

PUBLISHERS INTRODUCTION  
"ONE NATION UNDER ISRAEL..."

Former United States Senator J. William Fulbright, Chairman of the  
powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated repeatedly in 1973, "Israel  
controls the (U.S.) Senate." Senator James G. Abourezk of South Dakota told reporters  
at a Colorado Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner where he was keynote speaker in 1977, "as  
a United States Senator, I have sworn an oath to uphold the government of the United States,  
but I never dreamed I would be required to swear allegiance to any other government." He  
continued, "the United States is likely to become, if it has not already become, a captive state  
of its client state." Senator Fulbright was driven from office by the very lobby he tried to  
expose, a testimony to the power of the Israeli lobby (Senator Abourezk served only  
one term).

Israeli influence extends to the Executive Branch as well. On May 18, 1998,  
Vice President AI Gore told the 39th Annual Policy Conference of the American  
Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), "our commitment to the security of Israel is  
unconditional." At the very hour when President William Jefferson Clinton faced an  
impeachment indictment, the Vice-President pledged his allegiance, not to "one  
nation under God..." but to one nation under Israel.

Nor is the power of AIPAC limited to Democrats. Former President George  
Prescott Bush admitted in an interview on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's  
January 1999 documentary "Fifty Vears War: Israel & the Arabs" that he had been  
threatened and intimidated when, prior to the 1992 election, he considered  
withholding a $10 billion dollar loan guaranty to the State of Israel. He described his  
intimidator as an agent of "AIPAC... a very powerful Israeli lobby", Mr. Bush stated he  
was threatened with an "end to his political career". However, his interview omits one  
even more incredible detail: that later in 1992 President Bush quietly approved that  
very same loan.

"One Nation Under Israel" may be the first historically documented expose  
of the hijacking of the American Congress. It is a popular lament that, "Congress is  
out of control," but nothing could be further from the truth. For as Author Andrew  
Hurley clearly explains, Congress is not under the control of its constituents but of a  
foreign power.

"One Nation Under Israel..." was first published in 1990 on the very  
threshold of the Gulf War. It was then entitled "Holocaust II, Saving Israel From  
Suicide." In it, Author Andrew Hurley wrote a clear but unheard warning to the

American people that they were losing control of their government. In spite of  
Hurley's careful scholarship and the timely subject matter, the book was blacklisted by  
the Israeli patriot controlled media, publishing houses, booksellers, and book  
reviewers, and few had a chance to read it. Mr. Hurley's warning rings out even more  
strongly today with the return to power of the more militant, Likud party under  
Benjamin Netanyahu and former Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, the crumbling peace  
process, and seemingly endless explosion of bombs, threats and famines in the Middle

Author Hurley is a historian. His book is a fascinating, scholarly history of  
the creation of the State of Israel in 1948 by United Nations' partitioning of Palestine.  
He factually documents Israel's subsequent expansion by war and encroachment into  
neighboring territories. The middle chapters describe the lobbying history of the State  
of Israel in the American Congress, and the last chapters are devoted to Hurley's  
suggestion for a lasting peace plan in the Middle East. It is only in this third section  
that the publisher's views differ in some respects from those expressed by the author.  
These divergent views are available to readers in the Publisher's Warmaker Series,  
timely reports exposing the hidden agenda of global subjugation via ruthless imposed  
World Government organizations masquerading as "peace promoting benefactors of

In delivering this revelation to the American people, author Hurley states,  
"As many writers and speakers have learned, it is virtually impossible for a non-Jewish author or  
speaker to write or say anything to do with Israel or Jewish people that cannot be interpreted by  
someone as veiled, if not blatant anti-SemitismAccordingly, Hurley's book relies almost  
exclusively upon "well known and highly respected Israeli and Jewish writers, members  
or former members of the Israeli government, well known and generally accepted

Mr. Hurley holds academic degrees in both political science and law. He has  
been an attorney for more that 40 years, during which time he served as an executive  
or on the Boards of Directors of Northern Pacific Railroad, Hunt Foods and  
Industries, the McCall Corporation, and the Norton Simon Foundation. He is now  
retired. Andrew Hurley wrote this remarkable book as a public service at the end of a  
long successful financial and law career. Your Publisher is distributing "One Nation  
Under Israel..." primarily through Internet sales in order to bypass establishment  
book distribution channels, which would again bury the book without comment.  
Truth Press can be contacted at 4839 East Greenway Rd.#151, Scottsdale, AZ 85254

Hurley's uniquely vital message to the peoples of the entire world is that the  
American Congress has for decades been virtually under the control of a lobbying  
machine dominated by the State of Israel. Those who govern the State of Israel  
receive billions of dollars annually in U.S. Foreign Aid. Millions of these dollars are  
recycled into the American Israeli Public Affairs Council (AIPAC). This lobby acting  
in concert with possibly as many as 100 American financed, pro-Israeli PAC's then  
influence and intimidate a sufficient number of our elected Congressmen, who  
provide more billions for Israel, and the cycle continues.

More expensive than the direct cost of foreign aid, is the effect of the Israeli  
lobby's influence over U.S. policy involving other countries and resultant human cost  
of warmaking over the last 50 years. Senator Charles Percy, a successor to Fulbright as  
Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated in a public debate on 60  
Minutes in 1988, "I finally reached the point where I saw our foreign policy totally turned  
around with the Muslim World - 800 million people. Can Israel and the Prime Minister have  
more power than the Congress?" Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United  
Nations, George Ball stated, "Practically every congressman and senator says his prayers to  
the AIPAC lobby...they have done an enormous job of corrupting the American democratic  
process." Percy was rewarded for objecting to massive foreign military aid to Israel by

Speaking from his California home, Author Hurley recently stated, "while the  
U.S. attacks Iraq for alleged violation of United Nations resolutions, Israel has violated almost  
every resolution of the U.N. for the past 25 years and remains in violation. Virtually every other  
nation in the U.N. has voted in support of the Palestinian position and against Israel's  
confiscation of Arab lands. The U. S. has vetoed every such resolution of the UN. concerning

The powerful Israeli lobby does not depend entirely on a club to get its way  
with Congress, it also offers bait. The subtle, everyday workings of this "Israeli  
occupation" of Congress was shown through a routine back page news story in a  
Phoenix newspaper in July 1998, which revealed that second term Arizona  
Congressman John Shadegg and his wife accepted an, $8,400.00 expense paid trip to  
Israel the previous year. The trip was reported as an in-kind contribution from  
AIPAC. In truth it was a quid pro quo donation from Israel. The junket story  
appeared coincidentally with an important May 24, 1998, foreign policy vote on a  
heavily Israeli lobbied bill which contained severe economic sanctions against the  
central African Republic of Sudan, a country so remote that no standing Congressman  
has ever visited it. But Sudan is one of Israel's most outspoken critics and a growing  
influence in the Arab world due to its enormous undeveloped oil reserves. All but 41

members of Congress voted for the sanctions. In 1994 AIPAC offered its posh Israel

U.S. warmaking in the Middle East appears to have only one lasting  
beneficiary, the State of Israel. Israel's military and political power has been magnified  
by the destruction of its neighbors and the enormous military aid it has received from  
the American taxpayer. Andrew Hurley's magnificent book clearly explains why and  
how. At a Phoenix meeting of AIPAC in 1998 its spokesman boasted to the attendees  
that in a poll of 2,400 Congressmen and staff members AIPAC had been voted the  
second most powerful lobby group in Washington. But Andrew Hurley tells us  
AIPAC is being modest. He states, "You need not concern yourself about educating  
Congress about AIPAC, every one of them knows it very well. It is the public who doesn't know  
about it - and they need to know." Your Publisher agrees. "One Nation, Under Israel..."  
reveals a 51 state with more power that the other 50 put together. And now...the
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INTRODUCTION

How the Book Was Written

F

IRST, AND MOST IMPORTANT, the book has been written  
in a race against time. One of the major challenges has been to keep  
ahead of current events.

The subject matter of the book is so highly controversial and emotionally  
charged that writing it has involved special problems. The format,  
therefore, has been determined more by necessity than by choice, and, in  
some respects, departs from customary book structure.

As many writers and speakers have learned, it is virtually impossible for  
a non-Jewish author or speaker to write or say anything having to do with  
Israel or the Jewish people that cannot be interpreted by someone as veiled,  
if not blatant, anti-Semitism. The only completely safe course to follow is  
to write or say nothing on the subject, which is the conventional wisdom.

An alternative may be to support and establish a position upon the basis  
of sources and authorities that have unimpeachable credentials and are  
immune to any suggestion of anti-Semitism.

The latter course has been the choice adopted for this book. Accordingly,  
with few exceptions, this book relies almost exclusively on the following  
sources and authorities:

1. Well-known and highly respected Israeli and Jewish writers.
2. Members, or former members, of the Israeli government.
3. Well-known and generally accepted historians.
4. Responsible and objective news media, i.e., the Jerusalem Post  
   (International Edition), the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times,  
   Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report, Fortune, Business Week, The  
   Wall Street Journal, network television, etc.
5. Members of Congress and the Executive Branch of the United States
6. The Congressional Record and other public documents.
7. The Encyclopedia ]udaica and The Encyclopedia Britannica.

To avoid a charge that the sources and authorities have been misquoted,  
selectively quoted, or quoted out of context, the quoted material relied upon  
to support various positions taken in this book has been set forth verbatim

This approach also serves to reduce the number of source or reference  
notes at the end of the book since, in most cases, the sources are set forth  
in the text itself. This gives the reader the benefit of knowing immediately,  
before reading the material, the authority relied upon by the author for the

PREFACE

I HIS BOOK IS CONCERNED with the Israeli-Palestinian  
JL crisis and the threat it poses to the survival of Israel and to world

It is not primarily intended as a literary work—but rather as a means of  
advancing a plan for peace in the Middle East.

Many of the positions taken in this book reflect, not only the views of the  
author, but also the opinions of many prominent Israelis, as well as those  
of important members of the American Jewish Community.

The following, in summary form, are the contentions of the author as set

* 1. The present Likud government of Israel is embarked on a suicidal  
     course which, if allowed to continue, will lead inevitably to the
  2. Today, as so often in its tragic history, Israel is the victim of the folly
  3. The survival of Israel is too important to leave solely in the hands of
  4. The continuance in power of the Likud government, despite its  
     disastrous policies, has been made possible by the well-meaning but  
     misguided and blind support of the American Jewish Establishment.  
     Acting through the Israeli Lobby, it has frustrated and defeated efforts  
     on the part of the U.S. and others to bring peace to Israel and the
  5. The American Jewish leadership is not listening to the urgent voices  
     of reason from Israel, i.e., Abba Eban, Yehoshafat Harkabi, Simha  
     Flapan, Amos Perlmutter, and many others, who are alarmed and fear
  6. The time has come when the Israeli people desperately need the  
     intervention of the Diaspora to save Israel from its government  
     before it is too late.
  7. The historic events that have occurred in the Middle East over the  
     past year have provided an unprecedented opportunity to bring about  
     a peaceful settlement of the central issue—the future of the West  
     Bank, Gaza, and a Palestinian state.

The intent and purpose of this book is to offer a solution to the Middle  
East crisis and to outline a plan for peace between Israel and the Pales-  
tinians, which will provide for Israel the security it needs, and at the same  
time will satisfy the right of the Palestinian people to an independent  
sovereign state.

As the U.S. government continues to be intimidated and paralyzed by the  
Israeli Lobby, and the American Jewish leadership continues to remain  
aloof from this crisis, all that stands between Israel and catastrophe is the  
voice of the American Jewish Community.

If American Jewry does not respond at this critical moment in Israel's  
history, they must be prepared to accept the inevitability of a new Holo-  
caust with the Jews of Israel among the victims.



CHAPTER I

The March of Folly

I

N HER RECENT BOOK entitled The March of Folly, distin-  
guished author-historian, the late Barbara Tuchman, explains what the  
title of her book is intended to mean:

A phenomenon noticeable throughout history regardless of place or  
period is the pursuit by governments of policies contrary to their own  
interests. Mankind, it seems, makes a poorer performance of govern-  
ment than of almost any other human activity. In this sphere, wisdom,  
which may be defined as the exercise of judgment acting on experience,  
common sense, and available information, is less operative and more  
frustrated than it should be. Why do holders of high office so often act  
contrary to the way reason points and enlightened self-interest suggests?  
Why does intelligent mental process seem so often not to function?

She defines it as the "pursuit of policy contrary to self-interest." As a  
classic example, she cites the case of Rehoboam, King of Israel, son of King  
Solomon, who succeeded to his father's throne in 926 b.c.

Rehoboam, a headstrong and ambitious ruler, ignored the advice of his  
father's prudent counselors and provoked the northern ten tribes of Israel  
into revolt under a new leader, Jeroboam. Only the tribes of Judah and  
Benjamin stayed loyal to Rehoboam, with the result that the Hebrew  
kingdom was bitterly divided. The historic rupture never healed; it de-  
stroyed forever the unity of Eretz Israel (Land of Israel) and proved a  
turning point in the political and religious history of the Hebrews.

Tuchman goes on to cite other instances in history where human  
blindness to consequences has caused many avoidable catastrophes and  
summarizes the far-reaching consequences of Rehoboam's folly:

The kingdom of Judah, containing Jerusalem, lived on as the land of the  
Jewish people. It suffered conquest, too, and exile by the waters of  
Babylon, then revival, civil strife, foreign sovereignty, rebellion, another  
conquest, another farther exile and dispersion, oppression, ghetto and  
massacre—but not disappearance. The alternative course that Reho-  
boam might have taken, advised by the elders and so lightly rejected,  
exacted a long revenge that has left its mark for 2800 years: [Emphasis  
supplied]

Thus the ancient land of Eretz Israel was not conquered from without,  
but was torn apart by internal dissension.

The theme of recurrent tragedy, above referred to by Tuchman, has been  
the cruel fate of the Jewish people throughout its history. However, most  
of these tragedies were self-inflicted and the result of the folly, foolhardi-  
ness, and ambition of its leaders. Once again the people of Israel are being  
betrayed by their leaders, it is the pied pipers of the Likud government who  
are today marching the people of Israel to certain disaster.

folly marches on

As we have seen, beginning in 926 b.c., Eretz Israel was divided into two  
rival and hostile kingdoms: "Israel" in the north and "Judah" (including  
Jerusalem) in the south, each torn by bitter dynastic struggles and enmities.  
After his successful revolt from Judah, Jeroboam dedicated his efforts to  
making his new kingdom of Israel, completely independent of Judah under  
Rehoboam. To keep his people from going to Jerusalem to worship, he  
established new sanctuaries for worship at Bethel and Dan. He removed  
from the religious rituals all Judean reminders and changed the old festival  
dates to new ones. He set up two golden calves in the sanctuaries for the  
people to worship, thus transforming completely the spiritual meaning of  
the worship of Yahve (God).

Politically and spiritually alienated from Judah, the kingdom of Israel  
suffered through repeated revolutions and assassinations. Nine dynasties  
were established in little more than two hundred years. Nineteen kings fol-  
lowed each other, usually compelled to fight a bloody path to the throne.[[1]](#footnote-1)

the assyrians

In the year 734 b.c., the Kingdom of Israel (the northern ten tribes)  
under King Pekah joined a league of other kings in defiance of Assyria, the  
then dominant empire in the Middle East.

