thank Sylvia Weinberg for her dedicated and thoroughly professional and perfectionist work on all the technical and editorial aspects of the manuscript. As in all my previous books, the opportunity to cooperate with her on this project was a most inspiring and rewarding experience for me.

Abraham Ben-Zvi
The University of Haifa, 2006

1 The origins of the American–Israeli alliance

A new perspective

A review of the plethora of works that seek to elucidate the origins of the American–Israeli alliance reveals a dichotomy between two basic paradigms which, in terms of their basic premises and intrinsic logic, are respectively patterned on two divergent interpretations of human behavior. The first, which may be termed the "national interest paradigm," fully and quintessentially reflects the essence of the structural-realist theory of international behavior. Viewing the international system as inherently and endemically permeated with tension and instability, which originates in the fact that states are not subject to one central authority, proponents of this theory are predisposed to define state behavior as an endless and omnivorous quest for security, which is exclusively determined by power considerations and calculations.

Against the backdrop of these acutely threatening conditions of international anarchy and endemic crisis, national entities – according to this realist vision – repeatedly employ such strategies and methods as alliance and coalition formation in order to increase their relative power and leverage in the constant, ceaseless struggle for survival or – in the case of American diplomacy – hegemony.

In the context of the American–Israeli framework, specific components and facets of this paradigm are evident in the emphasis – in studies which are committed to this orientation – on the changing dynamics of the Middle Eastern strategic landscape which began to unfold during the late 1950s. These increasingly made Israel an indispensable asset to American and British strategic plans and objectives, and thus a viable alternative to President Dwight D. Eisenhower's original plan to form, in the Middle East, a broad inter-Arab security alliance linked to the West which could effectively contain and deter Soviet encroachment.

The second paradigm, which may be termed "the special relationship paradigm" or "special relationship orientation," envisions state behavior as the cumulative outcome of certain formative social and cultural experiences, on the basis of which shared identities, affinities, norms and domestic structures are formed. In other words, it is not the "objective" conditions of international anarchy that invariably and automatically shape state behavior, but rather the specific cognitive and normative attributes of the social structure in which a given political entity is embedded, and which ultimately delineate and define the range of the legitimate and the viable behavior in the international arena.

In the context of the American–Israeli dyad, proponents of this constructivist paradigm sought to identify the cluster of beliefs and attitudes that reflect – in the aggregate – the cultural similarity between the two political and social entities in terms of their historical ethos, pioneering spirit, political culture and commitment to democracy. They further argued that, to the extent that American Jews (the backbone of the special relationship paradigm) were able to advance their interest in Israel and effectively employ such mechanisms as electoral politics as a means of engendering pro-Israeli policies and legislation, their success reflected the sympathy, empathy and solidarity of the public at large, and was based upon the perceived congruence of values between the two nations and societies rather than upon organizational factors.[1]

Without attempting to obfuscate or completely downgrade the role of these two broad paradigms in laying the groundwork for the establishment of the American–Israeli alliance, the following analysis will seek to augment the prevailing strategic explanation, which maintains that the roots of the American–Israeli partnership were inherent in certain broad regional developments that unfolded in the 1950s (such as the rising tide of strong anti-Western sentiments which swept the Arab world, and which was further reinforced by a resurgent wave of Arab nationalism). These doomed to failure the initial American effort to solicit the support and cooperation of such pivotal regional actors as Egypt and Iraq for their containment designs with another – a more specific – layer of strategic factors and considerations, whose impact on the American–Israeli dyad was direct and immediate.

In other words, while accepting the basic premises of the national interest paradigm, according to which the sources of the American–Israeli alliance were inextricably related to such broad regional processes as the failure of the early American effort to unite the Arab

world against the Soviet menace (which had dictated a reserved and highly critical posture toward Israel during President Eisenhower's first term in the White House), the following examination will seek to proceed beyond the level of the general and the systemic by focusing on the specific and delineated processes which enabled Israel to fill the vacuum and eventually become a central guardian of Western interests in the turbulent and recalcitrant Middle East.

Similarly, while recognizing the fact that several Jewish organizations (such as the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, the Conference of Presidents of Major American-Jewish Organizations, and the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee), whose *modus operandi* quintessentially reflected the basic premises of the special relationship paradigm, were successful in most (albeit not all) of their efforts to prevent successive administrations since the beginning of the 1960s from resorting to harsh and coercive measures *vis-à-vis* Israel, it is evident that they were far less effective in their earlier quest (namely, during the 1950s) to incorporate their preferences and derivative policy recommendations in the American–Israeli sphere into the official American posture.[2] In other words, although these organizational representatives of the special relationship paradigm eventually managed, on numerous occasions, to significantly constrain official Washington by setting severe limits on the administration's margin of maneuverability and latitude of choice in pursuing policies and plans which had a direct bearing on and linkage to Israel's security, they did not play a significant role in the course of the second half of the 1950s, when the seeds of the strategic American–Israeli partnership were planted.

Turning now once again, and with more detail, to the national interest paradigm as a possible explanatory tool, and as a prism through which the very inception of the alliance between Washington and Jerusalem could be clearly elucidated, there is no denial of the fact that, during the period which followed the Suez/Sinai War of 1956, it became increasingly clear to the architects of President Eisenhower's foreign and defense policy that their initial hopes of forging a broadly based security alliance in the Middle East that would effectively deter Soviet expansionist designs could not be reconciled with the actual dynamics of a recalcitrant region whose main Arab actors (and primarily Egypt) remained irrevocably opposed to American priorities and Cold War objectives. As the hope of achieving Arab unity against the Soviet threat faded into the background in the face of incessant inter-Arab rivalries and unabated hostility toward the West, there was

little point (during the second half of the decade) in persisting any longer in the American quest to secure Arab goodwill by remaining fully committed to an accommodative posture toward such regional powers as Egypt and Iraq at the direct expense of Israel.[3]

With the vision of Arab defection to the Soviet orbit gradually becoming an acutely threatening reality during the second half of the 1950s despite the early propensity of the Eisenhower administration to endorse most Arab positions concerning the Arab–Israeli conflict and its resolution, President Eisenhower became increasingly predisposed, during his second term in the White House, to reassess his original vision of Israel as a strategic liability and a major impediment to Washington's regional plans.[4] For all of its apparent validity, this structural-realist emphasis on Eisenhower's second tenure as president as the formative period of incubation, during which Israel gradually emerged, in the thinking of the administration, as a valuable bulwark and a strategic asset that could contribute, albeit unobtrusively and indirectly at first, to the defense of the few remaining pro-Western strongholds in the region, does not in itself provide an exhaustive and compelling explanation of all the specific dynamics that actually precipitated the change in the American perceptions of (and eventual policies toward) Israel.

Thus, in addition to identifying the cluster of broad regional processes (such as the rise of Arab nationalism and the tide of anti-Western sentiments which swept the Middle East) that aborted President Eisenhower's original strategy in the Middle East and created a window of opportunity for Israel to become fully incorporated into American thinking as an indispensable strategic asset, there is still a need to shed light on the more specific regional factors and processes primarily responsible for this transformation of Israel's perceived image, from the initial extreme (during the first Eisenhower term) of being depicted as a strategic liability to American interests, to the pole of being ultimately considered, as the decade approached its end, an important strategic asset and a vital counterbalance to the insurgent and recalcitrant forces of Arab nationalism. In other words, what is still required in order to augment and supplement the picture of an endemically unstable region, whose remaining pro-Western entities found themselves increasingly threatened and besieged, during the second half of the 1950s, by the flag-bearers and advocates of change and revolution (particularly in the aftermath of the Iraqi revolution of July 1958, which brought to an abrupt and violent end the pro-Western Hashemite regime in Baghdad), is to identify another layer of

intermediate factors. This layer would systematically and coherently link to each other the macro and the micro levels, namely, the broad dynamics of change and transition which, in the course of the decade, dramatically reshaped the political and ideological landscape of the entire area, and the far more specific and direct impetus which precipitated change (first cognitive and later, during the early 1960s, strategic as well) within the American–Israeli framework, thus transforming the potential into a new and largely consensual reality along the American–Israeli axis.

In essence, whereas proponents of both the national interest paradigm and the special relationship orientation focus, in their quest to explore the root causes and evolution of the American–Israeli alliance, on the Israeli part of the dyadic equation as the main precipitant to the process that culminated, in the 1960s, in the establishment of a patron–client strategic relationship between Washington and Jerusalem (and thus as an independent variable and a direct impetus to the process of alliance-formation), the new intervening category will attempt an explanation in terms of certain exogenous bilateral relationships that – by virtue of their dynamics and impact – provided the initial impetus for the process of alliance-formation to unfold and develop within the bounds of the American–Israeli framework as the extension of these original interactions.

Viewing the formation of the American–Israeli alliance as a phased, interactive and interconnected process, the following analysis will therefore seek to demonstrate that the origins of the strategic partnership between Washington and Jerusalem lay outside the intrinsic parameters of this dyad and, in fact, reflected certain strategic developments that took place in other bilateral (and occasional trilateral) frameworks. In terms of its sources and inception, the alliance – according to this line of argumentation – amounted to an extended (or third-party) partnership that spun off other interactions, thus constituting – at least in its initial phase – the by-product of the strategic changes that initially unfolded in other frameworks.[5] And although there is no denial of the fact that this by-product would later assume a life of its own by virtue of eventually becoming the intrinsic core of a multifaceted and proliferating partnership (incorporating both strategic and cultural components), this development should by no means obscure the fact that the core of this relationship, at least in its initial phase, was subordinated to, and conditioned by, developments that unfolded in other bilateral frameworks that took precedence over developments whose origin was endogenous and exclusively dyadic.

More specifically, following Robert Jervis' assertions that "the relations between two actors [in the system] often are determined by each one's relations with others";[6] that "changes in relations between two states affect each state's stance toward third parties"; that "the distribution of bargaining power between two states is strongly influenced by existing … relations with others"; and that "countries can … benefit from, or be endangered by, changes in relations among others over which they have no control,"[7] the following analysis will endeavor to identify the changes that came to increasingly affect the Egyptian–Jordanian and the Syrian–Jordanian frameworks during the years 1957–70 (which progressively increased Jordan's sense of vulnerability in the face of a growing regional threat), and that only at a later phase came to permeate and directly influence the American–Israeli setting. In other words, the gradual establishment of strategic ties between Washington and Jerusalem reflected – according to this perspective – neither the inherent and intrinsic attributes of this framework nor the changing dynamics of the overall balance of American strategic interests in the Middle East. Rather, this process derived largely from certain exogenous sets of strategic interactions that initially developed within the Jordanian–Egyptian framework (and, to a lesser extent, within the Jordanian–Syrian dyad as well) and that ultimately – but only ultimately and not initially – laid the groundwork for the establishment of the American–Israeli partnership as a third-party (or extended) alliance (as well as for the later establishment of the considerably more constrained and delimited Jordanian–Israeli alignment, which reflected Jordan's growing commitment to the logic and basic premises of the balancing strategy).

Thus, it is surmised that the alliance originated in a cluster of specific and delineated developments and processes (and primarily in the growing Egyptian threat to Jordan) that first unfolded outside the bounds of the American–Israeli dyad. These affected the relationship only *after* they had precipitated a frame change in Washington's perceptions of the nature and magnitude of the Egyptian threat to the existence of the Hashemite Kingdom, as well as of the role that was assigned to Israel in the effort to defend the beleaguered monarchy and thwart – by virtue of pursuing a strong and consistent balancing strategy *vis-à-vis* Egypt – the threat to one of the few remaining pro-Western strongholds in the Middle East (particularly after the Iraqi revolution of July 1958).[8]

Viewed from this perspective, it is against the backdrop of the growing menace to the very existence of the Hashemite Kingdom that

the Eisenhower administration, which was severely constrained in its range of military means and available options for directly coping with this threat, came increasingly to rely upon Israel's balancing behavior *vis-à-vis* Egypt (manifested primarily by the pursuit of the strategies of deterrence and coercion as its central tools for restraining President Nasser's activities in Jordan) as a major reinforcement of its overall containment strategy in the region. The following reconstruction of the July 1958 crisis will seek to demonstrate this.

Contrary to the prevailing interpretations of the origins of the American–Israeli alliance, it is therefore assumed that the infrastructure and groundwork of this partnership were laid by factors and considerations that were inextricably related not to the intrinsic characteristics of this framework, but to the American desire to prevent Egypt from disrupting the regional balance of power by incorporating Jordan (by force or the threat of force) into the anti-Western camp during "the Arab Cold War." Thus, in its formative stage, the alliance between Washington and Jerusalem developed as a direct and immediate response to the growing perception of the mounting threat to core American interests in the region, which originated within the Egyptian–Jordanian partnership, and which ultimately resulted in the emergence of Israel as the "regional balancer" – namely, as a power determined to confront the growing Egyptian threat to Jordan by becoming irrevocably committed to the survival of the Hashemite Kingdom.[9]

Not only did this threat perception clearly and operationally underscore Israel's strategic value to American interests as a protector and guardian of the Jordanian monarch, King Hussein bin Talal (as was clearly manifested in the course of the July 1958 crisis, the reconstruction of which will constitute the core of the analysis in Chapter 3), but it resulted, in the wake of the 1963 crisis (which will be addressed in Chapter 4), as well as the 1970 crisis (which will be discussed in Chapter 5), in the conclusion of new arms deals between Washington and Jerusalem and thus in the upgrading of the strategic components of the relationship. In these instances, although the administration was initially reluctant to conclude new arms deals with Israel, the fact that it decided to supply the besieged Jordanian monarch with new weapon systems (such as the M-48A Patton tank in 1965 and the F-104 interceptor in 1966) as a means of insuring his political survival and continued adherence to a pro-Western orientation, compelled American decision-makers to compensate Israel in kind for any shipment of arms to Amman.[10]

The cumulative outcome of this process was the emergence of a "checkerboard alliance" between Israel, Jordan and the US, which was designed to augment and supplement Israel's balancing behavior (of seeking to contain and thwart the perceived Egyptian threat) by incorporating it into a more comprehensive, albeit a largely soft and informal, trilateral balancing framework.[11]

While these three parties shared the basic desire to balance the growing Egyptian threat, they still differed from one another in terms of the level of cooperation they perceived as required for coping with that threat, with Jordan – the most threatened entity – generally demonstrating, throughout the 1960s, a deep-seated reluctance to formalize its security ties with Israel. (This reluctance was further reinforced as a result of several comprehensive retaliatory raids, such as the November 1966 Israeli raid on the West Bank village of Samo'a. These were directed against Palestinian groups, but exposed King Hussein's weakness while further aggravating an already tense and highly charged situation across the West Bank.) During this period, the Hashemite monarch largely predicated his collaborative behavior with Israel upon the logic and basic premises of the minimalistic, highly constrained "tethering" model and – on one occasion (in June 1967) – even opted to abandon altogether his balancing strategy for the sake of cooperating, or bandwagoning, with Egypt in its war effort against Israel.

It was only during the September 1970 crisis, which posed a most acute threat to the existence of the Hashemite Kingdom, that Jordan ultimately agreed to upgrade and accelerate its security ties with Israel (which continually faced the same adversaries) and thus to proceed beyond the traditional and minimalistic parameters of its *de facto* and informal partnership by virtue of forming an active and hard balancing alliance with the Golda Meir government for containing the Syrian invasion.[12]

On the whole, seeking to avoid the further alienation of the pro-Egyptian (and pro-Syrian) segments on the Jordanian domestic scene, King Hussein (who was similarly unwilling to further antagonize the Palestinian population in the West Bank after the expulsion of the PLO from Jordan) largely – albeit not invariably – relied upon the basic premises and logic of the "buck-passing" stratagem, continuously expecting the US and Israel to perform most of the balancing acts on his behalf without having to formally coordinate joint strategies and tactics with them.[13]

Against the backdrop of these regional dynamics, it was King

Hussein's acute security predicament, precipitated by persistent Egyptian pressure (designed to guarantee that Jordan abandoned its traditional and pro-Western foreign policy orientation and embarked upon a neutralist, bandwagoning, pan-Arab course under Egypt's regional leadership), that provided the direct and immediate impetus for the formation of the American–Israeli alliance (and its largely soft balancing counterpart within the Jordanian–Israeli framework).[14]

This threat to the very existence of the Hashemite Kingdom provided the Eisenhower administration with concrete and empirical proof of Israel's usefulness to the defense of the West by virtue of the measures that were taken by Israel in order to prevent the collapse of the embattled Jordanian regime. In addition, after the alliance had already been formed, the measures (particularly in the areas of arms procurement and military cooperation) that were taken by Washington *vis-à-vis* Israel in order to reinforce the Israeli deterrence and coercive strategies within the Israeli–Egyptian sphere resulted in the overall upgrading of this partnership in terms both of the forms of collaboration that were inaugurated between the two countries and of the quality and sophistication of the American arms supplied to Israel. At the same time, security ties between Israel and Jordan were extended, and the alliance spilled over and expanded to new areas and issues which surpassed the delimited and constrained Egyptian–Jordanian dyad, thus encompassing a broad array of bilateral as well as multilateral issues related to regional security.

In other words, the fact that the US and Israel had initially "worked together" on the Jordanian issue led them eventually "to work together on unrelated issues,"[15] with the growing threat to the Hashemite Kingdom ultimately becoming the springboard and impetus for transforming the very essence of the American–Israeli framework and thus for predicating it upon new premises (which would later be decoupled from their original context).

In conclusion, both the cognitive change which, by the late 1950s, had completely distanced Israel from its initial image (during the Eisenhower era) as a strategic liability to American interests in the region and replaced it with the opposite vision of a strategic asset to the US, and the later operational manifestations of this perceptual change, were therefore inextricably linked to developments that initially unfolded outside this dyadic framework.

It is to the analysis of these developments, in the Egyptian–Jordanian context as well as within the derivative American–Israeli framework, that we now turn.

2 The road to the July 1958 Jordanian crisis

Motivated by the vision of a worldwide communist threat to the global balance of power, and alarmed by the rapid fall of the East European states to Soviet domination, President Dwight D. Eisenhower – who would lay, in his second term in the White House, the conceptual, albeit not the operational, groundwork of the American–Israeli alliance – initially embarked upon a policy that sought to encircle the Soviet Union with states allied to, and supported by, the West.

In the Middle East, which was fully incorporated into this highly confrontational vision by virtue of its economic and strategic value to the West, this overriding strategic objective was to be accomplished by strengthening the defense of the "Northern tier states" as a first step toward forging a security alliance among such regional powers as Egypt, Turkey, Iraq and Pakistan (with Egypt depicted as "the key to the development of strength in the Middle East").[1] Convinced that the Soviets consistently strove "to cause global confusion" and exploit the difficulties in the Middle East "to make inroads into the Free World and to disrupt the normally close cooperation among the nations of the West,"[2] the president was unremitting in his determination to prevent this strategically vital area from becoming dominated by the Soviet Union. Perceived as critical to American security because of its "strategic and oil assets," the Middle East – which "continued to loom large in the US strategic thinking" on account of "the region's military bases, lines of communications, and the Suez Canal, all in close proximity to the Soviet Union"[3] – therefore emerged, in the thinking of the president and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, as a major front in the global effort to contain Soviet penetration and encroachment.

In order to prevent these acutely threatening processes and effectively challenge the Soviet quest for new strongholds, it was essential

for Washington to try and induce such regional powers as Iraq, and particularly Egypt, to align themselves with the United States in the all-encompassing, highly threatening confrontation with Soviet designs by providing them with generous military, economic and political assistance and support: "Sensing a Soviet campaign to expand into the Third World, Eisenhower became determined to erect a Middle East security pact as a shield against Soviet advance." The corollary of this determination was the unabated American desire to convey to the Arab world "that it had sympathy for the legitimate aspirations" of its people, including in the context of the Arab–Israeli dispute.[4]

This preoccupation with the role assigned to the Arab world in blocking a political or military Soviet thrust into the Middle East through a series of bilateral and multilateral defense alliances led the Eisenhower administration to adopt, from the start, an extremely reserved attitude toward Israel and to endorse at least some of the basic Arab positions concerning the shaping of an Arab–Israeli settlement, as well as the appropriate means of its resolution.

The overriding fear of Arab defection and alienation clearly overshadowed, in the thinking of Washington's policy-makers, any other consideration, and led the architects of American diplomacy and strategy in the Middle East to refrain – in view of the continued Arab–Israeli conflict – from any pro-Israeli move or gesture and instead to exert pressure upon the Israeli government in a variety of issues, ranging from the territorial components of the Arab–Israeli dispute to Israel's immigration policy. In the words of Douglas Little:

> The new administration that took office on January 20, 1953, quickly proved more attentive to the complaints of Israel's Arab foes and less sensitive to the concerns of the new nation's American friends. Although Eisenhower acknowledged America's moral obligation to support Israel, he insisted that the United States must also address Arab concerns.[5]

And as Secretary Dulles observed on May 11, 1953:

> Faced with the Communist threat, the US naturally seeks the help of others. … In the past, the US has … centered too much on its interest on Israel as a result of pressure groups in the US. The new administration is seeking a balanced view of the Middle East, directed against neither the Arabs nor the Jews.[6]

Convinced that the pursuit of a pro-Israeli posture was bound to abort the entire American design by compelling "the Arab nations ... to turn to Russia,"[7] President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles were therefore strongly predisposed to view the logic and basic premises of the special relationship paradigm as inherently incompatible with the very essence of the national interest orientation. As an inevitable corollary of this contradiction, the special relationship paradigm quickly faded into the background of American–Israeli relations, with little impact on the initial shaping and course of American diplomacy in the Middle East. What was essential, then, was to pursue a conciliatory posture toward the Arab world in the hope of ultimately inducing its leading powers to join forces in the struggle against Soviet penetration and encroachment. This initial propensity of the Eisenhower administration to pursue an accommodative course toward such regional powers as Egypt and Iraq as a means of winning their goodwill and trust, and thus of ultimately enticing them to contribute to the defense of the West against Soviet encroachment (while maintaining a considerable distance from Israel), was further reinforced, during the president's first term, by the pervasive vision of Israel as a socialist society, whose leaders were irrevocably committed to a "leftist" orientation and a strong and unwavering attachment to Marxist ideology.

The fact that, during the period immediately following the establishment of Israel, there was still "a lingering anti-American feeling in Israel,"[8] and such leaders as Golda Meir were reluctant – on ideological grounds – to commit themselves to a pro-American posture (believing that Israel should remain neutral in the conflict between East and West), added another layer to the administration's predisposition to approach Israel with utmost suspicion and undiminished reservations. (It was also believed in Washington that this approach would help erase the remaining residue of Arab resentment toward the US, which originated in President Harry S. Truman's decision to recognize the Jewish state as soon as it was born in May 1948.) And although, after the outbreak of the Korean War, in late June 1950, the Israeli leadership opted to formally abandon its "non-identification" posture, and instead to adopt an explicit pro-American course, this reorientation of Israeli diplomacy could not in itself erode this deeply held and broadly based complex of beliefs, which portrayed the Israeli political system as largely committed to "Bolshevik ideology."[9] These beliefs remained intact in subsequent years despite the determined Israeli effort to side with the Eisenhower administration on several contro-

versial issues (such as India's participation in the Korean Peace Conference, which was convened in August 1953 under UN auspices in order to define the parameters of a Korean settlement).

None of these manifestations of Israel's commitment to American global objectives and policies had any impact on the administration's early approach to the Middle East. Nor could they erode its pre-existing belief that an irreconcilable gap separated the American national interest from the premises of the special relationship paradigm. In Secretary Dulles' words, which clearly and dramatically expose this dichotomy:

> We do not think arms shipments to Israel [are] the answers to Israel's vulnerability in the face of Soviet shipments to the Arabs because it would greatly weaken Europe economically and bring NATO to a standstill. All the gains of the Marshall Plan would be [aborted] and Europe would be forced to turn to the Soviet Union for economic survival and for its oil imports. Thus we would save Israel but lose Europe.[10]

During the first term of the Eisenhower presidency, this pervasive perception of Israel as a major liability to American strategic designs and interests (which was further reinforced by deep suspicion of its dominant Socialist ideology) was continually translated into compatible and derivative policies. Not only was Israel – by virtue of being depicted as "a security risk" – excluded from any discussion of the regional security system (the Baghdad Pact) that the administration had begun to forge as soon as it took office in January 1953, but it was denied military aid, security guarantees, and access to a variety of security programs and frameworks (such as "Operation Gift" or "Operation Stockpile"). In the words of Israeli Ambassador to the US, Abba Eban, which clearly elucidate Washington's preliminary images and predilections in approaching the strategic landscape of the Middle East during the first two years of the Eisenhower administration:

> Israel could no longer count on the United States for the protection of its interests because America was resolved, chiefly for Cold War reasons, to make a very strong bid for Arab support. … The first two years of Dulles's tenure were very unhappy years … the speech that Dulles made on returning from the Middle East [on June 1, 1953] did enunciate the view that the basis of Arab

> alienation with the West was the existence of Israel, and that the Arabs had to be reassured or compensated, as it were, for the existence of Israel.[11]

Notwithstanding this initial conviction that "backing Israel might be very costly to vital United States national interests,"[12] and that a series of unilateral Israeli concessions on core issues constituted the only feasible way to secure an Arab–Israeli accord (while, at the same time, proving to the Arab world that the US did not have a pro-Israeli bias), it became clear to the president and his secretary of state by 1956 that their initial quest for achieving Arab unity, and for consolidating a broadly based collective security system which would help contain the Soviet threat, could not be reconciled with the recalcitrant dynamics of the region.

Clearly, for all the administration's determination "to work out a Middle Eastern policy on the basis of [the] enlightened self-interest of the US as a whole [rather than the] self-interest of particular groups of Americans,"[13] and thus to avoid at all costs the impression that "our policy [was] made by the Zionists"[14] (which led the Eisenhower presidency, in 1954, to suggest that the Israeli government impose limits on Jewish immigration to Israel as a way "to lay at rest [the] fears of her neighbors [of an Israeli expansion]"),[15] at the end of President Eisenhower's first term in the White House it became evident that the goal of converting the Arab Middle East into a springboard for effectively containing "the Communist threat"[16] could not be comprehensively implemented. Indeed, despite its adamant refusal to predicate its policy in the Arab–Israeli zone upon any of the premises of the special relationship paradigm (combined with its reliance – both in 1953 and 1956 – on the strategy of economic coercion as a means of securing Israeli strategic or territorial concessions), the administration remained incapable of convincing such pivotal actors as Egypt and Iraq to set aside their differences and join forces for the sake of pursuing Cold War objectives under the auspices of the Baghdad Pact.

Viewing Iraq as its main rival "for leadership in the Arab world," Egypt (which, in the wake of its arms deal with Czechoslovakia, which was concluded in September 1955, became increasingly supportive of Soviet policies in the region), charged "that the [Baghdad] Pact divided the Arab community, undermined the Arab League's Collective Security Pact, and served European and colonial interests."[17] It also remained adamant in its refusal to accept any formal, direct or

explicit forms of strategic cooperation with Washington for fear that they would symbolize foreign occupation and thus jeopardize Cairo's entire nationalist drive.

With the hope of achieving Arab unity, and of forging the much desired multilateral security alliance, subsiding into the background against the regional environment of incessant inter-Arab rivalries and pervasive hostility toward the West and its colonial legacy (and with Egypt and Syria drifting rapidly into the Soviet orbit), there was apparently no need to persist any longer in the administration's effort to secure Arab goodwill by coercing Israel into unilateral territorial concessions, or by imposing upon it comprehensive economic sanctions (as was the case in the aftermath of the Suez War of 1956). In other words, with the acutely menacing vision in the mid-1950s of Arab defection to the Soviet bloc becoming a partial reality despite the early American determination to approach Israel with utmost suspicion and to ignore, or set aside, the basic premises of the special relationship paradigm, it was only natural to expect that the president and his entourage would become increasingly prepared, under these adverse regional circumstances, to reassess their pre-existing premises, including the view of Israel as a strategic liability and an impediment to Washington's regional plans.

