

Introduction was
broken up and
separated into

[Business](#), [Industries](#)



INTRODUCTION There has been American and Western interests in the Middle East involving military, political and economic issues for at least 100 years from The United States, Great Britain and France. It was 95 years ago when United States Congress passed a bill called "The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920." The bill was designed to coerce Great Britain to let American companies into the Middle Eastern oil fields with them when the initial drilling and excavation of the region's oil reserves began.

Today's posited US interests in the Middle East can be broken down into five areas: ensuring the free flow of oil; preventing nuclear proliferation; fighting terrorism; maintaining the security of Israel; and promoting democratization. LITERATURE REVIEW In 1928, American interest in stabilizing the region came when Standard Oil Company's CEO, Walter Teagle, signed the negotiation for American interest in oil excavation in the Middle East. The deal that was negotiated by a Turkish citizen named Gulbenkian, who gave 23.75 percent to Great Britain, Denmark, France and America that desired the oil assets of the Near East Development Company (American oil interests), and the key negotiator of the deal was to receive five percent. There were no profits left for the people who actually live on the land and have lived there for many generations. This sort of agreement with the Indigenous people should only be possible when a nation has been defeated by war, such as, when the British and French took control of the Ottoman Empire and at the end of WW1 the Central Powers had been defeated. The defeated Ottoman Empire was broken up and separated into many countries by the newly formed League of Nations; most of the responsibility fell on Great Britain, being the greatest power in the world at

the time. The British had actually used the war with the Ottoman Empire to invade and seize the oil rich land.

They were so sure of the potential that Great Britain risked by alienating France through capturing Mosul from French control in order to seize the land for potential oilfields. This was the beginning of what would be three decades of exploitation of the oil fields of the Middle East. ORIGIN AND NATURE The American interests in the Middle East took a blow in the 60's and 70's in Iraq; when through the progression of steps, Saddam Hussein nationalized the oil industry of Iraq.

The nationalization of the oil industry encompassed all of the assets that were in Iraq; that is, the entire infrastructure that was for oil exploration and transportation of oil were lost. Israel is another central U. S. interest, often linked to a desire to promote peace between Israel and the Palestinians. The Palestinian-Israel conflict originated after World War I as a result of the promise of independence to Middle-East after the war which later turned into Palestine and other territories becoming " mandates".

The peace process, moreover, is dead for now. Palestinians and Israelis seem more skeptical than ever—a skepticism shared by U. S. officials. Thus, for the foreseeable future, high-level diplomacy to bring peace seems unlikely.

The first official involvement of the European Community (EC) in the Palestinian-Israel conflict dates back to the 1973 Yom Kippur War and the resulting global oil crisis. One month after the war, the EC issued a declaration recognizing the " legitimate rights" of the Palestinians and calling

for an Israeli withdrawal from all territories occupied during the 1967 Arab-Israeli War. Simultaneously, the EC initiated the "Euro-Arab Dialogue" to foster better understanding with the Arab world. These actions marked a historic change in European attitudes toward Israel, with unflinching support being much less likely after 1973. At the 1977 London summit, EC member states declared that a solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict could not be achieved without recognition of the national identity of the Palestinian people and their right to "a homeland". Issued in the wake of the US-sponsored Camp David Accords, the Venice Declaration proclaimed that "traditional ties and common interests" with the Middle East obliged EC member states to play "a special role" in the pursuit of a peace settlement.

In a radical diversion from the US position, the EC also called for the participation of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in peace negotiations and branded Israeli settlements as "illegal" under international law. While the 1970s therefore witnessed the emergence of a more consolidated European position on the Palestinian problem, the EC's influence on the conflict throughout the following decades remained minimal. Indeed, it was only with the onset of the 1993 Oslo Peace Process - aimed at preparing the ground for a final settlement - that Europe started to assume a greater role in regional affairs. Ceding the high-diplomacy of the peace process to the United States, Europe sought to back a final settlement through the provision of greater economic aid and by bankrolling the emerging Palestinian Authority (PA).

The launching of the 1995 Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) was supposed to provide Europe with another tool to influence regional developments. The government of the United States was at the time run by President Jimmy Carter; his plan was to begin national oil independence, thus freeing the U. S. from the grip of Middle Eastern control over the flow of oil. Some laws were passed to push companies to build more fuel-efficient cars, and some government regulations were created, like the 55 mph speed limit. The problem was that in the next few years many of the conservation measures were abandoned with the return of cheap oil, the Arab countries of Organizations of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) realized that they could lose their largest customer so they cut the U.

S. some slack, allowing foreign countries to continue to obtain their oil at a reduced rate. This chain of events that took place in the seventies was all that some politicians needed to connect the security of our nation to the stability of the Middle East. The importation of oil suddenly took on national importance when politicians thought about the potential for disaster with the country's economy to be so dependent on the importation of cheap oil from the Middle East. The statement now is that the nation's security is not dependent on stability in the Middle East. CURRENT SCENARIO The interests of the American oil industry have been protected by government through the use of force and the loss of American servicemen and women, and this is reprehensible.

The fact is, if the United States as a nation had spent as much effort and money on finding energy alternatives, they would not be worried about Iraq,

Iran, Syria or ISIS. The American interests in the Middle East are a direct result of the country's policies, not the other way around, and these policies are a direct result of supporting the oil company's exploitation of the natural resources of the Middle East. In recent years, the European Union has sought a larger role in the Middle East peace process through developing a unique set of instruments and policies. The EU has at its disposal several distinctive diplomatic instruments that it can draw on in its search for multilateral solutions and crisis management, most notably: the EuroMediterranean Partnership (EMP), the EU Special Envoy (EUSR), and the EU's participation in the Quartet. To these has recently been added the new European Neighborhood Policy (ENP).

The EC has channeled humanitarian aid to the Palestinian territories since 1971 through the UN Relief Works Agency (UNRWA). Subsequently, this was complemented by direct assistance to Palestinian civil society and the financing of large infrastructure projects within the framework of the Oslo Process. Indeed, EU aid has been instrumental in establishing public services in the occupied territories and has bankrolled some prestigious projects, such as the Gaza air and sea ports.

Preferential trade access has been granted to some Palestinian products since 1986. Israel has enjoyed limited preferential trade access with the EC since 1964, which has been broadened over the years. An EC-Israel Association Agreement entered into force in 2000. This agreement includes provision for free trade in industrial products, a gradual liberalization in

agricultural products, political dialogue, free movement of capital, freedom of establishment, and many more.

Although Europe has been able to develop an increasingly united stance on the peace process, the real extent of its internal cohesion remains questionable. Indeed there are several countries, including Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK, which have been prone to veto any European attempt to criticize Israel's behavior or sanction its actions. The Middle East peace process has been a priority of the European Union since 1973 and its solution remains one of Europe's prime foreign policy goals. While over the last forty years Europe has been successful in carving out a more influential role for itself, the limits of its influence are a good representation of the problems haunting Europe's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).

Contrary to popular opinion, the EU has at its disposal a unique set of instruments that it could potentially use to play a more assertive role in the peace process. It has important political and economic ties with the two conflicting parties, and in many ways has followed a more even-handed approach toward the conflict than America has. REFERENCE <http://europa.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Brief6-0803-palestinian-israeliconflict.pdf>