The Assyrian king, Tilgath-Pileser III, responded by launching a ruthless  
military campaign to crush the alliance. The Kingdom of Israel was quickly  
invaded by the Assyrians and thousands of its most important inhabitants  
were uprooted and scattered throughout the Assyrian empire. What had  
been the Kingdom of Israel was renamed "Samaria" by its Assyrian con-  
querors.

Within a decade, two successive invasions by Assyrian kings, Shalma-  
neser V and Sargon II, completed the destruction of the northern kingdom.  
The remaining population was deported and scattered by the Assyrians to  
the four winds and disappeared from history as the "Ten Lost Tribes of  
Israel."

As was their custom with difficult conquests, the Assyrians transplanted  
and resettled into Samaria new and alien peoples in place of the Israelites.  
These non-Jewish inhabitants, called "Samaritans," were largely composed  
of Cathaeans, Babylonians, Elamites, and Sushanites.

isaiah

Having witnessed the fate of Israel and the consequences of defying the  
Assyrian Empire, the surviving Kingdom of Judah prudently decided to  
follow the path of peace. For a time King Hezekiah of Judah wisely  
counseled his people to live and prosper in the sight of God, to build cities,  
to carry on commerce, and avoid war.

Thus for a time Judah escaped the fate of other neighboring countries,  
many of which suffered ruin and desolation as a consequence of war and  
defeat at the hands of the Assyrians. Nevertheless, the militant factions at  
Hezekiah's court were conspiring to stage a rebellion and conclude an  
alliance with Egypt and the Philistines to overthrow the Assyrians. The  
more King Hezekiah hesitated, the more the militants clamored for action.

The prophet Isaiah begged Hezekiah to profit by the fate of the  
Kingdom of Israel and other Assyrian victims. Desperately, Isaiah appealed  
over the heads of the "war party" to the good sense of the people. He  
walked around Jerusalem in bare feet, in sackcloth, prophesying that those  
who plotted to join the war against Assyria would be destroyed.

In spite of Isaiah's pleas in 714 b.c., Hezekiah under pressure from the  
militants joined the alliance against the Assyrians.

The vindication of Isaiah's foresight and the consequences of Hezekiah's  
folly came in 701 b.c. Sennachireb, the Assyrian king, attacked the league  
and crushed the rebellion. His armies spread fire and destruction through-  
out Judah and besieged Jerusalem. Finally a truce was arranged under which  
the Kingdom of Judah lost most of its territories. The city was plundered,  
Hezekiah's daughters were carried off to Nineveh, and he was left with  
only his crown and the ruined city of Jerusalem.

jeremiah

A century later, the Assyrian empire in its turn was overthrown by the  
Babylonians under the great King Nebuchadnezzar. In his reign of forty-  
three years, Nebuchadnezzar spread the civilization of the new Babylon  
throughout the world. History records his reign as a time of relative peace  
and prosperity.

As long as the Kingdom of Judah submitted peacefully to Babylon,  
Nebuchadnezzar did not interfere with its internal affairs. However, a  
militant rebel faction in Judah was soon scheming with surrounding  
nations for a war to break loose from Babylon. This time it was the Prophet  
Jeremiah who pleaded for peace, insisting that Judah, wedged between  
mighty nations, could find salvation only by remaining outside of alliances  
and coalitions and that any thought of rebellion was foolhardy.

Because of his warnings, Jeremiah became the most unpopular man in  
Jerusalem. He was ridiculed by the priests, denounced by the militants, and  
condemned by the people. He sent copies of his sermons, pleading for  
peace, to the king who angrily destroyed them. Jeremiah barely escaped  
execution as a traitor. The king defied the might of Babylon and prepared  
for war.

While Jeremiah was still preaching the cause of peace, the Babylonian  
King Nebuchadnezzar swept down and overwhelmed the kingdom of  
Judah. The king, and most of the leading citizens, were taken captive and  
transported to Babylon.

the babylonian captivity

Incredibly, the surviving militants in Jerusalem were plotting a new  
rebellion against Babylon. Again, Jeremiah vainly preached peace and  
repentance. In a final act of exasperation Nebuchadnezzar descended again  
with his armies upon Jerusalem. Jeremiah advised King Zedekiah to  
surrender, and for this advice Jeremiah was starved, beaten, and left to die.

After a two and a half year siege, Jerusalem was taken, the temple burnedto the ground, the city utterly destroyed, and the population taken as  
captives to Babylon.

The Jews remained in Babylon for approximately fifty years after the  
destruction of Jerusalem, until Cyrus the Persian conquered Babylon. Cyrus,  
a generous king, gave the Jewish exiles permission to return to their home  
and rebuild the Temple. A majority of them, however, preferred to live in  
Babylon rather than return to Jerusalem. As a result, Babylon developed  
into, and remained, a great center of Jewish culture for the next mil-  
lennium.

Other Jewish communities in Babylon, instead of returning to Jerusalem,  
chose to emigrate to Egypt, where they became populous and powerful in  
the centuries to come.

The rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem was begun almost imme-  
diately by the returnees from Babylon. The Samaritans (the people who  
had been settled by the Assyrians in Samaria on the West Bank of the  
Jordan and who had replaced the ten tribes of Israel) offered to help rebuild  
the Temple. Their offer was scornfully rejected by the Jews who refused to  
have anything to do with them. The Samaritan population was despised by  
the Jews as a "mongrel race." Jews were not only forbidden to intermarry  
with them, but were denied any social or religious contact with them. Even  
commercial transactions were severely limited. Samaritans were considered  
enemies of Judah or, at least, friends of the enemies of the Jews.

Bitter at their rejection and resentful of the attitude of the Jews toward  
them, the Samaritans built their own temple at Mount Gerizim at Shechem  
(today known as Nablus, a city on the West Bank of the Jordan). When  
Antiochus of Syria invaded Judea in 168 b.c., the Samaritans, as an  
expression of revenge for their ostracism, rededicated their temple at  
Mount Gerizim to the Greek god Zeus. Forty years later, following the  
restoration of the Jewish (Hasmonean) monarchy, John Hyrcanus des-  
troyed the Samaritan temple.

The Jews and Samaritans lived side by side in a relationship of mutual  
hatred and distrust for many centuries.

The pious talk of the present-day Likud government of Israel about  
reclaiming the "sacred land of Samaria" on the West Bank is an historical  
travesty.

In 332 b.c. Alexander the Great burst upon the world scene, and in his  
short life conquered the entire Persian empire. Upon Alexanders death,  
the empire was divided among his senior generals. Ptolemy became ruler  
of Egypt, and its capital city of Alexandria attracted large numbers of Jews,who prospered under the privileges extended to them by him. Over the  
years, the Jewish community grew powerful and at one time comprised  
almost forty percent of the population of Alexandria, the second largest city  
in the Mediterranean world.

In the case of Palestine, however, this favorable situation came to an end  
with the triumph of Antiochus of Syria over the Ptolemian armies and in  
201 b.c. Judah came under the control of the Selucids.

The Selucid dynasty (also founded by one of Alexander's generals)  
attempted to impose Greek customs and religious practices upon the Jews  
to whom "Hellenism" was anathema.

The Jews of Palestine revolted under the famous leader Judas Macca-  
baeus, who conducted a brilliant guerrilla campaign against the Syrians.  
Judas reconquered Jerusalem and reconsecrated the Temple in 165 b.c., an  
event celebrated today as "Hannukah." Thus began the Jewish (Hasmo-  
nean) dynasty of the Maccabees.

the jewish kingdom restored

The first years of the Jewish kingdom under the Maccabees were  
spiritually rich and materially prosperous. Then came a tragic turn in the  
fate of Judah. This is described in the following passage from Abram  
Sachar's A History of the Jews referred to earlier:

Material prosperity continued under John Hyrcanus (son of Simon  
Maccabaeus), who succeeded to the headship of the State when Simon,  
his father, was treacherously assassinated. Perhaps there was now too  
much prosperity; Hyrcanus' head was turned by ambitions to play a role  
in the eastern Mediterranean world. He created a mercenary army, with  
which he proceeded to carve out an empire. He subjugated the  
Samaritans and destroyed their temple. He gave Israel's ancient enemies,  
the Edomites, the alternative of exile or conversion to Judaism. It was a  
sorry commentary upon the perverseness of human nature that Hyrca-  
nus was already spreading his faith by the point of the sword, although  
he was only one generation removed from those who had poured out life  
and fortune for religious freedom. His son, Aristobulus, continued and  
improved upon his example. He pushed his conquests up through  
Galilee and ultimately crowned himself king. He reintroduced the  
dreadful Oriental custom of destroying the members of his family who  
could become a threat to the security of his throne.

Meantime a formidable party had developed that vigorously opposed

the policy of the rulers and their abandonment of Hasmonean idealism,

The Pharisees were opposed by the Sadducees who supported the royal  
policy of imperialism. Their opposition reached the point of civil war in the  
reign of Alexander Jannaeus who succeeded his brother, Aristobulus.  
Jannaeus inaugurated a persecution in which six thousand Pharisees lost  
their lives. Sachar describes the state of anarchy in Judah in these words:

For six years the civil strife continued. Jannaeus was merciless when  
opposed. At one time eight hundred rebels who had held a fortress  
against him were crucified and the throats of their wives and children  
were cut before their dying eyes. Eight thousand others were driven into  
Egyptian exile. Even in the worst days of the Israelite monarchy there

After the death of Jannaeus, his wife, Alexandra, who succeeded to the  
throne, reversed his policy and favoured the Pharisees. For a moment  
there was peace in Judah. The exiles returned, foreign wars ceased, and  
the old faith was practiced without hindrance. But the Pharisees had  
been too sorely outraged to allow their enemies to escape without  
punishment. Firm in their belief that their rancor was virtue, they  
instituted a series of persecutions and judicial murders which opened

The Roman general Pompey was creating an empire in the East for  
the new mistress of the Mediterranean and looked greedily upon the  
fortresses of south-western Asia. Both warring factions in Judea  
appealed to him in 64 b.c. to judge between them, and after a show of  
deliberation he supported Aristobulus and bade his rival begone. He sent  
to Rome the magnificent golden vine which the grateful Aristobulus sent

Next year the Pharisees begged Pompey to abolish the kingship  
altogether, take control of the country, and remove the curse of dynastic  
war. Pompey acted with alacrity and sent his legions to take over the

Thus the end of the Jewish Kingdom of Judah came with an invitation  
to the Romans to take over Jerusalem and Judea.

Sachar concludes this sad chapter with the following observation:

Freedom was again crushed because the Jews had not learned how to use  
it. The selfishness of the ruling houses and the strife of political and  
religious factions exhausted the strength of the State. A curse seemed to  
lie on the Jews which prevented them from reaching the highest levels  
of moral power except when they were hammered and beaten by

A quarter of a century after Rome assumed control over Judea, the state  
was still in turmoil. The people suffered from the interminable feuds of the  
Hasmonean princes—but also from the civil strife and upheaval in Rome

It was during this period that Herod supplanted the declining Hasmo-  
nean dynasty. Herod turned out to be one of the ablest rulers in Jewish  
history and brought peace to Judah. His reign was a genuine Augustan Age  
for Palestine. He respected the scruples of the Pharisees and, as far as he  
was able, did not allow any offensive statues into Jerusalem and even  
omitted his own image from the coinage. He built a magnificent temple, far  
more beautiful than the already legendary Temple of Solomon.

Upon the death of Herod, the last phase of stable Jewish rule effectively  
ended. Instead, there followed a period of great and rising tension, the  
reasons for which were not clear to the Romans. Rome's method of  
governing the empire was considered liberal for the times. Certainly this  
was the view of the six million or more Jews in the Diaspora who were  
treated as a special people accorded many privileges not allowed any other

They had their own courts and system of taxation and were the only  
people not required to offer sacrifices to the emperor or recognize his  
divinity. The Roman Legions were not allowed to enter Jerusalem with  
their Eagle standards for fear of giving offense to the Jews who prohibited  
"graven images." Most of the Jews in Palestine did not see Romans as  
oppressors or enemies of their religion. However, a substantial minority of  
zealots and other extreme militants in Palestine were unreconciled to the  
Romans' rule and from time to time committed violent acts of defiance.

Ultimately, the Romans found the Jews to be ungovernable, even under  
their own rulers, and the people too turbulent to handle without direct  
Roman supervision. A procurator was therefore placed in control, respon-  
sible directly to the emperor. Still the country was rife with rebellion. Therewere three different factions in the Jewish population opposed to the  
Romans, but bitter enemies of each other.

The Roman wars began when the fortress at Masada, which was  
occupied by a Roman garrison, was captured by one group of rebels and the

The Roman soldiers, at the fortress Antonia, offered to surrender and be  
allowed to leave the country. The terms were accepted by the Jews—but as  
soon as the Romans had laid down their arms they were savagely

The tragic story of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman

For the purpose of this book Sachar's account is referred to here:

The city was magnificently fortified, protected externally by a triple circle  
of walls and internally by numerous towers and defenses. And the Jews  
fired by holy zeal were determined not to give in to the Romans while  
the breath of life remained in them. Titus implored the city to surrender  
but the Roman emissaries were killed.

Courage and defiance went for naught, however, in the face of the  
cursed factional strife which cropped up again even in the most critical

Three factions fought each other divided by temperament, by personal  
animosities, by disputes over war methods. One held the upper tower,  
one the lower, and the other the Temple area in between. None co-  
operated with another, riots and assassinations were frequent, while the  
most powerful legions in the world pounded at the gates.

The zealots refused any Roman offers of truce or surrender. They firmly  
believed that God would not let Jerusalem fall. Finally in A.D. 70, after  
incredible suffering, Jerusalem was captured and destroyed. Almost a

The great Jewish historian-general, Josephus, in his account "The Jewish  
War," which was written to show the total impossibility that the war  
against Rome could have succeeded, blames the war and the disaster on the

Josephus wrote that because of their actions, "out of all the cities under  
Roman rule it was the lot of ours [Jerusalem] to attain the highest felicity,

For almost half a century after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews  
lived at peace, enjoying equal political rights with the non-Jewish subjects  
of Rome and enjoying the general prosperity of the times.  
As Sachar describes it:

The Jews gradually adjusted themselves to the tragedy that had come  
upon them. The fall of the Temple and the dissolution of the State  
destroyed all of the outward symbols by which the religious and national  
life of the people had been regulated. Fortunately Judaism was not  
dependent for existence on a sanctuary and sacrifices. The life-blood of  
the nation was the law and the traditions which had grown up about it.  
The truest defenders of the faith were now, not the desperate Zealots  
who sacrificed themselves with sublime stupidity, but the scribes and  
sages who devoted their lives to teaching the masses the meaning of the  
ancient heritage. Such was Johanan ben Zakkai, who established an  
academy at Jabneh at the very moment that the physical State was being  
destroyed. The light which smoldered out in Jerusalem was again  
rekindled. [Emphasis supplied]

Nevertheless, an irreconcilable minority of Jews kept alive an opposition  
which no prosperity could smother. They remained quiet so long as revolt  
seemed useless—but at the first sign of imperial weakness their hopes  
drove them to sedition.