However, despite the evident collapse of the initial American effort to predicate its strategic posture in the Middle East upon broad multilateral premises (which resulted, in January 1957, in the inauguration of the Eisenhower Doctrine, which was based upon strictly bilateral premises), and despite the emerging backdrop of a regional setting that remained largely defiant to American objectives and order of priorities, the change which took place in the administration's image of Israel was slow and gradual. Clearly, the recognition that, under these revised regional circumstances, Israel could play a useful strategic role in preventing the collapse of the remaining pro-Western strongholds in the region by providing assistance to the US and Britain in their efforts to protect such besieged entities as the Hashemite dynasty of Jordan, came to permeate American thinking only incrementally at the beginning of Eisenhower's second term as president. Evidently, the growing American belief (which became increasingly manifest after September 1955) that the Baghdad Pact could not be forged as a broadly based and effective security alliance; that President Nasser "proved to be a complete stumbling block" to peace; and that "there seems little likelihood that the US will be able to work with Nasser in the foreseeable future," and would therefore

"have to consider other means of obtaining US objectives in the Near East," did not initially lead the architects of American Middle East policy to reassess their perception of (and policy toward) Israel as part of their search to identify "other means" for promoting American strategic objectives in the region.[18]

In this context, the main factor which provided the impetus for accelerating the swing of the pendulum, from the initial image of Israel as a strategic liability to American regional designs and objectives to the revised view of its being an indispensable asset to American and British plans, was inextricably linked to the Jordanian theater, where King Hussein found himself, as of April 1957, increasingly threatened by elements within the Jordanian government and military, who demanded that the Hashemite Kingdom adopt a pro-Egyptian foreign policy orientation while dissociating itself completely from the West. It was the evolution of this "Jordanian predicament," which reached its dramatic climax in July 1958, and, in particular, the American assessment of the role which Israel played in the crisis that month, that provided the administration with the final, definitive and iron-clad proof of its value as a strategic asset to the US. In other words, it was the actual and tangible dynamics of this crisis episode, and the specific inferences which President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles made on the basis of the observed Israeli behavior in July 1958, which completed the ongoing process of "frame change" in the American perception of Israel, thus transforming what had heretofore been general and implicit into concrete and explicit evidence concerning the Israeli operational code and Israel's willingness to take risks for the sake of protecting the remaining pro-Western strongholds and interests in the region.[19]

Although the July 1958 Jordanian crisis posed an imminent and most acute challenge to the very existence of the Hashemite Kingdom, it did not unfold in a regional vacuum. Rather, it can be thought of as the culmination of a series of increasingly threatening crisis episodes, which reflected the confrontational dynamics of the Middle Eastern strategic landscape while exposing the king's growing weakness and vulnerability in the face of the resurgence of the forces of Arab nationalism and pan-Arabism. King Hussein's initial acquiescence, in November 1955, to the British pressure to join the Baghdad Pact (in return for a generous package of economic and military aid) can be thought of as a major watershed along this path. It precipitated (with Egypt's encouragement, particularly by virtue of the provocative broadcastings of the Egyptian radio channel) a storm of violent

Palestinian protest across the West Bank (which had been incorporated into the Hashemite Kingdom by King Abdullah Ibn Hussein – King Hussein's grandfather – in 1950).

Ultimately, as a result of these disturbances, and the direct pressures exerted concurrently by Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser upon the Jordanian cabinet to reconsider its position, King Hussein decided, in January 1956, to suspend the entire Baghdad Pact initiative. Ironically, the British plan to solidify its Middle Eastern position by strengthening Jordan ultimately "succeeded only in weakening the Hashemite ruler and undermining British hegemony in the region,"[20] thus further intensifying and accelerating the ongoing process of erosion in British power in the Middle East, which had spilled over now to the traditionally pro-Western Jordan.

Notwithstanding the king's about-face and subsequent efforts to predicate his regional posture on the premises of bandwagoning (namely, of joining the state that posed the major threat) rather than on either the soft and informal or the hard variant of the balancing strategy of seeking to deter or contain the dominant and most threatening power[21] (most clearly manifested in his dramatic decision of March 1, 1956, to dismiss Sir John Bagot Glubb, the British commander of the Royal Jordanian Army, as well as eleven other top-ranking British officers), it became increasingly clear in 1957 and 1958 that Jordan's accommodative posture toward Cairo did not help even marginally to reduce the Egyptian threat to the Hashemite rule in Jordan. In fact, it further aggravated the monarchy's already severe security predicament (ultimately pushing Amman to predicate its behavior *vis-à-vis* Egypt and Syria upon the premises and logic of the balancing strategy).[22]

It was in this highly charged regional context, with British power diminishing rapidly (particularly in the aftermath of the Suez War), and with Jordan becoming increasingly besieged by both external and internal forces of anti-Western nationalism, that Israel gradually emerged – in the thinking of the Eisenhower administration – as the only power that could fill the vacuum and, in the face of this mounting threat, assume greater responsibility for the fate of the Hashemite Kingdom by resorting to a strategy of extended deterrence *vis-à-vis* Egypt.[23] Indeed, despite King Hussein's bandwagoning tilt toward Egypt as a means of alleviating his security dilemma and of stabilizing the West Bank (where a wave of anti-Western and radical pan-Arab sentiments among West Bank Palestinians led to successive riots and disturbances), and despite such overtures toward President Nasser

and his supporters within the Jordanian cabinet as the king's decision of January 18, 1957, to conclude an Arab Solidarity Agreement with Egypt and Syria (and his equally important decision of March 13, 1957, to abrogate Jordan's long-standing defense treaty with Britain), the Jordanian monarch continued to be the target of "subversive Egyptian action," designed to accomplish "one of the Egyptian leader's objectives," namely, "Hussein's overthrow."[24]

It was under these adverse circumstances, and against the backdrop of the continued Egyptian challenge to the Jordanian monarchy, that a window of opportunity was opened for Israel to become – in Washington's thinking – a crucial bulwark or balancer in the struggle "to contain Soviet-backed revolutionary Arab nationalism."[25]

The precursor to the July 1958 Jordanian crisis, which prompted King Hussein to finally abandon his bandwagoning strategy and instead to adopt a quintessentially balancing approach toward the Egyptian and Syrian threat, started to unfold in the spring of 1957. Alarmed by the renewed efforts of several high-ranking pan-Arabist officers (led by Ali Abu Nuwar, the Chief of the Jordanian General Staff) and "a hostile Palestinian public opinion … to destabilize the Hashemite regime" with full Egyptian backing, the embattled King decided, on April 10, 1957, to meet the challenge.[26] Faced with a recalcitrant prime minister, Sulayman al-Nabulsi, who (without consulting or alerting the king) announced, in two public speeches, Jordan's intention to recognize the People's Republic of China (on March 24, 1957) and to establish full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union (on April 3, 1957), and who aspired to form a federation with Egypt and Syria, King Hussein forced Nabulsi (who had gained Abu Nuwar's support in his quest to secure "more authority *vis-à-vis* the king") to resign.[27] Abu Nuwar, who, on April 13, 1957, together with Syrian army officers and Ba'th Party loyalists, attempted a *coup d'état* against King Hussein ("the Zerqa plot"), was forced into exile in Syria.[28]

King Hussein's determined action in the face of the conspiracy "to overthrow the monarchy"[29] precipitated a wave of violent demonstrations that swept the West Bank. Carrying banners denouncing the Baghdad Pact and "Western imperialism," the demonstrators demanded that both Nabulsi and Abu Nuwar be reappointed respectively as the prime minister and chief of the general staff.[30] When the riots spread to Amman, leading to bloody brawls between angry protestors and Bedouin troops loyal to the Hashemite Kingdom, King Hussein opted to complete the swing of the pendulum from the

extreme of basing his foreign policy behavior upon the premises of the bandwagoning strategy to the pole of resorting now to the soft variant of the balancing posture, designed to solicit the direct support of the Eisenhower administration for his quest "to save … the Hashemite state from disaster."[31] Specifically, in addition to placing Jordan, on April 24, 1957, under martial law and to suspending the Jordanian constitution, the king, without becoming formally affiliated with "the Free World," moved to *de facto* "reorient Jordan into the pro-Western camp, where he was received with open arms: the impressed Americans immediately offered military aid."[32]

And indeed, viewing the independence and territorial integrity of Jordan as vital to the protection of American strategic interests in the region, the president, in a powerful display of American support for the Hashemite Kingdom, on April 26, 1957, dispatched the Sixth Fleet to the Eastern Mediterranean, stationed its Amphibious Task Group in Beirut, and positioned two destroyers near Massawa-Aden (while alerting ground and air units in Europe for possible deployment to air and land bases in Turkey and Lebanon). Three days later, the administration granted Jordan $10 million in emergency economic aid.[33] Six weeks later, the White House approved the appropriation of an additional $10 million in military aid to Jordan in an effort "to ensure that the Arab Legion remained an effective force for the maintenance of internal security"[34] (which was augmented by an additional economic package),[35] thereby demonstrating that the US "had taken the place of Britain" as the chief Western patron of the embattled Jordanian monarchy.[36]

Notwithstanding this "dramatic American gesture"[37] to King Hussein (which helped him to stabilize a domestic situation that had been permeated with tension and uncertainty), and notwithstanding the fact that the Eisenhower administration, in April 1957, "responded swiftly and forcefully to the needs of Hussein as he himself perceived them,"[38] thus enabling him (by virtue of pursuing a strong deterrence strategy *vis-à-vis* Egypt and Syria) to suppress domestic opposition quickly and comprehensively (while Egypt and Syria refrained from any direct intervention on the side of the anti-royalists), senior American officials remained fundamentally pessimistic concerning "Jordan's ultimate fate" and its prospects of survival in the long-run.[39]

Against the backdrop of the belief – which pervaded American thinking in the aftermath of the April 1957 crisis – that "neither a fleet nor money constituted a permanent solution to Jordan's external

and internal problems," and that "Jordan had never been a viable state,"[40] a window of opportunity was indeed opened for Israel to augment and supplement American deterrence through becoming committed to the preservation of the Hashemite Kingdom. With the US continuously reluctant to formally guarantee Jordan's long-term security and to provide King Hussein with sophisticated weaponry (and with British regional power diminishing rapidly), the way was therefore cleared for Israel to fill the vacuum by significantly reinforcing the sporadic, half-hearted and generally constrained American efforts to protect the fragile and highly vulnerable Jordanian regime. In other words, it was the increasing Egyptian (and Syrian) threat to the Hashemite Kingdom which came to gradually permeate and affect the American–Israeli framework by way of bestowing upon Israel the task of augmenting and reinforcing Western deterrence (or balancing) *vis-à-vis* Egypt and the resurgent forces of Arab nationalism (and, on occasion, of directly assisting King Hussein in his efforts to stabilize his regime by providing him with intelligence about rebel movements within Jordan).[41]

Far from comprising the quintessential reflection of the special relationship paradigm and its institutional manifestations, or of the changing dynamics of the overall strategic landscape of the region in the aftermath of the Suez War, the American–Israeli partnership was shaped and delineated in a far less dramatic and sweeping fashion. It originated in the change which was diagnosed in the balance of perceived and actual threats within the Egyptian–Jordanian dyad, and which progressively exacerbated King Hussein's security predicament.

In the context of the 1957 crisis, and notwithstanding the king's precarious position in the face of both Egyptian and Palestinian subversion, the role which Israel was called upon to perform was not only devoid of any dramatic components, but was of a strictly passive nature. Specifically, in view of the plethora of Israeli threats, augmented by its partial mobilization along the Jordanian border, to intervene militarily by seizing the West Bank of the Jordan River should King Hussein lose control over events (thereby reducing the risks to its security in case Jordan defected to the Eastern orbit and became an obedient proxy of Egypt), it was essential for the administration to guarantee that Israel indeed remained on the sidelines throughout the crisis.

Fearing that an Israeli intervention would greatly exacerbate an already tense situation in the Jordanian theater by injecting the strains

of the Arab–Israeli predicament into a fundamentally different, yet highly charged context, President Eisenhower moved rapidly to alleviate Israeli concerns by explicitly assuring Prime Minister Ben-Gurion that American policy in the region "embraced the preservation of Israel."[42] (At this historical juncture, the administration had not yet used the Israeli threat to intervene in Jordan as part of an explicit deterrence strategy *vis-à-vis* Egypt and Syria, and would only later, during the July 1958 and the April 1963 Jordanian crises, use such threats as a means of deterring President Nasser.)

And while this pledge fell considerably short of the formal security guarantees that Israel had been seeking in vain for years (and while the administration was still unprepared to make direct use of the Israeli threat to intervene as a deterrence weapon *vis-à-vis* Egypt and Syria), the president's words clearly underscored his keen awareness that Israel had the potential of aborting, or vastly complicating, American regional plans and strategic designs. In Secretary Dulles' words of April 24, 1957, which reflected the same concern:

> Developments in Jordan were moving rapidly toward a climax. It appeared that King Hussein would persist in a strong line to defend himself against what had been openly exposed as Egyptian and Syrian intrigues. … *Israel's action could be the one thing which would unite the Arabs.*[43]

In the administration's thinking, Israel had, therefore, to be at least informally reassured as a means of safeguarding its continued restraint and abstention in the face of domestic turmoil across its Eastern border. The Eisenhower presidency, which in the not too distant past relied upon the strategies of deterrence and coercion as its preferred methods for influencing Israeli behavior, was now prepared – in view of the imminent danger to the existence of the Hashemite Kingdom – to set aside any remaining trace of its accommodative posture toward Egypt (and Syria) for the sake of signaling, by word and deed, its commitment to the Jordanian king.

Against this altered regional backdrop, Secretary Dulles' tone and negotiating style concerning Israel (which had reinforced its troops on its Eastern front) were markedly different from his earlier and irreconcilable rhetoric toward the Ben-Gurion government. According to the memorandum of his April 24, 1957, conversation with Ambassador Eban:

> The secretary thought that if Hussein won, it would have great significance and mark the beginning of a trend away from the extreme nationalistic views expounded by Nasser and others and which were, to some extent at least, Communist inspired. The US wanted to give Hussein a fair chance. We wanted to tell the Israelis our thoughts with respect to his efforts. … There might be a deliberate provocation of Israel by anti-Hussein forces. … The secretary welcomed Israel's council. … We were not warning Israel. … If the US decided to act … it would be useful if Israel were prepared.[44]

One week later there surfaced once again, and in a forceful and uninhibited manner, this American recognition of the need to address, at least rhetorically, Israel's security needs against the backdrop of the "irrefutable evidence" indicating that "the Egyptians and the Syrians are carrying out widespread covert operations against Hussein"[45] as a means of ensuring that the Ben-Gurion government "exercises the greatest restraint in the present crisis in Jordan."[46] In his meeting of May 2, 1957, with Ambassador Eban, Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter expressed full understanding of Israel's security concerns emanating from the Jordanian crisis and, for the first time, called for a continued American–Israeli strategic dialogue on regional issues. According to the memorandum of the conversation:

> Mr. Herter noted that … we had made abundantly clear to the states of the Near East the fact that United States foreign policy embraced the preservation of the State of Israel. We were prepared to reaffirm this to those states should we feel that the situation required it. We hoped to continue our consultations with Israel on problems affecting the Near East. … We appreciate Israel's deep concern over developments of such importance to her and we hoped that we could work together toward solutions of the many problems of the Near East.[47]

As Herter's words clearly indicate, in view of the highly menacing possibility that the remaining pro-Western strongholds (and primarily Jordan, which, in the official American thinking after the April 1957 crisis, "stood little … chance of survival")[48] might soon succumb to the pressures and forces of Arab nationalism, the preliminary vision of Israel as a strategic liability to American regional interests gave way, in the aftermath of the Suez War, to a new image of the country

as a power that had the potential of augmenting and reinforcing Washington's intermittent and constrained deterrence efforts. Not only was Israel depicted – according to this revised assessment – as having "very real" security interests, which the administration had to take into account in pursuing its Middle Eastern strategy,[49] but – under these adverse regional circumstances – it was seen as being capable "of contributing to a situation which would be helpful."[50]

In conclusion, highly skeptical of King Hussein's long-term prospects of survival against the backdrop of the insurgent forces of Arab nationalism, and reluctant to become "the sole source" of military aid to Jordan[51] (an eventuality which, it was feared in Washington, "could well generate pressures for similar assistance to Israel"),[52] the Eisenhower administration had thus become increasingly dependent, in 1957, on Israeli policies and actions in its quest to prevent the total collapse of the remaining pro-Western bastions in the area. And while this revised perception of Israel did not lead the administration to altogether abandon all the premises of its original policy, it did result in a growing flexibility in pursuing certain tenets of its traditional policy (such as in the administration's willingness to sell spare parts of military equipment to Israel in the aftermath of the crisis).[53]

This emerging American willingness to rely upon "the constructive attitude" of Israel as a means of "assisting King Hussein"[54] was further reinforced in the immediate aftermath of the September 1957 Syrian crisis, which provided yet another demonstration of the fact that the Middle East had indeed become increasingly dominated by the forces of Arab radicalism and nationalism, and thus set the stage – less than a year later – for Israel to play a more significant role in the Western effort to thwart the renewed threat to the Hashemite Kingdom.

Although the role assigned to Israel in the September crisis was identical to the one it had been called upon to play four months earlier, being confined to its strict acquiescence in the face of the alarming changes that unfolded across its Syrian border, the cumulative weight of these two consecutive crises helped to underscore the gap which separated Israel – a pro-Western island of stability – from its surrounding inter-Arab system, which was torn by incessant friction and cleavage, and, in the wake of the defection of Egypt (and, more recently, of Syria) into the Eastern bloc, fraught with animosity toward the West.

The crisis itself started to unfold in early September 1957, when the terms of a new economic agreement, concluded in August between

Moscow and Damascus, became known in Washington (by 1957 Syria was receiving from the Soviet Union an estimated US$60 million in tanks and other military hardware). Fearing that, in view of these expanding economic ties, Syria might "fall under the control of International Communism and become a Soviet satellite,"[55] the Eisenhower administration accelerated its shipment of arms to Turkey and Iraq and committed itself to protecting their rear flank against any potential Soviet threat.[56] Determined to prevent Syria from committing "any acts of aggression against her neighbors,"[57] the president further decided, late in September 1957, to intensify the pressure upon Damascus by sending – as he had done in the course of the preceding Jordanian crisis – the Sixth Fleet into the Eastern Mediterranean. He also ordered the redeployment of American aircraft from Western Europe to the US base at Adana.[58]

Combined with the concurrent concentration of about 50,000 Turkish troops along the Syrian border, as well as the mobilization of the Iraqi and Jordanian armed forces, these deterrence measures helped defuse the crisis, although the more ambitious American objective of toppling the Syrian regime failed to materialize in subsequent months.[59]

Although the Syrian crisis did not lead to a dramatic and immediate reorientation of the specific American posture toward Israel, it further reinforced the lessons drawn in the wake of the Jordanian crisis of April 1957. Specifically, faced with the pressing need to provide support to Syria's neighbors as a means of protecting the region against the resurging forces of radicalism and Arab nationalism, the administration could no longer ignore the potential strategic value of Israel as a viable and stable bulwark against continued communist aggression. In the thinking of the Eisenhower administration, the regional dynamics of the September 1957 crisis were outweighed and downgraded by a "globalist application to the Middle East ... of the Soviet threat,"[60] with the prospects of Syria "becoming a Soviet satellite, whose destinies are directed by Moscow,"[61] perceived in Washington as real and imminent. Nor could it remain oblivious any longer to the threat to Israel's security, which was inherent in the growing military ties between Syria and Egypt.

Indeed, against the backdrop of a highly charged and fragmented regional setting, and with Syria – now a staunchly pro-Soviet power – becoming engaged in provocative acts against its neighbors (including Israel), American policy-makers became increasingly predisposed to view Israel as both a potential victim and a potential strategic asset to

American interests. Fully aware of these dynamics, Secretary Dulles, in his references to Israel during, and in the aftermath of, the Syrian crisis, was uninhibited (as he was in the course of the Jordanian crisis) in underscoring the gravity of Israel's security predicament in view of the recent reorientation of Syrian foreign policy. As the secretary of state told Senator William F. Knowlad (R., California) on August 30, 1957:

> They [the Israelis] might not be indefinitely acquiescent if they thought that the Soviet orbit would be extended to Syria and then to Jordan, thus with Egypt virtually surrounding Israel by land.[62]

Similarly, whereas – during the first term of the Eisenhower presidency – Israel had been continually portrayed as an inherently aggressive entity whose actions in the Arab–Israeli sphere were designed to provoke its neighbors into another round of hostilities, it was now depicted as the likely target of Syrian (and Egyptian) provocation, and thus as the party which had to be reassured and conciliated as the means of preventing it from retaliating, and thus of ultimately precipitating, a highly dangerous regional conflagration, with "the whole Arab world" rallying "on [Syria's] side."[63]

Contrary to the secretary's initial conviction, which had been repeatedly expressed during the first term of the Eisenhower presidency, that the Arab fear of Israeli territorial expansion was real (and that this fear was further reinforced by unlimited Jewish immigration), he was now motivated by the belief – which surfaced for the first time in the course of the Jordanian crisis – that such Arab parties as Egypt and Syria were cynically manipulating and exacerbating the Arab–Israeli dispute as a convenient means of obfuscating and disguising their own inherently aggressive designs. In this revised regional context, Israel's strategic value was initially inherent not in any specific move or decision designed to defend Western interests in the area or deter Egypt, but in its acquiescence and continued restraint in the face of the growing Syrian and Egyptian menace.

And indeed, as was the case during the 1957 Jordanian crisis, the unfolding Syrian crisis and the prospects of the establishment in Damascus of a staunchly pro-Soviet regime did prompt Israel to seriously consider the option of military action. However, in view of the fact that the administration, while reiterating its commitment to Israel's security, employed a broad spectrum of deterrence and coercive tactics *vis-à-vis* Syria (and in the process encouraged Syria's

Muslim neighbors to mobilize against the Syrian regime), the Ben-Gurion government ultimately decided to avoid any overt involvement in the crisis. In the American view, it was this decision which helped prevent another cycle of hostilities in the Arab–Israeli zone leading to the "undermining of the pro-Western governments of Iraq, Jordan, and Lebanon."[64]

And while the American compensation for Israel's restraint fell considerably short of a formal or binding security commitment (which Prime Minister Ben-Gurion repeatedly sought to obtain), it did surpass – in terms of the rhetoric used – the highly delimited and constrained bounds of the first four years of the Eisenhower administration. In essence, this compensation reflected Washington's growing recognition of the fact that, with the region becoming increasingly dominated by the forces of radical and militant Arab nationalism, it was essential to adequately address the security concerns of Israel – one of the few remaining pro-Western strongholds in the Middle East – as a means of stabilizing the highly-tense Arab–Israeli zone, and thus of reducing the dangers of escalation and deterioration.

One year later, as we shall soon witness, this awareness would be augmented and solidified by a more explicit American recognition of Israel's deterrence power *vis-à-vis* Egypt (which would become an effective tool for the administration in pursuing its posture of extended deterrence with respect to President Nasser in the context of the July 1958 Jordanian crisis). In September 1957, however, this emerging sensitivity to the possible repercussions for Israel of the changing regional landscape had not yet merged into a coherent strategy. This would seek to rely upon the threat of Israel's deterrence power as a central ingredient in the administration's quest to contain the growing Egyptian (and Syrian) threat, and was largely manifested in the issuing of verbal reassurances to Israel, without linking them directly to the Egyptian side of the equation as an integral part of a broader deterrence strategy.[65] These reassuring words were echoed on the following day by President Eisenhower, who noted that Prime Minister Ben-Gurion "should have no doubt of the deep US interest in the preservation of the integrity and independence of Israel."[66] Convinced that President Nasser "was an aider and abettor of [recent developments in Syria]," the administration repeatedly indicated – in the course of the crisis – that it had abandoned all remaining residual hope that Egypt could still be induced, through a policy of conciliation, to reconsider its foreign policy orientation.[67]

From the onset of the crisis, President Nasser had repeatedly expressed solidarity with Syria, and he continued to support the regime in Damascus unconditionally "against any external threat" while asserting that any attack on Syria "would be considered an attack on Egypt." Coming in the wake of the Jordanian crisis (in which Egypt was believed to be deeply involved in the effort to destabilize the Hashemite Kingdom), Egypt's rhetoric and perceived behavior in the course of the September 1957 crisis helped erase all remaining residues of doubt concerning the direction of Cairo's foreign policy, thus convincing the president and his secretary of state that it had indeed become an integral part of the communist conspiracy to spread anti-Western and revolutionary sentiment throughout the Arab world.[68] Jordan was depicted as Egypt's most immediate target.

This image of Egypt as a power which had chosen "to align with Soviet materialistic atheism," thus posing "formidable hindrances to US aspirations,"[69] became even more pervasive and menacing in October 1957, when President Nasser sent a small contingent of Egyptian troops to Damascus, thus signaling his unwavering commitment to his nationalist allies there. As Secretary Dulles remarked on October 29, 1957, in his conversation with Eugene Black, the president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:

> Nasser seemed to think that he could deal with impunity with the Soviets and did not appear alarmed as to where his policies might take him. … Egyptian blindness toward the danger of the Soviet Union had presented a barrier between Egypt and the United States. … Nasser's actions in recognizing Red China, in concluding the large arms deal with the Soviet Union, etc. had completely changed the situation with regard to our attitude toward him as an Arab leader.[70]

It is against this backdrop of these incessant cleavages and chronic instability in the Arab world, combined with the alarming defection of such central regional actors as Egypt and Syria into the Eastern orbit, that Israel began to be increasingly depicted in Washington as a viable and credible island of stability and continued pro-Western orientation in a turbulent and volatile environment. It thus came to be seen as a power that could potentially be incorporated – albeit unobtrusively and informally at first – into the administration's regional strategic plans.

During the period following the September 1957 crisis, this emerging perception of Israel as a potential strategic asset and a guardian of American interests in the region – which would be transformed less than a year later into a coherent and well-defined vision of the country as an actual and proven strategic asset – was repeatedly manifested in a series of American statements and memoranda. These statements reflected the cumulative lessons the administration had drawn in the wake of both the Jordanian and Syrian crisis episodes of 1957, and thus established the conceptual groundwork for the completion, in July 1958, of this process of reassessing Israel's strategic role and significance on the Middle Eastern landscape.

A clear illustration of the administration's approach toward Israel in the aftermath of the September 1957 crisis is provided by the account of the December 5, 1957, meeting between Secretary Dulles and Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Said. When the Iraqi prime minister argued – as had Secretary Dulles during the first term of the Eisenhower administration – that the necessary impetus for an Arab–Israeli peace was a unilateral "Israeli territorial gesture," combined with an Israeli willingness to absorb most Palestinian refugees, he was sharply rebuked by the secretary of state, who forcefully asserted:

> It does not solve problems to create new ones. 500,000 Jewish people could not be driven into the sea. . . . The clock could not be turned back. . . . People who were now in territory allotted to the Arabs could not be thrown out.[71]

The fact that, in the immediate aftermath of the crisis, such pro-Western Arab powers as Saudi Arabia, Iraq and even Jordan (despite the proximity and the length of its frontier with Syria) claimed to see "no clear danger to any other Arab states from Syria"[72] (thereby reflecting the pervasive regional belief that "there was nobody in Syria remotely approaching Abdel Nasser in charisma"),[73] and even began "to speak reassuringly of the priority they gave to the concept of solidarity among the Arab states,"[74] provided yet another impetus for the administration in its continued drive to contain and restrain those regional powers believed to be dominated by international communism, to accelerate the search for reliable allies.[75]

Although the administration continued to refuse, during the months that followed the crisis, to cross the Rubicon and sell arms to Israel (this traditional arms sales policy would ultimately be changed by

President John F. Kennedy in 1962), it repeatedly sought to reassure Israel that it would resist any effort to infringe upon its territorial integrity. As Secretary Dulles pointed out in his September 12, 1957, conversation with Ambassador Eban, while the American commitment to Israel "might not have the same weight as a formal expression, we thought that Israel ... need not believe that the United States would be indifferent to an armed attack from any quarter." Two months later, in a message to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, Dulles further reinforced this commitment to "the maintenance of ... Israel's independence and integrity."[76]

During the months preceding the outbreak of the July 1958 Jordanian crisis, a vision of an essential compatibility between Washington and Jerusalem, in terms of the perceived regional concerns and threats, came to dominate the thinking of the president and his secretary of state. Thus what had initially been – during the first term of President Eisenhower's administration – a highly tense and conflict-ridden framework, was progressively transformed into a considerably more consensual dyad. Reflecting the cumulative impact made by the recent Jordanian and Syrian crises upon the perceptions and attitudes of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in the Arab–Israeli sphere, this revised tone and rhetoric toward Israel was also indicative of the perceived lessons of the 1956 War, which underscored Israel's impressive fighting abilities, "especially in comparison with its neighbors." The Israelis (who remained irreconcilably opposed to the regional forces of nationalism and revolution) were thus made to appear in Washington "as more natural (and militarily adapt) potential Cold War partners [of the US] than [were] their Arab adversaries."[77]

Against the backdrop of this continued swing of the pendulum in the direction of increasingly envisioning Israel as a strategic asset and a credible guardian of American interests in the region, the dramatic and tumultuous events of July 1958 provided final and ironclad evidence of the fact that, with the tide of insurgent and militant Arab nationalism threatening to engulf the entire region, Israel remained a reliable pro-Western stronghold by virtue of its willingness to take considerable risks in order to defend the remaining and besieged islands of moderation and continued allegiance to the West.[78] And while this perceived compatibility and convergence in the American–Israeli sphere did not invariably precipitate – at least during the remaining years of the Eisenhower era – congruent derivative policies (particularly in the field of arms procurement), it did open a conceptual

window of opportunity for Israel to eventually become fully integrated – under the shadow of the Jordanian monarchy – into the revised and reformulated American regional designs and plans.