In A.D. 115 the emperor Trajan was heavily involved in a military  
campaign against the still unconquered Parthians and at the same time was  
faced with a rebellion in other parts of the empire. Sachar continues:

The Jews of Egypt, taking advantage of Roman difficulties, began to riot  
against their Roman and Greek enemies, and their disturbances grew  
into a formidable rebellion. This had hardly been suppressed when even  
more serious disturbances occurred in Cyrene and in Cyprus. The Roman  
historian Dio Cassius paints a sensational picture of the uprisings. The  
Jews wiped out nearly half a million people in both places, eating their  
flesh, besmearing themselves with their blood, sawing them asunder,  
feeding them to wild beasts! The account is the distorted version of a  
prejudiced historian, but evidently the Jews were in the grip of a wild and  
irresponsible fanaticism, which drenched Cyprus and Cyrene with blood.  
Trajan was compelled to send one of his ablest generals to cope with the  
fury of the Jews. The devastation was complete; when the last embers ofthe rebellion had been extinguished, it was necessary to rebuild Cyprus  
from its foundations. No Jew was thereafter permitted to set foot on the  
island.

Trajan died in A.D. 117 and was succeeded by Hadrian, whom the Jews  
welcomed as a second "Cyrus." Without malice toward the Jews or an  
understanding of the possible consequences, Hadrian issued two edicts, one  
to build a new city on the ruins of Jerusalem, to be called "Aelia Capitolina"  
and another to outlaw, what he considered a barbaric practice, mutilation.  
He mistakenly included circumcision in that category.  
Sachar dramatically describes the reaction:

Both edicts set the Jews afire and they rose in their final rebellion against  
Rome, one of the most serious and protracted in Roman history.

Led by the venerable Rabbi Akiba and a brilliant young warrior,  
Simon Bar-Kokba, the might of Rome was forgotten. The Jews believed  
that this last stand against the Romans was like no other. It was the  
prelude to the establishment of God's kingdom on earth and, to some of  
his followers, Bar-Kokba was thought to be the Messiah.

The amazing zeal of the aroused nation brought them unexpected  
success in the early months of the rebellion. They completely routed the  
Roman legions and cleared the country of the enemy. Hadrian was obliged  
to recall from Britain his best general Severus to put down the revolt.

In a lengthy campaign of attrition the rebels were finally isolated and  
destroyed. Both Bar Kokba and Akiba were executed. The Romans, who  
had suffered heavy casualties and were in no mood for leniency, began a  
campaign of extermination which finally ended the tragedy.  
Sachar concludes his powerful theme:

The Jewish casualties were much greater than attended the destruction  
of the state in A.D. 70. It is not improbable that a half million lives were  
sacrificed in the hopeless cause. Those who escaped death were rushed to  
the slave markets of the East or to the gladiatorial arenas of the chief  
cities of the West. On the site of the sanctuary a temple was built in  
honor of Jupiter Capitolina. The very name of Judah was discarded and  
the province which had given the Roman legions so much trouble was  
renamed Syria Palestine. Jews were forbidden on pain of death to ever  
set foot in Jerusalem.22

This prohibition continued until Rome itself fell.  
It is a remarkable story. One can only speculate on the course of Jewish  
history, had the advice and pleas of the peacemakers (Isaiah, Jeremiah,  
Josephus and, finally, Rabbi Yochanan Ben Zakki) been heeded, instead of  
those of the fanatical zealots or the power-hungry demagogues. Through-  
out the ages, who of these proved to be the true friends of the Jewish  
people? Of this great drama, how much was rooted in faith—how much the  
consequences of folly?

The eminent professor and Israeli historian Yehoshafat Harkabi has  
pondered this matter and has written a book entitled Facing Reality in  
which he points out the remarkable parallel between Israel's situation today  
and that which existed prior to the destruction of Jerusalem by the  
Romans. 3

Professor Harkabi's views are summarized in an Associated Press report  
appearing in the Los Angeles Times, October 18, 1988 edition, from which  
the following is quoted:

ISRAELI HISTORIAN WARNS  
OF PERIL IN MASADA S EXAMPLE

tel aviv—An Israeli historian has ignited a controversy by arguing  
that a much-heralded Jewish revolt against the Romans—far from being  
a glorious chapter in Jewish history—was self-destructive fanaticism and  
a bitter lesson for modern Israel.

The revolt was followed by the mass suicide on Masada in a.d. 73 and  
Gen. Shimon Bar-Kokba's rebellion nearly 60 years later.

A small but articulate group of scholars, writers and politicians has  
long contended that in the cold light of modern scrutiny the revolt was  
lunacy, rather than glorious.

The debate has been lifted out of the realm of pure history and  
plunged into the political battlefield because Israel today faces many of  
the same themes that confronted the rebel against Rome 1,911 years  
ago—among them survival, liberty and religion.

Occurred at Opportune Time

The way a generation of school children have been told it, the Jews  
revolted because they considered the Roman occupation brutal and in  
contempt of Jewish religious sensibilities. After a glorious fight of the  
few Jews against the many Romans, the story goes, the rebellion was

crushed, Jerusalem was sacked, and the last thousand defenders commit-  
ted suicide atop the mountain fortress of Masada.

But the rebellion smoldered on, and in A.D. 132 a Jewish general,  
Shimon Bar-Kokba, captured Jerusalem and held it for three years until  
the Romans vanquished his army and sent the Jews into an exile that  
was to last until the rebirth of Israel in 1948.

In his 107-page book, Facing Reality, Harkabi portrays the revolt as a  
disaster from start to finish, whipped up by rabble-rousing zealots blind  
to the realities of power in the Roman Empire.

The result, he writes, was the destruction of Jerusalem and the  
slaughter of 500,000 of the 1.3 million Jews living there.

The argument is not entirely new. But coming from Harkabi, an  
eminent scholar, former military intelligence chief and a pillar of the  
Establishment, it caused a sensation among intellectuals.

In an oblique, understated style, Harkabi suggests that his country may  
be treading the same dangerous waters as did the rebels against Rome.  
He discerns the same two camps today that existed in Bar-Kokba's time:  
what he calls the "realistic" and "sane" camp and the "blind," "euphoric,"  
"unrealistic" one.

Harkabi does not deny that by "blind" and "euphoric" he is referring  
to Israel's present-day extreme nationalists who would annex the occu-  
pied West Bank of the Jordan River in defiance of world opinion.

Parallels to Modern Times Seen

Harkabi sees parallels between the Israelis who minimize the weight of  
the superpowers, and the zealots who misread the might of Rome; who  
tell Jews to ignore the outside world and trust in God alone; who, after  
having annexed the West Bank and its million Arabs, would then lean  
back on the Messianic dream of a mass Jewish migration to Israel to  
correct the demographic imbalance.

He likens the euphoria that overcame Israel after the 1967 Six-Day  
War to the ecstasy of the zealots after their own early victories.

"The problem is not where Bar-Kokba erred," Harkabi writes. "The  
problem is how we came to worship his error, and how it affects our  
national thinking."

But Amos Eylon, a prominent writer and political commentator, says  
it is high time someone challenged "the angels of death and destruction  
like Bar-Kokba" who had become Israel's "hallowed symbols of national  
renewal

In a spectacular play called The War of the Jews, leftist playwright  
Joshua Sobol portrays the zealots as bloodthirsty demagogues shot  
through with personal hatred and greed. To Sobol, as to Harkabi, the  
voice of sanity comes from Yochanan Ben-Zakkai, the rabbinical sage  
who opposed the revolt and made a separate peace with Rome in return  
for being allowed to go on teaching the Bible to his disciples.

Israeli television entered the dispute by airing a debate called "If I  
Were There," in which six politicians of various political bent were asked  
how they would have conducted the revolt. To the amazement of many,  
all but one said they would have surrendered rather than lead their  
people to their death.

"None of us has the right, morally or otherwise, to lead our people  
knowingly to its doom" one said.

Moderator Israel Segal summed it up succinctly: "The dilemma that  
faced that generation and the problems that accompanied the revolt  
confront us today, too, it seems." [Emphasis supplied]

CHAPTER II

The Diaspora and Eretz Israel

A

LTHOUGH THE JEWS of Judea, who survived the destruction  
of Jerusalem in a.d. 70 and the Bar-Kokba revolt in a.d. 135, were  
widely dispersed by the Romans, the main Jewish Diaspora which has  
existed throughout the centuries was not the result of these events.

Today the word Diaspora is sometimes used among Jews as a convenient  
means of distinguishing between the Jews living in Israel and those living  
in other parts of the world.

However, to use the word Diaspora as it is also frequently used, to create  
the idea that it represents the "scattered remnants" of the Jewish people  
"exiled" from their homeland in "Eretz Israel" (The Land of Israel) is,  
historically, without foundation.

As we have seen, a majority of the Jews who had been taken away into  
Babylonian captivity preferred not to return to Israel when Cyrus the  
Persian liberated the Jews in Babylon and encouraged them to return to  
Palestine. This majority, who made the decision to stay in Babylon rather  
than return to Israel, became a prosperous and powerful community and a  
center of Jewish culture and learning for many centuries. Others, as has  
been mentioned, migrated to Egypt where eventually their number ex-  
ceeded one million.

Before a.d. 70, when the second Temple was in its highest glory, the vast  
majority of Jews, by choice, did not, and never had, lived in Eretz Israel.  
They were not exiles in any sense of the word. Centuries before the fall of

Jerusalem their ancestors had emigrated from Israel voluntarily and had  
colonized the major centers of population around the Mediterranean and  
beyond. These Jewish communities were highly successful and prosperous.Paul Johnson, in his History of the Jews, states:

At the time of the Claudian census in A.D. 48 some 6,944,000 Jews were  
within the confines of the Roman Empire, plus what Josephus calls the  
"myriads and myriads" in Babylonia and elsewhere beyond it. One  
calculation is that during the Herodian period there were about eight  
million Jews in the world, of whom 2,350,000 to 2,500,000 lived in  
Palestine, the Jews thus constituting about 10 per cent of the Roman  
Empire. This expanding nation and teeming Diaspora were the sources  
of Jerusalem's wealth and influence?

The Diaspora, through which Paul and others traveled, was vast. The  
Roman geographer, Strabo, said that the Jews were a power throughout  
the inhabited world. There were a million of them in Egypt alone. In  
Alexandria, perhaps the world's greatest city after Rome itself, they  
formed a majority in two out of five quarters. They were numerous in  
Cyrene and Berenice, in Pergamum, Miletus, Sardis, in Phrygian  
Apamea, Cyprus, Antioch, Damascus and Ephesus, and on both shores of  
the Black Sea. They had been in Rome for 200 years and now formed a  
substantial colony there; and from Rome they had spread all over urban  
Italy, and then into Gaul and Spain and across the sea into north-west  
Africa. [Emphasis supplied]

The ubiquity of Jewish communities in the ancient world has caused  
speculation by Nathan Ausubel in his Book of Jewish Knowledge that some  
Jews may not have left Egypt with Moses in the Exodus.

He quotes Philo, the Hellenistic Jewish philosopher, as writing:

So populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them and  
therefore they settle in very many of the most prosperous countries in  
Europe and Asia, both on the islands and on the mainland.

It should be pointed out that during the period of the Hasmonean  
dynasty, which lasted almost two hundred years, the Kingdom of Judah was  
a sovereign and independent state to which any Jew could have migrated or  
returned if he wished to do so.

As noted in the previous chapter, the reason that the Hasmonean  
dynasty ended was because the Jews invited the Romans to take over

control of Judea to establish order in the Kingdom which was torn by

The Diaspora Jews living throughout the Roman Empire, in most cases,  
were not persecuted by the Romans. They were in fact a privileged people

As mentioned earlier, the Roman authorities were so sensitive to Jewish  
religious feelings that the Roman legions could not carry their Eagle-  
headed standards into Jerusalem. The Jews of the ancient world who  
comprised ten percent of the population of the entire Roman Empire were  
not living in "ghettos," which were unknown until the year 1570, or as

This is even more true in modern times. The Jews have always been an  
enterprising and resourceful people who, in most cases, have moved to  
various places in the world in search of opportunity rather than refuge.

Certainly, there have been tragic times when Jewish communities have  
been driven into exile—but this by no means accounts for or explains the  
distribution of the Jewish population in the world today.

It is estimated that the distribution of the Jewish population of the world,  
in the year 1980, was approximately as follows: Out of a total world  
population of 13-5 million Jews, about 3.5 million lived in Israel. By far, the  
largest Jewish community is in the United States (5,750,000) and this,  
combined with important Jewish communities in Canada (310,000),  
Argentina (250,000), BrazU (130,000), and Mexico (40,000), and a dozen  
smaller groups, means that nearly half of world Jewry (6.6 million) is now

The next largest Jewish community, after the U.S. and Israel, is Soviet  
Russia's, with about 1,750,000. There are still sizable communities in  
Hungary and Rumania (30,000), and a total of 130,000 in Marxist eastern  
Europe. In western Europe there are a little over 1,250,000 Jews, the  
principal communities being in France (670,000), Britain (360,000), West  
Germany (42,000), Belgium (41,000), Italy (35,000), the Netherlands  
(28,000), and Switzerland (21,000). In Africa, outside the South African  
Republic (105,000) there are now few Jews except in the diminished  
communities of Morocco (17,000) and Ethiopia (perhaps 5,000). In Asia  
there are still about 35,000 Jews in Persia and 21,000 in Turkey. The  
Australian and New Zealand communities together add a further 75,000.

It is obvious that the vast majority of the Jews of the world don't consider  
themselves in "exile" and have no intention of returning to live in their

Since the coming of modern Zionism, which is discussed in the next  
chapter, certain Zionist leaders, particularly Zeev Jabotinsky who founded  
the Zionist-Revisionist party, have made as their principal objectives the  
conquest of all of Palestine and the expulsion or subjugation of the Arab  
population in order to make room for a new "aliya" (Ingathering of the

In recent years, this has been the sacred doctrine of the Gush Emunim  
(Bloc of the Faithful), a religious party of the extreme right and a major

The Gush Emunim is the primary ideological force behind the Likud  
governments policies on the West Bank and Gaza.