It is to the analysis of the July 1958 Jordanian crisis and its cognitive ramifications on the American–Israeli dyad that we now turn.

3 The July 1958 Jordanian crisis and its ramifications

Coming in the wake of the 1957 crises in Jordan and Syria and the American military intervention in Lebanon, the dramatic events of July 1958 can be thought of as a conceptual watershed in American–Israeli relations by virtue of providing a definitive and tangible demonstration of the fact that, despite the costs and risks to Israel in terms of severely straining its relations with the Soviet Union, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion – unlike such traditional allies of the West as King Saud of Saudi Arabia – was prepared to contribute to the Anglo-American operation in Jordan. Designed to rescue the besieged King Hussein from the surrounding forces of radical Arab nationalism (which sought to use the violent overthrow of the Iraqi monarchy on July 14, 1958, as a springboard for toppling the Hashemite Kingdom), this operation included the dispatch of 2,200 British paratroopers from Cyprus to Amman and the aerial shipment, by both Western powers, of vital strategic shipments through Israeli airspace to Jordan (necessitated as the result of the suspension of all Iraqi oil supplies to Jordan in the immediate aftermath of the Iraqi revolution).

Although the Israeli decision to permit the British and American airlift into Jordan through its airspace may, at first glance, appear marginal and relatively insignificant, as it did not commit any Israeli troops to the defense of the embattled Hashemite Kingdom, it was still regarded in Washington as a major strategic contribution to the Western effort to prevent the complete disruption of the regional balance of power in the wake of the Iraqi revolution. Indeed, although unobtrusive and devoid of any overt military components, the supporting role that Israel agreed to play during most of the 1958 Jordanian crisis was still viewed by the Eisenhower administration as an inherently credible indication of its overall strategic *modus operandi*, namely, as a quintessential reflection of an entire cluster of

basic Israeli attitudes and behavioral patterns in responding to similar regional challenges.

All remaining residues of the initial American strategy of cementing a broad inter-Arab coalition that would constitute an effective bulwark against the Soviet Union faded rapidly into the background of the regional landscape in the wake of the formation, between Egypt and Syria, in February 1958, of the United Arab Republic (UAR), which was viewed in Washington as a means of mobilizing the entire Arab world against Western influence.[1] In this adverse and highly menacing regional setting, Israel now emerged as a reliable and credible ally in the drive to deny "Nasser and his Soviet backers"[2] a victory in Lebanon and Jordan, and thus to prevent them from sweeping over the entire Arab Middle East.

In this respect, and against the backdrop of this new dichotomy between Israel – the stable and reliable pro-Western bastion – and Egypt – the Soviet proxy which was now "committed to notions of pan-Arabism [in the same way] that Hitler whipped up pan-Germanism as a means of promoting an extension of his power"[3] – the crisis of July 1958 can indeed be thought of as a "trigger event."[4] As such, it completed the shift in the administration's perception of (though not in its policies toward) Israel, from the initial pole of being an obstacle to Washington's regional designs, to the opposite extreme of becoming a reliable asset, fully incorporated into the American (and British) quest to deter the recalcitrant and intransigent forces of pan-Arabism (as well as their superpower patron) from further threatening the very existence of such few remaining pro-Western regimes in the Middle East as Jordan and Lebanon.

The crisis itself, a spin-off from the Iraqi revolution of July 14, 1958 (which was initiated by a group of military officers under the leadership of Brigadier Abdel Karim Qasim, and which brought the Iraqi monarchy to an abrupt and violent end), unfolded against the backdrop of a growing fragmentation and friction across the Arab world. Specifically, in late February 1958, in an effort to jointly balance the newly established, highly threatening UAR (and in particular President Nasser's growing influence in Damascus), Jordan and Iraq formed their own federal union.[5] In early July 1958, King Hussein was warned by the American diplomatic mission in Amman of an impending military coup against him engineered by Lieutenant Colonel Mahmud Rusan, who acted in collaboration with several senior Syrian army officers.[6]

Profoundly alarmed by the imminent threat to his throne (and to

his life), the Jordanian king appealed to his close ally, Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Said, to reinforce the Iraqi military contingent in Jordan as an additional protection against Syria. Ironically, it was the Twentieth Iraqi Brigade, scheduled to move to Jordan on July 14 in defense of the Hashemite Kingdom, which, on the very same day, actually carried out the revolution in Baghdad (in the course of which Hussein's beloved cousin King Faisal was assassinated, along with Prime Minister Nuri al-Said). The revolution further exacerbated King Hussein's security predicament, as in its immediate aftermath the new Iraqi regime cut off its oil supplies to Jordan, while Syria closed its border with its besieged Hashemite neighbor.[7]

Concurrent with the growing turbulence in the Iraqi–Jordanian sphere, the continued domestic cleavage between opposing factions and armed groups in Lebanon escalated into a civil war, which originated in the country's "sectarian divisions between Christians and Muslims."[8]

The immediate crisis, which culminated in the American decision to intervene militarily in Lebanon on July 15, 1958, namely, in the immediate aftermath of the Iraqi revolution, was precipitated by a growing friction between the American-backed Maronite President, Camille Shamoun, and the commander-in-chief of the Lebanese army, General Fouad Chehab. Convinced that President Shamoun intended to amend the Lebanese constitution so that he could be reelected for a second six-year term as president, General Chehab became an outspoken critic of the Lebanese government, repeatedly expressing support for the ideas of pan-Arab nationalism and neutralism.[9] This political and constitutional crisis was further exacerbated in the wake of the assassination, on May 8, 1958, of Nasib Matri, a Lebanese newspaper publisher who had been a severe critic of the Shamoun regime. The assassination touched off three days of anti-Chamoun rioting, which culminated in the burning of the US Information Service libraries in Tripoli and Beirut.[10]

Despite the escalating violence between opposing factions and armed groups and the growing instability and rioting across Lebanon, Chehab refused to use military power in order to restore order for fear of further fragmenting the army along ethnic and religious lines. In June 1958, as the fighting in the Beirut area became more intense, reports that Syrian infiltrators were entering Lebanon and aiding the factions that opposed President Shamoun began to be circulated. Meanwhile, Syrian and Egyptian radio broadcasts stepped up their attacks on the Lebanese president and called for his overthrow.[11]

Against this highly charged and violent Lebanese background, the Iraqi revolution, of July 14, 1958, can be thought of as the direct and immediate impetus for convincing President Eisenhower, who had previously been most reluctant to intervene militarily in the crisis, to set aside his reservations and order the US Marines to occupy key strategic positions in Beirut, and thus guarantee that the independence of Lebanon as a pro-Western entity was preserved. Perceived in Washington as an integral part of the drive, launched by the proxies and representatives of international communism, to disrupt pro-Western regimes throughout the Middle East, the overthrow of the Iraqi monarchy, combined with the continued violence and turmoil in Lebanon, prompted the administration to dispatch 14,000 Marines to Beirut on July 15, in a last-ditch effort to prevent President Nasser "from taking over the whole area."[12]

Indeed, believing that the Iraqi revolution could have a profound effect on the ongoing crisis in Lebanon by altering the balance of power in favor of the insurgents (while adversely affecting the pro-Western regimes of Jordan, Morocco, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia), the Eisenhower administration ultimately opted, on July 15, to act forcefully in order to prevent "the complete elimination of Western influence in the Middle East" and the regional chain reaction that could well endanger the survival of the remaining conservative Arab regimes in Lebanon, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. (In retrospect, it became clear that, apart from its initial and threatening moves against the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and its ill-fated effort, of June–July 1961, to annex Kuwait, the Kasim government did not subordinate itself to President Nasser's regional aspirations and ideological objectives and respected, in general, the international commitments of the pro-Western regime it had toppled.)[13] Convinced that "this is probably our last chance to do something in the area," that "we could not sit around and see the Near East lost," and that "the losses from doing nothing would be worse than the losses from action,"[14] the president, who – in the shadow of the Iraqi revolution – came to approach the Lebanese front as the stage on which his administration was called upon to project resolve and determination against the militant and recalcitrant forces of Arab nationalism, ultimately decided to dispatch the Marines to the shores of Beirut.

In the president's words, which demonstrate the fact that, in the thinking of the administration, the escalating turmoil in Lebanon and the Iraqi revolution were perceived as two facets or manifestations of a single, acutely menacing, global threat:

> It was better if we took a strong position rather than a Munich-type position if we are to avoid the crumbling of our whole security structure. … Our action [in Lebanon] would be a symbol of American fortitude and readiness to take risks to defend the values of the free world.[15]

Notwithstanding the risks involved and the expectation of "a very bad reaction through most of the Arab states,"[16] the American intervention bore fruit, albeit in the limited and constrained Lebanese context and not in the broader regional setting. The landing of the Marines in Beirut, and the concurrent mediating mission of Robert D. Murphy, Deputy Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, paved the way toward an early resolution of the crisis and led to the smooth withdrawal, in late October 1958, of the American troops without any Egyptian, Syrian or Iraqi interference. On July 31, 1958, General Chehab won the presidential election and quickly moved to restore order and stability in Lebanon.

However, before the Lebanese crisis had been defused, Israel's role on another Middle Eastern front began to unfold in mid-July as a by-product of the mounting threat to the Jordanian Kingdom. Although King Hussein did succeed in thwarting the military coup, which was engineered in early July by Lieutenant Colonel Mahmud Rusan, he found himself suddenly confronted – in the immediate aftermath of the Iraqi revolution – by an internal coalition of Jordanian and Palestinian nationalists who were more receptive to President Nasser's revolutionary and impassioned rhetoric than to any conservative, pro-Western views.

The fact that the new Iraqi regime cut off its oil supplies to Jordan as soon as it managed to solidify its control of Baghdad further aggravated a situation already fraught with danger and uncertainty for the Hashemite monarchy and convinced Secretary Dulles that "the Jordanian situation [was] rapidly becoming extremely dangerous."[17] On his part, the king reiterated his commitment to the premises of the hard variant of the balancing strategy (to which he became committed in late February 1958, when he formed his short-lived federal union with the old Iraqi regime) by urging the US and Britain to come to his rescue and by avoiding any conciliatory gestures toward Egypt (and its supporters on the Jordanian political scene).

Notwithstanding the growing recognition that, with the Iraqi revolution and the imminent and grave threat to King Hussein's regime, the pendulum of power in the entire region, despite the American

intervention in Lebanon, was on the verge of completing its swing to the pole of anti-Western, pan-Arabic nationalism, the Eisenhower administration – while seeking to keep Arab nationalism "in bounds" and "to prevent a lasting damage to our interests in the Near East until events deflate the great Nasser hero myth"[18] – still remained invariably reluctant to proceed militarily beyond the constrained parameters of the Lebanese scene and to intervene directly in the Jordanian crisis. While continually attempting covertly to counter Egypt's influence in Syria and Saudi Arabia, the Eisenhower presidency "wished to avoid too open an association with 'imperialist' Britain"[19] (which strongly supported a joint British–American intervention in Jordan) in order to guarantee the survival of the embattled Jordanian regime.

Believing that such a move "would undoubtedly give rise to an intensified wave of anti-Western feelings on which Nasser could capitalize,"[20] and convinced that King Hussein "was an unpopular leader of a state which could be swept very quickly by the forces of pan-Arabism,"[21] the administration – while remaining interested in the continued survival of the pro-Western Hashemite Kingdom – refused to commit itself "to act with [the British] in Jordan and possibly Iraq."[22] It thus remained unresponsive to the British pressure to launch a combined operation in Jordan (which could eventually become a convenient bridgehead for a military offensive against the new Iraqi regime). The fact that Britain's regional status and stature declined dramatically in the aftermath of the 1956 Suez fiasco further reinforced the American decision not to become militarily engaged in Jordan alongside the British troops.

Ultimately, despite the repeated British requests for a "truly joint [American–British] operation" in Jordan, which would "in effect make it a kind of deterrent"[23] by virtue of preventing the defection of Jordan "into the orbit of the United Arab Republic,"[24] the Eisenhower administration – while anxious in principle "to break the chain of Nasser's successes" and "myth of invincibility" – remained irrevocably opposed, throughout the crisis, to any direct military involvement beyond Lebanon (for fear that it would lead to the resurgence of pan-Arabism across the region).[25] It therefore continually insisted – as the president did on July 14, 1958, in his telephone conversation with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan – that "the initiation of a big operation that could run all the way through Syria and Iraq" would be "far beyond anything I have the power to do constitutionally."[26] (Beyond its immediate strategic considerations, Britain

was motivated – in its approach toward Jordan – by its long-standing commitment to the Hashemite Kingdom, which dates back to 1922, the year in which it placed Abdullah ibn Hussein – King Hussein's grandfather – on the throne of the newly established Transjordan.) Although the Eisenhower presidency fully supported the king's regime and the political status quo in Amman, fearing that the collapse of the Jordanian monarchy was bound to "critically affect the Western position in the entire Middle East,"[27] this concern with the repercussions of King Hussein's downfall did not lead the president to join the British in the pursuit of the military option in Jordan, particularly in view of the fact that American troops had already been dispatched to Lebanon.

This reluctance to expand American military involvement, which originated primarily in the administration's fear of becoming completely alienated throughout the region, was reiterated by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles on numerous occasions in the immediate aftermath of the Iraqi revolution. In addition to the regional repercussions which were likely to result, in their view, from the dispatch of American troops to Jordan (as part of a broader Anglo-American enterprise to thwart Egypt's designs), administration officials repeatedly expressed concern over the possibility that a joint Anglo-American intervention in support of King Hussein might, in fact, have an adverse effect, both across the Arab Middle East and within the delimited Jordanian context, by alienating at least some of the king's remaining supporters. In the words of Secretary Dulles (quoted from the memorandum of his meeting of July 14, 1958, with Lord Samuel Hood, the British Chargé d'Affaires in Washington):

> I told Lord Hood … that I could not give any considered view of what to do about Jordan without consulting our military and political advisers but that my off-hand thought was that Hussein has a better chance of pulling through without Western military assistance than with it.[28]

Furthermore, believing that, for all its importance to the West, the Jordanian theater was secondary in comparison with the Persian Gulf area, the Eisenhower administration remained unwavering in its reluctance to become militarily engaged on a front which was not inextricably related to core strategic interests.

And indeed, for all the British efforts to persuade President Eisenhower to support the establishment of "a Western force in Jordan,"

which would "serve the double purpose of stiffening the King's resolve and forming a bridgehead for such possible future action as may be necessary in Iraq,"[29] the administration remained firm in its decision to limit its military activity in Lebanon. Prime Minister Macmillan's desperate, highly personal message (which was drafted on July 15, 1958) to President Eisenhower, in which he urged the American president "to carry out the operation through the end" by "sending in some American troops [to Jordan] to be alongside ours on the ground" in the hope that this joint effort would profoundly affect "the whole situation in the Middle East,"[30] could not overcome the deep American skepticism concerning "the need … and the desirability of a military operation in Jordan."[31] Perceiving such an operation as too risky in terms of its anticipated regional ramifications, the president and his secretary of state were also acutely aware of the fact that the era of British domination in the region had been terminated, and that the resurgent forces of Arab nationalism "could not be successfully opposed" throughout the Middle East.[32]

Against this firm conceptual backdrop, the British effort to entice Washington to deploy an American military contingent to Jordan, in the hope of thereby setting the stage for a counter-revolution in Baghdad, was doomed to failure. Indeed, despite Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd's assertion that the security of "the British position" would be greatly enhanced "if the United States also had troops in Jordan," and that the success of the British operation in Jordan "as a deterrent to further Egyptian interference in Jordan might be greater if US troops were also in the country,"[33] his American counterpart remained invariably committed to his view that no American troops should be deployed to Amman, and that the Beirut operation should not spill over to the Jordanian theater.

It was this unwavering American reluctance to become militarily engaged in Jordan (combined with Washington's undiminished desire to guarantee that, despite its inaction, Jordan is "left free to decide its own policies according to its own conception of its national interests")[34] that paved the way for Israel, against the backdrop of an intensifying Egyptian, Syrian and Palestinian threat to the Jordanian monarchy, to fill this strategic vacuum and gradually assume the role of protector and custodian of the Hashemite Kingdom.

With the initial hope of using the Jordanian theater as a springboard or a beachhead for a joint British–American counteroffensive in Iraq (which reflected Britain's long-standing commitment to Hashemite Iraq, the origins of which were laid in 1921 when it placed

Faisal ibn Hussein – King Abdullah's brother – on the throne in Baghdad as Iraq's nominal ruler) fading into the background, Prime Minister Macmillan – who was still determined to dispatch troops in order to guarantee King Hussein's survival – now requested from the Eisenhower administration logistical support for the impending operations in Jordan. Although the British Prime Minister reiterated to President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles that he "was unhappy [about] doing it alone" when we could have been "beautifully together" in the operation,[35] he now became increasingly preoccupied – in view of the irrevocable American opposition to any joint military initiative to restore the situation in Iraq through the Jordanian back door – with the prospects of receiving from the US "some air logistics."[36]

And indeed, in this revised and considerably more limited and constrained context, Prime Minister Macmillan proved more successful. Concerned with the possibility of yet another coup "against King Hussein," and with the "severe petrol shortage" in Jordan as a result of the suspension of "normal supplies from Iraq," the administration (which needed Britain's support in the proceedings at the Security Council over its intervention in Lebanon) ultimately decided to acquiesce.[37] Thus, while remaining irreconcilably opposed to any form of direct American intervention in Jordan (including the dispatch of a small auxiliary American contingent), President Eisenhower agreed, on July 17, 1958, to ship to Jordan (as part of an American–British airlift) vital strategic materials (and primarily petroleum and lubricants). He also agreed to fully support the British decision to dispatch from Cyprus to Amman 2,200 paratroopers to protect Jordan's capital and signal its commitment to the Hashemite regime in the face of the combined threat from Iraq and the renewed domestic insurgency.

It is precisely at this crucial strategic juncture, with the Jordanian crisis approaching its peak and on the very eve of the deployment to Jordan of the British Sixteenth Parachute Brigade, that Israel was called upon to play a supportive role in the operation – a role that would underscore its value to the West in a regional setting increasingly permeated with emotion and fraught with incessant crisis and chronic instability. It is therefore clear that Israel's emergence as a strategic asset to the US was not the product of any broad or general reassessment of the various strategic and political functions it was capable of performing in the revised Middle Eastern landscape of 1958. Rather, it reflected the lessons drawn by the administration

from Israel's behavior in a crisis which originated neither within the bounds of the Jordanian–Israeli framework nor within the Egyptian–Israeli dyad.

Despite the fact that the Israeli component in the crisis did not comprise an intrinsic part of its initial origins, characteristics and attributes (and amounted, in fact, to an extension of its original characteristics), the lessons drawn by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles from Israel's behavior in July 1958 (which further reinforced the cumulative lessons of the 1957 crises) far surpassed the delimited contextual setting within which it originally unfolded by providing the architects of American diplomacy with a conclusive, ironclad empirical demonstration of Israel's innate, and inherently valid, overall strategic operational code (which was juxtaposed with the behavioral attributes of other regional allies, such as Saudi Arabia and Bahrain). In other words, although the role assigned to Israel in the crisis – of permitting the British and American airlift into Jordan through Israel's airspace – may appear at first glance marginal and relatively insignificant (as it did not commit Israel to any active move in defense of the Hashemite Kingdom), the inferences drawn from its performance were nevertheless profound and far-reaching by virtue of unequivocally demonstrating to the American leadership that its preliminary vision of Israel as a strategic liability to American interests in the region had become outdated, and that the Ben-Gurion government could now be credibly viewed as a reliable strategic ally. Indeed, by providing a tangible, undisputed proof of Israel's overall *modus operandi* in the region, the Jordanian crisis ultimately became the Rubicon or the new yardstick for appraising and assessing Israeli actions and role in the area. The conceptual pendulum thus completed its swing, with Israel now depicted, in the aftermath of the Jordanian crisis, as an integral part of the American effort to deter Egypt's aggressive designs by contributing, "from its resources of spiritual strength and determination, to a stable international order."[38]

It is clear therefore that, with the threat (from Egypt, Iraq and domestic Palestinian opposition) to King Hussein's regime becoming acute in the immediate aftermath of the revolution in Baghdad, all residual doubts concerning Israel's status as a bulwark and guardian of American strategic interests faded into the background, particularly in view of the American reluctance to become militarily engaged in the Jordanian crisis. In an environment whose main Arab actors were now either irreconcilably opposed to the West or, as in the

case of Saudi Arabia, reluctant to become directly engaged in any containment design, there simply remained no feasible alternatives to Washington's reliance upon Israeli deterrence and balancing efforts (by deed or by acquiescence).

This revised view, which came to dominate the administration's thinking in the immediate aftermath of July 1958, of Israel as a strategic asset and a guardian of Western interests in a region engulfed by strong "anti-Western sentiments,"[39] was manifested in numerous statements, messages and internal memoranda depicting the Israeli role in the Jordanian crisis as a useful precedent – one which should pave the way toward the formulation of a new, and more realistic, regional strategic doctrine. Against the backdrop of President Eisenhower's unwillingness to engage American troops in such locations as Iraq and Jordan, and of the reluctance of all remaining pro-Western powers to contribute, even marginally or indirectly, to the Jordanian operation (including Saudi Arabia, which turned down a similar request for permission to overfly its territory), the road was therefore cleared for Israel to fill the vacuum and emerge as a reliable partner in times of crisis and duress.

As Secretary Dulles acknowledged in his meeting of July 21, 1958, with Ambassador Eban: "We appreciate Israel's acquiescence in the airlift to Jordan. We were trying to find alternatives, but the matter was very difficult." Impressed with Israel's willingness to defy the Soviet Union (which reacted with harsh and threatening rhetoric to Israel's decision to permit the overflights), the secretary of state – contrary to his cold and reserved statements of the previous years – was uninhibited in alluding, in these remarks, to the American commitment to the survival of Israel:

> Our action with respect to Lebanon should give Israel confidence that we would respond in similar circumstances to an Israeli appeal. . . . If there should be a meeting at which there would be a definition of vital interests, we would not agree to the exclusion of Israel. This would be unthinkable.[40]

This revised image of Israel was most comprehensively articulated in a memorandum entitled: "Factors Affecting US Policy toward the Middle East," which was submitted, on August 19, 1958, to the National Security Council (NSC) by the NSC Planning Board. In a section entitled: "Should the United States Reconsider its Policy toward Israel?" the paper asserted:

> It is doubtful whether any likely US pressures on Israel would cause Israel to make concessions which would do much to satisfy Arab demands which – in the final analysis – may not be satisfied by anything short of the destruction of Israel. *Moreover, if we choose to combat radical Arab nationalism and to hold Persian Gulf oil by force if necessary, a logical corollary would be to support Israel as the only pro-West power left in the Near East.*[41]

Similarly, at the NSC meeting of August 21, 1958, which addressed "Israel's vulnerability to a surprise air attack" and the fact that "the Israelis lived in mortal terror of such an attack," President Eisenhower, alluding to the possibility that Israel would be "in a situation to be seriously threatened," with "a much greater build-up of military strength of Arab nations surrounding [it]," further remarked: "it seemed ironic … that not so long ago we were worrying about the likelihood of an Israeli aggression against the Arab states rather than about the reverse."[42]

And although, in subsequent months, these recommendations were not translated into a derivative, fully compatible American arms sales policy toward Israel (primarily as a result of the opposition of the regional experts in the Department of State to the supply of advanced weapons systems to Israel), they did establish the perceptual foundation for predicating the American–Israeli framework upon new and collaborative premises after a decade which had been fraught with incessant cleavage and crisis between Washington and Jerusalem. In other words, at least on the perceptual level, the 1958 crisis "had drawn the United States closer to Israel. … America had taken … [a] small step in the direction of the special relationship that the United States and Israel would have after the Six-Day War."[43]

Whereas, during the first term of the Eisenhower administration, Israel had been continually depicted as the main obstacle to the formation of a broad inter-Arab security alliance linked to the West, the 1958 Jordanian crisis convinced President Eisenhower that it was "Communist imperialism," in combination with Arab nationalism as promulgated by President Nasser, rather than Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's positions in the Arab–Israeli sphere, that posed the most serious "and real danger" to Western interests and designs in the region.[44]

The corollary of this newly established vision of the Egyptian president as invariably committed to a radical ideology, and thus as a constant source of regional instability and chaos, was the recognition

that Israel could now play – in this revised strategic setting – a balancing role *vis-à-vis* President Nasser's ambitious designs, and thus help effectively deter Egypt from any direct effort to topple the Jordanian regime. Indeed, it was this realization – which now fully permeated the administration's thinking – that Israel was capable of effectively deterring Cairo's unabated ambitions, and more specifically of preventing "the collapse of Hussein's regime" and the installment of "a pro-Nasser successor" in Amman, which quickly became a central component in the American effort to mitigate the July 1958 crisis.[45] Although Eisenhower and Dulles had, in the past, vehemently opposed the pursuit, by Israel, of a deterrence posture toward Egypt, fearing that it could set in motion a highly dangerous escalatory process, they came around, in July and August 1958, to support precisely this strategy (although not an actual Israeli military intervention in Jordan, to which they remained strongly and irreconcilably opposed).[46]

In view of the imminent menace to the very existence of the Jordanian regime, the administration became increasingly prepared, as of August 1958, to look upon Israel as the only regional power capable (and willing) of deterring and effectively balancing Cairo's ambitions, particularly in the Jordanian sphere. Thus, in his meeting of August 8, 1958, with Lord Samuel Hood, the British Chargé d'Affaires in Washington, Secretary Dulles remarked that "he saw some advantage in the existence of an Israeli threat [to militarily intervene in Jordan]."[47]

Evidently, Secretary Dulles' allusion to the "advantage" inherent in the Israeli deterrence threat was directly precipitated by the recent pursuit, by the administration, of the strategy of extended deterrence toward Egypt. Specifically, two days earlier, in his meeting with President Nasser, the special American envoy to the region, Deputy Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Robert Murphy, for the first time explicitly referred to the possibility that, in case of an Egyptian "intervention" in Jordan, "Israel would attack and that would be a situation that the US could not control." As Murphy further elaborated, any violence which would be directed toward the Hashemite Kingdom "could not be confined to Jordan itself." Hence, "it is in [the] interests of everybody concerned that necessary steps be taken to prevent the creation of a situation which might result in such hostilities." The Egyptian president, according to Murphy's report, "became grave … and reverted to the subject several times thereafter. He declared that we could be assured that Egypt was not

promoting an uprising or a disturbance in Jordan and did not intend to so do."[48]

Ironically, whereas American diplomacy consistently attempted, throughout the crisis, to dissuade Israel from any form of military intervention in Jordan (such as the occupation of the West Bank and the establishment of a buffer zone between its territory and a potentially militant East Bank), it concurrently made use of this contingency as a means of deterring Egypt from escalating the crisis while denying that, under these circumstances, the administration had any effective leverage upon Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's margin of maneuverability on the Jordanian front. Thus, while the administration remained irrevocably opposed to any actual military move initiated by Israel in the West Bank, fearing that it would escalate into a regional conflagration (eventually involving the Soviet Union), in the summer of 1958 it clearly supported and reinforced a posture designed to deter Egypt from intervening in Jordan by raising the specter of an Israeli operation in the country. (Throughout the crisis Israel threatened that, in the event of the imminent collapse of the Hashemite Kingdom and the likely rise to power in Amman of a pro-Egyptian regime, it would have to establish "a political union" with the West Bank.)

This newly established American propensity to rely upon the Israeli threat of intervention in Jordan as a deterrence tool, designed to prevent Egypt from exploiting the volatile situation in Jordan, surfaced once again, with vigor and clarity, in Secretary Dulles' meeting with British Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd, which took place in Washington on August 12, 1958. According to the memorandum of the conversation:

> … the secretary said that the question was if Jordan collapsed, would the Israelis move in? What was important was what Egypt thought the Israelis would do. If Egypt thought that the Israelis would touch off a big war, it was doubtful if Egypt would want Jordan. In such a war, Egypt would suffer an initial defeat by the Israelis. Egypt would then need aid from the Soviet Union. Aid to Israel would be forthcoming from Western countries. The area would be off to what would … be something like the Spanish Civil War.[49]

Two days later, this threat of an Israeli occupation of the West Bank if the Hashemite Kingdom was on the verge of disintegration, or if

foreign troops were to enter its territory, was used once again by Secretary Dulles as a means of deterring Egypt from intervening in Jordan. In his meeting of August 14 with Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Fawzi, the secretary of state was uninhibited in portraying a highly menacing picture of the repercussions (to Egypt and to the region) that would be bound to result from the collapse of the Jordanian monarchy. As the secretary pointed out:

> ... if the situation in Jordan should be permitted to disintegrate, that would almost certainly bring about internal chaos, giving rise to a real danger of renewed Arab/Israeli hostilities. ... If Egypt really wanted to take over Jordan, [it should take into account] the question of the likely Israeli reaction to the various contingencies. ... We did not know Israel's purposes, but there was a 50–50 chance that if Jordan collapsed, the Israelis would occupy the West Bank. This could start a lot of other things. ... The reason for [Jordan's] existence was that its disappearance might reopen the Arab–Israeli war. We were paying tribute to Jordan so that war would not break out.[50]

Throughout the crisis, and in an effort to increase the pressure on Egypt to avoid any escalatory action in Jordan, Secretary Dulles alluded to the possibility of an Israeli intervention in his meetings with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. On August 12, 1958, for example, he told Gromyko that "there was an even chance that Israel would move in to take over the West Bank and war between her and the Arabs would follow."

Less than a week later, in another meeting with the Soviet foreign minister, on August 18, Secretary Dulles, in an effort to impress upon the Soviet Union the need to restrain Egypt's actions in Jordan, once again raised the specter of a highly dangerous regional conflagration which was likely to break out in the wake of Israel's occupation of the West Bank. According to the memorandum of the conversation, the secretary of state warned that, "if Jordan disintegrated, a very serious situation would result. The problem of Jordan could not be easily and quickly dismissed. ... If the UAR wanted Jordan, it would at least have to face war with Israel."[51]

Two months later, in his meeting October 13 with the British ambassador in Washington, Sir Harold Caccia, the Secretary of State once again alluded to this threat as a means of deterring Cairo from invading Jordan.

The American retrospective recognition, which was reiterated after the crisis had abated, that these deterrence threats indeed succeeded in restraining Egypt, which "was particularly sensitive" to the possibility that Israel "will take over the West Bank should it so desire," did not, however, during the remaining 30 months of the Eisenhower presidency, engender a significant modification of such tenets of the administration's regional policy as its long-standing refusal to supply advanced weapons systems to Israel. Despite Secretary Dulles' conviction that Egypt "really believes ... that the Israelis could mobilize very quickly ... and take over the West Bank should they so desire," [52] the Eisenhower administration continued to be committed – after the crisis had subsided – to its traditional arms sales policy in the region.

In other words, notwithstanding this growing perception of Israel as an important outpost of the Western bloc and as a power capable of deterring Egypt, and notwithstanding the impact which the Israeli decision to permit the British and American overflights en route to Jordan had upon the thinking of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, this growing convergence between Washington and Jerusalem concerning the origins of the threat to regional stability was not translated, at least during the remainder of the Eisenhower era, into compatible and derivative policies, particularly in the field of arms procurement. While the seeds of comprehensive regional collaboration within the American–Israeli dyad had started to bear fruit in the summer of 1958 (as the cumulative lessons of the 1957 and 1958 crises fully permeated the administration's thinking), the task of transforming the conceptual into the actual, namely, into congruent, concrete and institutionalized measures and policies, was ultimately transferred to John F. Kennedy.

It was indeed during the brief Kennedy era in the White House that the gap, which continued to exist, between Washington's perceptions of Israel and its actual strategic behavior was finally closed. Four years after Israel had demonstrated its value to the West by virtue of its contribution, during the July crisis, to the American–British operation to defend and protect the embattled Jordanian Kingdom, the potential was converted into the actual. In August 1962 the Kennedy administration agreed to sell the Ben-Gurion government Hawk anti-aircraft missiles and to make Israel eligible for a multi-million dollar military assistance credit under the Mutual Security Program. Thus, while the Jordanian theater provided the conceptual prism, or lens, through which the growing compatibility in terms of the perceived strategic interests and objectives between Washington and Jerusalem (which

far surpassed the delimited Jordanian context) could be fully recognized and appreciated by leading members of the Eisenhower administration, the task of actually predicating the American behavior toward Israel upon the basic premises of this strategic convergence was handed over to the Kennedy administration. It was only then that the "operational environment," in which American–Israeli relations actually unfolded, finally merged with, and came to quintessentially reflect, the logic of the "psychological environment"[53] of this relationship. Specifically, with the Department of State – which continued to oppose the sale of arms to Israel – losing its predominance in the shaping of American foreign policy during the Kennedy era, the National Security Council – which quickly emerged as the central component within the Kennedy foreign policy machinery – could now proceed apace toward revising Washington's traditional arms sales policy.

Turning now to the Israeli part of the equation, it is clear that the plethora of American statements during, and in the aftermath of, the Jordanian crisis, which expressed appreciation for the Israeli supportive role in the British–American operation and acknowledged the valuable strategic services it provided, fell considerably short of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's expectations. He was unimpressed with the abstract American recognition that "recent events have brought the United States and Israel closer together,"[54] and his actions following the outbreak of the July crisis were designed to use the overflights issue as a springboard for an immediate trade-off, involving the sale of American arms to Israel and the provision of security guarantees from the US. Indeed, seeking to convert the perceptual into tangible and concrete measures which would upgrade the strategic dimension of the relationship, the Israeli Prime Minister was relentless in his efforts "to reap strategic dividends for Israel" as compensation and reward for his contribution to Operation Fortitude (the code name for the Anglo-American airlift to Jordan).[55] Determined to take full advantage of the American and British dependence on the Israeli permission for the overflights, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion – in his communications with the American and British leaders – repeatedly emphasized the political risks that were embedded in his decision to cooperate with the Western powers in their quest to rescue King Hussein.

In this respect, the dynamics of the crisis of July 1958 provided Prime Minister Ben-Gurion with a window of opportunity for promoting his long-standing desire to commit the Eisenhower administration

– both militarily and politically – to Israel's defense as its patron. Convinced that the special relationship that had developed in the mid-1950s between France and Israel would not last indefinitely (and would most likely erode following the termination of the Algerian War, leading Paris to refrain, in its aftermath, from concluding new arms deals with the Israeli government), the Israeli leadership (with the exception of Shimon Peres, Director General of the Defense Ministry) was determined to make the United States Israel's major arms supplier and ally. Indeed, believing that, unlike the transient and instrumental nature of the French–Israeli alliance, American ties with Israel could well develop into a durable and lasting partnership, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion and his entourage continually searched for ways which would help predicate the American–Israeli framework upon new, more cooperative and more binding premises and ground rules.

The bargaining tactics which Prime Minister Ben-Gurion used *vis-à-vis* the US in the course of the July crisis quintessentially reflected his abiding and unmoderated desire to use any regional opening as a springboard for strengthening and solidifying Israel's ties with the administration. Specifically, seeking to extract a strategic price for his assistance, the Israeli prime minister presented his domestic predicament (namely, the opposition of two of his coalition partners to the decision to cooperate with Operation Fortitude) and the likely external repercussions of his collaborative posture (such as the further deterioration in the already strained relations between Israel and the Soviet Union and the growing alienation toward Israel in many Third World states in Asia and Africa) as major constraints which severely limited his freedom of action and margin of maneuverability:

> Although he [Ben-Gurion] was a powerful and influential figure, his power over this decision was limited . . . and he had to convince the members of his coalition government to support his decision. Ben-Gurion also wanted to avoid any overt involvement in the upheaval in the Arab world and preferred . . . to remain in the background.[56]

In view of these constraints, which were repeatedly and comprehensively addressed throughout the crisis in Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's messages to President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles and Prime Minister Macmillan, he repeatedly threatened to suspend or drastically restrict the overflights unless there was an American (and British) compensation of sufficient magnitude (in the form of security

guarantees and the supply of arms) to counterbalance the new complex of political threats directly emanating from Israel's involvement in the operation (the Israeli arms request included 100 tanks, three squadrons of aircraft and two submarines). The fact that, on July 17, 1958, Israeli fighters indeed attempted to interfere with the overflights, which were conducted without Israeli permission, added credence to Ben-Gurion's threats to terminate Operation Fortitude unless provided with major strategic compensation.

The prime minister's diary entry of July 24, 1958, clearly elucidates the essence of his bargaining strategy and unabated desire to use the Jordanian crisis as an impetus for changing the actual American strategy toward Israel:

> The United States and Britain must know that we must first assure our own existence and that we are convinced that we have the capacity to aid and to provide crucial services to the West. [But] we cannot give an unqualified answer to permit overflights for an unlimited period, which will place us in danger from Nasser and the Soviet Union, especially as despite all our appeals, the US has refused to guarantee our security as it has that of Turkey, Pakistan and now Lebanon. . . . The US has no need and no right to demand that we risk our existence for the sake of that of Hussein's regime . . . which the US itself does not believe will survive.[57]

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's instructions to Abba Eban, the Israeli Ambassador in Washington (and to his counterpart in London, Eliyahu Elath), as well as his direct messages to the American president and the British Prime Minister, quintessentially reflected the positions he articulated in his diary, as the Israeli ambassadors presented requests for arms and "a working partnership," which amounted to a *de facto* security alliance of the type that was established between Israel and France in 1956.[58]

Ultimately, for all the prime minister's efforts, which were further reinforced by his decision of August 2, 1958, to temporarily suspend his permission for the overflights in the immediate aftermath of a threatening Soviet message (which was submitted to the Israeli prime minister on the previous day, and which warned Israel that, by permitting the British overflights, "it had become associated with aggressive actions that might endanger its national interests"),[59] President Eisenhower remained adamant in his refusal to provide Israel with concrete compensation in terms of advanced arms and guarantees.

Although the president did reaffirm, in his message of July 25 to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, the existing and general American pledge to uphold Israel's independence and integrity, this reaffirmation by no means contradicted or eroded the traditional parameters of American diplomacy in the Middle East.

Thus, while fully recognizing the fact that "the Israeli Government has been helpful to us in such matters as the recent overflights to Jordan and in its adherence to attitudes favorable to the US position on recent developments in the area,"[60] Washington was still unwilling to deviate from the basic premises of its arms sales posture (with the only exception being its decision of August 22 to sell 100 recoilless rifles to Israel). Notwithstanding Ben-Gurion's repeated demand that Israel be rewarded for "jeopardizing itself for the Western Powers," and for incurring "great risks for ourselves ... in relation to the Soviet Union" because of its overflights permission,[61] and notwithstanding his warning that, unless provided with arms and security guarantees, Israel may resort to military action to safeguard its security interests in the Jordanian sphere, no formal change in the administration's policy was forthcoming.

Ironically, whereas the administration used the Israeli threat to occupy the West Bank as a means of deterring Egypt, Ben-Gurion resorted to this threat as a means of inducing Washington to compensate Jerusalem for its contribution to Operation Fortitude. Thus, whereas the British government (which came to realize, in the course of the crisis, that "our previous attitude towards Israel ... got us little credit with the Arabs," and that "Israel's ... agreement to the airlift was building up a backlog of Russian and Arab resentment") ultimately decided, in late September 1958 (after the situation in Jordan had stabilized and the threat to the Hashemite Kingdom had faded into the background), to sell Israel sixty Centurion tanks and two submarines, and to inaugurate discussions on strategic cooperation with it, the Eisenhower administration remained unwavering in its refusal to cross the Rubicon and thus to convert its new perception of Israel into compatible, derivative policy.[62] Despite this continued opposition, Washington did support the sale in September of British arms to Israel, believing that despite the dangers to regional stability, which were inherent in the supply of such weapons as submarines to Israel, this transaction had the twofold advantage of deterring Egypt and of reducing Israel's security concerns.

Ultimately, Secretary Dulles' message of August 1, 1958, to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, which stated that Israel "should be in a position

to deter an attempt at aggression by indigenous forces," and that he was prepared to examine "the military implications of this problem with an open mind,"[63] did not provide the impetus for revising Washington's long-standing arms sales policy toward Israel during the remaining thirty months of Eisenhower's tenure in the White House. Nor were the secretary's reassuring words, from October 2, 1958, to Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir, according to which "the US action in Lebanon made it clear that if Israel should be the victim of an unprovoked aggression to extinguish its sovereignty, our response would be just as good as it was in the Lebanese case," accompanied by specific measures in the field of arms procurement intended to guarantee that "Israel's sense of security [to] act as a deterrent" was indeed enhanced.[64]

And although Christian Herter (who, in view of Dulles' deteriorating health, was appointed secretary of state on April 22, 1959) initially supported, in 1960, the sale of "air defense equipment [to Israel] for use in the event of an Egyptian attack,"[65] he ultimately (and reluctantly) accepted the unanimous opinion of his subordinates, who vehemently opposed any deviation from the traditional parameters of American arms sales policy. Indeed, Secretary Herter's conviction that "he found it difficult to understand why we are refusing to allow the Israelis to buy the purely defensive Hawk missiles," and that "unless better arguments could be presented … the Israelis should have the missiles,"[66] did not at the end of the day precipitate any immediate and congruent action by the Eisenhower administration.

Confronted by all the Middle Eastern experts in the Department of State, who strongly and unequivocally argued that the supply of American arms to Israel would inevitably accelerate the regional arms race, that the overall balance of military capabilities between Israel and its neighbors was already overwhelmingly in Israel's favor, and that the sale would further aggravate the administration's relations with most of the Arab world, the secretary of state (who served as governor of Massachusetts before his appointment as Dulles' successor, and thus did not share his subordinates' pre-existing perceptions of the region) finally acquiesced and entrusted the task of revising the American arms sales posture toward Israel to the Kennedy presidency.

On July 7, 1960, these department arguments were comprehensively articulated by G. Lewis Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. In a long memorandum to T. Livingston Merchant, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs

(which was later submitted to Secretary Herter), Jones forcefully argued that:

> Our traditional policy has been to avoid becoming a major supplier of arms to Near East countries. Our supplying Hawk missiles to Israel would represent a measure three times the scope of the electronic equipment offer we recently made to the Israelis. … Having set a precedent of this magnitude, we would have difficulty in refusing future Israeli requests by referring to our "traditional policy". … Were we to introduce missiles, there would be no assurance that missiles provided by the Soviets to Israel's neighbors might not have a surface-to-surface capability. … In brief, by giving the Israelis missiles, we would be setting in motion a new spiral in the Middle East arms race, with the likely result that no one would gain except the Soviets, who wish to exacerbate tensions in that area.[67]

Four weeks later, on August 7, 1960, these arguments were fully incorporated into Secretary Herter's message to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, which formally turned down the Israeli arms request. Maintaining that "the introduction of … spectacular weaponry into the Near East area [was bound] to contribute to an intensification of an arms race to the detriment of the states concerned,"[68] the letter effectively brought to an end a long and intricate process of intergovernmental and intragovernmental bargaining. Unwilling to abandon the traditional tenets of the American arms sales posture toward Israel, the administration remained convinced, despite years of frustration and disappointment, that a policy of even-handedness in the Arab–Israeli sphere could still prevent the further drift of the Arab world into the Soviet orbit.[69]

In the final analysis, though, and for all this operational continuity in most components of American policy toward Israel during the entire Eisenhower era, it is clear that the shift in the administration's perception of Israel – which became evident during, and in the aftermath of, July 1958 – would make it easier for the Kennedy presidency to sell advanced weaponry to Israel (the Hawk surface-to-air missile) by virtue of laying the conceptual groundwork for the eventual about-face of the American arms sales posture. Similarly, tentative, intermittent and partial as they may appear in themselves, some forms of strategic cooperation between Washington and Jerusalem initiated in the aftermath of the Jordanian crisis (such as in connection with

Israel's "periphery alliance" with Iran, Sudan, Turkey and Ethiopia, which was fully supported by the Eisenhower administration)[70] nonetheless further reinforced and augmented the July 1958 experiment, and thus set the stage for the eventual transformation, in the 1960s, of the perceived and sporadic into an actual and durable policy within the American–Israeli framework.

Thus, while the change which came to be manifested "in the American posture" toward Israel in the aftermath of the July 1958 crisis may appear subtle at first glance, and while Israel was unable to wrest from the Eisenhower administration either "a formal security pact" or advanced weapons systems, "it did score a number of significant accomplishments."[71] Among other things, "the United States made its most far-reaching commitment to date to Israel's existence and integrity" and undertook – as we have already witnessed – "to ensure that Israel's security needs would be met," thus becoming in effect "a *de facto* guarantor of [its] security."[72] In addition, in July 1958 "new channels of communication regarding security matters" were established between Washington and Jerusalem, with Israeli diplomats meeting with "Department of State officials during the crisis on a daily basis, usually more than once a day, to exchange views and information and coordinate matters of mutual interest."[73]

Ultimately, it was the Kennedy administration which moved to close the gap between perception and actual policy by deciding, in August 1962, to sell to Israel – for the first time – an advanced weapon system, namely, the Hawk short-range, anti-aircraft missile.

During the Kennedy period the Department of State was replaced by the National Security Council as the central and most powerful organization involved in the shaping of American foreign policy. The department's regional specialists, who had traditionally comprised a source of continued and irreconcilable opposition to the sale of arms to Israel, were therefore relegated to the periphery of the process, and the new Middle Eastern experts, and primarily Robert Komer, who were much more pragmatic than their Department of State counterparts, could now focus on the specific terms of the transaction in their quest to make it an integral part of a broader trade-off, involving Israeli concessions on a variety of strategic issues.

4 The April 1963 Jordanian crisis and its ramifications

When the last British troops departed from Jordan in October 1958, it became evident that Operation Fortitude had indeed accomplished its objectives. The infusion of British troops, financial subsidies and crucial raw materials (which were flown to Amman through Israel's airspace) helped stabilize the embattled King Hussein, even though it could not guarantee the long-term survival of his monarchy.[1] However, while the operation, to which Israel contributed by permitting the Western airlift to cross its airspace, provided the Eisenhower administration with a final, and most conclusive, proof that Israel was indeed a strategic asset, capable of protecting and safeguarding its regional interests, it did not precipitate compatible and derivative policies (during the remainder of the Eisenhower era), particularly in the sphere of arms procurement.

By comparison, the April 1963 Jordanian crisis – which broke out after Israel had become, in August 1962, the recipient of advanced American weaponry for the first time – provided the impetus for upgrading the relationship by virtue of inducing the Kennedy administration to inaugurate a comprehensive strategic dialogue on regional security issues with the Israeli government of Levi Eshkol (who succeeded Ben-Gurion as prime minister in June 1963).[2]

As we shall soon witness, it was once again the Jordanian zone, namely, the renewed threat to the Hashemite Kingdom, which helped American diplomacy recognize Israel's value as a power capable of deterring Egypt from directly intervening in the crisis, thus further reinforcing the lessons of 1958 and precipitating an American posture which exceeded the delimited and constrained parameters of the Jordanian context. In other words, as in the summer of 1958, it was the turbulent Jordanian context which comprised the prism or lens, through which Israel's role, as a country determined to prevent the

forces of Arab nationalism from completely disrupting the regional balance of power, could be fully elucidated and appreciated by the Kennedy administration, thus further consolidating its image as a major strategic asset to American interests. And, as was the case in the 1958 episode, in April 1963 the Kennedy administration – while interested in the continued survival of the Hashemite Kingdom – from the outset of the crisis ruled out the use of force as a means of rescuing the beleaguered King Hussein.

The direct result of this American reluctance to intervene militarily in Jordan was its growing reliance – which was once again closely patterned on the 1958 precedent – upon the Israeli threat to capture the West Bank as a means of deterring Egypt from becoming directly engaged in the effort to topple the Jordanian regime. Thus, while the Eisenhower administration remained – as in 1958 – irrevocably opposed to the actual implementation of the Israeli intervention threat, it was fully prepared to make extensive use of the "intervention scenario" as a useful stratagem for restraining and constraining President Nasser's activities in the highly charged and emotion-laden Jordanian zone.

As was the case in 1958, the Jordanian crisis of 1963 originated in regional dynamics which were not directly related to the American–Israeli framework, and which came to affect this dyad only later and as a by-product of developments that took place in other bilateral and multilateral frameworks. Still, despite its relative distance from the conditions and circumstances which in the spring of 1963 originally precipitated the renewed threat to King Hussein, the Ben-Gurion government did ultimately emerge from the crisis with its image as a strategic asset of the US further reinforced. Clearly, while the role which the Ben-Gurion government was called upon to play in April 1963 was purely passive, the fact that the Kennedy administration, in its last-ditch efforts to prevent Egypt from escalating its involvement in the crisis, was once again capable of using the threat of Israeli intervention in Jordan as major leverage (without actually supporting such a move) further augmented and reinforced the lessons which American diplomacy drew in the wake of the July 1958 crisis. Consequently, the groundwork was laid for the eventual establishment of institutionalized and formal security ties between Washington and Jerusalem.

Specifically, such *ad hoc* forms of strategic cooperation as the exchange of intelligence (especially about Egypt's military capabilities) and joint military planning that were initiated during April and

May 1963, in the delimited and constrained context of the imminent threat to the Hashemite Kingdom, set new and expanded ground rules within the American–Israeli dyad and thus paved the way toward the inauguration – on November 13, 1963 – of a comprehensive and formal American–Israeli dialogue on regional security issues.[3] Although the November 1963 dialogue exposed considerable differences between the Kennedy presidency and the Levi Eshkol government on such issues as the military significance of Egypt's missile development program, the magnitude of the Arab military threat to Israel, and the nature of the American commitment to Israel's security, it did engender an understanding concerning the Israeli need to modernize its armored forces (which established the groundwork for the eventual sale to Israel, in 1965, of 210 M-48A Patton tanks) and the administration's willingness to periodically examine, with Israeli representatives, Israel's security situation and needs.[4]

Once again, then, it was the Jordanian theater that provided the impetus for the architects of American diplomacy and strategy to further upgrade, expand and institutionalize security ties with Israel, which by now was broadly depicted in Washington as a proven and reliable strategic asset and as a pro-Western island of stability in a highly turbulent and hostile regional environment.

Despite this basic similarity between the 1958 and the 1963 episodes (by virtue of the American reliance – in both – upon the threat of Israeli military intervention in Jordan as a means of deterring Egypt from intensifying its challenge to the Hashemite dynasty), a major difference between them should not be overlooked. Indeed, whereas the growing threat to King Hussein's regime led, in 1958, to the dispatch of British troops to Amman (and to the joint British–American airlift of strategic raw materials to the embattled monarchy), in 1963 the Hashemite dynasty had to contend with a combined domestic and regional challenge on its own without Western support. The Kennedy administration was unwilling to proceed beyond the consideration of sending US ground and air contingents to Jordan on "training missions" and joint exercises with the Jordanian Army.[5]

It is against the backdrop of this growing isolation and of aggressive domestic and external opposition (and with the king's British and American supporters becoming reluctant, after 1958, to come to his rescue) that Israel gradually consolidated its role as an active guardian of the Hashemite Kingdom. Specifically, concurrent with the Israeli consideration (which repeatedly surfaced during the decade 1957–67) of the possibility, in the face of the disintegration of the monarchy

(which was used by the US as a means of deterring and restraining Egypt), of occupying the West Bank as a precautionary measure, Israel and Jordan initiated, in 1960, a full-scale political and strategic dialogue. The crisis of April–May 1963 witnessed a significant expansion of this dialogue, with Israel moving in to fill the vacuum left by the decision of the Western powers not to become directly engaged – as was the case in 1958 – in an effort to defend the beleaguered Jordanian monarchy. With the Kennedy administration still committed, in early 1963 (albeit with diminishing enthusiasm), to an essentially accommodative policy toward Egypt, and with Britain unable to guarantee any longer the survival and well-being of King Hussein and his regime, Israel remained the only regional power which was both capable and willing, directly and indirectly, to challenge President Nasser and his militant Palestinian supporters in Jordan in an effort to prevent the total disruption of the Middle Eastern balance of power and strategic landscapes. Indeed, with the Arab Middle East continually permeated with rivalries, strife and violence (culminating in the Iraqi coup of February 8, 1963, which resulted in the establishment of a Ba'thist regime in Baghdad, and then the Syrian coup of March 8, 1963, which exacerbated King Hussein's security predicament by virtue of the establishment of a second, and hostile, Ba'thist regime across the Jordanian border), it was up to the Ben-Gurion government (and later to the Levi Eshkol government) to act as a bulwark and a Western surrogate in an effort to contain the renewed threat to the Hashemite Kingdom from both the East and the North.[6]

The crisis itself was precipitated by the inauguration, on April 17, 1963, of a new Arab union among Egypt, Syria and Iraq, which was followed by a series of inflammatory broadcasts on Cairo's Voice of the Arab Nation radio, which urged "the free valiant men in Arab Jordan to … overthrow King Hussein's throne forever."[7] These developments provoked riots across the West Bank and thus posed a direct and immediate challenge to the Jordanian king. With Secretary of State Dean Rusk unwilling to make any binding commitment to Jordan's independence (confining himself to a general and non-binding expression of interest), and with a wave of violent demonstrations which included massive student disturbances (in support of the immediate incorporation of Jordan into the new Egyptian–Syrian–Iraqi union) sweeping the West Bank, the embattled Jordanian monarch decided to move forcefully – with Israel's quiet backing – in order to reassert his authority and control over his fragmented and recalcitrant kingdom.[8]

Confronted with an escalating storm of violent demonstrations in the quest for Arab unity, which engulfed Nablus, Jenin, Hebron and East Jerusalem (combined with a strong anti-government sentiment), on April 20, 1963, King Hussein imposed a strict curfew on the main Jordanian cities.[9] Concurrently, he moved to reassert his authority by appointing his great-uncle, Sharif Hussein ibn-Nasser (who replaced Wasfi Tal), as the nominal head of a new transition government. This appointment "was merely a cover of the king's determination to take the leadership of his country into his own hands."[10]

It was precisely at this highly charged, emotion-laden juncture, with Amman fraught with rumors concerning an imminent pro-Nasser coup (and with the American Sixth Fleet dispatched to the Eastern Mediterranean),[11] that the American stratagem of extended deterrence *vis-à-vis* Egypt started to unfold. Specifically, seeking to prevent the possibility that Hussein would soon "be toppled" and that Jordan would soon fall "under an Egyptian umbrella" (but reluctant to directly intervene in the crisis), American diplomacy resorted in April 1963 – as had been the case in July 1958 – to the threat of Israeli intervention in Jordan (without actually supporting such a move) as a major leverage in its last-ditch effort to deter Egypt from engineering a coup against the besieged King Hussein.

While the administration was unequivocal in urging Israel to "adopt a policy of restraint" and avoid any military action (i.e. the capturing of the West Bank), which was bound "to touch off a chain of events with serious possibilities of escalation" by virtue of making Jordan "the cockpit of a tussle between Nasser and Ben-Gurion,"[12] it concurrently used – in its crisis-management diplomacy within the American–Egyptian sphere – the Israeli threat to occupy the West Bank in the event of the collapse of the Hashemite Kingdom as a means of restraining President Nasser, and of minimizing the danger that the Jordanian crisis would escalate into an acutely menacing regional conflagration. (The Israeli threat to occupy the West Bank was communicated to President Kennedy on a number of occasions during April 1963, including in a personal message which Prime Minister Ben-Gurion drafted on April 26.)

On April 27, faced with Ben-Gurion's threat to intervene in the crisis, and determined to prevent such an action in Jordan, President Kennedy – whose words were closely patterned on many of Secretary Dulles' statements and remarks of July and August 1958 – proceeded to outline the essence of his strategy of extended deterrence by instructing the Secretary of State Dean Rusk to

> … go back to [John S.] Badeau [American Ambassador to Cairo] and have him make sure that Nasser understood the consequences if Israel moved. Badeau should tell Nasser we were sure he wasn't interested in an Arab–Israeli war at this point but indicate that the Israelis might well be interested in war before the Arabs were ready. Therefore Nasser ought to do what he could to prevent such a confrontation.[13]

A few hours later, this recognition "of the usefulness of an Israeli threat to intervene in Jordan as a means of guaranteeing King Hussein's survival"[14] was indeed translated into specific action, when Undersecretary of State George W. Ball, in accordance with the president's (and Secretary Rusk's) instructions, ordered Ambassador Badeau to warn the Egyptian president that any Egyptian involvement in such a coup, or the dispatch of Egyptian troops to the "Israeli–Jordanian frontier," was likely to precipitate "a sudden [Israeli] military action with little of no chance of prior detection."[15] As Undersecretary of State Ball further elaborated in his message of April 27, 1963, to Ambassador Badeau:

> It is desirable to get word to Nasser … that while the US has cordial relations with Israel and presses for restraint, we cannot count on restraining Israel when it considers that its vital interests are at stake. We are not relaying an Israeli threat. We recognize reality. … We want Nasser to know that our views [are] not based just on concern for Israel but [are] related to all we and Egypt are trying to do. The US and Egypt face mutual peril in this situation. The US has much to lose, but we think that Egypt has even more to lose. … Even if the world community acted rapidly in the face of an Israeli armed action, the Israelis might well be in the *de facto* possession of the West Bank, from which it would be difficult to dislodge them.[16]

Whereas, in his message to President Nasser, Undersecretary Ball attempted to leave a wide margin of ambiguity concerning the administration's capacity to control Israel's behavior in the Jordanian sphere (depicting Israel as being inherently predisposed, in security matters, to take independent action), in his concurrent meetings with Abraham Harman, the Israeli Ambassador in Washington, he was unequivocal in seeking to eliminate any traces of ambiguity concerning Washington's irrevocable opposition to the immediate use of military force by Israel in Jordan.