The presence and continued expansion of Israeli settlements on occupied  
Palestinian lands is the most volatile, emotional, and intractable issue  
involved in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is why the Intifada began and  
why the Israeli settlers have retaliated with "vigilante" raids against Arab

Yet the policy itself is based upon the fiction of an aliya from the  
Diaspora, which is expected to populate the West Bank and Gaza after the

In referring to the Zionist-Revisionist movement, started by Jabotinsky,

On these grounds he founded the Union of Zionist-Revisionists to use  
the full resources of Jewish capitalism to bring to Palestine "the largest  
number of Jews within the shortest period of time." He attracted an  
enormous following in eastern Europe, especially in Poland, where the  
Revisionist militant youth wing, Betar—of which the young Menachem  
Begin became the organizer—wore uniforms, drilled, and learned to  
shoot. The object was to achieve the Jewish state in one sudden, irresist-  
ible act of will. In fact, all three Jewish leaders (Zionist) overestimated  
the actual willingness of Jews to emigrate to Palestine during the 1920s.  
After the turmoil of the immediate post-war years, especially the  
pogroms in Poland and the Ukraine, the Jews like everyone else shared  
in the prosperity of the decade. The urge to take ships to Haifa abated.  
During the 1920s the Jewish population of Palestine did, indeed, double,  
to 160,000. But the total number of immigrants was only 100,000 of  
which 25 per cent did not stay. So the net rate of immigration was amere 8,000 a year. Indeed, in 1927, the peak year of twenties prosperity,  
only 2,713 came and more than 5,000 left. In 1929, the water-shed year  
in the world economy, arrivals (to Eretz Israel) and departures just about

Therein lay a great missed opportunity, and the makings of tragedy.  
During the calm years, when Palestine was relatively open, the Jews

In a full-page article appearing in the Jerusalem Post, October 7, 1978,  
edition entitled "The General With a Phantom Army," Meir Merhav  
exposes the specious arguments used by Ariel Sharon and Menachem Begin  
about the massive aliya that will settle the West Bank. The following is an

Most Israelis, and our politicians most of all, have always kept up a lot  
of sanctimonious pretense about aliya. Like God and motherhood, eve-  
rybody has always been for it. There has been little realistic thinking of  
what the prospects of significant immigration really are. There has been  
little practical effort to maximize the relatively limited existing potential

More importantly, what seems to have been forgotten—not only by  
Ariel Sharon and Hanan Porat, but by the chief ideologue of Greater  
Israel, Menachem Begin himself—is that in the entire history of  
Zionism and of the State of Israel there has never been a mass immigra-  
tion except in the wake of catastrophe. Jews motivated by ideals, whether  
secularly Zionist or religious, have always come in a trickle of small  
numbers. And many of them, simply because they were idealists, often  
became discouraged and left when reality soured their dreams.

Even when catastrophe overwhelmed entire Jewish communities, the  
majority of them sought refuge not in Israel, but elsewhere. Perhaps no  
more than 60,000 German Jews out of a total of some 300,000 who left  
Germany in 1933-39 could have come to Israel. Perhaps the British  
would not have allowed in more. But many of them did not even  
consider the possibility of coming here. The same is true of other Jewish

Today, physical disaster does not threaten Jews anywhere. Even if it  
did, in one country or another, there would always be a preference for a  
refuge other than Israel. Even among Russian Jews, who are the most  
persecuted today in the national sense, 50-60 percent of those who areallowed to leave the Soviet Union choose to go to a place other than  
Israel.

We may not like these facts, but we cannot ignore them. We must  
realize that, the world being what it is, we cannot expect any large-scale  
immigration from the Diaspora. If, unpredictably, large numbers of Jews  
anywhere should be expelled and turn to Israel, we would of course take  
them in. But meanwhile we must settle down to being a Jewish state of  
four million by the end of the century. [Emphasis supplied]

The above article from the Jerusalem Post was written eleven years ago,  
at a time when more than half of the Jews allowed to leave the Soviet  
Union decided to go to some country other than Israel.

Today the immigration situation has deteriorated to the point that in  
some years more Jews are leaving Israel than are arriving. More than  
300,000 former Israelis live in the U.S. and Canada.

The latest figures available for 1988 (Jerusalem Post, June 20, 1988)  
show that 90 percent of Jews leaving the Soviet Union refuse to go to Israel.  
The situation has become so alarming that the Likud government has put  
into effect a plan to force Jews leaving the Soviet Union to go to Israel. This  
is done by putting them on a plane bound for Israel and allowing no  
stopover. The term "refusenik" now has a new meaning.

Time magazine, November 22, 1986, reports on the problem in an  
article entitled "Soviet Jews: Israel Wants Them All," from which the fol-  
lowing has been excerpted:

LET OUR PEOPLE GO has been the compelling slogan of a massive  
campaign to win for the U.S.S.R.'s 3 million Jews the right of free  
emigration. Yielding reluctantly to worldwide pressure, the Kremlin has  
granted exit permits to about 125,000 Jews since 1970. No other Soviet  
minority has been allowed to leave the country in any significant  
numbers.

Halfway House. To the dismay and embarrassment of Israeli officials,  
a growing number of Russian Jews are reluctant to go to Israel. While  
the vast majority of refugees in the early 1970s went to Israel, 59% of  
those who arrived at the halfway house for emigrants in Vienna last  
month expressed a desire to settle in the U.S. Now a long-simmering  
dispute between Israelis and some Jewish organizations over the destina-  
tion of the refugees may jeopardize the future of Jewish emigration from  
the Soviet Union.

The Diaspora and Eretz Israel

To Israeli officials, the refugees' lack of interest in becoming citizens of  
the Jewish state seems like rank ingratitude and an affront to Zionist  
faith.

Unable to stem the tide of about 10,000 Russian Jews who have  
already emigrated to the U.S., the Israeli government has moved to force  
most refugees in the future to come to Israel. As the Israelis explain it,  
their basic problem is with the way station in Vienna; where Russian  
Jews arrive in the West by train. Nearly all emigrants must travel on  
Israeli visas to meet Soviet requirements for exit. Those wishing to  
proceed to the U.S., however, may stop in Vienna and request rerouting  
to the U.S. They apply to the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS)  
and other American humanitarian organizations for financial and prac-  
tical assistance.

These America-bound refugees receive money raised nationwide  
among American Jews. The U.S. government since 1973 has contributed  
$13 million to their support. Some angry Israelis have dubbed those who  
seek this aid "defectors" or "dropouts." Josef Almogi, chairman of the  
Jewish Agency, which supervises all immigration to Israel, complains  
that "those who drop out enjoy better conditions."

They can stay in Europe three to six months at the expense of  
American agencies that then get them refugee visas to go on to America,  
Canada, or wherever.

An early Israeli attempt to stop the dropouts involved trying to  
establish an air link between Moscow and Tel Aviv. In that way, Russian  
Jews might be flown directly to Israel, thus eliminating the Vienna  
stopover and the refugees' option to go elsewhere. (Emphasis  
supplied.)

An article in the Jerusalem Post of June 18, 1988, expressed dissatisfac-  
tion in the manner that U.S. Jewish leaders are dealing with the problem.  
The article is entitled "Erase Disgrace of Drop-Outs."

U.S. Jewish leaders must be confronted fearlessly by Israelis and told that  
Soviet Jews seeking to leave the USSR on Israeli visas must come to  
Israel.

The disgrace of the mass exodus of Soviet Jews under the guise of  
immigrating to Israel must cease immediately, Absorption Minister  
Ya'acov Tsur insisted. The struggle for Soviet Jewry, he continued, is a  
national, Zionist endeavour of the first order.

The benefits extended to former Soviet Jews by the U.S. government  
and the enticements offered them by U.S. Jewry place Israel in a position  
of cynical competition with that Jewry, Tsur asserted.

The real crunch will probably come next year, however, as the number  
of Russian Jews emigrating to the "golden medina" continues to climb,  
and as U.S. government funding for refugee resettlement begins to drop.  
HIAS [the Hebrew Immigration Aid Society] estimates that, in 1989,25-  
30,000 Russian Jews will apply for admission to the U.S. as refugees.

A large portion of what HIAS, the JDC and federations spend on  
Soviet Jewish immigrants has come from the U.S. federal budget. In the  
past, when the number of Jewish refugees admitted to the U.S. rose,  
Jewish organizations would run to Congress for additional dollars.[Emphasis supplied]

Why is it that so many Soviet Jewish emigres refuse to go to Israel and  
by a wide margin prefer the U.S. instead?

As long ago as July 1979, the Los Angeles Times, July 6 edition,  
published an article in which Alexander Dranov, who had emigrated from  
the Soviet Union in 1978, expressed his opinion regarding the feelings and  
attitudes of the Jewish emigres.

The following are excerpts from his interesting explanation:

Many Israelis cannot understand why it is that many Soviet Jews do not  
wish to emigrate to Israel, why it is that many seem to lack patriotic  
feelings for their "historical motherland," why it is that many seem to  
possess materialistic ideas about America. I would like to explain.

The most compelling reason for emigrating from the Soviet Union is  
to get away from an oppressive society—oppressive not only to Jews,  
though to the Jews more than any others, but oppressive also in all the  
countless ways that you don't have to be Jewish to experience. Perhaps  
the chief form of oppression is simply the constant shortage of anything  
making a good and normal life: food, money, clothes, cars, apartments,  
information, the hope for a better future.

In addition, Israel's geographic position is not particularly attractive to  
many Soviet Jews. To many, Israel does not seem to be Western enough  
and, indeed for Soviet Jews, particularly those from developed urban  
centers like Leningrad, Moscow, and Kiev, Israel seems almost Oriental.  
The climate is another factor. Many Soviet Jews are simply afraid of the  
heat of the deserts that make up much of Israel's territory. In America,  
they are convinced, the climate is more moderate.

The Diaspora and Eretz Israel

Even more important is the image that many Soviet Jews have of  
Israel as a country that is less than free and democratic than is the United  
States. To many it even resembles the Soviet Union in some ways. This  
image is fairly strong, and it includes real and imaginary things. Compul-  
sory military training and service, an overtly religious society and rumors  
of restrictions on leaving the country are all upsetting to a Soviet Jew.

It is perhaps understandable why many Soviet Jews would prefer to  
emigrate to a rich and free country with a reputation for stability, peace,  
a high standard of living, work opportunities and, perhaps most impor-  
tant of all, the right to be "left alone/' For a Russian, the joy not to care  
a damn about anything political is a precious joy. The opportunity to be  
free from any obligation, from having to be anything—not even a Jew,  
if one so chooses—is synonymous with freedom in the minds of many  
Soviet Jews. America's diverse and developed culture, famous cities and  
a temperate climate explain the tendency of Soviet Jews to prefer the  
United States over Israel.\* [Emphasis supplied.]

Noteworthy in Dranov's article is the remarkable statement that the  
chief form of "oppression" in the Soviet Union is not, as we thought, the  
lack of religious freedom, but rather the constant shortage of consumer  
goods, i.e., food, money, clothes, cars, apartments, etc.

Another objection of many Soviet emigres to going to Israel, he says, is  
"the climate—it's too hot." This is something that God seems to have  
overlooked in selecting a suitable promised land.

On the other hand, Dranov points out that the Soviet Jews prefer to  
emigrate to a rich and free country with a reputation for stability, a high  
standard of living and work opportunities.

It appears that nothing has changed in the last ten years since Dranov  
wrote his article. The Los Angeles Times, June 23, 1989, reports that the  
Anti-Defamation League and other Jewish agencies are trying hard to  
induce Soviet Jewish emigres to go to Israel but are having little success.  
The Times concludes the report in these words:

But the Soviets are not buying. Israel's climate is too hot, says one. Its  
people are too religious, complains another. Hebrew is too hard to learn,  
says a third. A fourth young man feels the streets of Israel are unsafe. He  
wants to settle in Detroit.

The tragedy of all this is that the Shamir-Sharon plan for the West Bank  
and Gaza is to dispossess the Palestinian people of land upon which their  
ancestors have lived for centuries (and to which they are passionately  
attached) upon the pretext of making room for people whose ancestors  
may have lived there two or three thousand years ago, but who themselves  
have never lived there and do not want to live there, unless forced to by the  
Israeli government.

\* \* \*

Author's Note: The foregoing chapter was written in June of 1989, before  
the dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe occurred. As of this writing  
(March 1990) the political instability currently prevalent in Eastern Europe  
has caused some concern among the Jewish population of certain Soviet-  
bloc nations about the possibility of a revival of indigenous anti-Semitism.  
This is happening at a time when the U.S. has decided that Jewish citizens  
of the Soviet Union can no longer be properly classified for immigration  
purposes as oppressed people and thus entitled to the status of refugees.  
The consequence has been to reduce and limit the number of Soviet  
immigrants accepted into the U.S. annually. Therefore, this recent combi-  
nation of circumstances has resulted in a significant increase in the number  
of Soviet Jews immigrating to Israel. The effect of this immigration has  
been to exacerbate the already grave crisis in the Middle East and to under-  
score the central issue discussed later in this book, namely, whether Euro-  
pean immigrants are more entitled to live in Palestine than Palestinians.

CHAPTER III

The Zionist Movement:  
1887-1948

M

ODERN ZIONISM as a movement did not originate with the  
Holocaust survivors—but had a long and eventful history which  
began in the last century. Nevertheless, the Nazi persecutions and Hitlers  
"final solution," which aroused the sympathies of the world for the Jewish  
people, were the operative events which culminated in the creation of the  
State of Israel.

However, as Amos Perlmutter[[2]](#footnote-2) points out in his book entitled Israel:  
The Partitioned State, the present political discords and rivalries within  
Israel today are simply a continuation and perpetuation of earlier divisions  
in the Zionist movement:

Israel may be territorially secure, but old themes, voices, and faces still  
seem to echo from the past. The debate over autonomy, the Palestinians,  
settlements and the West Bank, and over secure boundaries is a variation  
on old debates that went by other names and were waged in World  
Zionist Congress meetings decades ago, in the political halls of the pre-  
state entity that was the Yishuv, in the first Knesset, and in the Knessets  
flush with undreamt-of military victories. To have heard Begin expoundpassionately on Eretz Israel, the old biblical lands of Israel, was to hear  
again the voice of Revisionist Zionism and its long-dead founder, Zeev  
Jabotinsky. When hearing the leader of the Labor Party, Prime Minister  
Shimon Peres, complain about Begins autocratic ways, one must  
remember how fiercely Labor's founder and father, David Ben-Gurion,  
tried to stamp out the followers of Revisionist Zionism, and recall how  
deep the struggle really goes. Old themes, old fears, and old drives are  
still very much alive in today's Israel—frontiers, security, the Arab  
question, Palestine, Eretz Israel, internal political struggles, and the  
world at large.

Perlmutter's scholarly analysis of the philosophical and political history  
of Zionism is enlightening—but discouraging, when one realizes that the  
same issues and conflicts which existed almost a century ago are no closer  
to resolution today. Indeed, the fears, obsessions, and ambitions, which  
dominated earlier debates, have since been magnified and intensified by two  
world wars, the Holocaust, five Arab-Israeli wars, and the recent Pales-  
tinian uprising.

Perlmutter in his book summarizes the situation in these words:

The question after the 1984 elections is not of one government or  
another's survival. Israel appears once again to be defining and redefin-  
ing its territorial aspirations, which is the essence of the politics of  
security of the third partitioned state. As in the days before statehood,  
the same question is being asked and debated: What are the final  
boundaries of the state?

The answers to that question are, it is hoped, to be found in this book.  
Different men throughout Israel's history and pre-history have answered  
this question differently. For Theodore Herzl, there were no boundaries,  
no real country or state, only the passionate notion that the Jews must  
find a homeland of their own. For Chaim Weizmann, the Jewish state  
was indelibly tied to the British Mandatory, which existed like some  
protective umbrella overhead. For David Ben-Gurion, neither a funda-  
mentalist nor a visionary, the boundaries of the state were flexible, never  
finally fixed, dependent on the nature and need of the historical moment.  
For Zeev Jabotinsky, who violently opposed the idea of any sort of  
partition, and even more so for Menachem Begin, the caretaker of  
Jabotinsky's ideas, the state meant unpartitioned Eretz Israel, complete  
Israel, the old biblical lands of Judea and Samaria, in which there is no  
room for real Palestinian autonomy, let alone a Palestinian state.