As was the case in July 1958, and in contrast with its efforts – in its communications with the Egyptian leadership – to downgrade its leverage over Israel's latitude of choice and margin of military maneuverability, the Kennedy high policy elite was quite outspoken and assertive in its quest to dissuade Israel (which had reinforced its troops along its border with Jordan) from resorting to the military option. As Undersecretary of State Ball pointed out in his meeting with Ambassador Harman, which took place on April 27, 1963 – namely, a few hours after he had underscored, in his instructions to Ambassador Badeau, the potential for a sudden, independent and uncontrolled military action on the part of Israel in Jordan:

> It is a matter of concern to us that if something should happen, Israel would not act precipitously or until the nature of what emerges [in Jordan] has become clearer. If Israel were to move militarily, it is doubtful that Egypt could sit still and in the end we might find that the Soviets had become involved also.[17]

Whereas, in its effort to coerce Egypt into acquiescence in Jordan, the Kennedy presidency relied upon Israel's military power "as a deterrent to externally-inspired revolution in Jordan,"[18] in its concurrent attempt to prevent Israel from occupying the West Bank it resorted to another threat – that of a Soviet intervention – which might further aggravate Israel's overall security predicament.[19]

This duality in its signals toward Israel and Egypt continued to characterize American crisis-management diplomacy. On the one hand, in its approach toward Egypt and its Iraqi and Syrian allies, the administration was uninhibited in repeatedly referring to the "Israeli intervention scenario" as a vehicle for exacerbating "their worries over Israeli reaction if Hussein falls," and thus of ultimately "deterring Cairo, Damascus and Baghdad."[20] Thus, notwithstanding President Nasser's reassurances to Ambassador Badeau (in their meeting of April 29, 1963) that "Egypt was not involved whatsoever in the disturbances within Jordan," which exclusively "reflected the will of the Jordanian people and their dissatisfaction with the Jordanian leadership,"[21] and notwithstanding the fact that he agreed with Badeau that "an Israeli attack on the West Bank would mean a disastrous Egyptian–Israeli war," the fact that the wave of disturbances continued, in early May, to pose a direct threat to Hashemite Jordan prompted the Kennedy presidency to make repeated use of the Israeli intervention threats as a deterrence *vis-à-vis* Egypt.[22] In the process,

the administration underscored its inability "to guarantee the present armistice lines," and thus to "prevent Israel from resorting to the military option before the Arabs were ready," as a means of preventing President Nasser from escalating his drive to bring about "a revolution in Jordan." In its communications with Baghdad and Damascus, it insisted that an attempted intervention in Jordan by other Arab states "could well lead to a regional war with unforeseeable repercussions, including the involvement of non-regional powers."[23] On the other hand, however, and in numerous meetings with, and messages to, the Israeli leadership, administration officials repeatedly resorted to strong – and occasionally coercive – rhetoric in an effort to ensure that Israel indeed remained fully committed to "a policy of restraint."[24]

An additional illustration of Washington's continued reliance upon the threat of Israeli intervention in Jordan as a means of guaranteeing that Egypt would avoid "any movement toward interference in Jordan's affairs"[25] and that the crisis would rapidly subside, is provided by a second message to Ambassador Badeau, which was sent by Undersecretary Ball on May 10, 1963. Closely patterned on the premises of his message of April 27, the undersecretary of state instructed the American ambassador in Cairo to deliver an oral message from President Kennedy to President Nasser, which was designed to further reinforce his earlier warning. The message stated:

> I know you recognize as well as I that situations may arise in which we cannot effectively influence Israeli politics any more than those of Egypt. If Jordan ... becomes a cockpit of struggle, there is a real danger that the Israelis might ... intervene, regardless of what external pressures could be brought to bear. If this compelled you and other Arab forces to react, a major conflict might ensue – and one in which the Arab forces might be at a considerable initial disadvantage. Thus we see it in your interest as well as ours to avoid a possible blow-up in Jordan.[26]

On May 27, 1963, against the backdrop of what was perceived in Washington as an undiminished Egyptian effort to engineer the downfall of King Hussein's regime, a new and urgent presidential message to President Nasser was drafted. Fraught with anxiety and concern, the message was unequivocal in alluding to the likely regional ramifications of an Israeli intervention in Jordan. As President Kennedy pointed out:

> I am deeply troubled [by the possibility] that Jordan will become the cockpit of an inter-Arab struggle. … Peace in the Middle East might well be destroyed by an Israeli intervention in Jordan, using the argument of her own security interests. We might be faced with a *fait accompli*. Should the other Arab states feel compelled to react in such a situation, a major conflict might ensue – and one in which … the Arab forces might not be at any advantage.[27]

This series of private presidential warnings (which met with President Nasser's repeated denials that Egypt was responsible for the storm of violent disturbances that swept the West Bank, or that it conspired to topple the Jordanian regime) was further augmented by several concurrent public statements similarly raising the specter of a regional confrontation in the wake of an Israeli move into the West Bank (precipitated by an externally inspired revolution in Jordan). These statements invariably refrained from openly and unequivocally reaffirming or endorsing the May 1950 Tripartite Declaration, which guaranteed the post-war armistice lines between Israel and its neighbors, and thus injected a residue of ambiguity concerning the actual American commitment to these lines. Such an ambiguity, observed Robert Komer – the leading Middle Eastern expert within the National Security Council – on April 30, 1963, would help deter President Nasser "from [executing] a coup in Jordan" because of his uncertainty as to whether the administration would remain committed – under such circumstances – to its policy of "keeping Israel [out of] the West Bank."[28]

Notwithstanding this consistent American effort to use the Israeli threat of intervention in Jordan as a restraining leverage *vis-à-vis* Egypt, which repeatedly emphasized Washington's limited margin of maneuverability and control over Israel's actions in the Jordanian theater, in its concurrent and direct discussions with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion (and in its public statements), the Kennedy foreign policy machinery was far more unequivocal, assertive and forceful in trying to eliminate any traces of ambiguity concerning the desired Israeli *modus operandi*. Seeking to guarantee Israel's continued acquiescence in Jordan at all costs, and regardless of the dynamics of the crisis and the possibility that it would result in a regime change in Amman, the administration projected, in these bilateral contacts with Israel, an image of determination and resolve in its drive to thwart the Israeli intervention threat – which was completely divorced from the vision of impotence and insufficient leverage over Israel's actions which it

sought to portray in its dealings with Cairo. Indeed, in all the numerous private messages issued in the course of the crisis by the president and members of his administration to the Israeli government, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion was unequivocally and strongly urged to refrain from intervening in Jordan under any circumstances.

A clear illustration of this unwavering opposition to any Israeli action in Jordan is provided by President Kennedy's message of May 5, 1963, to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, in which he argued that such a move could well "exacerbate rather than improve the situation by providing the Soviet Union with a further opportunity to extend its influence in the region." Maintaining that "our ability to help will depend not only upon us but upon you," the president was explicit in demanding that Israel "refrain from precipitous actions or reactions" which were bound to further aggravate "a regional situation" already fraught with tension and animosity, and instead seek to coordinate its policies along the Jordanian front with those pursued by the administration.[29]

The warning embedded in this message forcefully reinforced several earlier presidential statements, which were invariably designed to impress upon the Israeli leadership the need to exercise utmost restraint in approaching the Jordanian theater. Thus, in his meeting of April 28, 1963, with Abraham Harman, Israeli Ambassador in Washington, President Kennedy "reiterated very strongly our concern regarding the situation as evolving. Whatever happens," he pointed out, "and we hope nothing does, it is our hope that Israel not act precipitously and would consult with the US Government" before resorting to the military option in Jordan.[30] Similarly, in his meeting of May 1, 1963, with Israeli Deputy Defense Minister Shimon Peres, the president was equally unequivocal in insisting that "any Israeli move against Jordan would make a bad situation worse."[31]

As was the case in the context of the 1958 Jordanian crisis, this twofold American strategy of using "the fear of an Israeli attack [in Jordan] ... as a deterrence [*vis-à-vis* Egypt],"[32] and of simultaneously discouraging Israel from intervening militarily (a course which was expected to "lead to an Arab-Israeli war"),[33] bore fruit. Combined with the dispatch, early in June 1963, of units of the Sixth Fleet toward the Eastern shore of the Mediterranean "in a show of support for King Hussein,"[34] these deterrence measures ultimately helped the Jordanian monarch to weather the storm.

Ultimately, with President Nasser, as President Kennedy observed in his meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson on

May 11, 1963, appearing "sensitive to the possibility of an attack by the Israelis and fully cognizant of the realities of the situation,"[35] the crisis gradually subsided, and the king's control of the West Bank was guaranteed for four additional years (until the outbreak of the Six-Day War of June 1967).

Closely patterned on the 1958 precedent, the April 1963 crisis, which started to unfold within a delimited inter-Arab context, was soon elevated from the dyadic Egyptian–Jordanian framework to the global level, with additional actors (both regional and global) becoming engaged in an intricate deterrence effort *vis-à-vis* Egypt. The apparent success of this effort was soon to reverberate in the American–Israeli zone by accelerating the ongoing process of alliance-building between Washington and Jerusalem. However, whereas the 1958 crisis provided the impetus for completing the process of modifying the administration's perception of Israel, the short-term ramifications of the 1963 crisis were more tangible and concrete. Indeed, while the learning experience of the Eisenhower administration was initially confined to the conceptual level and was not immediately translated into major derivative policies in the American–Israeli zone, the 1963 episode – which took place after the Kennedy administration had already become, in August 1962, an arms supplier to Israel – provided the impetus for further consolidating and intensifying an entire cluster of strategic ties both within the Jordanian–Israeli framework and the American–Israeli dyad.

In the Jordanian–Israeli sphere, the crisis led to the renewal, after a break of twelve years, of operational contacts "in regard to which the Six-Day War [of June 1967] was a mere hiatus."[36] As Dann observes:

> On the Israeli side, the view prevailed that Hashemite Jordan was better than any conceivable alternative and that it might even be made to serve Israel's interests. … Beset with existential dangers as [King Hussein] was, he responded to a favorable atmosphere that did not, after all, demand overt action and that might, moreover, afford him additional protection.[37]

On September 24, 1963, this secret strategic dialogue culminated in a meeting, which took place in London, between King Hussein and Ya'acov Herzog, the Director General of the Prime Minister's Office, and which resulted in an understanding "regarding the division of the Jordan and Yarmuk rivers."[38] The success of the London summit in turn paved the way to additional top-level meetings, including one

which took place in the autumn of 1965 between the Hashemite leader and Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir, which further consolidated the special relationship between Israel and Jordan. Israel was now functioning as an effective bulwark for protecting the king, and thus "as a sort of security shield for the Jordanian Kingdom."[39]

Against this backdrop, the establishment – in the aftermath of the crisis – of a tacit and informal security alliance between Jordan and Israel (which was broken only once, when Jordan – which concluded a military pact with Egypt in May 1967 – joined Egypt in the following month in the war effort against Israel) signaled that Jordan was determined, from then on, to predicate its foreign and defense policy behavior upon the premises of the soft variant of the balancing strategy by relying on Israel as a deterrent against the combined threat of the Palestinian national movement, Egypt and Syria. And while the king would occasionally invoke the threat of defection and bandwagoning in his quest to obtain advanced weapons systems from the US,[40] only once (in June 1967) did he fully accept the logic inherent in the bandwagoning strategy (and had, as a result, to face its repercussions).

Turning to the American–Israeli dyad, it is clear that, just as the 1958 Jordanian crisis had consolidated the image of Israel as an indispensable asset to American and British strategic plans and objectives, so the no less acute threat to the very existence of the Hashemite Kingdom which unfolded in April 1963 can be thought of as the major trigger event that laid the groundwork for the establishment of institutionalized and formal security ties between Washington and Jerusalem. (These would eventually expand beyond their original and delimited Jordanian context.) Specifically, such *ad hoc* forms of strategic cooperation as joint military planning and the exchange of intelligence (especially about Egypt's military capabilities), which were initiated during April 1963 in the highly constrained context of the imminent threat to King Hussein, set new ground rules within the American–Israeli framework and paved the way for the inauguration – on November 13, 1963 – of a comprehensive and formal American–Israeli dialogue on regional security issues.[41] And while the administration remained invariably opposed, both before and during these discussions, to the idea of granting formal security guarantees to Israel, it indicated a willingness to periodically examine, with Israeli representatives, Israel's security situation.[42] It also sought, on numerous occasions, to strengthen and reinforce President Kennedy's security commitment (articulated in the course of his meeting with

Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir on December 27, 1962) by emphasizing the undiminished "American will and intention" to come to Israel's assistance "if [it] were the victim of aggression."[43]

This tight linkage between developments that had initially unfolded within the Jordanian–Egyptian dyad (and within the broader context of Jordan's relations with the Arab League) and developments which unfolded within the American–Israeli framework as a direct result of the changing dynamics of Jordan's relations with its Arab neighbors, continued to be manifested throughout Lyndon B. Johnson's tenure as president. Indeed, during the Johnson era, the evolution of the American–Israeli alliance remained, to a considerable degree, inextricably linked to the Jordanian theater and to a cluster of strategic issues inherent in the Hashemite Kingdom's unending security predicament.

A clear illustration of the impact which the Egyptian–Jordanian dyad had upon the derivative American–Israeli setting concerned the issue of Jordan's arms procurement policy. Specifically, in the spring of 1964, following his participation in the Arab summit that convened in Cairo in January of that year, King Hussein once again became the subject of Egyptian pressure, designed to persuade the Jordanian monarch to turn to the Eastern bloc for military assistance (which would be subsidized by the Unified Arab Command). Fearing that the king might ultimately succumb to this pressure and that – consequently – such advanced Soviet weapons systems as MIG-21 interceptors would indeed "be delivered [to Jordan] either through Egypt or directly from the Soviet Union," and that "the western monopoly on arms [supplies] to Jordan would be broken,"[44] the Johnson administration quickly moved to meet the perceived threat by promising Jordan 36 F-104G interceptors, as well as 50 M-48A (basic) tanks and armored personnel carriers. (The American pledge to sell arms to Jordan was conveyed to King Hussein on April 15, 1964, in the course of his meetings in Washington with President Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.) Convinced that the delivery of Soviet arms to Jordan would vastly increase "Nasser's influence" in the area (thus threatening "King Hussein's regime" as well as Israel's security),[45] President Johnson recognized the need to prevent this defection (and the possible disintegration of Jordan) by providing a comparable alternative to the promised Soviet weaponry. Indeed, unwilling to risk the conclusion of a Soviet–Jordanian arms deal which would be "the beginning of the end of the pro-Western regime in that country," the administration decided to

counter the Soviet MIG-21 offer with its own package of aircraft and tanks despite the fact that its commitment to sell advanced weaponry to Amman amounted to a *de facto* abandonment of "our policy of arms restraint."[46]

On March 1, 1965, this recognition led to the formal conclusion of the American–Jordanian arms deal (based on the American pledge to Jordan of April 15, 1964), which was perceived by the administration as the only means of preventing "the movement of the entire Arab bloc into Nasser's domination"[47] and, more specifically, of guaranteeing that Jordan remained fully committed to its traditional pro-Western posture.

Although it is doubtful whether the Jordanian king – who had withstood so many Egyptian attempts to topple his regime in the course of the 1950s and early 1960s – would have actually agreed in 1964, even in the absence of an American compensation for the Egyptian offer, to readjust Jordan's deeply ingrained, long-standing pro-Western orientation in accordance with President Nasser's preferences, all branches of the Johnson administration, being unwilling to take the risk of a Jordanian defection into the Eastern orbit, were united in seeking to preempt an Egyptian (or a Soviet) arms deal by supporting the supply of American arms to Jordan,[48] The inevitable corollary of this determination to prevent "the defection of the Hashemite Kingdom"[49] from the Western sphere of influence into the Soviet orbit by selling Amman both aircraft and armor, was the administration's decision to compensate Israel (by virtue of providing it with more advanced weaponry than the arms sold to Jordan) as a means of preventing any disruption in the regional balance of power.

Thus, as soon as the decision was made to provide arms to Jordan, the Middle Eastern experts in the NSC (who played a central role in shaping American policy in the region throughout the 1960s) came to fully support the supply of arms to Israel as "a fact of life," and thus as "the only way of … maintaining a decent Arab–Israeli deterrent balance, [which] was essential to forestall another Arab–Israeli clash."[50] The only alternative to this policy, observed Robert Komer, the leading Middle Eastern specialist in the NSC, "was a flat US security guarantee [to Israel] … which would spook the Arabs even more [than the sale of arms to Israel]."[51] Repeatedly insisting that stability in the Middle East required a credible Israeli deterrent of sufficient magnitude, Komer was relentless in his efforts to convince the president of the need to provide Israel with comparable (and

occasionally with more advanced) arms as the unavoidable supplement, or corollary, of the American–Jordanian deal.

This strategic calculus was further reinforced and augmented, in Komer's thinking, by a cluster of domestic political considerations. These evolved around the need to prevent the public outcry and storm of protest at home which would be likely to follow a strictly bilateral arms transaction between Washington and Amman, and thus to protect the administration's domestic flank. And indeed, Komer's belief that "we must give the Israelis some hope on hardware if we want a deal in time to give Hussein his answer"; that "if we sell the planes to Hussein, then we will have to provide them to Israel"; and that, "in the absence of compensatory actions," the Eshkol government "will be compelled to oppose such sales [to Jordan]," ultimately became, in March 1965, the source of the administration's arms sales policy, which was now based upon the premises of symmetry and compensation.[52] As Komer further observed in his message to President Johnson of February 6, 1965:

> ... the minimum needed is a promise to consider favorably Israel's tank and plane requests, subject – of course – to later agreement on type, number, price, delivery schedules and timing of each step in each specific case. ... If we want to prevent Israeli nuclear proliferation yet protect Israel and forestall another conflict, we'll have to provide Israel with its own arms. A sale of arms to Jordan could give us the excuse for selling to Israel too. We could justify this publicly as a response to Soviet moves. ... Since this basic policy reversal on our part (from avoiding sales to making them) is probably inevitable, there's a case for making it now.[53]

And in the words of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who ultimately joined Komer and the Pentagon in supporting the dual sale of arms to Jordan and Israel:

> If we sell to Jordan, there would have to be a compensating sale to Israel. ... To deny arms to Israel will greatly reinforce its tendency to take early preemptive action against the Arabs. It will also reinforce Israel's tendency to go nuclear as its best means of maintaining a deterrent edge. ... On balance, we believe that the risks of turning down the Jordanians are greater than those of selling to both sides.[54]

Thus, in the same way that Komer had envisioned, in 1962, the sale of Hawk missiles to Israel as a confidence-building tool that was capable of moderating its positions on key political and strategic issues (and in particular of enticing the country to adopt a more pragmatic and accommodative posture in the Palestinian sphere), so did the leading Middle Eastern expert in the NSC look upon, during the Johnson era, the supply of tanks and aircraft to Israel (which were more advanced than those promised to Jordan) not only as an inevitable compensation for the sale of American arms to Jordan, but as a crucial means of reassuring Prime Minister Levi Eshkol that the administration remained firmly committed to Israel's security. Such a confidence-building posture was necessary, according to Komer, in order to guarantee that Israel refrained from desperate and militant action in the Arab–Israeli zone and from the development of the nuclear option. Thus, provided with a tangible indication that the administration remained determined to prevent the disruption of the regional balance of power, Israel – according to Komer's thinking – would avoid any recalcitrant and intransigent measures in the aftermath of the sale of arms to Jordan. The supply of arms to Israel was therefore perceived by Komer as a stabilizing mechanism (against the backdrop of the American–Jordanian arms deal), which would "reduce Israel's incentive to go nuclear" by virtue of preserving "a conventional arms balance … between Israel and the Arabs."[55]

The American decision, of March 10, 1965 (which was formally ratified by the Johnson administration on July 29), to sell to the Jewish state 210 M-48A Patton tanks (which, in turn, followed the sale of less advanced American tanks to Jordan) can, therefore, be thought of as the pure and quintessential manifestations of this logic of interconnectedness and tight linkage between the American–Jordanian and the American–Israeli frameworks, with the upgrading of the latter dyad comprising – and not for the last time – the corollary or inevitable by-product of the earlier American decision to sell arms to Jordan. (Throughout its negotiations with the administration, the Israeli government insisted that, since the problem facing Israel was not "of balancing Jordan but of balancing everything around us," it should be provided with "a different," namely, a more advanced, "material" from the US, as the only way to prevent the disruption of the overall balance of military capabilities in the region.)[56] Thus was "the limited sale of arms to Jordan," which was precipitated by "the threat of

Soviet equipment in Jordan," incorporated into a broader context as part of a trilateral trade-off involving the sale of arms to Israel. Perceived as the inevitable corollary of the desire to provide arms to Jordan, the decision "to do the same for Israel"[57] was, therefore, intended to prevent the disruption of the regional balance of military capabilities by "reinforcing the deterrent balance,"[58] while avoiding any erosion in President Johnson's pro-Israeli domestic base of support.

Not only did the March 10, 1965, tanks deal between Washington and Jerusalem (which was augmented – in February 1966 – by the sale of 48 A-4E Skyhawk bombers to Israel as part of a simultaneous trilateral transaction that involved the sale of 34 F-104A interceptors to Jordan) reflect the logic and premises of interconnectedness, but it fully incorporated these premises as an integral part of its provisions by virtue of explicitly committing Israel to avoid any statements or actions against the March 1, 1965, American–Jordanian agreement. And, indeed, in the March 10 agreement, the Eshkol government formally consented to refrain from directly "attacking or undermining" the American–Jordanian deal of March 1, and even promised the administration "to inform [its] friends in the United States that the Jordan arms deal was something that Israel understands why the United States felt compelled to go ahead with."[59]

Here, then, was another quintessential illustration of the logic of interconnectedness and linkage, albeit in a reverse manner – namely, as a constraint upon Israel's margin of maneuverability and as a means of obtaining its acquiescence to the sale of American arms to Jordan.

In the words of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (who – in his meeting with Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban on February 12, 1966, which was set to finalize the terms of the simultaneous sale of planes to Israel and Jordan – was quite outspoken in defining this Israeli commitment to acquiesce as an indispensable part of the American–Jordanian arms deal):

> … we cannot sell planes to Jordan unless we have your support publicly and privately. … We will not deny planes to Jordan if we hear from you that you understand why we should … sell planes to Jordan, and that you will use your good offices, if necessary, with your friends, including your friends in Congress. If we agree, then we can sell you planes …[60]

For all this blunt rhetoric and the administration's insistence on Israel's quiet acquiescence in the face of the new American–Jordanian arms deal, the fact that this demand was made in a strategic context which guaranteed that Israel would be instantly and adequately compensated for the sale of planes to Amman should be neither ignored nor obfuscated. As Robert Komer pointed out in his February 8, 1966, message to President Johnson:

> If we refuse planes to Israel, we can't get away with Jordan's sales without a storm of domestic US protest. But if we deny Hussein's request, he may feel compelled to risk our wrath by caving to the UAR's demands and buy MIGs. ... Thus there is a compelling case for selling planes to Jordan as well as to Israel. ... As with the tanks last year, if we sell [planes] to one, the same logic suggests that we sell to both.[61]

And indeed, on February 22, 1966, the simultaneous sale of 48 A-4E Skyhawk bombers to Israel and thirty-four F-104A interceptors to Jordan – the supplement to the March 1965 sale of tanks to Jerusalem and Amman – was finalized. Once again it was Robert Komer who emerged victorious from the intragovernmental bargaining over American arms sales policy in the Middle East, with his unwavering conviction concerning the need to accompany any arms deal with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan with the sale of more advanced weaponry to Israel becoming the source of the official American posture, thus leading directly and inevitably to the upgrading of the strategic dimension in the American–Israeli proliferating partnership.

Similarly, when the Johnson administration decided, in early 1967, to sell to Jordan five additional F-104A interceptors, it quickly moved to compensate Israel (and thus avoid a fierce domestic political battle over Israel's security) by agreeing to advance the delivery schedule of the 48 A-4E Skyhawk bombers that were sold to Israel in February 1966. Once again, then, the logic of interconnectedness was fully recognized by the Johnson presidency, whose decision-makers remained keenly aware of the need to accompany any sale of arms to Amman with a reciprocal move *vis-à-vis* Israel.

Another illustration of the same pattern of interconnectedness became apparent in 1968. Although, in this episode, the linkage between the additional Jordanian request – which was submitted to the administration in January of that year (and approved, in its final form, in October) – for the sale of 18 F-104A interceptors and the

American decision (made in November, after the Jordanian request had been approved) to sell Israel 50 F-4 Phantom fighter bombers was on the whole less compelling than was the case during 1964–6, the timing of the Phantom decision was clearly affected by the administration's eagerness to supply Jordan with the requested aircraft while at the same time minimizing the domestic repercussions of the transaction (especially on Capitol Hill) by providing Israel with instant compensation of sufficient magnitude. (In the Phantom negotiations, the administration attempted – without success – to use the planes as a vehicle for softening the Israeli peace posture in the Jordanian theater.)[62] In Levey's words:

> The US decision to arm Jordan in order to prevent a Soviet entry into that country had brought it to compensate Israel with offensive weapons that Washington had wanted to withhold for a much longer period. The desire of the United States both before and after the Six Day War to support Hussein and ensure the future of Jordan as a pro-Western element in the region had brought about a major change in its Middle East arms policy.[63]

It is therefore clear that, in the same way that, in 1964, King Hussein's arms request was coupled with his threat (which, in turn, was closely patterned on the logic of the blackmail bargaining strategy)[64] to seek comparable Soviet weaponry unless the administration agreed to supply him with the requested package, so did the Jordanian monarch, in January 1968, state that, unless his "legitimate arms requirements" were met by the Johnson administration, he would turn to Moscow for the desired weaponry. In an effort to add credibility to his threat of defection, the king told Harrison M. Symmes, the American Ambassador in Amman, that he had already "invited a Soviet military mission" in order to discuss the terms of the transaction (in view of the American decision to accept the Jordanian request, the visit never took place).[65]

Furthermore, as was the case with the earlier transaction, the king's threat "to stay a step ahead of the situation by moving toward the Soviets"[66] was perceived as credible in Washington in 1968, leading both the Department of State and the Pentagon to advocate the sale of the requested weapons systems to Amman. In Secretary Rusk's words, "given our traditional close relationship with Jordan, Hussein's demise or his acceptance of Soviet arms would be a serious blow to US prestige and interests in the area and would be interpreted

as a significant Soviet victory."[67] And as a special national intelligence estimate, drafted on April 18, 1968, asserted, "Hussein has consistently refused to accept Soviet arms but would almost certainly accede if he felt it necessary to enable him to remain in power. A Soviet arms deal would be popular with the military and the public at large."[68]

In this recurrent interconnected context, it was the renewed Palestinian challenge to the Hashemite Kingdom, which originated in the establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964, that came to increasingly affect (particularly after the Jordanian–Palestinian crisis of June 1966) both the Jordanian–Israeli dyad and the American–Israeli framework.[69]

With the threat to the monarchy in Amman becoming most acute (during the September 1970 crisis), both Jordan and Israel moved to strengthen and operationalize their balancing partnership *vis-à-vis* the PLO, Egypt and Syria. The level of military coordination between Jerusalem and Amman reached a new and unprecedented height in the summer of 1970, when Israel provided the Royal Jordanian Army with detailed intelligence concerning the size, deployment and movement of the invading Syrian forces.

And while the web of strategic ties between Washington and Jerusalem eventually became at least partially decoupled from the Jordanian theater and, assuming a life of its own, continued to develop and expand in an essentially bilateral and symmetrical context, the later dynamics of this evolution should by no means obscure the fact that it was the Jordanian context which provided the initial impetus and springboard for predicating American–Israeli relations upon the premises of congruence and compatibility. In other words, the fact that – particularly after 1970 – the American–Israeli alliance surpassed the delimited and constrained parameters of the Jordanian security predicament (within which it was originally shaped and delineated), and far exceeded the degree of cooperation that the Jordanian theater had initially engendered, should not obfuscate or downgrade the role which this conundrum played in laying both the perceptual and, later, the operational groundwork for the establishment of a special strategic relationship between Washington and Jerusalem.[70]

Indeed, by virtue of comprising the filter, or lens, through which the entire Middle Eastern strategic landscape came to be perceived by the architects of American diplomacy, the Jordanian zone (and the threats it periodically produced to the continued existence of the Hashemite Kingdom) set in motion a process of frame change and attitude change toward Israel, which was inextricably linked – at least

in its initial and formative phases – to the role which the Israeli government was called upon to play in protecting the besieged and embattled Hashemite Kingdom. That this "protecting function" later became decoupled from its original context and incorporated into a revised agenda as one facet or component within a comprehensive and proliferating network of bilateral strategic interactions should not, therefore, obfuscate, obscure or minimize the role which this function played in establishing the initial and formative infrastructure of the American–Israeli alliance.

5 The alliance in full bloom

The September 1970 Jordanian crisis as a watershed

As we have witnessed in the preceding chapters, the origins of the American–Israeli alliance were not inherent – as is widely believed – in the institutional manifestations of the special relationship paradigm. Nor did the partnership originate in the basic premises of this paradigm, which underscore the fundamental similarity – in terms of certain cultural, ideological, historical and social attributes – between the two societies and political systems. Thus, while factors that were closely patterned on this orientation (whether institutional or amorphous) did help to further solidify and strengthen the bond between Washington and Jerusalem, particularly after 1967, they merely reinforced, or accelerated, a process which had been initially predicated upon a cluster of quintessential strategic premises and components. Not only did the alliance reflect the growing strategic convergence between the US and Israel – which became evident in the late 1950s – but its original roots lay outside the dyadic parameters of this relationship.

It was the growing Egyptian (as well as Syrian and Palestinian) threat to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan – manifested in a series of crises in the second half of the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s – which came to profoundly affect the American–Israeli framework (as well as the Jordanian–Israeli dyad) by virtue of demonstrating to the architects of American Middle Eastern policy Israel's strategic value as the only regional entity (particularly after the Iraqi revolution of July 1958) that was prepared to assist the West in its quest to balance Egypt's hegemonic drive in the region (and in the process to thwart President Nasser's repeated efforts to engineer a regime change in Amman). Indeed, it was this cumulative learning experience – based upon the lessons drawn by the Eisenhower (and later the Kennedy) administration concerning the role that Israel played in defending the

besieged and threatened King Hussein in successive crises – which laid the conceptual groundwork for the establishment of the American–Israeli alliance. Closely patterned on processes and developments which had initially unfolded in the Egyptian–Jordanian (and the Syrian–Jordanian) context, this strategic partnership later surpassed and transcended its delimited and constrained *raison d'être*, and thus assumed a life of its own that was no longer confined or invariably linked to the Jordanian theater (and which incorporated a new complex of ideological components to augment its strategic core).

Notwithstanding the fact that the post-1967 period witnessed an accelerated process of consolidation, expansion and institutionalization of the American–Israeli alliance, its Jordanian facet continued to provide, at certain crucial junctures, the direct and immediate (and, on occasion, a most dramatic) impetus for upgrading and expanding the relationship. Thus although, during the years which immediately followed the Arab–Israeli war of June 1967, the Jordanian theater ceased to be the only springboard or precipitant for further solidifying the American–Israeli alliance (on either the perceptual or the operational level), it would still resurface from time to time onto the scene as a powerful precursor and prelude to a new, and more collaborative, phase in the special strategic relationship along the American–Israeli axis by virtue of comprising the filter, or prism, through which Israel's usefulness in protecting American interests in the region could be most clearly and repeatedly elucidated.

A clear and formative illustration of this renewed pattern originated in a most acute and imminent threat to the Hashemite Kingdom (initiated by Syria and by Palestinian military groups), which led the Nixon administration and the Golda Meir government to embark upon new and unprecedented forms of security cooperation – strategic as well as tactical – for the sake of compelling Syria (which, on September 18, 1970, had launched, together with units of the Palestine Liberation Army, a massive invasion of Jordan) into withdrawing its troops from the occupied Irbid area. Indeed, it was against the backdrop of this renewed menace to the Hashemite monarchy (following King Hussein's successful military drive to uproot the PLO strongholds in Jordan), which culminated in the armored Syrian invasion of September 18, that the dynamics of what had originally been an intrinsically inter-Arab conflagration came to spill over and profoundly affect the American–Israeli framework by prompting the two external allies to pursue a fully coordinated balancing strategy *vis-à-vis* Syria.

The crisis itself developed as a result of the growing tension between King Hussein and several Palestinian groups and factions which sought to use Jordan as a base and a staging area. The Hashemite monarch narrowly escaped two assassination attempts (in June and in early September 1970). On September 6, 1970, this Jordanian–Palestinian friction further escalated with the simultaneous hijacking of three Western airliners by members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). After two of the aircraft were blown up on the outskirts of Amman (with most of the hostages released), the Jordanian king decided to crack down on the military Palestinian presence on Jordanian soil, and it was his determined and successful onslaught against the defiant Palestinian factions in and around Amman which precipitated the Syrian intervention of September 18 in the Jordanian civil war.[1]

Seeking to prevent the imminent collapse of the Hashemite Kingdom and the disruption of the regional balance of power, the two parties quickly moved to upgrade the level of their bilateral strategic cooperation by inaugurating such measures as joint contingency planning, extensive and real-time intelligence-sharing, and, with full American support, the pursuit – on the part of the IDF (Israel's Defense Forces) – of a strong deterrence (and later coercive) strategy on the Israeli–Syrian border along the Golan Heights.[2]

With the reinforcement of the US naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean, the IDF started, on September 18, a massive and ostentatious mobilization drive (which included 400 tanks and two armored brigades) on the Golan Heights, which threatened the flank of the Syrian forces in Jordan and thus added credibility to the spate of earlier Israeli threats to intervene militarily in the war unless Syria started immediately to withdraw its troops from the Irbid area. (The fact that the Marines deployed with the Sixth Fleet lacked adequate helicopter transport, and that the transport of American troops to the region was expected to be slow and cumbersome, made the Israeli reinforcement all the more significant, since the administration lacked an immediate and adequate military option.) And while the Syrian decision to comply with the plethora of American–Israeli threats and begin, on September 22, to disengage from the Jordanian front may have also been influenced by a cluster of quintessential domestic considerations and constraints, the official American thinking attributed the disengagement largely to the Israeli pursuit of a strong deterrence posture *vis-à-vis* Damascus. This was further reinforced by a spate of strong and unequivocal American statements which warned the Soviet

Union that, unless its Syrian partner stopped its invasion of Jordan, Israel would launch both ground and air action against the Syrian forces.[3]

Unlike previous instances, in which both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations used the threat of Israeli intervention in Jordan merely as an effective deterrence weapon *vis-à-vis* Egypt and Syria without actually supporting the implementation of this option, in September 1970 President Nixon became fully supportive – at the height of the crisis – of this interventionist course on the part of Israel as the optimal way of preventing the imminent collapse of the Hashemite Kingdom. (The success of the Jordanian counteroffensive in the war, and the subsequent Syrian decision to withdraw its troops from Jordan, relieved Israel of the need to confront the Syrian army.) This posture, in turn, was fully consistent with the spirit of the "Nixon Doctrine," which had been predicated upon the notion that local allies of the American superpower, rather than American troops, should carry the main burden of confronting and challenging Soviet proxies in third-area crises and conflagrations, and was thus adopted by the president in the immediate aftermath of the Syrian invasion as a less risky course (in terms of its potential to escalate into an eventual superpower confrontation) than a direct American intervention.[4]

Indeed, despite the fact that, at the end of the day, Israel was not called upon to carry out its intervention threat, its role in the crisis was fully acknowledged by President Nixon who, on September 24, 1970, in a personal message to Prime Minister Meir, expressed his belief that "the steps Israel took [during the crisis] contributed measurably to [the Syrian] withdrawal. We appreciate the prompt and positive Israeli response to our approach."[5] On the following day, in an oral message to the Israeli prime minister (transmitted through Yitzhak Rabin, Israeli Ambassador in Washington), which was designed to further reinforce his written message, President Nixon was even more effusive in promising "never to forget Israel's role in preventing the deterioration in Jordan and in blocking the attempt to overturn the regime there," adding that "the United States [was] fortunate to have an ally like Israel in the Middle East."[6]

Clearly, during the period immediately following the crisis, President Nixon became predisposed to look upon Israel "in much the same way as his predecessor Lyndon Johnson had – as a strategic ally and pillar of democracy in the region."[7] And, although the specific strategic and political context in which the 1970 crisis unfolded was fundamentally different from the regional setting in which the 1958

crisis took place, President Nixon's lavish rhetoric and warm appreciation for the role Israel played during the violent confrontation in September 1970 were very similar, in both tone and substance, to the words of praise of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles who, in the aftermath of the 1958 crisis, were quite uninhibited in recognizing the Israeli contribution to the success of Operation Fortitude. In both crises, it was through the Jordanian lens, namely, through the filter of the threat to the very existence of the Hashemite Kingdom (which, in 1970, materialized in the form of a massive Syrian invasion), that Israel's value to American regional interests became fully manifested and evident in Washington.

Coming in the wake of a whole sequence of crisis episodes, which repeatedly witnessed Israel as a potential defender and actual supporter of the besieged Hashemite Kingdom, the dramatic events of September 1970 therefore helped to further consolidate and reinforce, in the thinking of President Richard Nixon and his National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, the vision of Israel as a reliable and most valuable strategic asset to American interests. As we shall soon demonstrate, it is this vision – unlike the situation which had existed during President Eisenhower's last 30 months in office – which, during the period following the crisis, would become the source of certain derivative, fully compatible policy decisions toward Israel, and would, in turn, directly lead to the further expansion and intensification of the American–Israeli partnership. As Dowty points out:

> Nixon and Kissinger did … come out of the crisis with a new appreciation of Israel's willingness and capability to act on the behalf of common American and Israeli interests in the Middle East. The availability of Israeli forces, when the adequacy of US military capability was questionable, put new light on Israel's potential as a strategic asset.[8]

Not only did the September 1970 Jordanian crisis quickly become a major prism, or screen, through which Israel's role as a strategic asset to the US came to be assessed and appreciated during the period immediately following the tumultuous events of "Black September" (thus providing yet another impetus for upgrading the relationship), but it also helped to further consolidate and strengthen the partnership between Amman and Jerusalem, which has now become a fully operational alliance.

Faced with the same adversaries (namely, Syria, Egypt and the

PLO), King Hussein and members of the Israeli political leadership, throughout the crisis, engaged in direct, top-level operational discussions, which included the exploration of the possibility of an Israeli air or ground intervention in the face of the Syrian attack. However, whereas King Hussein became fully supportive, on the morning of September 20 (48 hours after the Syrian invasion of Jordan had begun), of an Israeli air strike against the invading Syrian army (requesting, on two occasions on September 20, "an Israeli air intervention"), he remained highly reserved and skeptical (unlike President Nixon and National Security Adviser Kissinger) in his attitude toward the more comprehensive and far-reaching intervention option, namely, the deployment of Israeli ground forces into Jordan. Fearing that such a move would further alienate Jordan across the Arab world, the king viewed this contingency as a last resort, to be implemented only against the backdrop of a most acute and imminent threat to his throne (the Israeli leadership, and particularly Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan, were equally unenthusiastic in their attitude toward this scenario).[9]

On the whole, motivated by a desire to balance and contain the same regional forces that continually sought to challenge both the Hashemite Kingdom and Israel (and which, in September 1970, escalated their efforts to bring about a regime change in Amman), Israel and Jordan – operating in the shadow of a most acute and imminent threat to King Hussein's regime – opted, in September 1970, to upgrade their security ties and thus to convert what had been a loose and soft balancing partnership into an operational, explicit and hard alliance. This included the supply, by Israel, of military intelligence to King Hussein about the size, deployment and movement of the Syrian forces in Jordan.

It is against the backdrop of these intensive and operational contacts (which further reinforced the comprehensive political and strategic dialogue that took place secretly in London between May 4 and May 16, 1968, between King Hussein and General Amer Khammash, the Chief-of-Staff of the Royal Jordanian Army, on the one hand, and Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban and Haim Barlev, the Israeli Chief-of-Staff, on the other),[10] combined with the strong Israeli effort to coerce Syria into retreat and disengagement from Jordan, that King Hussein's decision to provide Israel – three years later – with conclusive and unequivocal warning of the impending Syrian (and Egyptian) military offensive across the Israeli border should be at least partially (or even marginally) understood. Fearing that the joint Syrian–

Egyptian war initiative might spill over to the West Bank and precipitate a violent Palestinian uprising against his regime, the Hashemite king embarked, on September 26, 1973, upon his secret mission to Israel in a last-ditch effort to convince the highly skeptical and complacent Israeli leadership of the imminent threat.[11]

Fully committed to the basic premises of either the hard or the soft variant of his balancing strategy (from which he deviated on two occasions only, namely, in 1956 and 1967), the king may have been influenced, in his decision to warn Israel personally of the impending Syrian–Egyptian attack, by the lessons he drew from the 1970 crisis concerning the Israeli determination to prevent – by political, strategic or military means if necessary – the violent collapse of his Hashemite monarchy. Believing that the key to the preservation of his throne lay – as became abundantly clear in 1970 – in the effective pursuit (by Jordan, Israel and the US) of an uncompromising balancing strategy *vis-à-vis* Jordan's traditional adversaries, King Hussein may also have been motivated, in deciding to embark on his September 26 initiative, by his desire to reciprocate and thus return Israel the favor for having contributed, three years earlier, to the effort to save his beleaguered regime from destruction and oblivion. The fact that, in doing so, the Jordanian king opted *de facto* to deviate from the basic premises of the minimalistic "tethering" model of collaborate behavior which had guided his balancing conduct for more than a decade is, of course, a different matter. This can be attributed to the severity of the challenge he was forced to meet in September 1970 and to the lessons and inferences which he drew from this encounter.

If one proceeds beyond the intrinsic context of the king's warning of September 26, 1973, it is clear that the decades which followed the 1970 crisis further reinforced, by and large, Hussein's strategic decision to back away from the Arab camp and solidify his ties with the West and Israel.[12] As Haddad and Hardy point out,

> Like his grandfather, Hussein thought that the Israelis could help him defeat the Palestinian threat to his regime. This decision was especially helpful in 1970, when the Israelis came to his aid by warning that Syrian intervention in the Palestinian–Jordanian civil war would lead to their intervention.[13]

The September 1970 Jordanian crisis was the last major external precipitant to profoundly affect the American–Israeli framework. Indeed, what was inaugurated during the second half of the 1950s as

a modest, highly constrained and unobtrusive by-product and extension of processes that had originated outside this dyad, gradually assumed an intrinsic active and expanding core, which was no longer subordinated or conditioned by the dynamics of certain exogenous bilateral relationships, but came to assume an intrinsic life of its own. It is against the backdrop of this ongoing transformation of the American–Israeli alliance, from its initial phase of being merely the corollary of certain external processes into a viable and autonomous framework incorporating a broad cluster of endogenous attributes, that the violent events of September 1970 in the Jordanian sphere should be approached.

By dramatically underscoring and accentuating Israel's traditional role in protecting the chronically besieged Hashemite Kingdom, the 1970 Jordanian crisis – by virtue of its magnitude and severity (and by virtue of reinforcing the lessons of the 1957, 1958 and 1963 crisis episodes) – provided Washington's high-policy elite with yet another, and a most conclusive, proof of Israel's strategic value to the West. In Spiegel's words:

> The crisis reinforced the close working relationship between [National Security Adviser Henry] Kissinger and [Israeli Ambassador in Washington Yitzhak] Rabin and the mutual respect between [President Richard] Nixon and [Prime Minister Golda] Meir. Israel's supporters and opponents now saw a White House more sympathetic to Israeli aid requests and arguments.[14]

Against this backdrop, with the crisis providing the platform and opportunity for Israel to demonstrate so dramatically its unwavering commitment to the defense of its Eastern neighbor, regardless of the costs required, there was no longer any need for additional proof of Israel's value as a pivotal and crucial link in the relentless American effort – during the years and decades that followed September 1970 – to balance, contain and restrain the recalcitrant forces of militancy, radicalism and fundamentalism across the Arab–Israeli front and their Soviet patron. The alliance could thus develop and further expand, from then on, on its own and intrinsic merits and without being dependent any longer upon its regional landscape for ironclad proof of its continued viability and value.

The upsurge in American aid to Israel after 1970 (particularly military sales and long-term arms commitments), and the provision of a broad range of economic inducements and security commitments

(including those embedded in the 1971 and 1972 American–Israeli Memoranda of Understanding), were some of the most salient and significant landmarks along this process of expansion, intensification and consolidation of the strategic partnership between Washington and Jerusalem in the aftermath of the September 1970 crisis.[15] All of these measures augmented, and further reinforced, the president's decisions – which were made during the crisis – to authorize $500 million in military aid to Israel, and to speed up the shipment to the country of eighteen F-4 Phantom fighter bombers.[16]

Similarly, the Israeli–Jordanian strategic partnership, which in its formative phases had remained inextricably linked to developments along the American–Israeli axis, could now assume a life of its own and further expand in subsequent decades without being subordinated to, or dependent any longer upon the dynamics in other frameworks, regional or global, until its culmination – in 1994 – in a formal and comprehensive peace treaty.

In conclusion, whereas the 1958 Jordanian crisis can be viewed as the first major step in the process of alliance-formation within the American–Israeli framework, which had initially originated outside the bounds of this dyad, the tumultuous events of September 1970 can be thought of as the culmination and completion of this process – a process that made, from its very inception, the evolution of the strategic American–Israeli partnership contingent upon developments whose origin was dyadic.[17] Not only were the sources of the alliance inherent in unmitigated, quintessential strategic calculations and considerations, but this strategic logic unfolded initially in other dyads. Stated differently, not only were the factors that laid the groundwork for the establishment of this partnership unrelated to any component of the special relationship paradigm, but the strategic core of the alliance was formed as a by-product of strategic changes that had initially unfolded in other dyads. That this by-product, which spun off other relationships, later became, after the 1970 Jordanian crisis had faded into the background, the new and intrinsic core of a multidimensional and proliferating partnership that assumed a life of its own without being subordinated any longer to developments that unfolded in other frameworks is, of course, quite a different matter, which should by no means obscure the sources and original nature of the American–Israeli alliance.

Notes

1 The origins of the American–Israeli alliance

1 Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' words of June 1, 1953, quoted in P. L. Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945–1956*, p. 159. On the general debate between proponents of structural-realist and constructionist theories of international behavior, see, for example, A. Wendt, "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 2, spring 1992, 422–5; A. Wendt, "Constructing international politics," *International Security* 20, no. 1, summer 1995, 71–81; A. Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*; E. Adler and M. Barnett (eds), *Security Communities*; C. L. Glaser, "Realists as optimists: cooperation as self-help," *International Security* 19, no. 3, winter 1994–5, 53–6; J. Mearsheimer, "The false promise of international institutions," *International Security* 19, no. 3, winter 1994–5, 9–11; J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. For an analysis of the origins of the American–Israeli alliance in terms of both cognitive and organizational factors, see R. N. Barnett, "Identity and alliances in the Middle East," in P. J. Katzenstein (ed.), *The Culture of National Security*, pp. 400–47.

2 W. J. Burns, *Economic Aid and American Policy toward Egypt, 1955–1981*, p. 21.

3 A. Ben-Zvi, *John F. Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 1–2; A. Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, pp. 80–96.

4 A. Ben-Zvi, "Influence and arms: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and the politics of arms sales to Israel, 1962–66," *Israel Affairs* 10, nos. 1–2, autumn–winter 2004, 30.

5 See, in this connection, R. Jervis, *System Effects*, pp. 17–34. See also G. H. Snyder, *Alliance Politics*, p. 53.

6 Jervis, *System Effects*, p. 29.

7 Ibid., p. 33. See also R. Jervis, "System and interaction effects," in J. Snyder and R. Jervis (eds), *Coping with Complexity in the International System*, p. 33; G. D. Miller, "Hypotheses on reputation: alliance choices and the shadow of the past," *Security Studies* 12, no. 3, spring 2003, 52; S. M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, pp. 33–40. For a similar analysis of interconnectedness, albeit in a different context, see R. N. Lebow, *Between Peace and War*, pp. 41–56.

8 See, in this connection, Jervis, "System and interaction effects," pp. 33–4.
9 For analyses of these balancing dynamics and their sources, see Miller, "Hypotheses on reputation," p. 52; L. Fawcett, "Alliances, cooperation and regionalism in the Middle East," in L. Fawcett (ed.), *International Relations of the Middle East*; R. J. Harknett and J. A. Van Den Berg, "Alignment theory and interrelated threats: Jordan and the Persian Gulf crisis," *Security Studies* 6, no. 3, spring 1997, 133; D. Reiter, "Learning, realism, and alliances: the weight of the shadow of the past," *World Politics* 46, no. 4, July 1994, 500–01; J. S. Levy and W. R. Thompson, "Hegemonic threats and great-power balancing in Europe, 1495–1999," *Security Studies* 14, no. 1, January 2005, 3–4.
10 Ben-Zvi, "Influence and arms," pp. 42–52.
11 K. Mueller, "Patterns of alliance: alignment balancing and stability in Eastern Europe," *Security Studies* 5, no. 1, autumn 1995, 50–53; Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, pp. 234–333; S. M. Walt, *Taming American Power*, pp. 120–21.
12 For an analysis of the tethering strategy and its premises, see P. A. Weitsman, *Dangerous Alliances*, pp. 17–24. See also Reiter, "Learning, realism, and alliances," pp. 503–4; Walt, *Taming American Power*, p. 126.
13 For an analysis of the "buck-passing" strategy and its premises, see M. L. Haas, "Ideology and alliances: British and French external balancing decisions in the 1930s," *Security Studies* 12, no. 4, summer 2003, 38; D. Reiter, *Crucible of Beliefs*, pp. 41–54; Reiter, "Learning, realism, and alliances," p. 500; Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, pp. 267–72; G. G. Lee, "'I see dead people': air-raid phobia and Britain's behavior in the Munich crisis," *Security Studies* 13, no. 2, winter 2003–4, p. 233.
14 The notion of "soft balancing" is explored in R. A. Pape, "Soft balancing against the United States," *International Security* 30, no. 1, summer 2005, 10; T. V. Paul, "Soft balancing in the age of US primacy," *International Security* 30, no. 1, summer 2005, 47; Lee, "'I see dead people,'" p. 233.
15 This analysis is based on Jervis, *System Effects*, p. 214.

2 The road to the July 1958 Jordanian crisis

1 A. Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, pp. 26–7; G. Aronson, *From Sideshow to Centerstage*, pp. 96–124; U. Bialer, *Between East and West*, p. 265; P. L. Hahn, "National security concerns in US policy toward Egypt, 1949–56," in D. W. Lesch (ed.), *The Middle East and the United States*, p. 94; P. L. Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 148.
2 D. D. Eisenhower, *The White House Years*, p. 25.
3 Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, pp. 148–9. See also S. L. Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 56.
4 Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, pp. 149–51. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, pp. 27–8; G. Lenczowski, *American Presidents and the Middle East*, p. 46.

5 D. Little, *American Orientalism*, pp. 88–9; See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 151; Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, pp. 28–9.
6 Dulles' remarks of May 11, 1953, quoted by A. Ben-Zvi, in *The United States and Israel*, pp. 31–2.
7 Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 57.
8 Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 29. See also A. Shlaim, "Israel between East and West, 1948–56," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 36, no. 4, November 2004, 658–9; Bialer, *Between East and West*, p. 261.
9 T. Kollek, *For Jerusalem*, p. 97. See also Bialer, *Between East and West*, p. 261; Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 30; Ben-Zvi, *John F. Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 8–9; Shlaim, "Israel Between East and West," pp. 663–4.
10 Dulles' remarks of April 10, 1956, to a group of Congressional leaders, quoted by Ben-Zvi, in *Decade of Transition*, p. 31.
11 Quoted from the interview recorded on May 28, 1964, with Abba Eban, then Israeli Deputy Prime Minister. Princeton University, Seeley Mudd Manuscript Library (hereafter SMML), Dulles Oral History Project, *John Foster Dulles Papers*: 17.
12 Dulles' remarks of January 11, 1956, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with President Eisenhower. SMML, *Dulles Papers*, Box 10, "Subject Series" folder: 3.
13 Secretary Dulles' remarks of May 14, 1953, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereafter *FRUS*), *1952–1954*, 9: *The Near and Middle East*, Part I, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1986, p. 39.
14 Ibid., pp. 39–40. See also I. L. Kenen, *Israel's Defense Line*, p. 105.
15 Remarks of Henry A. Byroade, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation on April 8, 1953, with Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett. *FRUS, 1952–1954*, 9: Part I: 1166–7. See also I. Alteras, *Eisenhower and Israel*, p. 90.
16 Dulles' remarks, quoted from the memorandum of the conversation which took place on May 11, 1953, at the American Embassy in Cairo. *FRUS, 1952–1954*, 9: Part I: 130.
17 Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 153. See also Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt*, pp. 200–06.
18 Eisenhower's words, quoted from his diary entry of March 13, 1956, by Hahn, in *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt*, p. 200.
19 For an analysis of the process of frame change in the context of the 1938 Munich Crisis, see B. Farnham, "Roosevelt and the Munich crisis: insights from prospect theory," *Political Psychology* 13, no. 2, June 1992, pp. 205–35.
20 M. B. Oren, "A winter of discontent: Britain's crisis in Jordan, December 1955–March 1956," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 22, 1990, 177. For an analysis which views challenges to the ruling elite in the Third World as largely internal, see S. R. David, "Explaining Third World alignment," *World Politics* 43, no. 2, January 1991, 235–6. See

also, in this connection, D. Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer? The United States, King Hussein, and Jordan, 1953–70," *International History Review* 17, no. 3, 1995, 520–21; D. Schoenbaum, *The United States and the State of Israel*, p. 112.

21 For an analysis of the bandwagoning and balancing strategies, see, for example, D. Reiter, "Learning, realism, and alliances: the weight of the shadow of the past," *World Politics* 46, no. 4, July 1994, 500–01; P. A. Weitsman, "Alliance cohesion and coalition warfare," *Security Studies* 12, no. 3, spring 2003, 83; R. A. Pape, "Soft balancing against the United States," *International Security* 30, no. 1, summer 2005, 10; T. V. Paul, "Soft balancing in the age of US primacy," *International Security* 30, no. 1, summer 2005, 47; S. G. Brooks and W. Wohlforth, "Hard times for soft balancing," *International Security* 30, no. 1, summer 2005, 71–4; P. A. Weitsman, *Dangerous Alliances*, pp. 11–37; R. L. Schweller, "Bandwagoning for profit: bringing the revisionist state back in," *International Security* 19, no. 1, summer 1994, 72–107; S. M. Walt, "Alliance formation and the balance of world power," in M. E. Brown, S. M. Lynn-Jones and S. E. Miller (eds), *The Perils of Anarchy*, pp. 211–13; S. M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, pp. 19–21; R. Kaufman, "To balance or to bandwagon? Alignment decisions in 1930s Europe," *Security Studies* 1, no. 3, spring 1992, 417–47; S. Cooper, "State-centric balance of threat theory: explaining the misunderstood Gulf Cooperation Council," *Security Studies* 13, no. 2, winter 2003–4, 318–19.

22 L. Tal, "Britain and the Jordan crisis of 1958," *Middle Eastern Studies* 1, no. 2, January 1995, 39. See also Oren, "A winter of discontent," p. 179; I. Pappé, "The state and the tribe: Egypt and Jordan, 1948–88," in J. Nevo and I. Pappé (eds), *Jordan in the Middle East*, pp. 171–2; E. Shuckburgh, *Descent to Suez*, pp. 340–43; U. Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, pp. 43–4. On the American perspective and immediate reaction to the dismissal of John Glubb, see the telegram which was sent on March 16, 1957, by Lester D. Mallory, the American Ambassador in Jordan, to the Department of State. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: *Near East: Jordan–Yemen*, 32.

23 F. G. Gause III, "Balancing what? Threat perception and alliance choice in the Gulf," *Security Studies* 13, no. 2, winter 2003–4, 281; Cooper, "State-centric balance of threat theory," p. 318; Snyder, *Alliance Politics*, pp. 158–61.

24 Pappé, "The state and the tribe," p. 172. See also Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, pp. 47–50; Dann, *King Hussein's Strategy of Survival*, pp. 13–14.

25 Little, *American Orientalism*, p. 93.

26 Pappé, "The state and the tribe," p. 172; Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 236.

27 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, pp. 51–2; Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 236; Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 524.

28 Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 524; O. Almog, *Britain, Israel and the United States, 1955–1958*, p. 145.

29 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 58.