Thus, the political history of Israel and its institutions becomes a  
description of a great debate over boundaries, argued by great men who  
then enacted imperfect resolutions of that debate. As we can see in Israel  
today, in Lebanon, and in the West Bank, the debate goes on. [Emphasis

Therefore, even a limited understanding of the political and religious  
forces at work in Israel today requires some historical perspective.

The acknowledged Father of modern Zionism, Theodore Herzl, was a  
journalist born in Budapest in 1860, and an "assimilated Jew." His historic  
role is remarkable, considering the fortuitous circumstances under which it

As a journalist, he took on as an assignment the notorious Dreyfus case.  
The case was an international sensation involving Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish  
French army officer, who had been falsely accused of treason by a Gentile  
officer who was later proven to be the guilty party.

The trial caused the latent anti-Semitic emotions in the French army and  
in the French people to surface violently. This convinced Herzl that  
emancipation and assimilation had failed the Jews of Europe, and that the  
only solution was for the Jews to have a homeland of their own. He was not  
concerned about the particular location of such a homeland, only that it  
would be "Jewish" and a place where Jews could live in peace and security.

However, he met strong opposition from many assimilated, as well as  
Orthodox Jews, the latter of whom believed that only the coming of the  
Messiah could bring about a new Zion.

Nevertheless, Herzl persevered in his idea and carried his dream to as  
many of the courts of Europe as would receive him. He also enlisted the aid  
of influential Jewish financiers whenever and wherever he could find them.  
Impressed with his sincerity, the British offered to give him Uganda for a

Herzl found his greatest support among the East European Jews—who  
had been suffering persecution and pogroms at the hands of the Russian  
czar. With these East European Jews as a base, he began to organize the  
movement which became known as the World Zionist Organization. In  
1892 he called a meeting of the World Zionist Congress in Basel,  
Switzerland, at which meeting he was elected president of the organization.  
His suggestion of a Jewish homeland in Uganda was met with such bitteropposition by the delegates that it threatened the very survival of the  
movement. Finally, the delegates rejected the idea of any place other than

The dissensions and divisions among Socialist Zionists, Religious  
Zionists, and Secular Zionists soon made a battleground of the Zionist  
movement, and the personal attacks upon some of Herzl's programs may  
have contributed to his early death on July 3, 1904.

At the time of Herzl's death, Palestine was, as it had been for more than  
four hundred years, part of the Ottoman Empire. Of a population of  
approximately 700,000, Jews numbering 35,000 resided mostly in Jerusa-  
lem and the port cities and engaged principally in commerce. The remain-

For centuries there had been no organized Jewish immigration into  
Palestine except for a small "Lovers of Zion" movement among Russian  
Jews in 1882. Notwithstanding the numerical odds presented by a large  
indigenous Arab population, the early Zionists intended to establish an  
undivided Jewish hegemony over the entire territory of Palestine. They  
recognized the Arab problem—but decided it could be solved later, after  
they achieved their primary objective—a Jewish state.

After Herzl's death, the Zionist movement continued its momentum  
under new leaders, each of these leaders, as we have seen, holding very  
different ideas and philosophies as to how their common purpose—a  
completely Jewish Palestine—might best be accomplished.

Closest to Herzl's ideas was Chaim Weizmann, who believed that a  
Jewish homeland could best be established through the power and influence  
of the British Empire. Consequently, he assiduously cultivated such prom-  
inent persons as David Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, and Anthony

At first Zeev Jabotinsky was a supporter of Weizmann's British solu-  
tion—but later broke away to found the movement known as Revisionist  
Zionism. This movement declared Britain to be the enemy, and laid claim  
to all ancient biblical lands, including Judea and Samaria. The more extreme  
elements later dominated the movement and, as described by Perlmutter:

They would achieve a black fame as violent terrorists actively fighting  
the British. Ironically, the legacy of Jabotinsky, as embodied by former  
prime minister Menachem Begin, still lives in Israel today and still  
wreaks emotional havoc. [Emphasis supplied]

However, the leader who would ultimately have the greatest impact and  
be responsible for bringing about the reality of a Jewish homeland and the  
State of Israel was David Ben-Gurion, the head of the Socialist Zionist  
movement. Although all three heirs to the Zionist movement were united  
in their devotion to Zionism and admiration of Herzl, they agreed on very

Gradually, Chaim Weizmann emerged to the forefront of Zionist leader-  
ship. His purpose was to reconcile Zionist aspirations with British  
imperialism. Weizmann cared little for the indigenous Arabs of Palestine.  
He believed that Arabs and Jews must live separately since, in his opinion,  
the Arabs would reduce the standard of living of the Jews. He felt that the  
Jewish settlements would lag if there was cooperation and fraternization  
among Jews and Arabs. He doubted whether Arabs had patriotic feelings  
and saw them as nothing but backward, scheming, deceptive, and untrust-

The Zionist movement, as a nationalistic movement, was uncomprom-  
isingly committed to these fundamental tenets:

1. Establishment of a Jewish state in Eretz Israel ("the historical land")  
   as the territorial center of the Jewish nation in direct opposition to the
2. Creation of a Jewish majority in Palestine.
3. Separation from the Arabs. In calling for Jewish statehood, and the  
   restoration of Jewish culture, the Zionists sought to establish a clear-  
   cut position isolated from Arab and Muslim cultural values and social  
   structure. The conscious aim was to create an independent and  
   autonomous Jewish national culture and social system in Eretz Israel  
   which would he fortified by erecting political, economic, social, and  
   cultural walls designed to separate Jews from the Arab population

With the advent of World War I in 1914 and the Ottoman Empire s  
decision to join Germany and Austria-Hungary against the Allies, the first  
real opportunity came to bring the Zionist dream into reality. A victory for  
the Allies was expected to result in the dismemberment of the Ottoman  
Empire, leaving the fate of Palestine in the hands of the victors, Britain and

Britain needed all the help she could get in her struggle with Germany.

Britain enlisted the aid of the Arabs against Turkey, and an Arab army  
under British General Allenby and T.E. Lawrence (Lawrence of Arabia)  
achieved spectacular victories in the Middle East, including the capture of  
Jerusalem. Relying on British assurances, the Arabs had no doubt that their  
sacrifices and military successes would justify Britain's recognition and  
support of Arab nationalism.

At the same time, however, the British wanted to use the Jews as a  
wedge against France by creating a British (League of Nations) Mandate  
over Palestine. They reasoned that this could best be accomplished by  
reaching an understanding with the Zionist leaders.

The result was the famous "Balfour Declaration of 1917," which was  
simply a short note from Anthony Balfour, British Foreign Minister, to  
Lord Rothschild. It is quoted here in its entirety:

Dear Lord Rothschild:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's  
Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist  
aspirations which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet.

His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in  
Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their  
best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being  
clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the  
civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Pales-  
tine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other  
country.

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowl-  
edge of the Zionist Federation. [Emphasis supplied]

Anthony Balfour

This ambiguous document was the first official recognition of the Zionists'  
political objectives and may be said to be the only claim up to that time to  
the legitimacy of a future Jewish state. However, the Arabs saw in the Balfour  
Declaration official support for the Jews, and even a promise of an eventual  
Jewish state within their midst. Indeed, publication of the Balfour Declara-  
tion marked the moment that Palestinian Arab nationalism, quiescent but  
pregnant with possibility until then, took the offensive against the Zionists.  
The Socialist Zionists in Palestine knew the Balfour Declaration for what  
it was—both a lifeline of legitimacy for the Jews, and an endless and  
potentially murderous source of enmity between Arab and Jew.

In the meantime, as a result of the Russian pogroms of 1905, an  
additional 20,000Jews migrated to Palestine, among whom was David Ben-  
Gurion. To the Zionists, any concession to the idea of dividing the Palestine  
territory between Arabs and Jews was simply a pretext to be used until the  
final achievement of Jewish sovereignty over all of "Eretz Israel"

Although a small moderate faction of Zionists thought it possible for  
Jews and Arabs to live together peacefully in an integrated society, the  
militant nationalist rejectionists vehemently opposed this theory. Their  
approach was pessimistic and condescending. Professor Yoseph Klausner, a  
prominent historian of ancient Jewish history at the Hebrew University in  
Jerusalem, and eventually a prominent revisionist scholar, argued that the  
Arabs and Jews were irreconcilable. He saw integration between the two as  
culturally dangerous, fearing that the Jews would "descend from their high  
culture into the semi-primitive Arab culture." Zeev Jabotinsky, at that time  
second only to Weizmann in the World Zionist leadership, also saw the  
prospect of future conflict and struggle, but he, like many Zionist leaders,  
underestimated the strength and ferocity of Arab nationalism.

The Zionist movement and its implications for the indigenous Arab  
population of Palestine were apparent as far back as 1910, when the  
Ottoman Empire announced its opposition to new Jewish settlements.  
Well before 1914, the Arabs were very aware of Zionist aims to take  
control of their country and voiced their adamant opposition to the Jewish  
plans for new settlements. From the start, the Arabs distinguished  
between "foreign Jews," meaning Zionist European, and the indigenous  
"Ottoman Jews," a small number of whom had shared Palestine with the

As previously noted, the roots of the Arab-Zionist conflict antedated the  
Balfour Declaration, but when the declaration was actually made, the Arab  
resistance solidified in the form of Palestinian Arab nationalist opposition.  
Despite many warnings from the Arabs, all of the Zionist leaders underes-  
timated the Arab nationalist movement and its intensity. To the Arabs, the  
Balfour Declaration was a betrayal of Arab nationalism and, while promis-  
ing to protect their rights, was simply an attempt to legitimize Jewish  
political domination over Palestine in complete disregard to the numerical  
superiority of the Arabs and the Wilsonian principles of majority rule and

To the British and their Palestinian Mandate, it was obvious that there  
was no compromise position which would accommodate both the Zionist  
and Palestinian claims and aspirations. The "partition" of Palestine was analternative, but not a solution, since it antagonized both Jews and  
Palestinians.

Gradually, British policy began to drift away from the Balfour Declara-  
tion in favor of limiting Jewish immigration into Palestine. Recognizing  
the mounting crisis in Palestine, Britain issued a report on July 7, 1937,  
which, in part, stated:

Arab nationalism is as intense a force as Jewish. The Arab leaders'  
demand for national self-government and the shutting down of the  
Jewish National Home has remained unchanged since 1920. Like Jewish  
nationalism, Arab nationalism is stimulated by the educational system  
and by the growth of the Youth movement. It has also been greatly  
encouraged by the recent Anglo-Egyptian and Franco-Syrian treaties.  
The gulf between the races is thus already wide and will continue to  
widen if the present Mandate is maintained. [Emphasis supplied]

The British report concluded with another proposed partition plan,  
which found no support on either side—and ignited acrimonious debate  
throughout the Zionist movement worldwide. The Socialist Zionist Labor  
movement, however, was willing to accept the principle of partition as a  
temporary and intermediate step toward full Jewish hegemony and a state  
comprising all of Palestine.

Revisionist Zionism's leader, Zeev Jabotinsky, was the labor movement's  
chief antagonist and one of the principal opponents of partition. Jabotinsky  
believed that the Zionist goal must be to establish a Jewish state comprising  
all of pre-1922 Palestine, including Transjordan. He based the Revisionist  
program on three goals:

1. The gradual transformation of Palestine (including Transjordan) into  
   a Jewish commonwealth; that is, into a self-governing commonwealth  
   under the auspices of an established Jewish majority.
2. To create the tools for building this commonwealth, including a  
   regular army, a system of state control over customs and taxation, and  
   the nationalization of all land.
3. To harness the Balfour Declaration to Zionist aims through active  
   political and diplomatic work.

Jabotinsky opposed the concept of a Jewish enclave and isolation from  
the rest of Palestine. He believed that the one national group—the Jews—would surpass the other—the Arabs—because their culture, values, and  
commitments were superior, and that a Jewish state would dominate and

It is clear that the Arabs' hostility toward aggressive Zionism had nothing  
to do with the fact that the "aggressors" were ethnically "Jewish." The same  
hostility would have been aroused in the Arab population had the immi-  
grants (invaders to the Arabs) been Swedish. The Arabs' response to  
Zionism was a purely human reaction toward a movement whose uncon-  
cealed purpose was to take over and rule the country in which they had been  
born and in which their ancestors had lived for centuries. Also, to make  
matters worse, this was happening at a time when the Palestinians' own  
nationalist dreams (they believed) were nearing the point of fulfillment.

As previously noted, the basic strategy of nearly all segments of the  
Zionist movement was to win the population battle with the Arabs first,  
after which Jewish hegemony and domination of Palestine would be estab-  
lished. In effect, the Arabs were to be overwhelmed by the Jewish immi-  
grants and, hopefully, induced either to migrate or, if necessary, be expelled  
from Palestine to some other Arab state or community. Gradually, what  
had always been clear to the Palestinians became apparent to the British,  
namely, that the Zionists were distorting the intent and purpose of the  
Balfour Declaration by unwarranted interpretations. Accordingly, in the  
spring of 1939, the British issued its famous "White Paper," which was  
intended to clarify the ambiguities in the Balfour Declaration and to restate  
British policy on Palestine in unmistakable terms.  
A portion of the "White Paper" is set forth below:

Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose  
in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used  
such as "Palestine is to become as Jewish as England is English." His  
Majesty's government regard any such expectation as impracticable and  
have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contem-  
plated ... the disappearance or the subordination of the Arab popula-  
tion, language or culture in Palestine. They would draw attention to the  
fact that the terms of the Balfour Declaration referred to, do not  
contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish  
National Home but that such a home should be founded in Palestine. But  
this statement has not removed doubts, and His Majesty's government

therefore now declares unequivocally that it is not part of their policy

that Palestine should become a Jewish State. [Emphasis supplied]

The White Paper then sets forth certain specific provisions limiting  
Jewish immigration over the next five years.

Within months after the issuance of the White Paper, in the spring of  
1939, the war with Nazi Germany broke out. Therefore, the White Paper  
did not address the later and graver problems of Jewish refugees from  
Hitler's "final solution," and the British continued to limit Jewish immigra-  
tion into Palestine, in strict accord with the White Paper quotas. This  
infuriated the Zionists who considered launching an all-out guerrilla war  
against the British Mandate. The dilemma faced by Ben-Gurion and the  
Socialist Zionists was that the Nazi threat was far greater than the British  
and, as more became known concerning the magnitude of the Holocaust, it  
became clear that outright hostilities against the British were unwise as  
long as the Nazis constituted the principal danger.

Accordingly, a middle course was decided upon—the Jews would accum-  
ulate arms and military equipment and organize their military strength, but  
would not provoke the British into all-out war. Instead, the Jews would  
continue to evade the British immigration restrictions and to fortify the  
settlements then in place and continue to open new settlements regardless  
of land restrictions. It would be open defiance of the White Paper—but not

However, to the militant Zionists of the Revisionist faction who had  
opposed the British Mandate even before the White Paper was issued, it  
became a call to arms to be pursued with assassinations, robberies, and

In the meantime, however, as the momentum of World War II seemed  
to be going against the British and the Nazi tide was lapping at the gates  
of Cairo, thousands of Jews volunteered to serve in the Allied forces against  
Germany. All of this made the British more amenable toward Zionism, and  
they began helping to train and arm the Haganah (the military arm of the  
Socialist Zionists). This help included courses in explosives, mines, artillery,  
etc., even though the British recognized the risk that the Haganah might

The death in 1940 of Zeev Jabotinsky, founder of the Revisionist party,  
opened the way for Israel's most militant terrorist, Abraham Stern, the  
predecessor of Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir. Stern, a wild-eyed  
fanatic, began feverishly to organize commandos, build up arms caches, andrecruit immigrants from Europe. Stern was committed to Israel's "eternal  
aspirations," which included the building of the third Temple, transferring  
the Arab Palestinians out of Palestine and expelling the British. To this last  
purpose he even sought an alliance with Nazi Germany to destroy the  
British Mandate.

Stern envisioned a Jewish Fatherland with the borders of Israel (accord-  
ing to the "Torah") to extend from the Nile to the Euphrates.t This was to  
be achieved by a Jewish army, with the help of the underground and the  
Diaspora. Stern considered the Socialist Zionists, and especially Ben-Gurion  
and Weizmann, to be traitors. To many moderate Zionists the "Stern gang"  
was a particularly murderous group of terrorists, and they frequently  
assisted the British in rounding them up. Stern was finally trapped by the  
British and killed. Although an outcast from moderate Zionism, he was also  
a symbol of a growing revolt that Menachem Begin would come to embody.  
After his death, Stern was succeeded by another terrorist, Yitzhak Shamir,  
who took over leadership of the Stern gang (later called the Lehi).

As the German threat receded, the British became more aggressive in  
their efforts to enforce the White Paper policy. They turned back several  
refugee ships from Europe in which, tragically, Jewish lives were lost. In no  
way, of course, could anything that the British did or did not do regarding  
immigration change materially the course or magnitude of the Holocaust  
once it was underway. Nevertheless, the perceived callousness of the British  
toward the Jewish refugees aroused a feeling of great bitterness among the  
Jews and this set the final stage for the forced abandonment of the British  
Mandate. The British army of occupation was now facing a guerrilla war—  
but it never clearly understood whom it was fighting.

the jewish underground and terrorism

In April 1942, Menachem Begin arrived in Palestine as a member of the  
"Andres Free Polish Army." He obtained a release from the army to  
assume control of the forces of Revisionist Zionism which included ele-  
ments of the Irgun and Lehis underground.

Begin's objective was to use terrorism as the means of making British  
presence in Palestine intolerable to Britain. With passionate intensity,  
Begin led the fight against the British in Palestine. His mind-set, which he  
retained even as prime minister, was an obsession with Britain's "guilt" in  
the Holocaust. Begin wrote:

t From the Nile to the Euphrates includes present-day Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq.

One cannot say that those who shaped British policy did not want to save  
the Jews; it would be more correct to say that they very eagerly wanted  
the Jews not to be saved.... They were highly interested in achieving  
the maximum reduction in the number of Jews liable to seek to enter the  
land of Israel. [Emphasis supplied]

Begin officially launched his war against the British on February 1,1944.  
His battle plan was simple—an unrestricted campaign of terror. The most  
infamous of these terrorist acts was the bombing under Begins orders of  
the King David Hotel (the British headquarters) on July 22,1946, in which  
eighty people died. A particularly cruel deed perpetrated by the Etzel  
(Irgun) is described by Perlmutter as follows:

Begins Etzel forces had kidnapped two young British sergeants, con-  
scripts with no particular animosity toward the Jews, in retaliation for  
the capture of three Etzel men. In effect, the British were being held  
hostage. Then, on July 29, 1947, the Etzel men were hanged by the  
British in Acre Prison.

The drama that had been playing out for months was coming to a  
grisly climax. Parents of the sergeants had pleaded for their lives. British  
officials called the "hostage" system heinous. In many ways, this was  
another misperception on the part of the British. The mandatory viewed  
Etzel and the underground groups as terrorists fighting an illegal war.  
Begin saw it as a real war and viewed their fighters as legitimate soldiers.  
Etzel Chief of Staff Amichal Paglin said that "we had nothing against the  
two boys personally. We just wanted to stop the hangings."

After the Etzel fighters were hanged, even Zionist supporters pleaded  
with the Etzel to spare the two British soldiers. The plea fell on deaf  
ears. Immediately upon hearing the news of the hangings, the two  
sergeants, hooded, were placed on chairs and a noose was put around  
their necks. Etzel men kicked the chairs away. The bodies were trans-  
ported to a eucalyptus grove nearby and hung upside down from a tree  
for the British to find. The area around the bodies was booby-trapped  
and mined.

Johnson, in his book entitled History of the Jews, expresses the opinion  
that the Jewish underground introduced the "first use of scientific terrorism  
in the modern world" and that Menachem Begin was its most accom-  
plished practitioner.

In his final commentary on this period, Perlmutter gives Menachem  
Begins terrorist activities a major share of the credit for driving out the

Etzel often confused with Lehi, of course performed numerous acts of  
violence against the British, not all of them as grisly or horrifying as the  
King David bombing or the hanging of the British sergeants. These  
included a daring raid on the supposedly impregnable Acre Prison to  
release Lehi and Etzel prisoners. What was most important was that the  
acts were played out to the world, and it would not be wrong to say that  
they played as key a role in pushing the hamstrung, weary, frustrated  
British out of Palestine as did the combined efforts of the Haganah and  
Palmach, and the political tenacity of Ben-Gurion and Weizmann.

Looking back at the struggle against the mandatory from the stand-  
point of modern times, there is no denying the importance of both the  
more moderate forces of Ben-Gurion and the terrorist forces of Etzel and  
Begin. Begin provided the often horrific spark which would stir and  
incite the British to the point where they were ready to leave Palestine.  
Ben-Gurion, often in politically ruthless ways, kept the forces of resist-  
ance together, and molded the state-in-being that was to become Israel.

However, the Lehi, led by Yitzhak Shamir, was too extreme even for  
Begins taste. Among other terrorist acts, it was responsible for the murder  
in 1944 of Lord Moyne, British Minister for Middle East Affairs, and on  
April 26,1944, the cold-blooded killing of six sleeping British paratroopers.  
Later, Shamir's Lehi planned and carried out the assassination of Count  
Folke Bernadotte, the United Nations envoy.

It is clear that throughout the history of the Zionist movement the major  
factions were agreed on only one thing—they wanted all of Palestine, not  
a "partitioned" Palestine except as a first step toward total control. In  
essence this meant that a homeland for the Jews meant no homeland for

As we have seen, one proposed solution had long been to "partition"  
Palestine between Jews and Arabs in an attempt to accommodate both the  
Jews and Palestinian national movements. The insoluble problem con-  
tinued to be that neither side wanted partition—each claiming the entire

In 1942, the Socialist Zionists, led by Ben-Gurion, reluctantly began tomove toward accepting a partition of Palestine—but only as a first step in  
achieving a Jewish state encompassing all of Palestine.

Ben-Gurion's philosophy is summarized in the recent book by Simha  
Flapan, entitled The Birth of Israel, Myths and Realities:

Ben-Gurion's long-range objective was quite clear: "Just as I do not see  
the proposed Jewish state as a final solution to the problems of the  
Jewish people," he told his party members, "so I do not see partition as  
the final solution of the Palestine question. Those who reject partition  
are right in their claim that this country cannot be partitioned because it  
constitutes one unit, not only from a historical point of view but also

Addressing the Zionist Executive, he again emphasized the tactical  
nature of his support for partition and his assumption that "after the for-  
mation of a large army in the wake of the establishment of the state, we  
will abolish partition and expand to the whole of Palestine." He reiterated  
this position in a letter to his family during that same period. "A Jewish  
state is not the end but the beginning. ..we shall organize a sophisticated  
defense force—an elite army. I have no doubt that our army will be one  
of the best in the world. And then I am sure that we will not be prevented  
from settling in other parts of the country, either through mutual  
understanding and agreement with our neighbors, or by other means."

In May 1942, Ben-Gurion convened a Zionist conference in New York  
City that was attended by some six hundred delegates, including leaders  
from Palestine and from the European movements. The main thrust of  
the resulting Biltmore Program (named after the hotel where the  
meeting took place) was that "Palestine be established as a Jewish  
commonwealth integrated into the structure of the new democratic  
world." The British Mandate, it was declared, could no longer assure the  
establishment of the national home. Significantly, the subject of borders  
was not mentioned in the final resolution. Yet the implications of the  
commonwealth plan were obvious: Palestine was to be a Jewish state.  
The Arabs were no longer a party to negotiations and had no role in

With the support of the increasingly influential and militant Ameri-  
can Zionists in a coalition against the more liberal, conciliatory elements  
in the movement, Ben-Gurion gained passage of the resolution. The  
Biltmore Program became the official policy of the World Zionist move-  
ment and heralded Ben-Gurion's ascent to unchallenged leadership. Onhis return to Palestine after the conference, Ben-Gurion continued to  
emphasize that Biltmore referred to a Jewish state in the whole of  
Palestine. At a meeting of the Histadrut Council at Kfar Vitkin, he  
explained that "this is why we formulated our demand not as a Jewish  
state in Palestine, but Palestine as a Jewish state " and he specifically  
advised not to identify the Biltmore Program with a Jewish state in part

On August 5, 1946, the Executive Board of the Jewish Agency met in  
Paris and adopted the concept of "partition" as the official policy of the

Ben-Gurion knew that President Truman was opposed both to a Jewish  
state in Palestine and to partition. Truman was, however, sympathetic to  
the refugee problem of the Holocaust survivors.

Perlmutter calls attention to a popular misconception that associates  
Zionism primarily with the victims of the Holocaust:

Ben-Gurion and the Zionists then decided to combine the Holocaust and  
independence, the plight of Jewish displaced persons and survivors of  
the camps with the concept of partition. Even for the Zionists this was  
something of a departure, for they had come late to the issue of the  
plight of the victims of the Holocaust. The pursuit of a displaced persons  
policy had not been one of the Zionists' major goals {no matter how  
much some historians like to insist it was.) Now, in 1946, the plight of  
the displaced persons in British camps coincided with pragmatic politics  
on several levels. On the most immediate front, immigration to Eretz  
Israel was always a major Zionist concern, and the survivors of European  
Jewry represented hundreds of thousands of potential Jewish settlers  
who had nowhere else to go since the gates of most countries, including  
the United States, were closed to them. The displaced persons therefore  
also represented a practical way to mix humanitarian concerns with  
pragmatic politics. This was especially true in finding a way to get the  
United States involved in the Palestine problem. The British, without  
meaning to, were eminently cooperative. [Emphasis supplied]

As efforts to involve the United States grew, the political pressure on

Truman, as did almost everyone else, felt great sympathy for the Jewish  
refugees from Europe. He was also much less sure of the Jewish vote than

Roosevelt had been. For the coming 1948 election, he needed the endorse-  
ment of Jewish organizations in such swing-states as New York, Pennsylva-  
nia, and Illinois. Once the British renounced their mandate, Truman pushed  
for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. In May 1947, the Palestine  
problem came before the United Nations. The majority produced a new  
partition plan—there would be Jewish and Arab states, plus an interna-  
tional zone in Jerusalem. Being aware of Zionist ambitions for all of  
Palestine, neither the American State Department, nor the British Foreign  
Office wanted a Jewish state. They foresaw disaster for the West if one were  
created. The British War Office and the U.S. Defense Department were  
also strongly opposed.

PARTITION AND THE BIRTH OF ISRAEL

Nevertheless, on November 29, 1947, thanks to Truman's vigorous  
backing, the plan was adopted by the General Assembly, 33 votes to 13,  
with 10 abstentions.

The Partition Plan contains, among others, the following provisions:

1. The basic premise underlying the partition proposal is that the claims  
   to Palestine of the Arabs and Jews, both possessing validity, are  
   irreconcilable, and that among all of the solutions advanced partition  
   will provide the most realistic and practicable settlement, and is the  
   most likely to afford a workable basis for meeting in part the claims  
   and national aspirations of both parties.
2. It is a fact that both of these peoples have their historic roots in  
   Palestine, and that both make vital contributions to the economic and  
   cultural life of the country. The partition solution takes these consid-  
   erations fully into account.
3. The basic conflict in Palestine is a clash of two intense nationalisms.  
   Regardless of the historical origins of the conflict, the rights and  
   wrongs of the promises and counter-promises, and the international  
   intervention incident to the Mandate, there are now in Palestine  
   some 650,000 Jews and some 1,200,000 Arabs, who are dissimilar in  
   their ways of living and, for the time being, separated by political  
   interests which render difficult full and effective political cooperation  
   among them, whether voluntary or induced by constitutional arrange-  
   ments.
4. Only by means of partition can these conflicting national aspirations  
   find substantial expression and qualify both peoples to take theirplaces as independent nations in the international community and in  
   the United Nations.
5. The partition solution provides that finality, which is a most urgent  
   need, is the solution. Every other proposed solution would tend to  
   induce the two parties to seek modification in their favour by means  
   of persistent pressure. The grant of independence to both States,  
   however, would remove the basis for such efforts.
6. Partition is based on a realistic appraisal of the actual Arab-Jewish  
   relations in Palestine. Full political cooperation would be indispensa-  
   ble to the effective functioning of any single-State scheme, such as the  
   federal State proposal, except in those cases which frankly envisage  
   either an Arab or a Jewish dominated State.
7. Partition is the only means available by which political and economic  
   responsibility can be placed squarely on both Arabs and Jews, with the  
   prospective result that, confronted with responsibility for bearing  
   fully the consequences of their own actions, a new and important  
   element of political amelioration would be introduced. In the pro-  
   posed federal State solution, this factor would be lacking.
8. Jewish immigration is the central issue in Palestine today and is one  
   factor, above all others, that rules out the necessary cooperation  
   between the Arab and Jewish communities in a single State. The  
   creation of a Jewish State under a partition scheme is the only hope  
   of removing this issue from the arena of conflict.
9. It is recognized that partition has been strongly opposed by Arabs, but  
   it is felt that the opposition would be lessened by a solution which  
   definitively fixes the extent of territory to be allotted to the Jews with  
   its implicit limitation on immigration. The fact that the solution  
   carries the sanction of the United Nations involves a finality which  
   should allay Arab fears of further expansion of the Jewish State.  
   [Emphasis supplied]

Although the partition resolution of the United Nations General Assem-  
bly, referred to above, constitutes the de jure foundation for the State of  
Israel, it is clear that the Zionists had no intention of abiding by either the  
letter or the spirit of the U.N. resolution.