30 R. B. Parker, "The United States and King Hussein," in D. W. Lesch (ed.), *The Middle East and the United States*, pp. 108–9. See also Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, pp. 59–61.
31 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 60. On the theoretical implications of this, see Reiter, "Learning, realism, and alliances," pp. 500–02; David, "Explaining Third World alignment," pp. 251–3.
32 Pappé, "The state and the tribe," p. 173.
33 Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 525. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 67; Parker, "The United States and King Hussein," pp. 109–10; Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 236; B. I. Kaufman, *The Arab Middle East and the United States*, p. 27.
34 Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 525.
35 Parker, "The United States and King Hussein," p. 109; Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 67; Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 65; R. B. Satloff, "The Jekyll-and-Hyde origins of the US–Jordanian strategic relationship," in D. W. Lesch (ed.), *The Middle East and the United States*, pp. 120–21.
36 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 65. See also Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 525; Satloff, "The Jekyll-and-Hyde origins," p. 121.
37 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 65; Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, pp. 236–7; A. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, pp. 226–34.
38 Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 525.
39 Ibid. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 236; Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, pp. 68–9.
40 Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 525; Satloff, "The Jekyll-and-Hyde origins," p. 122.
41 Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 237; Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, p. 70.
42 Quoted by Ben-Zvi, in *Decade of Transition*, p. 71. See also Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" pp. 523–5.
43 Dulles' remarks of April 24, 1957, to Eban, quoted from the memorandum of their conversation. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: 104. Emphasis added.
44 Ibid.: 104–5.
45 Quoted from a telegram which was sent on April 25, 1957, by the Department of State to the American Embassy in Riyadh (Saudi Arabia). Ibid.: 111.
46 Quoted from a telegram which was sent on April 25, 1957, by the Department of State to the American Embassy in Beirut. Ibid.: 114.
47 Acting Secretary of State Christian A. Herter's remarks of May 2, 1957, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Eban. Ibid.: 118.
48 Satloff, "The Jekyll-and-Hyde origins," p. 122.
49 Quoted from a telegram which was sent on April 26, 1957, from the American Embassy in Tel Aviv to the Department of State. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: 116.

50 Herter's remarks of May 2, 1957, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Eban. Ibid.: 119. See also Satloff, "The Jekyll-and-Hyde origins," p. 122.
51 Quoted from a memorandum entitled "Military assistance to Jordan," which was sent on June 7, 1957, by William M. Rountree, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, to Secretary Dulles. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: 136.
52 Ibid.
53 In August 1957, the administration decided to grant export licenses for certain spare parts of military equipment to Israel. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: *Arab–Israeli Dispute*: 712–13.
54 President Eisenhower's words, quoted from his message of April 25, 1957, to Lebanon's President, Camille Chamoun. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: 114. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 71.
55 Dulles' words, from a memorandum which he prepared for the president on August 20, 1957, quoted by Little, in *American Orientalism*, p. 133.
56 D. W. Lesch, "The 1957 American–Syrian crisis: globalist policy in a regional reality," in *The Middle East and the United States*, pp. 131–2. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 227.
57 Dulles' press release of September 7, 1957, quoted by A. L. George and R. Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, p. 334. See also Little, *American Orientalism*, p. 133; P. L. Hahn, *Crisis and Crossfire*, p. 43.
58 Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 69.
59 Ibid.; Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 86; Lesch, "The 1957 American–Syrian crisis," pp. 133–4; Little, *American Orientalism*, pp. 133–4.
60 Lesch, "The 1957 American–Syrian crisis," p. 141.
61 Dulles' words, from a memorandum which he prepared for the president on August 20, 1957, quoted by Little, in *American Orientalism*, p. 133.
62 Dulles' remarks of August 30, 1957, to Senator William F. Knowland (R., California), in SMML, *Dulles Papers*, Box 1, "General Correspondence" folder: 1–2. For an earlier statement, which was permeated with empathy and sympathy toward Israel, see the memorandum of Dulles' conversation of August 6, 1957, with Eban. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 703.
63 Dulles' remarks of September 11, 1957, to Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana). SMML, *Dulles Papers*, Box 1, "General Correspondence" folder: 2–3.
64 Dulles' remarks of September 12, 1957, to Eban, quoted from the memorandum of their conversation. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 732.
65 See, in this connection, ibid.
66 Eisenhower's statement of September 12, 1957, from the memorandum of the conversation with Dulles, quoted by Little, in *American Orientalism*, p. 93.
67 See, for example, Eisenhower's message of September 12, 1957, to King Saud of Saudi Arabia. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 734. See also F. A. Gerges, *The Superpowers and the Middle East*, p. 87.
68 Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 71.
69 Eisenhower's remarks, quoted from his message of September 12, 1957,

to King Saud. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 734. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, pp. 228–9.

70 Dulles' remarks of October 29, 1957, to Eugene Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, quoted from the memorandum of their conversation. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 776–7. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 71.

71 Dulles' remarks of December 5, 1957, to Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Said, quoted from the memorandum of their conversation. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 844–5.

72 George and Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, p. 334.

73 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 76.

74 Ibid. See also, in this connection, George and Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, p. 334. See also Gerges, *The Superpowers and the Middle East*, pp. 87–8.

75 George and Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, p. 334. See also Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 87.

76 Dulles' words of September 12, 1957, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Eban. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 732. See also the text of Dulles' message to Ben-Gurion of November 12, 1957. Ibid.: 792.

77 M. Mart, *Eye on Israel*, p. 161.

78 Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 72.

3 The July 1958 Jordanian crisis and its ramifications

1 A. Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 73.

2 Dulles' remarks of June 23, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with a group of Congressional leaders. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: *Lebanon and Jordan*, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1992, 167. See also A. L. George and R. Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, pp. 338–9.

3 Dulles' address at the Pan American Union, June 25, 1958. SMML, *Dulles Papers*, Box 1: "General Correspondence" folder: 1.

4 S. Touval, *Domestic Dynamics of Change from Confrontation to Accommodation Politics*, p. 17.

5 I. Pappé, "The state and the tribe," p. 173. See also M. B. Oren, "The test of Suez: Israel and the Middle East crisis of 1958," *Studies in Zionism* 12, no. 1, 1991, 58; S. M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, pp. 72–3; W. R. Louis, "Britain and the crisis of 1958," in W. R. Louis and R. Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, p. 19; R. Owen, "Conclusion," in *A Revolutionary Year*, pp. 289–90; A. Sela, *The Decline of the Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 45.

6 U. Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, pp. 86–7.

7 Ibid., p. 87.

8 P. L. Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 240.

9 George and Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, p. 340.

10 Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 240.

11 Ibid., p. 241. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 74.

12 Dulles' statement of July 14, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with Congressional leaders. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 219. See

also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 242. It was only later, toward the end of its tenure, that the Eisenhower administration came to realize that the Qasim regime in Baghdad was *not* a Soviet proxy which was inherently hostile to the West.

13 Quoted from Eisenhower's statement of July 14, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 219–20. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 75; D. Little, "His finest hour? Eisenhower, Lebanon, and the 1958 Middle East crisis," in P. L. Hahn and M. A. Heiss (eds), *Empire and Revolution*, p. 32; P. Sluglett, "The pan-Arab movement and the influence of Cairo and Moscow," in Louis and Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, pp. 219–20; Owen, "Conclusion," p. 292.

14 Eisenhower's remarks of July 14, 1958, quoted from his conversation with the White House Staff Secretary, Brigadier General Andrew J. Goodpaster. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 211–12. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 242, and Little, "His finest hour?" p. 32.

15 Eisenhower's remarks of July 14, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with a group of Congressional leaders. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 219. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 242.

16 Dulles' remarks of July 14, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with the president. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 212.

17 Dulles' remarks of July 16, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his July 16, 1958, meeting with Eisenhower. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library (hereafter DDE Library), Ann Whitman File, Dwight D. Eisenhower Diary Series, Box 35: Staff Memos, July 1958: 1. See also R. Owen, "The dog that neither barked nor bit: the fear of oil shortages," in Louis and Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, pp. 281–2.

18 Dulles' remarks of July 31, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of the 374th meeting of the NSC. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 12: *Near East Region; Iraq; Iran, Arabian Peninsula*: 129. See also Dulles' remarks of July 15, 1958, in a Department of State meeting. *FRUS 1958–1960*, 11: 304. Louis, "Britain and the crisis of 1958," p. 20.

19 Oren, "The test of Suez," p. 62.

20 Dulles' remarks of July 15, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with Lord Samuel Hood, British Chargé d'Affaires in Washington. DDE Library, John Foster Dulles Papers, 1951–9. JFD Chronological Series, Box 16: July 1958(1): 1. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 242; Oren, "The test of Suez," p. 66.

21 Dulles' words, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with Eisenhower, July 16, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 31.

22 Eisenhower's remarks to Dulles, quoted from a telephone conversation of July 15, 1958. DDE Library, Ann Whitman File, DDE Diary Series, Box 34: Telephone Calls, July 1958: 1. See also O. Almog, *Britain, Israel and the United States, 1955–1958*, p. 183.

23 British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd's words, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting of July 17, 1958, with Eisenhower and Dulles. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 321. See also I. L. Gendzier, "Oil, politics, and US intervention," in Louis and Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, p. 129.

24 H. Macmillan, *Riding the Storm, 1956–1959*, p. 517.

25 Dulles' remarks of July 31, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of the 374th meeting of the NSC. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 12: 129. See also Almog, *Britain, Israel and the United States*, p. 183; N. J. Ashton, "A microcosm in decline: British loss of nerve and military intervention in Jordan and Kuwait, 1958 and 1961," *Historical Journal* 40, no. 4, December 1997, 1080.

26 Eisenhower's remarks of July 14, 1958, to British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, quoted from the report of their telephone conversation. DDE Library, Ann Whitman File, DDE Diary Series, Box 34: Telephone Calls, July 1958: 1. See also N. J. Ashton, "'A great new venture'? Anglo-American cooperation in the Middle East and the response to the Iraqi revolution of July 1958," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 4, no. 1, March 1993, 72; Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, pp. 242–3; Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 76; D. B. Kunz, "The emergence of the United States as a Middle Eastern power, 1956–58," in Louis and Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, pp. 92–3; Gendzier, "Oil, politics, and US intervention," p. 129.

27 Remarks of Lester D. Malloy, American Ambassador to Jordan, quoted from his telegram of March 30, 1957, to the Department of State. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: 36.

28 Dulles' remarks of July 14, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Lord Hood. DDE Library, *John Foster Dulles Papers*, 1951–9, JFD Chronological Series, Box 16: July 1958(1): 1–2. See also Ashton, "'A great new venture,'" p. 73; Ashton, "A microcosm in decline," p. 1180.

29 Lloyd's words, from the memorandum of his conversation with Dulles of July 15, 1958, quoted by Ashton, in "'A great new venture,'" p. 74. See also Macmillan, *Riding the Storm*, pp. 517–19.

30 Macmillan's words of July 15, 1958, quoted from his message to Eisenhower. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 301. See also R. Ovendale, "Great Britain and the Anglo-American invasion of Jordan and Lebanon in 1958," *International History Review* 16, no. 2, May 1994, 272; Ashton, "'A great new venture,'" p. 76; Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 243; Louis, "Britain and the crisis of 1958," pp. 16–17, 62–3. See also Macmillan's message to Eisenhower of July 22, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 366; Macmillan, *Riding the Storm*, p. 519.

31 Macmillan's words, from the memorandum of his report to the British cabinet of July 16, 1958, in which he described Eisenhower's and Dulles' position concerning a joint British–American intervention in Jordan, quoted by Ashton, in "'A great new venture,'" p. 76.

32 Dulles' words, from the memorandum of his conversation of July 23, 1958, with the president, quoted by Ashton, in "'A great new venture,'" p. 78. See also Louis, "Britain and the crisis of 1958," p. 16; H. Beeley, "The Middle East," in W. R. Louis and H. Bull (eds), *The "Special Relationship"*, p. 288.

33 Lloyd's words, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation of July 17, 1958, with Dulles. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 319–20. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 242; Ashton, "'A great new venture,'"

p. 76; Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, pp. 76–7; Ovendale, "Great Britain and the Anglo-American invasion," p. 292.

34 Dulles' words, quoted from his telegram of June 17, 1957, to Raymond A. Hare, American Ambassador in Cairo. *FRUS, 1955–1957*, 17: 647.

35 Macmillan's words, quoted from the memorandum of his telephone conversation of July 16, 1958, with Dulles. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 314. See also Ovendale, "Great Britain and the Anglo-American invasion," p. 292.

36 Macmillan's words, quoted from the memorandum of his telephone conversation with Dulles of July 16, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 314. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, pp. 76–7.

37 Dulles' words, quoted from the memorandum of his conference with the president of July 16, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 309. See also Ashton, "'A great new venture,'" p. 76; Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, p. 73; R. Ovendale, *Britain, The United States and the Transfer of Power in the Middle East, 1945–1962*, p. 206; D. Tal, "Seizing opportunities: Israel and the 1958 crisis in the Middle East," *Middle East Studies* 37, no. 1, January 2001, 144; Owen, "The dog that neither barked nor bit," pp. 282–3; Louis, "Britain and the crisis of 1958," p. 63; Little, "His finest hour?" p. 35; Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 77.

38 Dulles' words of August 1, 1958, quoted from his letter to Ben-Gurion. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 78–9. For a condensed version of the Israeli role in the crisis, see also A. Ben-Zvi, "The July 1958 Jordanian crisis and the origins of the American–Israeli alliance: a new perspective," *Journal of Israeli History* 24, no. 2, September 2005, 215–26. It is interesting to note that this change in the administration's perception of Israel reflected a similar trend in American public opinion which – against the backdrop of "a series of crises in the Middle East, including the threat to King Hussein's throne in Jordan, the instability of the Lebanese government, the formation of the United Arab Republic (UAR) between Egypt and Syria, and the coup in Iraq" – led many Americans to worry "over what appeared to be a 'tide of anti-Americanism' among Arabs." Furthermore, whereas Nasser's position as "the undisputed leader of the Arab world" created "further anxiety since many observers had already decided that he was pro-Soviet and, therefore, anti-American, a few journalists urged a reconsideration of American policies and . . . [an] unquestioned support for Israel" (M. Mart, *Eye on Israel*, p. 156).

39 Eisenhower's words, quoted from his message of July 22, 1958, to Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 365. See also P. C. Merkley, *American Presidents, Religion, and Israel*, p. 5.

40 Dulles' words of July 21, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Eban. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: *Arab–Israeli Dispute; United Arab Republic; North Africa*: 72. See also, on the Saudi opposition to the overflights, Rountree's remarks to Eisenhower of July 20, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 12: 86.

41 See the memorandum entitled: "Factors affecting US policy toward the Near East," which was submitted, on August 19, 1958, to the NSC by

S. Everett Gleason, Acting Executive Secretary of the NSC Planning Board. DDE Library, White House Office, Office of the Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, 1951–61. NSC Series, Policy Papers Subseries, Box 23: NSC 5801/1: Policy Toward the Near East (1): 6 (emphasis added). See also Ben-Zvi, "The July 1958 Jordanian crisis," p. 221.

42 Eisenhower's words of August 21, 1958, at the 377th meeting of the NSC. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 12: 155. The reference to Israel's vulnerability to a surprise air attack was made by the CIA Director Allen Dulles. Ibid. See also Ben-Zvi, "The July 1958 Jordanian crisis," p. 222.

43 Kunz, "The emergence of the United States as a Middle Eastern power," p. 99. See also Matti Golan, *Shimon Peres*, p. 58.

44 Eisenhower's remarks of March 25, 1959, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with King Hussein. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 701.

45 Quoted from the National Intelligence Estimate of March 10, 1959, entitled "The outlook for Jordan." Ibid.: 684. See also the memorandum submitted on October 10, 1958, by Thomas K. Wright, American Chargé d'Affaires in Jordan, to Stuart W. Rockwell, Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs in the Department of State. Ibid.: 603–4.

46 A clear illustration of this strong and irrevocable American opposition to a military Israeli intervention in Jordan is provided by Dulles' words of April 24, 1957, to Sir Harold Caccia, British Ambassador in Washington. According to the memorandum of the conversation, Dulles told Caccia that he had warned Israel that an intervention in Jordan "would involve a strong adverse reaction on the part of the US" (*FRUS, 1955–1957*, 13: 106). Evidently, Dulles' reference was to his meeting – which took place earlier on the same day – with Abba Eban, Israeli Ambassador in Washington, in which he stated that "Israel's action [in Jordan] could be the one thing which would unite the Arabs," adding that he hoped that "no policy on Israel's part would lead to a conflict with the US" (ibid.: 104–5).

47 Dulles' remarks of August 8, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Lord Hood. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 445. On one occasion only, namely, on July 16, 1958, did the president deviate from this approach and allude to the possibility of encouraging a direct Israeli military strike against Egypt as "the strategic action in the circumstances." As Eisenhower further elaborated at a White House conference, this "strategic action" should be "to turn Israel loose on Egypt, thus going for the head of the snake." Ibid.: 310. For another adversarial remark on the part of President Eisenhower toward President Nasser, see the memorandum of his conversation with members of the Conference of Major National Jewish Organizations, which took place on September 20, 1960. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 370.

48 Words of Robert D. Murphy, Deputy Undersecretary of State, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Nasser of August 6, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 442. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 246; Kunz, "The emergence of the United States as a Middle Eastern power," p. 94.

49 Dulles' remarks of August 12, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with British Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 11: 458.
50 Dulles' remarks of August 14, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Fawzi. Ibid.: 471.
51 Dulles' remarks of August 12, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. Ibid.: 467. See also his remarks of August 18, 1958. Ibid.: 497–8.
52 Dulles' words of October 31, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Sir Harold Caccia, British Ambassador in Washington. Ibid.: 623. See also Ben-Zvi, "The July 1958 Jordanian crisis," p. 224.
53 On the distinction between the "operational environment" and the "psychological environment," see M. Brecher, *The Foreign Policy System of Israel*, p. 3.
54 Dulles' words of October 2, 1958, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 96. See also I. Pappé, "The junior partner: Israel's role in the 1958 crisis," in Louis and Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, pp. 266–7.
55 Tal, "Israel and the 1958 crisis," p. 144. See also Oren, "The test of Suez," p. 67; Ashton, "A microcosm in decline," p. 1079.
56 Almog, *Britain, Israel and the United States*, p. 185. See also ibid., p. 195.
57 Ben-Gurion's diary entry of July 24, 1958, quoted by Oren, in "The test of Suez," p. 72. See also the memorandum of the conversation between Eban and Dulles held on September 10, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 91–5.
58 Oren, "The test of Suez," p. 73. See also Pappé, "The junior partner," p. 267; Tal, "Israel and the 1958 crisis," p. 147.
59 From the message sent to Ben-Gurion by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolai Bulganin on August 1, 1958, quoted by Almog, in *Britain, Israel and the United States*, p. 194.
60 Rountree's words, quoted from his memorandum to Dulles of August 22, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 90.
61 Ben-Gurion's words, from his message to Eisenhower of August 3, 1958, quoted by Oren, in "The test of Suez," p. 75. See also Ben-Gurion's message to Dulles of August 5, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 86.
62 Macmillan's words, from the memorandum of his conversation with Dulles on July 27, 1958, quoted by Louis, in "Britain and the crisis of 1958," p. 65. See also the memorandum of the conversation held on October 17, 1958, between Rountree and Eban. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 101–3. See also Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 246; Tal, "Israel and the 1958 crisis," p. 147; Almog, *Britain, Israel and the United States*, p. 192. The British evacuation from Jordan, which began in late October after the crisis had subsided, was completed on November 2, 1958.
63 Dulles' words, quoted from his message to Ben-Gurion of August 1, 1958. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 78.

64 Dulles' words, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Meir of October 2, 1958. Ibid.: 96.
65 Herter's remarks of March 13, 1960, quoted from the memorandum of his meeting with G. Lewis Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. Ibid.: 299–300. Dulles died on May 24, 1959.
66 Herter's remarks of July 27, 1960, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Parker T. Hart, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. Ibid.: 356. See also H. Druks, *The Uncertain Friendship*, pp. 205–7.
67 Quoted from Jones' memorandum, which was submitted on July 7, 1960, to T. Livingston Merchant, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 344–5.
68 For the text of Herter's letter to Ben-Gurion of August 4, 1960, see *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 358–61. See also Ben-Zvi, *Decade of Transition*, p. 87.
69 For a typical illustration of this line of reasoning, see the memorandum which was submitted by Merchant to Herter on July 15, 1960. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 349–50. See also the memorandum which was submitted by Assistant Secretary Jones to Merchant on July 7, 1960. *FRUS, 1958–1960*, 13: 349–50.
70 Tal, "Israel and the 1958 crisis," pp. 152–3. See also Oren, "The test of Suez," p. 73; Z. Levey, "Israel's strategy in Africa, 1961–67," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36, no. 1, February 2004, 83.
71 Tal, "Israel and the 1958 crisis," p. 153. See also A. Ben-Zvi, *John F. Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 65–101.
72 See, for example, the memorandum entitled "Israel and United States policy," which was drafted by the Department of State on June 7, 1962. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 17: *Near East, 1961–1962*: 711–18.
73 Tal, "Israel and the 1958 crisis," p. 153.

4 The April 1963 Jordanian crisis and its ramifications

1 P. L. Hahn, *Caught in the Middle East*, p. 246.
2 A. Ben-Zvi, *John F. Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, p. 99.
3 Ibid., p. 98.
4 Ibid., pp. 98, 99.
5 Quoted from an internal Department of State memorandum, which was drafted on April 25, 1963, by Robert C. Strong, the director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs in the department's Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: *Near East, 1962–1963*: 480–81. See also A. Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 9.
6 Z. Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan, 1960–1963*, p. 49; Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 9.
7 W. Bass, *Support my Friend*, p. 121.
8 Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 10; D. Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer? The United States, King Hussein, and Jordan, 1953–70," *International History Review* 17, no. 3, 1995, 530; S. M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances*, pp. 84–5.

9 Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, p. 52; Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 10; U. Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 129.
10 Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, p. 52.
11 Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 530; Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, pp. 12–13.
12 Secretary of State Dean Rusk's words of April 27, 1963, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Abraham Harman, Israeli Ambassador in Washington. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 489.
13 Kennedy's words of April 27, 1963, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Ibid.: 485.
14 Ibid.: 486. See also Ben-Zvi, *Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 95–6.
15 Quoted from the telegram that was sent on April 27, 1963, from Undersecretary of State George W. Ball to Badeau. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 488.
16 Ibid.
17 Ball's words, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Harman of April 27, 1963. Ibid.: 489.
18 Komer's words, quoted from the memorandum which he submitted to Johnson on May 1, 1963. Ibid.: 507.
19 See Kennedy's message to Ben-Gurion of May 5, 1963. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 512–13. See also Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, p. 67; M. Zak, "The shift in Ben-Gurion's attitude toward the Kingdom of Jordan," *Israel Studies* 1, no. 2, 1996, 160–61.
20 Quoted from a message which was sent on May 1, 1963, from Robert W. Komer of the National Security Council to McGeorge Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs. John F. Kennedy Library (hereafter JFKL), Papers of President Kennedy (PPK), National Security Files (NSF), Box 427: Robert W. Komer, Israel, 1963: 1.
21 Nasser's words, from the memorandum of his conversation with Badeau on April 29, 1963, quoted by Shalom, in *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, p. 67. See also Bass, *Support my Friend*, p. 126.
22 See, for example, Komer's memorandum to Johnson of January 21, 1965. *FRUS, 1964–1967*, 18: 275.
23 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to McGeorge Bundy of April 30, 1963. JFKL, PPK, NSF, Box 125A: Jordan, General, April 1963: 1. The Department of State's message to its embassies in Baghdad and Damascus, which was sent on April 27, 1963, for immediate delivery to the leaders of Syria and Iraq, is quoted by Bass, in *Support my Friend*, p. 126.
24 Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, p. 67.
25 From a Department of State Memorandum of April 30, 1963, quoted ibid., p. 66.
26 Ball's words, quoted from his telegram to Badeau of May 10, 1963. JFKL, PPK, NSF, Box 446: Robert W. Komer, Egypt, General, 1963: 1–2.
27 Kennedy's words, quoted from his message to Nasser of May 27, 1963. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 556.

28 Komer's words of April 30, 1963, quoted by Ben-Zvi, in *Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, p. 98.
29 Kennedy's words, quoted from his message to Ben-Gurion of May 5, 1963. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 512–13.
30 The president's warning to Harman of April 28, 1963, is quoted from the memorandum of their conversation. *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 495.
31 Kennedy's warning to Israeli Deputy Defense Minister Shimon Peres, of May 1, 1963, is quoted by Little, in "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 530.
32 Komer's words, quoted from his message to McGeorge Bundy of April 30, 1963. JFKL, PPK, NSF, Box 125a: Jordan, General, 1963: 2. See also Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, pp. 82–3.
33 Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 22.
34 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, pp. 132–3. See also Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 531.
35 Kennedy's words, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson on May 11, 1963. JFKL, PPK, NSF, Box 436: The Middle East, 1961–63 (Folder II): 1.
36 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 133.
37 Ibid. See also Shalom, *The Superpowers, Israel and the Future of Jordan*, p. 104; D. B. Kunz, "The emergence of the United States as a Middle Eastern power, 1956–58," in W. R. Louis and R. Owen (eds), *A Revolutionary Year*, p. 95.
38 Dann, *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism*, p. 134. See also Zak, "The shift in Ben-Gurion's attitude," pp. 159–60.
39 Zak, "The shift in Ben-Gurion's attitude," p. 160. See also D. Schueftan, "Jordan's Israeli option," in J. Nevo and I. Pappé (eds), *Jordan in the Middle East*, p. 258.
40 See, for example, Abraham Ben-Zvi, *Lyndon B. Johnson and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 88–9.
41 Ben-Zvi, *Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, p. 98. For an American summary of this dialogue, see *FRUS, 1961–1963*, 18: 779–86.
42 Ben-Zvi, *Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 98–9.
43 Quoted from a statement which was made on May 8, 1963, by Averell W. Harriman, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, to a group of American Jewish leaders. JFKL, PPK, NSF, Box 427: Robert W. Komer, Israel: Security Guarantees, 1963: 2.
44 Remarks of Phillips Talbot, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, quoted from his memorandum to Rusk of July 22, 1964. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 18: *Arab–Israeli Dispute, 1964–1967*: 182.
45 Remarks of Thomas L. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research in the Department of State, quoted from his memorandum of July 31, 1964, to James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. United States National Archives and Records Administration (USNA), College Park, MD, Record Group (RG) 59, Records of the Department of State, Central Files, Defense Affairs (DEF) 19: 1. See also Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" pp. 532–3. See also Z. Levey, "United States arms policy toward Jordan, 1963–68,"

Journal of Contemporary History 41, 2006, forthcoming; Y. Rabin, *The Rabin Memoirs*, pp. 64–5.

46 Rusk's comments of December 31, 1964, quoted by Z. Levey, in "The United States' Skyhawk sale to Israel, 1966: strategic exigencies of an arms deal," *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 2, April 2004, 263. See also Komer's memorandum to Johnson of January 21, 1965. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 18: 274–5.

47 Rusk's words, quoted from his telegram to Harriman of March 1, 1965. *FRUS, 1964–1967*, 18: 366. See also Levey, "United States arms policy", forthcoming.

48 Ben-Zvi, *Johnson and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, pp. 52–3. See also the retrospective remarks of Harrison M. Symmes, former American Ambassador in Jordan, as to whether Hussein seriously considered the Soviet option. Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, Oral History Interview with Harrison M. Symmes, February 25, 1989, Foreign Affairs Oral History Program, Special Collection Division: 60. On Hussein's mistrust of the Soviet Union, see Levey, "United States arms policy," forthcoming.

49 Rusk's words, quoted from his telegram of August 12, 1964, to the American Embassy in Amman. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 18: 203. See also Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 533.

50 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to McGeorge Bundy of February 7, 1965. Lyndon B. Johnson Library (hereafter LBJ Library), NSF, Memos and Misc., Vol. 3: Israel, 1965: 1–2.

51 Ibid.: 2. See also Levey, "The United States' Skyhawk sale to Israel," p. 263.

52 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to Johnson of February 6, 1965. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 18: 335. See also his remarks at the 544th meeting of the NSC, which took place on February 1, 1965. Ibid.: 290.

53 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to Johnson of February 6, 1965. Ibid.: 309. For evidence of the Israeli intention to strongly and publicly oppose the sale of American arms to Jordan unless Israel was compensated in kind, see the message from March 2, 1965, which was sent from the Israeli foreign ministry to its diplomatic missions abroad. Israeli State Archives (hereafter ISA), Foreign Ministry Files, Box 3501/17: 1.

54 Rusk's words, quoted from his memorandum to Johnson of February 19, 1965. LBJ Library, NSF, Country File, Israel: Israeli Tanks, 1964/1965: 3–4. See also Levey, "The United States' Skyhawk sale to Israel," pp. 263–7.

55 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to McGeorge Bundy of January 10, 1965. LBJ Library, NSF, Files of Robert W. Komer, Komer Memos, 1964–66, Box 6, Vol. 2: 1–2.

56 Harman's words, quoted from his meeting with Philips Talbot, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, on May 19, 1965. ISA, Foreign Ministry Files, Box 3502/12: 3. The transaction of March 10, 1965, was completed on February 22, 1966, when the administration decided to sell Israel 48 A-4E Skyhawk bombers as part of a trilateral deal which also involved the sale of 34 F-104A interceptors

to Jordan. See also, in this connection, Levey, "The United States' Skyhawk sale to Israel," pp. 272–3.

57 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to Johnson of February 9, 1965. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 18: 318–19. See also Levey, "United States arms policy," forthcoming.