Menachem Begin, leader of the Irgun, declared that the "bisection of our  
homeland is illegal and will never be recognized." Begins Hezut party,  
founded in 1948, argued for a Jewish state not only in all of Palestine—but  
in Jordan as well, "even if it has to be won by blood and fire."

None of the Zionist parties accepted the U.N. resolution as anything but  
a temporary expedient.

As the late Simha Flapan,t in his recent book, The Birth of Israel, Myths  
and Realities, describes it:

In short, acceptance of the UN Partition Resolution was an example of  
Zionist pragmatism par excellence. It was a tactical acceptance, a vital  
step in the right direction—a springboard for expansion when circum-  
stances proved more judicious. And indeed, in the period between the  
UN vote on November 29, 1947, and the declaration of the State of  
Israel on May 14,1948, a number of developments helped to produce the  
judicious circumstances that would enable the embryonic Jewish State to  
expand its borders.

Overall Zionist strategy never wavered from its basic position—all of  
Palestine was to be Jewish and no Palestinian state would be allowed,  
regardless of the U.N. resolution. On Friday, May 14, 1948, Ben-Gurion  
read out the Scroll of Independence:

By virtue of our national and intrinsic right and on the strength of the  
resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, we hereby declare  
the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, which shall be known as  
the State of Israel.

tSimha Flapan was National Secretary of Israel's MAP AM party, and director of its Arab Affairs  
Department. He was founder and editor-in-chief of the Middle East monthly New Outlook, and  
founder and director of the Jewish-Arab Institute and the Israeli Peace Research Institute. He alsc  
lectured as a Fellow at the Harvard University Center for International Affairs, as a Visiting  
Scholar at the Harvard Center for Middle East Studies, and as a Foreign Associate of the Roya  
Institute of International Affairs in London.

CHAPTER IV

The Arab-Israeli Wars
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I HE CROWNING achievement and the culminating event in the  
JL history of Zionism was the founding of the State of Israel. It was  
also the casus belli of the "War of Independence," 1948-1949, the first of  
five Arab-Israeli wars. For the purposes of this book, it is the only one of  
these wars which will be discussed in any detail, because it is the source of  
the Palestinian refugee problem, one of the most difficult issues to be dealt  
with in resolving the Middle East crisis.

THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE AND ISRAELI MYTHOLOGY

The popularly accepted version of the War of Independence, in Israel  
and elsewhere, may be summarized as follows:

No sooner had the young nation of Israel declared itself as a State, it was  
set upon (in its cradle, so to speak) by powerful enemies determined upon  
its destruction. Only after a heroic defense, involving brilliant tactics and  
unsurpassed bravery, did Israel succeed in defeating and humiliating the  
Arab hordes. The imagery associated with the Israeli victory is that of a  
David desperately facing a Goliath and triumphing against great odds.

This account of the War of Independence has been told and retold with  
frequent embellishments to where it is now accepted (according to the late  
Simha Flapan) in Israeli society as historical truth and hardened into a  
dangerous ideological shield.

This version of the events surrounding the founding of Israel and the

War of Independence may never have been questioned or challenged except  
for the recent release and declassification of many state documents and  
military archives, including the secret war diaries of Ben-Gurion. The par-  
ticular significance of these recent revelations is that they cast an entirely  
new light on the crucial question concerning the Palestinian refugees.

This long-debated question is (1) whether, when the 1948-49 war  
started, the Palestinian refugees voluntarily abandoned their lands and  
homes not intending to return, so that Israel was entitled to seize and  
confiscate their homes and property, or (2) whether the Palestinians fled  
for their lives in a panic because of the threats and attacks by the Israeli  
army, and the terrorist atrocities committed by the Irgun, under Begin, and  
the Lehi, under Shamir, which were intended to terrify them into leaving.

This question may have remained unanswerable had the Israeli govern-  
ment's archives and Ben-Gurion's war diaries not been declassified.

Simha Flapan, in his recently published book entitled The Birth of Israel,  
Myths and Realities, undertakes to answer this crucial question. What is  
revealed by these newly declassified archives and diaries, Flapan says, is a  
"historian's Pandora's box." His book sets forth seven "Foundation Myths"  
which, when the truth is known, profoundly alters the prevailing percep-  
tion of the crucial events surrounding the birth of Israel.

In the realm of mythology, Flapan includes such popular beliefs as  
(1) that the Arabs forced the 1948 war on the peaceful Israelis, (2) that the  
Arab armies were a unified and powerful coalition determined to destroy  
Israel, and (3) that Israel was a David fighting Goliath for survival. It is also  
untrue, says Flapan, that Israel's hand has always been extended in peace.

Except for a brief period, Israel was the real Goliath in the War of  
Independence and has continued as such in the Middle East ever since.  
Flapan states his purpose in his introduction:

It is the purpose of this book to debunk these myths, not as an academic  
exercise but as a contribution to a better understanding of the Palestinian  
problem and to a more constructive approach to its solution.

There is also a personal issue—for me as for tens of thousands of  
Israelis, ardent Zionists and socialists, whose public and private lives  
have been built on a belief in those myths, along with a belief in Zionism  
and the State of Israel as embodying not only the national liberation of  
the Jewish people but the great humanitarian principles of Judaism and  
enlightened mankind. True, we did not always agree with many official  
policies and even opposed them publicly. And developments since 1967have created realities contradictory to these beliefs. But we still believed  
that Israel was born out of the agony of a just and inevitable war, guided  
by the principles of human dignity, justice, and equality. Perhaps it was  
naivete. Perhaps it was the effect of the Holocaust that made us unable,  
unwilling to be fundamentally critical of our country and ourselves.  
Whatever its sources, the truth cannot be shunned. It must be used even  
now in the service of the same universal principles that inspired us in

Flapan has the same grave concern regarding Israel's future, as is

To what extent does the growing support for the theocratic racist Rabbi  
Meir Kahane—who talks openly of deporting the Palestinians from Israel  
and the West Bank and Gaza—have its roots in the events of 1948?

Like most Israelis, I had always been under the influence of certain  
myths that had become accepted as historical truth. And since myths are  
central to the creation of structures of thinking and propaganda, these  
myths had been of paramount importance in shaping Israeli policy for

Israel's myths are located at the core of the nation's self-perception.  
Even though Israel has the most sophisticated army in the region and  
possesses an advanced atomic capability, it continues to regard itself in  
terms of the Holocaust, as the victim of an unconquerable bloodthirsty  
enemy. Thus whatever Israelis do, whatever means we employ to guard  
our gains or to increase them, we justify as last-ditch self-defense. We  
can, therefore, do no wrong. The myths of Israel forged during the  
formation of the state have hardened into this impenetrable, and danger-  
ous, ideological shield. Yet what emerged from my reading was that  
while it was precisely during the period between 1948 and 1952 that  
most of these myths gained credence, the documents at hand not only  
failed to substantiate them, they openly contradicted them. [Emphasis

Of the various "Foundation Myths," discussed by Flapan, this book is  
primarily concerned with Myth Three, which Flapan states as follows:

Myth Three: The flight of the Palestinians from the country, both before  
and after the establishment of the State of Israel, came in response to acall by the Arab leadership to leave temporarily, in order to return with  
the victorious Arab armies. They fled despite the efforts of the Jewish  
leadership to persuade them to stay. In fact, the flight was prompted by  
Israel's political and military leaders, who believed that Zionist coloniza-  
tion and statehood necessitated the "transfer" of Palestinian Arabs to  
Arab countries. [Emphasis supplied]

The importance of the truth concerning this myth is that it deals with  
the issue of the Palestinian refugees, which has festered and remained  
unresolved for forty years. It is a bitter and emotionally charged issue, that  
is as alive today as it was then, and one that must be faced and dealt with  
if peace is ever to be attained.

war, terror, and refugees: 1948-1949

On May 15, 1948, the day after the Scroll of Independence of Israel was  
read, a disorganized and loosely-led collection of Arab soldiers from differ-  
ent countries attacked Israel with disastrous consequence to the Arabs. This  
gave the Israelis the very opportunity for which they were waiting. The  
Israeli version of the events that followed is one of the "Foundation  
Myths," which Flapan discusses at length in his book.

The Palestinians were opposed in principle to the U.N. partition reso-  
lution and considered it un just, since it gave the Jews (with only 35 percent  
of the population), 55 percent of the country's territory. Furthermore, it cut  
off the Palestinian state from the Red Sea and from Syria, and provided  
only one approach to the Mediterranean.  
Flapan also points out that:

The Palestinians also failed to see why they should be made to pay for  
the Holocaust (the ultimate crime against humanity, committed in

Europe by Europeans) They failed to see why it was not fair for the

Jews to be in a minority in a unitary Palestinian state, while it was fair  
for almost half of the Palestinian population—the indigenous majority  
on its own ancestral soil—to be converted overnight into a minority  
under alien rule in the envisaged Jewish state according to partition.

Despite these feelings, the masses of Palestinians accepted the partition  
as irreversible and a fait accompli. This is confirmed by an unequivocal  
statement by Ben-Gurion in a report to Sharett on March 14, 1948: "It is  
now clear, without the slightest doubt, that were we to face the Palestiniansalone, everything would be all right. The decisive majority of them do not  
want to fight us, and all of them together are unable to stand up to us even  
at the present state of our organization and equipment."

The Palestinians did not want, or believe in, a war. Instead, they attemp-  
ted to protect themselves against warfare by the only means at their  
disposal: local agreements with their Jewish neighbors against mutual  
attacks, provocations, and hostile acts. Hundreds of such "nonaggressive  
pacts" were arranged. They were signed between Arab villages and neigh-  
boring Jewish Kibbutzim; between Jewish and Arab workers in places of  
common employment like ports, army camps, railways, oil refineries, and  
the postal service; and between Jewish and Arab businessmen, merchants,

As the local Arab population demonstrated a relative passivity, the move  
to sign nonaggressive pacts with Jewish neighbors spread all over the country.

Nearly all the Arab affairs experts at the Jewish Agency, regardless of  
political outlook, agreed that most Palestinians, particularly the peasants  
and urban property owners, were not interested in a war against the Jews.There was no Palestinian uprising in response to the Jewish state, and not  
a single Jewish settlement was attacked by them.

According to Flapan, the evidence is so overwhelming that the question  
arises how the myth of a Palestinian jihad against the Jews could survive so  
long. One reason, he said, is the "efficiency of the Israeli propaganda

Israel's overriding strategy was the elimination of the Palestinian people  
as contenders for and even as inhabitants of the same territory and the  
denial of their right to be an independent state. These objectives took  
precedence over peace. As it turned out, their attainment actually made  
peace impossible, transforming the Israel-Palestine conflict into an even  
more intense Israeli-Palestinian confrontation marked by a feverish arms  
race and five wars in thirty-four years. The 1948-49 war, then, was a  
golden opportunity for Israel to advance its territorial ambitions, as well as  
to reduce the Arab population to a fraction of its former numbers. Thus  
Israel could achieve, under the banner of a "defensive" war, sweeping  
changes in its boundaries and a drastic reduction in the Palestinian popu-

To implement its strategy, Israel allowed its terrorist factions, led by  
Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, to have a free rein to pursue their  
terrorist activities. Together with the Israeli army they carried out the

1. Raids upon peaceful and defenseless Arab villages involving murder,  
   torture, rape, and pillage.
2. Psychological warfare to convince the Arab villagers that the best  
   thing for their safety would be to flee their villages and come back  
   when the hostilities ended.
3. Direct expulsion of village inhabitants by razing their homes and  
   occupying their lands.
4. Destruction of the fabric of Palestinian life by wrecking the economy  
   and denying to the remaining Arabs the source of subsistence.
5. Confiscation of all the property of the refugees and refusing to let  
   many return to their land and homes.

The exodus of Palestinian Arabs, both forced and voluntary, began with  
the publication of the U.N. partition resolution on November 29,1947, and  
continued even after the armistice agreements were signed in the summer  
of 1949. Between 600,000 and 700,000 Palestinian Arabs were evicted or  
fled from areas that were either allocated to the Jewish state or occupied by  
Jewish forces during the fighting (and later integrated de facto into  
Israel). During and after the exodus, every effort was made—from the  
razing of villages to the promulgation of laws—to prevent their return.

There is overwhelming circumstantial evidence showing that a design  
was being implemented by the Haganah, and later the IDF (Israel Defense  
Force), to reduce the number of Arabs in the Jewish state to a minimum,  
to make use of most of their lands and properties, and to resettle Jewish  
immigrants on the confiscated lands.

As a result, hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were intimidated and  
terrorized and caused to flee in panic. Still others were driven out by the  
Israeli Army which, under the leadership of Ben-Gurion, planned and  
executed the expulsion in the wake of the U.N. partition.

The Israeli leadership, including Ben-Gurion, were all of one mind: that  
"the Arabs understood only the language of force and any proposals for  
compromise would be taken for weakness." They all accepted Ben-Gurion's  
view that the State of Israel should be demographically homogeneous and  
geographically as extensive as possible.

The Israeli propaganda was also effective as a psychological weapon. The  
Haganah disseminated leaflets to Arab villages which said:

We have no wish to fight ordinary people who want to live in peace, but  
only the army and forces which are preparing to invade Palestine.

Therefore .. .all people who do not want this war must leave together  
with their women and children in order to be safe.

This is going to be a cruel war, with no mercy or compassion. There  
is no reason why you should endanger yourselves. [Emphasis supplied]

Lest this notice be taken as a compassionate gesture, rather than a cynical  
method of causing evacuation of Arab villages, it is important to know  
something of what had just happened in the infamous Dir Yassin massacre.  
The following are quotations from Flapan s book:

The village of Dir Yassin was located in a largely Jewish area in the  
vicinity of Jerusalem and had signed a nonaggression pact with its Jewish

Yet for the entire day of April 9,1948, Irgun and LEHI soldiers carried  
out the slaughter in a cold and premeditated fashion. In a 1979 article  
dealing with the later forced evacuation of Lydda and Ramleh, New York  
Times reporter David Shipler cites Red Cross and British documents to  
the effect that the attackers "lined men, women, and children up against  
walls and shot them," so that Dir Yassin "remains a name of infamy in  
the world." When they had finished, they looted the village and fled.

Following this, Menachem Begin sent out an order of the day' to his  
band of terrorists: "Accept my congratulations on this splendid act of

conquest As at Dir Yassin, so everywhere we will attack and smite the

enemy, God, God, thou has chosen us for conquest."

The ruthlessness of the attack on Dir Yassin shocked Jewish and world  
public opinion alike, drove fear and panic into the Arab population, and  
led to the flight of unarmed civilians from their homes all over the  
country. David Shaltiel, the head of the Haganah in Jerusalem, con-  
demned the massacre of Arab civilians in the sharpest terms. He charged  
that the splinter groups had not launched a military operation but had  
chosen one of the quiet villages in the area that had never been con-  
nected with any of the attacks since the start of hostilities. But according  
to the Irgun, Shaltiel had approved of the attack. And years later, the  
historian of the Haganah, Aryeh Yitzhaki, wrote that the operation in  
Dir Yassin was in line with dozens of attacks carried out at that time bythe Haganah and Palmach, in the course of which houses full of elderly  
people, women, and children were blown up. (Less well-known than Dir  
Yassin but no less brutal was the massacre in Duweima, near Hebron,  
carried out on October 29,1948, by Former LEHI members and revealed  
by the Israeli journalist Yoela Har-Shefi in 1984.)