58 Komer's words, quoted from his memorandum to McGeorge Bundy of January 10, 1965. LBJ Library, NSF, Files of Robert W. Komer, Komer Memos, 1964–66, Box 6, Vol. 2: 1–2. See also, in this connection, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's remarks of February 12, 1966, to Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban. ISA, Foreign Ministry Files, Box 4332/5: 1. For a similar statement by Komer, see his words of May 12, 1965, to Mordechai Gazit, the Minister of the Israeli Embassy in Washington. USNA, RG 59, Records of the Department of State, Central Files, DEF 12–15: Israel: 1.

59 Komer's words, quoted from his conversation with Eshkol of March 10, 1965. ISA, Foreign Ministry Files, Box 3501/17: 5–6.

60 McNamara's words, quoted from the memorandum of his conversation with Eban of February 12, 1966. ISA, Foreign Ministry Files, Box 4332/5: 1.

61 Komer's words, quoted from his message to Johnson of February 8, 1966. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 18: 545–6.

62 See, for example, the message which was sent to Johnson on May 2, 1968, by his special assistant Walt W. Rostow, in which he suggested using the supply of the Phantom planes as a means "to improve chances for a settlement with Hussein" by virtue of precipitating "a marginal shift in Israel's position." *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 20: *Arab–Israeli Dispute, 1967–1968*: 321.

63 Levey, "United States arms policy," forthcoming.

64 S. M. Walt, *Taming American Power*, pp. 152–3.

65 Quoted from an interview with Harrison M. Symmes, American Ambassador in Amman, conducted on February 25, 1989. Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, Foreign Affairs Oral History Program, Special Collection Division: 79. See also Symmes' telegram to Rusk of January 9, 1968. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 20: 99.

66 Symmes' words, quoted from his telegram to Secretary Rusk of February 3, 1968, in which he conveyed to Washington King Hussein's growing willingness to tilt toward the Soviet Union and move toward the establishment of "arms relationships" with Moscow. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 20: 135.

67 Rusk's words, quoted from his memorandum to Johnson of February 6, 1968. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 20: 146.

68 Quoted from a special national intelligence estimate entitled "Terrorism and internal security in Israel and Jordan," which was drafted on April 18, 1968. Ibid.: 291. See also the message which was sent, on September 4, 1968, by Harold H. Saunders of the NSC to Rostow. Ibid.: 483.

69 For evidence of these direct and secret Jordanian–Israeli contacts of July 1968, see the memorandum of the conversation between Eban, Joseph J. Sisco (Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations Affairs) and George W. Ball (American Representative to the United

Nations), which took place on July 16, 1968 (the memorandum was sent to Rusk by Walworth Barbour, American Ambassador to Israel, on July 17, 1968). Ibid.: 415–17. For evidence on the resumption of these contacts in early 1969, see the memorandum which was submitted, on March 14, 1969, by Secretary of State William P. Rogers to President Richard M. Nixon. USNA, RF3, Nixon Files: NSC, Country Files, Israel: 1–2.

70 R. Jervis, *System Effects*, p. 214. It is interesting to note that the linkage between the Jordanian–Israeli dyad and the American–Israeli framework was not invariably in the direction of upgrading and expanding the latter in the aftermath of developments which had taken place in Jordan's regional environment. Thus, in a few instances (such as in November 1966), a deterioration in the relations between Jerusalem and Amman (which, in November 1966, followed the Israeli raid against the West Bank village of Samo'a) adversely affected American–Israeli relations (see, for example, Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer?" p. 535). This tight linkage, albeit of a negative nature, can be viewed as another illustration of the interconnectedness of these two frameworks.

5 The alliance in full bloom

1 On the impact which the Syrian–Jordanian crisis of September 1970 had upon the American–Israeli alliance, see, for example: A. Dowty, *Middle East Crisis*, pp. 140–71; H. Kissinger, *White House Years*, pp. 594–631; A. M. Garfinkle, "US decision-making in the Jordan crisis: correcting the record," *Political Science Quarterly* 100, no. 1, spring 1985, 122–35; A. Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, pp. 140–43; N. J. Ashton, "Pulling the strings: King Hussein's role during the crisis of 1970 in Jordan," *International History Review* 28, no. 1, March 2006, 94–118.

2 On September 9, 1970, a fourth Western airliner was hijacked and flown to Zerka. See, on the evolution of the crisis, Ashton, "Pulling the strings," pp. 103–7; Garfinkle, "US decision-making in the Jordan crisis," p. 128; Kissinger, *White House Years*, p. 626; P. K. Huth, *Extended Deterrence and the Prevention of War*, pp. 92–4; M. Dayan, *Moshe Dayan*, p. 429; Dowty, *Middle East Crisis*, pp. 111–44.

3 For evidence, see Kissinger, *White House Years*, p. 614;Garfinkle, "US decision-making in the Jordan crisis," p. 135; Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 113; D. Little, "A puppet in the search of a puppeteer? The United States, King Hussein, and Jordan, 1953–70," *International History Review* 17, no. 3, 1995, pp. 542–3; Ashton, "Pulling the strings," p. 115.

4 For evidence, see Kissinger, *White House Years*, pp. 625–6; H. R. Haldeman, *The Haldeman Diaries*, p. 196; D. Schoenbaum, *The United States and the State of Israel*, p. 181. On Nixon's global considerations in supporting Israel's military intervention in Jordan, see C. Lipson, "American support for Israel: history, sources, limits," in G. Sheffer (ed.), *US–Israeli Relations at the Crossroads*, pp. 133–41; Ashton, "Pulling the strings," pp. 115–18; A. M. Haig Jr., *Inner Circles*, p. 244.

5 Kissinger, *White House Years*, p. 631. In his memoirs, Nixon attributes

the Syrian decision to withdraw from Jordan to "the tough American position [*vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union], the Israeli threat [*vis-à-vis* Syria], and the superb fighting by Hussein's troops" (R. M. Nixon, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, p. 485).

6 Quoted by Y. Rabin, in *The Rabin Memoirs*, p. 189.

7 B. I. Kaufman, *The Arab Middle East and the United States*, p. 77.

8 Dowty, *Middle East Crisis*, p. 178. See also W. B. Quandt, *Decade of Decisions*, p. 106.

9 Ashton, "Pulling the strings," pp. 105, 110–18.

10 The details of the Jordanian–Israeli strategic dialogue of May 1968 are included in a message which was sent, on June 4, 1968, by the CIA Director, Richard Helms, to Johnson. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 20: 369. See also A. Eban, *Personal Witness*, pp. 496–7; Bligh, *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, p. 113. For evidence of the secret meetings which took place in London in December 1967 and January 1968 between King Hussein and members of the Israeli government, see Y. Hirschfeld, "Jordanian–Israeli peace negotiations after the Six-Day War, 1967–69: the view from Jerusalem," in J. Nevo and I. Pappé (eds), *Jordan in the Middle East*, pp. 239–40.

11 For evidence of King Hussein's meeting of September 26, 1973, with Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir and Defense Minister Moshe Dayan, see U. Bar-Joseph, *The Watchman Fell Asleep*, pp. 89–91. For evidence of an earlier Jordanian warning to Israel, see Symmes' message to Rusk of January 18, 1968. *FRUS, 1964–1968*, 20: 111.

12 E. Karsh, "Israel, the Hashemites, and the Palestinians: the fateful triangle," in E. Karsh and P. R. Kumaraswamy (eds), *Israel, the Hashemites, and the Palestinians*, p. 8.

13 W. W. Haddad and M. M. Hardy, "Jordan's alliance with Israel and its effects on Jordanian–Arab relations," in E. Karsh and P. R. Kumaraswamy (eds), *Israel, the Hashemites, and the Palestinians*, p. 46.

14 S. L. Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 202.

15 S. Lasensky, "Chequebook diplomacy: the US, the Oslo process and the role of foreign aid," in M. Keating (ed.), *Aid, Diplomacy, and Facts on the Ground*, pp. 33–6; S. Lasensky, "Dollarizing peace: Nixon, Kissinger and the creation of the US–Israeli alliance," unpublished manuscript, p. 6; Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict*, p. 202.

16 Kaufman, *The Arab Middle East*, p. 76.

17 A. Ben-Zvi, "The July 1958 Jordanian crisis and the origins of the American–Israeli alliance: a new perspective," *Journal of Israeli History* 24, no. 2, September 2005, p. 226. See also C. Mansour, *Beyond Alliance*, pp. 9–10.

Selected bibliography

The following list includes the major works which guided me – both theoretically and historically – in this search to identify the Jordanian factor in the origins and evolution of the American–Israeli alliance:

Adler, E. and Barnett, M. (eds) (1998) *Security Communities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Almog, O. (2003) *Britain, Israel and the United States, 1955–1958: Beyond Suez*, London: Frank Cass.

Alteras, I. (1993) *Eisenhower and Israel: US–Israeli Relations, 1953–1960*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Aronson, G. (1986) *From Sideshow to Centerstage: US Policy towards Egypt, 1946–1956*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bar-Joseph, U. (2005) *The Watchman Fell Asleep: The Surprise of the Yom Kippur War and its Sources*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bass, W. (2003) *Support my Friend: Kennedy's Middle East and the Making of the US–Israel Alliance*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Ben-Zvi, A. (1993) *The United States and Israel: The Limits of the Special Relationship*, New York: Columbia University Press.

——(1998) *Decade of Transition: Eisenhower, Kennedy, and the Origins of the American–Israeli Alliance*, New York: Columbia University Press.

——(2002) *John F. Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel*, London: Frank Cass.

——(2004) *Lyndon B. Johnson and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel: In the Shadow of the Hawk*, London: Frank Cass.

Bialer, U. (1990) *Between East and West: Israel's Foreign Policy Orientation, 1948–1956*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bligh, A. (2002) *The Political Legacy of King Hussein*, Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.

Brecher, M. (1972) *The Foreign Policy System of Israel: Setting, Images, Process*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brown, M. E., Lynn-Jones, S. M. and Miller, S. E. (eds) (1995) *The Perils of*

Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Burns, W. J. (1985) *Economic Aid and American Policy toward Egypt, 1955–1981*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dann, U. (1989) *King Hussein and the Challenge of Arab Radicalism: Jordan, 1955–1967*, New York: Oxford University Press.

——(1992) *King Hussein's Strategy of Survival*, Washington, DC: Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

Dayan, M. (1976) *Moshe Dayan: The Story of my Life*, New York: William Morrow.

Dowty, A. (1984) *Middle East Crisis: US Decision-Making in 1958, 1970, and 1973*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Druks, H. (2001) *The Uncertain Friendship: The US and Israel from Roosevelt to Kennedy*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Eban, A. (1992) *Personal Witness: Israel through my Eyes*, New York: Putnam.

Eisenhower, D. D. (1965) *The White House Years*, Vol. II: *Waging Peace, 1956–1961*, New York: Doubleday.

Fawcett, L. (ed.) (2005) *International Relations of the Middle East*, New York: Oxford University Press.

George, A. L. and Smoke, R. (1974) *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Gerges, F. A. (1994) *The Superpowers and the Middle East: Regional and International Policies, 1955–1967*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Golan, M. (1982) *Shimon Peres: A Biography*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hahn, P. L. (1991) *The United States, Great Britain, and Egypt, 1945–1956: Strategy and Diplomacy in the Early Cold War*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

——(2004) *Caught in the Middle East: US Policy toward the Arab–Israeli Conflict, 1945–1961*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

——(2005) *Crisis and Crossfire: The United States and the Middle East since 1945*, Washington, DC: Potomac Books.

Hahn, P. L. and Heiss, M. A. (eds) (2001) *Empire and Revolution: The United States and the Third World since 1945*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Haig, A. M., Jr. (1992) Inner Circles: How America Changed the World, New York: Warner.

Haldeman, H. R. (1994) *The Haldeman Diaries: Inside the Nixon White House*, New York: Putnam.

Huth, P. K. (1988) *Extended Deterrence and the Prevention of War*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Jervis, R. (1997) *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Karsh, E. and Kumaraswamy, P. R. (eds) (2003) *Israel, the Hashemites, and the Palestinians: The Fateful Triangle*, London: Frank Cass.

Katzenstein, P. J. (ed.) (1996) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Kaufman, B. I. (1996) *The Arab Middle East and the United States: Inter-Arab Rivalry and Superpower Diplomacy*, New York: Twayne.

Keating, M. (ed.) (2005) *Aid, Diplomacy, and Facts on the Ground*, London: Chatham House.

Kenen, I. L. (1981) *Israel's Defense Line: Her Friends and Foes in Washington*, Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Kissinger, H. (1979) *White House Years*, Boston: Little, Brown.

Kollek, T. (1978) *For Jerusalem: A Life*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Lebow, R. N. (1981) *Between Peace and War: The Nature of International Crisis*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lenczowski, G. (1990) *American Presidents and the Middle East*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lesch, D. W. (ed.) (1999) *The Middle East and the United States: A Historical and Political Reassessment*, 2nd edn, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Little, D. (2002) *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Louis, W. R. and Bull, H. (eds) (1986) *The 'Special Relationship': Anglo-American Relations since 1945*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Louis, W. R. and Owen, R. (eds) (2002) *A Revolutionary Year: The Middle East in 1958*, London: Tauris.

Macmillan, H. (1971) *Riding the Storm, 1956–1959*, London: Macmillan.

Mansour, C. (1994) *Beyond Alliance: Israel in US Foreign Policy*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Mart, M. (2006) *Eye on Israel: How America Came to View the Jewish State as an Ally*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mearsheimer, J. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: Norton.

Merkley, P. C. (2004) *American Presidents, Religion, and Israel: The Heirs of Cyrus*, Westport, CT: Praeger.

Nevo, J. and Pappé, I. (eds) (1994) *Jordan in the Middle East: The Making of a Pivotal State, 1948–1988*, London: Frank Cass.

Nixon, R. M. (1978) *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

Ovendale, R. (1996) *The United States and the Transfer of Power in the Middle East, 1945–1962*, London: Leicester University Press.

Quandt, W. B. (1977) *Decade of Decisions: American Policy toward the Arab–Israeli Conflict, 1967–1976*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rabin, Y. (1979) *The Rabin Memoirs*, Boston: Little, Brown.

Reiter, D. (1996) *Crucible of Beliefs: Learning, Alliances, and World Wars*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schoenbaum, D. (1993) *The United States and the State of Israel*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Sela, A. (1998) *The Decline of the Arab–Israeli Conflict: Middle East Politics and the Quest for Regional Order*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Shalom, Z. (1999) *The Superpowers, Israel, and the Future of Jordan: The Perils of the Pro-Nasser Policy*, Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.

Sheffer, G. (ed.) (1997) *US–Israeli Relations at the Crossroads*, London: Frank Cass.

Shlaim, A. (2000) *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*, New York: Norton.

Shuckburgh, E. (1986) *Descent to Suez: Diaries, 1951–56*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Snyder, G. H. (1997) *Alliance Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Snyder, J. and Jervis R. (eds) (1993) *Coping with Complexity in the International System*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Spiegel, S. L. (1985) *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict: Making America's Middle East Policy from Truman to Reagan*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Touval, S. (1973) *Domestic Dynamics of Change from Confrontation to Accommodation Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Walt, S. M. (1987) *The Origins of Alliances*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

——(2005) *Taming American Power: The Global Response to US Primacy*, New York: Norton.

Weitsman, P. A. (2004) *Dangerous Alliances: Proponents of Peace: Weapons of War*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Wendt, A. (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Index

Abdullah ibn Hussein (King of Jordan) 37
Abu Nuwar, Ali 18
alliances: between Egypt and Syria 27, 32; between France and Israel 48; between Iraq and Jordan 32–3; between Israel, United States and Jordan 8; between Israel and Jordan 79–81, 83, 102 n10, n11; between United States and Egypt 11, 14–15, 26; between United States and Israel *see* strategic partnership between United States and Israel; between United States and Jordan 19–20, 70; of inter-Arab security 1, 2–4, 11, 14
anti-Americanism: American public opinion on 93 n38; in Arab nationalism 2, 3–4; in Israel 12
April 1957 crisis (Jordan) 18–19
April 1963 crisis (Jordan) 54, 55, 57–8, 63–4; Israeli role in 55, 58
Arab Legion 19
Arab nationalism 57; American views of 38; anti-Westernism of 2, 3–4
Arab security alliance 1, 2–4, 11, 14
Arab Solidarity Agreement (Jordan, Egypt and Syria, 1957) 18
Arab world, and United States 12, 13–14
armistice lines between Israel and its neighbors 62
arms race, in Middle East 52
arms supplies: of Soviet Union to Jordan 66; of Soviet Union to Syria 24; of United Kingdom to Israel 50; of United States to Iraq 24; of United States to Israel 9, 28–9, 42, 46, 50–2, 53, 67–72, 83, 99–100 n56, n62; of United States to Jordan 7, 66–7, 68, 70–3, 99 n53; of United States to Turkey 24

Badeau, John S. 59
Baghdad Pact: Egyptian views of 14; Jordanian membership of 16–17
balancing strategies: of Israel 7, 18, 20, 43, 57; of Jordan 18, 19, 35, 81
Ball, George W. 59, 60, 61
bandwagoning strategies, of Jordan 17, 65
Ben-Gurion, David (Prime Minister of Israel), on strategic partnership between Israel and United States 47–9, 50
Byroade, Henry A. 86 n15

Caccia, Sir Harold 45
Chehab, Fouad 33, 35
civil war, in Lebanon 33
Cold War policies, of Eisenhower administration 10, 14, 24, 32
constructivist theories, in international relations 2

crisis management diplomacy, of Kennedy administration 60

Dann, Uriel 64
Dayan, Moshe 80
Department of State (United States) 47
deterrence strategies: of Israel towards Egypt 17, 26, 43, 60; of Israel towards Syria 77–8; of United States towards Egypt 58–9, 60–2
Dowty, Alan 79
Dulles, John Foster: on American–Israeli relations 11, 13–14; on Arab–Israeli conflict 28; on Egypt and Nasser 27, 94 n47; on Israel as a strategic partner 41, 50–1; on Israeli threats to intervene in Jordan 21–2, 43, 44–5, 94 n46; on Israel's security 25, 29, 41, 51; on Jordan and Hashemite monarchy 37

Eban, Abba 13
Egypt: alliance with Syria 27, 32; alliance with United States 11, 14–15, 26; American deterrence strategies towards 58–9, 60–2; American perceptions of 27; and Baghdad Pact 14; Israel's balancing behavior towards 7, 18, 20, 43, 57; Israel's deterrence strategies towards 17, 26, 43, 60; threats to Hashemite Jordan 6, 7, 17, 18, 43–4, 75
Eisenhower administration: and Arab world 13–14; Cold War policies of 10, 14, 24, 32; and July 1958 crisis (Jordan) 36–7; Middle Eastern policies of 1, 3, 4, 7, 10–12, 34–5, 41; perceptions of Egypt 27; reservations towards Israel 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 42; strategic partnership with Israel 5, 9, 15–16, 18, 21, 22–3, 24–5, 27–8, 29, 39–42
Eisenhower, Dwight D. (President of United States) 21, 26; on Nasser 94 n47

Factors Affecting US Policy toward the Middle East (US memorandum) 41–2
Faisal ibn Hussein (King of Iraq) 39
France, alliance with Israel 48

Great Britain *see* United Kingdom

Haddad, William W. 81
Hardy, Malcolm M. 81
Hashemite monarchies *see* Iraq; Jordan
Herter, Christian A. 22, 51, 52
Herzog, Ya'acov 64
Hussein bin Talal (King of Jordan) 7, 8, 17; blackmail bargaining strategy of 72; Egypt seeking overthrow of 18; instability of regime of 18–19, 32–3, 35, 40, 54, 56–7, 58, 76–7; secret meetings with Israeli political leaders 81, 102 n10; security dialogue with Israel 64–5; warning Israel of imminent Syrian–Egyptian offensive 80–1, 102n 11

Ibn Nasser, Sharif Hussein 58
inter-Arab security alliance 1, 2–4, 14
international relations 6; special relationship paradigm in 2; structuralist-realist theories 1
Iraq: alliance with Jordan 32–3; arms supplies of United States to 24; British commitment to Hashemite regime in 38–9; oil supplies to Jordan cut off 35; Qasim regime in 34, 90–1 n12; revolution in (July 1958) 33, 34
Israel: alliance with France 48; alliance with Jordan 79–81, 83, 102 n10, n11; American perceptions of 4, 12, 14, 42; anti-Americanism in 12; arms supplies

of United Kingdom to 50; arms supplies of United States to 9, 28–9, 42, 46, 50–2, 53, 67–72, 99–100 n56, n62; balancing strategies towards Egypt 7, 18, 20, 43, 57; deterrence strategies towards Egypt 17, 26, 43, 60; deterrence strategies towards Syria 77–8; opposition to American arms supplies to Jordan 99 n53; protection of Hashemite monarchy 20–2, 38, 43, 56–7, 64–5, 74, 76, 81, 82; role in April 1963 crisis (Jordan) 55, 58; role in July 1958 crisis (Jordan) 31, 39–40, 41, 49, 79; role in September 1957 crisis (Syria) 23, 25–6; role in September 1970 crisis (Jordan) 77–9, 80, 81; security guarantees from United States 21–2, 26, 29, 49–50, 53, 65–6, 67; security ties with Jordan 8, 64–5, 73, 80, 100–1 n69, n70; strategic dialogue with Jordan 57, 64, 80, 102 n10; strategic partnership with United States 5, 9, 15–16, 18, 21, 22–3, 24–5, 27–8, 29, 39–42, 46–7, 54–6, 73–4, 76, 78–9, 82–3; threats of military intervention in Jordan 21–2, 43, 44–5, 58, 60–1, 62–3, 80, 81, 94 n46

Jervis, Robert 6
Jewish lobby, in United States 2, 3
Johnson administration: arms sales policies of 66–9, 70–3; strategic partnership with Israel 66
Jones, G. Lewis 51–2
Jordan: alliance with Iraq 32–3; alliance with Israel 79–81, 83, 102 n10, n11; alliance with United States 19–20, 70; Anglo-American intervention in 31, 36–9; April 1957 crisis 18–19; April 1963 crisis 54, 55, 57–8, 63–4; arms supplies of United States to 7, 66–7, 68, 70–3, 99 n53; and Baghdad Pact 16–17; balancing strategies of 18, 19, 35, 81; bandwagoning strategies of 17, 65; Egyptian threats to Hashemite monarchy 6, 7, 17, 18, 43–4, 75; Israeli military intervention threats in 21–2, 43, 44–5, 58, 60–1, 62–3, 80, 81, 94 n46; Israeli protection of Hashemite monarchy 20–2, 38, 43, 56–7, 64–5, 74, 76, 81, 82; July 1958 crisis 7, 16, 18–19, 31, 32–3, 35–41, 49, 54, 79, 83, 95 n62; security ties with Israel 8, 64–5, 73, 80, 100–1 n69, n70; September 1970 crisis 8, 73, 76–80, 81, 83, 101–2 n5; strategic dialogue with Israel 57, 64, 80, 102 n10; Syrian intervention in 76; Western orientation of 67
July 1958 crisis (Jordan) 7, 16, 18–19, 32–3, 35, 83; Anglo-American intervention in 31, 36–9, 54, 95 n62; Israeli role in 31, 39–40, 41, 49, 79

Kennedy administration: and April 1963 crisis (Jordan) 56, 63–4; arms supplies to Israel 53; crisis management diplomacy of 60; deterrence strategies towards Egypt 60–2; objections to Israeli military intervention in Jordan 62–3; and security guarantees to Israel 65–6; strategic partnership with Israel 46–7, 54–6, 64
Kennedy, John F. (President of United States): on Egyptian threats to Jordan 61–2; on objections to Israeli military intervention in Jordan 63; on strategy of extended deterrence 58–9
Komer, Robert 53, 62, 67–8, 69, 71

Lebanon, civil war in 33, 34–5
Levey, Zach 72
Little, Douglas 11

Lloyd, Selwyn Brooke *see* Selwyn-Lloyd, (John) Selwyn (Brooke), Baron

Macmillan, Sir Harold (Prime Minister of United Kingdom) 38, 39
McNamara, Robert 70
Matri, Nasib 33
Meir, Golda 65
Middle East: anti-Western elements in 2, 3–4; arms race in 52; British influence in 17; crisis episodes in 16, 23; Eisenhower administration's policies towards 1, 3, 4, 7, 10–12, 34–5, 41; military presence of United States in 19, 24, 77; pro-Western elements in 4, 67
military assistance *see* arms supplies
military interventions: Anglo-American in Jordan 31, 36–9, 49, 54, 95 n62; of Syria in Jordan 76; threats of Israel in Jordan 21–2, 43, 44–5, 58, 60–1, 62–3, 80, 81, 94 n46; United States in Lebanon 33, 34–5
military presence, of United States in Middle East 19, 24, 77
Murphy, Robert D. 35, 43–4
Mutual Security Program (United States and Israel) 46

al-Nabulsi, Sulayman 18
al-Nasser, Gamal Abd (President of Egypt) 27; American views of 42–3' 94 n47; on Jordanian unrest 60
national interest paradigm 1, 3; in American–Israeli alliance 5
National Security Council (NSC, United States) 41–2, 47, 53, 67
nationalism, Arab 2, 3–4, 38, 57
Nixon administration, strategic partnership with Israel 76, 78–9, 82–3
'Nixon Doctrine' 78
Nixon, Richard M. (President of United States), on September 1970 crisis (Jordan) 101–2 n5
NSC *see* National Security Council (NSC, United States)

Operation Fortitude 31, 36–9, 49, 54, 95 n62

Palestinians: challenging Hashemite monarchy 73, 76; unrest on West Bank 17, 18, 57–8
PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization), establishment of 73
pro-Western orientations: of Jordan 67; in Middle East 4
public opinion, American 93 n38

Qasim regime (Iraq) 34, 90–1 n12

realist theories, in international relations 1
regional developments, in Middle East 2, 4
regional security issues, American–Israeli cooperation on 56, 65
revolution, in Iraq (July 1958) 33, 34
Rostow, Walt W. 100 n62
Rusan, Mahmud 32, 35
Rusk, Dean 57, 68, 72–3

al-Said, Nuri (Prime Minister of Iraq) 28, 33
security alliances, inter-Arab 1, 2–4, 11, 14
security guarantees, of United States to Israel 21–2, 26, 29, 49–50, 53, 65–6, 67
security ties, between Jordan and Israel 8, 64–5, 73, 80, 100–1 n69, n70
Selwyn-Lloyd, (John) Selwyn (Brooke), Baron 38
September 1957 crisis (Syria) 23–4, 25–6

September 1970 crisis (Jordan) 8, 73, 76–7, 83, 101–2 n5; Israeli role in 77–9, 80, 81
Shamoun, Camille 33
Soviet Union, military assistance to Middle Eastern countries 24, 66
special relationship paradigm: and American–Israeli alliance 3, 5, 12, 75; in international relations 2
Spiegel, Steven L. 82
strategic dialogue, between Israel and Jordan 57, 64, 80, 102 n10
strategic partnership between United States and Israel: connections with Israeli–Jordanian relations 73–4, 82, 83, 101 n70; Eisenhower administration 5, 9, 15–16, 18, 21, 22–3, 24–5, 27–8, 29, 39-42; Israeli views of 47–9; Johnson administration 66; Kennedy administration 46–7, 54–6, 64; Nixon administration 76, 78–9, 82–3
structuralist-realism: of Eisenhower administration 4; in international relations 1
Symmes, Harrison M. 99 n48, 100 n66
Syria: alliance with Egypt 27, 32; Israeli deterrence strategies towards 77–8; military intervention in Jordan 76; September 1957 crisis 23–4, 25–6

Tripartite Declaration (1950) 62
Turkey, arms supplies of United States to 24

United Arab Republic (UAR, Egypt and Syria) 32
United Kingdom: arms supplies to Israel 50; commitment to Hashemite Iraq 38–9; Middle Eastern policies of 17; military intervention in July 1958 crisis (Jordan) 31, 36–9, 54, 95 n62
United States: alliance with Egypt 11, 14–15, 26; alliance with Jordan 19–20, 70; and Arab world 12, 13–14; arms supplies to Iraq and Turkey 24; arms supplies to Israel 9, 28–9, 42, 46, 50–2, 53, 67–72, 99–100 n56, n62; arms supplies to Jordan 7, 66–7, 68, 70–3, 99 n53; deterrence strategies towards Egypt 58–9, 60–2; intervention in July 1958 crisis (Jordan) 31, 36–9; intervention in Lebanese civil war (1958) 33, 34–5; Jewish lobby in 2, 3; military presence in Middle East 19, 24, 77; perceptions of Egypt 27; perceptions of Israel 4, 12, 14, 42; public opinion in 93 n38; security guarantees for Israel 21–2, 26, 29, 49–50, 53, 65–6, 67; strategic partnership with Israel 5, 9, 15–16, 18, 21, 22–3, 24–5, 27–8, 29, 39–42, 46–7, 54–6, 73–4, 76, 78–9, 82–3; *see also* Eisenhower administration; Johnson administration; Kennedy administration; Nixon administration

West Bank: Israeli threats of moving into 62; Palestinian unrest on 17, 18, 57–8
Western orientations, in Middle East 4, 67