Former mayor of Jerusalem Khalidi called the attack on Dir Yassin  
senseless, especially in view of the pacific nature of the village and its  
relations with its Jewish neighbors. But from another perspective, it  
made perfect sense. More panic was sown among the Arab population by  
this operation than by anything that had happened up to then. Dir  
Yassin is considered by most historians to have been the direct reason for  
the flight of the Arabs from Haifa on April 21 and from Jaffa on May  
4. [Emphasis supplied]

Ben-Gurion made it clear, however, that even though the Arab areas  
which he considered important to the new state had been brought under  
Israeli control, there still remained the problem of their inhabitants. On  
May 11, he noted in his diary that he had given orders for the destruction  
of an "Arab island" in the Jewish-populated area.

The most significant elimination of these "Arab islands" took place two  
months after Israel's Declaration of Independence. In one of the gravest  
episodes of this tragic story, on July 12-13,1948, as many as fifty thousand  
Arabs were driven out of their homes in Lydda and Ramleh.

In Lydda, the exodus took place on foot. In Ramleh, the IDF provided  
buses and trucks. Originally, all males had been rounded up and enclosed in  
a compound, but after some shooting was heard, and construed by Ben-  
Gurion to be the beginning of an Arab legion counteroffensive, he stopped  
the arrests and ordered the speedy eviction of all the Arabs, including  
women, children, and the elderly. In explanation, he said that "those who  
made war on us bear responsibility after their defeat."

With the population gone, the Israeli soldiers proceeded to loot the two  
towns in an outbreak of mass pillaging that the officers could neither  
prevent nor control.

This was not the first time that Israeli soldiers had engaged in looting;  
nor was looting a problem confined to the army. Jewish civilians also  
rushed to plunder Arab towns and villages once they were emptied of their  
inhabitants.

Ben-Gurion had shown considerable concern over the phenomenon even  
before the events at Ramleh and Lydda. On June 16, he wrote: "There is amoral defect in our ranks that I never suspected existed: I refer to the mass  
looting, in which all sections of the population participated. This is not only  
a moral defect but a grave military defect." Six weeks earlier, on May 1,  
Ben-Gurion had noted that, in Haifa, professional thieves took part in the  
looting initiated by the Irgun, and that booty had also been found in the  
possession of Haganah commanders. He described other unsavory aspects  
of the operations as well: "There was a search for Arabs; they were seized,  
beaten, and also tortured " In October, he again referred to large-scale  
looting by the Haganah in Beersheba, which would appear to indicate that  
his previous exhortations had not been effective. Flapan adds this com-  
ment: "His moral revulsion, however, did not lead him either to insist that  
offenders be brought to trial or to abandon the strategy of evictions "  
Indeed, very few soldiers and civilians were tried for looting or indiscrim-

Ben-Gurion believed strongly that economic warfare against the Palesti-  
nian Arabs would also be an important tactic. This is explained in the

In a letter to Sharett... Ben-Gurion focused on economic issues, observ-  
ing that "the important difference with [the riots of] 1937 is the in-  
creased vulnerability of the Arab urban economy. Haifa and Jaffa are at  
our mercy. We can 'starve them out.' Motorized transport, which has also  
become an important factor in their life, is to a large extent at our mercy."

The destruction of the Palestinian urban bases, along with the con-  
quest and evacuation (willing or unwilling) of nearby villages, under-  
mined the whole structure of Palestinian life in many parts of the  
country, especially in the towns. Ben-Gurion's advisers urged closing  
stores, barring raw materials from factories, and various other measures.  
Yadin, the army's head of operations, advised that "we must paralyze  
Arab transportation and commerce, and harass them in country and  
town. This is the way to lower their morale." And Sasson proposed  
"damaging Arab commerce—even if Jewish commerce will be damaged.  
We can tolerate it, they cannot... we must not hit here and there, but at  
all transportation at once, all commerce and so on."

Within weeks, the urban disintegration of the Palestinian Arabs was  
a fait accompli. Ben-Gurion's tactics had succeeded. As he explained it:

The strategic objective [of the Jewish forces] was to destroy the urban  
communities, which were the most organized and politically conscious  
sections of the Palestinian people. This was not done by house-to-housefighting inside the cities and towns, but by the conquest and destruction  
of the rural areas surrounding most of the towns. This technique led to  
the collapse and surrender of Haifa, Jaffa, Tiberias, Safed, Acre, Beit-  
Shan, Lydda, Ramleh, Majdal, and Beersheba. Deprived of transporta-  
tion, food, and raw materials, the urban communities underwent a  
process of disintegration, chaos, and hunger which forced them to

The Israeli claim that most Palestinians abandoned their homes and left  
voluntarily is Israeli propaganda. According to Flapan:

Indeed, from the point of view of military logistics, the contention that  
the Palestinian Arab leadership appealed to the Arab masses to leave  
their homes in order to open the way for the invading armies, after  
which they would return to share in the victory, makes no sense at all.  
The Arab armies, coming long distances and operating in or from the  
Arab areas of Palestine, needed the help of the local population for food,  
fuel, water, transport, manpower, and information.

The recent publication of thousands of documents in the state and  
Zionist archives, as well as Ben-Gurion's war diaries, shows that there is  
no evidence to support Israeli claims. In fact, the declassified material  
contradicts the "order" theory, for among these new sources are docu-  
ments testifying to the considerable efforts of the AHC [Arab Higher  
Committee] and the Arab states to constrain the flight.

For its part, the Haganah avoided outright massacres like Dir Yassin  
but, through destruction of property, harassment, and rumor-mongering,  
was no less determined to evacuate the Arab population and prevent its  
return. Indeed, by the end of the 1947-48 war, IDF s burning, blowing  
up, and mining of the ruins accounted for the destruction of 350 Arab  
villages and townlets situated in areas assigned to the Jewish state or  
those conquered during the fighting. Thousands upon thousands of  
houses, workshops, storerooms, cattle pens, nurseries, and orchards were  
destroyed, while livestock was seized and equipment looted or burned.  
The operation, executed with a strict efficiency, was inexplicable since  
most of these villages were not engaged in heavy fighting against the  
Jewish forces and most of the inhabitants had fled either in fear of a  
"new Dir Yassin" or in response to "friendly advice" from Jewish neigh-

A more sophisticated form of pressure was achieved by legislation  
regarding property, particularly the Absentees' Property Law of 1950. This  
law, first promulgated in December 1948, stated that any Arabs who left  
their places of residence between November 29, 1947, and September 1,  
1948, either to go to areas outside Palestine or to areas within Palestine that  
were occupied by active Arab military forces, would be considered absentees  
and their property subject to appropriation by the Custodian of Enemy  
Property (an office soon replaced by the Custodian of Absentees' Property).  
Even Arabs who had traveled to visit relatives or to escape areas of fighting

A detailed account of exactly how "abandoned" Arab property assisted in  
the absorption of the new immigrants was prepared by Joseph Schechtman,  
an expert on population transfer who helped create the myth of "volun-  
tary" exodus. "The amount of this property," he wrote in 1952, is "very

Two million nine hundred and ninety thousand dunams (739,750 acres)  
of formerly Arab-owned land, including olive and orange groves, vineyards,  
citrus orchards, and assorted tree gardens, became totally deserted as a  
result of the Arab mass flight. Of this Arab land, 2,070,270 dunams were of  
good quality, 136,530 of medium quality, and 751,730 dunams were of poor  
soil. In addition, 73,000 dwelling rooms in abandoned Arab houses, and  
7,800 shops, workshops, and storerooms became ownerless in towns and

Bank accounts estimated to total 5 million Palestinian pounds, and left in  
Arab and non-Arab banks, were frozen by the Israeli government. All of  
this Arab absentee property, movable and immovable, was entrusted to an

It is difficult to overestimate the tremendous role this lot of abandoned  
Arab property has played in the settlement of hundreds of thousands of  
Jewish immigrants who have reached Israel since the proclamation of the  
state in May 1948. Forty-seven new rural settlements established on the  
sites of abandoned Arab villages had, by October 1949, already absorbed  
25,255 new immigrants. By the spring of 1950 over 1 million dunams  
(250,000 acres) had been leased by the custodian to Jewish settlements and  
individual farmers for the raising of grain crops.

Large tracts of land belonging to Arab absentees have also been leased to  
Jewish settlers, old and new, for the raising of vegetables. In the south  
alone, 15,000 dunams of vineyards and fruit trees have been leased to

This has saved the Jewish Agency and the government millions of  
dollars. While the average cost of establishing an immigrant family in a  
new settlement was from $7,500 to $9,000, the cost of doing so in aban-  
doned Arab villages did not exceed $1,500.

the myth of voluntary exodus

To justify these actions the myth was created and heavily propagandized  
that the Palestinians had left their homes voluntarily or were encouraged to  
do so by the Arab countries. Having thus "abandoned their homes, farms,  
orchards" to the Israelis, it was proper for the Israelis to confiscate and  
occupy them. This Flapan refutes in great detail:

Palestinian sources offer further evidence that even earlier, in March and  
April, the Arab Higher Committee, broadcasting from Damascus,  
demanded that the population stay put and announced that Palestinians  
of military age must return from the Arab countries. All Arab officials in  
Palestine were also asked to remain at their posts.

Why did such pleas have so little impact? They were outweighed by  
the cumulative effect of Zionist pressure tactics that ranged from eco-  
nomic and psychological warfare to the systematic ousting of the Arab  
population by the army and terrorism. [Emphasis supplied]

The myth of voluntary Palestinian exodus, in response to Arab "orders  
from above," has survived with an astounding perseverance. In retro-  
spect, the myth can be seen as the inevitable result of the denial of the  
Palestinians' right to national independence and statehood, a principle  
that guided Zionist policies from the beginning.

Political in origin, the myth became an important component in the  
prevailing self-image of the new state. First of all, it served to cover the  
traces of the unsavory methods employed by the authorities—from the  
confiscation of food, raw materials, medicaments, and land, to acts of  
terror and intimidation, the creation of panic, and finally, forcible expul-  
sion—and thus to exorcise the feelings of guilt in many sectors of society,  
especially the younger generation. Many of them bore the burden of the  
operations that caused the Arab flight. They personally implemented the  
instructions to destroy whole villages, forcing men, women, and children  
to leave their homes for some unknown destination beyond the borders.  
Many of them took part in operations where they rounded up all able-bodied men and then crowded them into trucks for deportation. Their  
feelings of moral frustration and revulsion were not easily eradicated.

The fact that the Israelis were responsible for the mass exodus of the  
Arab refugees is attested to by the IDF's own intelligence estimates.

As of June 1, 1948, 370,000 Arabs had left the country, from both the  
Jewish parts and the Arab parts conquered by the Jews. Jewish attacks on  
Arab centers, particularly large villages, townlets, or cities, accounted for  
about 55 percent of those who left: terrorist acts of the Irgun and Lehi, 15  
percent; whispering campaigns (psychological warfare), about 2 percent;  
evacuations ordered by the IDF, another 2 percent; and general fear, about

It is clear from these statistics that 84 percent left in direct response to  
Israeli actions, while only 5 percent left on orders from Arab bands. The  
remaining 11 percent are not accounted for in this estimate, and may refer  
to those who left voluntarily. (The total reflects only about 50 percent of  
the entire exodus, since a similar number were to leave the country within

Flapan concludes his discussion of Myth Three with the following:

Was there any significant opposition to official policy? On many occa-  
sions, the forceful expulsion of the Palestinian population generated  
protests in liberal and progressive circles against the violation of elemen-  
tary human rights. News of the expulsions, of brutal treatment, of  
looting, and of the terrible suffering of Arabs forced to leave their homes  
and properties were reported by witnesses, among them religious digni-  
taries, doctors and nurses, church-school teachers, journalists, Quakers,  
members of the staff of U.N. mediator Count Bernadotte, and people  
from the International Red Cross who moved in after the fighting. Their  
reports and appeals to international bodies to stop the bloodshed and  
help victims generated stormy debates in the press, as well as in the  
British Parliament and the U.S. Congress. Indeed, the tragedy of the ref-  
ugees was at the center of Bernadotte's report and recommendations.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The foregoing, therefore, is the truth concerning the historical back-  
ground of one of the most emotional and bitter issues involved in the  
Israeli-Palestinian conflict—the Palestinian refugees. As mentioned earlier,

this is an issue that has remained unresolved for more than forty years.

The importance of the disclosures from Ben-Gurion's war diaries and  
other recently declassified documents cannot be overestimated.

The conclusions reluctantly arrived at by Flapan in his book The Birth of  
Israel: Myths and Realities are so startling, and the implications so far-  
reaching, that Flapan's own words have been used as much as possible in  
stating the facts, which from any other source than Simha Flapan would be

His book is essential reading for anyone desiring a true perspective on  
the Israeli-Palestinian crisis, and especially the plight of the Palestinian

Following the War of Independence, no progress was made in solving  
the Palestinian refugee problem and an uneasy period of no war and no  
peace lasted until the Sinai war with Egypt in 1956.

In 1952, a military junta overthrew the Egyptian monarchy which led to

As a matter of policy, Egypt had always denied Israeli ships the right to  
use the Suez Canal. However, in 1956, Nasser also closed off Israel's access  
to the Gulf of Aqaba through the Straits of Tiran. Israel retaliated by  
launching a pre-emptive strike into the Sinai and, in conjunction with  
French and English forces, captured the Suez Canal and also opened the sea  
route to Aqaba. Under the agreement which ended the fighting, Israel  
agreed to withdraw from the Sinai on condition that Egypt would not  
remilitarize it and that U.N. peace-keeping forces be deployed in the Sinai  
to police the truce agreement. This arrangement lasted until 1967.

On May 15, 1967, Nasser abruptly invaded and remilitarized the Sinai  
and again closed the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping. He ordered the  
U.N. peace-keeping force to leave the Sinai and the U.N. force quickly  
complied. Jordan, Iraq, and Syria expressed their support of Egypt.

On June 5, 1967, Israel launched a surprise air attack on Egypt and  
completely destroyed the Egyptian air force on the ground. In six days, the  
Israeli army captured and occupied all of Jerusalem, the entire West Bank  
and Gaza, and the Syrian Golan Heights, and reoccupied all of the Egyptian

Following the cessation of hostilities, the United Nations adopted thefamous Resolution 242. Among the basic provisions of the resolution was  
the recognition by the parties of the "inadmissibility of acquiring territories  
by war, and the necessity for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from  
territories occupied in the 1967 Six-Day War."

The status of these conquered and occupied territories, which were  
populated by more than a million and a half Palestinians, became the  
fundamental issue involved in the Middle East conflict. This issue (except  
for the Sinai question, which was settled by the Camp David Accords)  
remains unresolved after twenty-two years.

The Israeli victory in the 1967 war also had other far-reaching conse-  
quences. Most importantly, it caused the Israeli people to have a new  
feeling about themselves. The euphoria which accompanied this spectacular  
victory caused many to believe that Israel was "invincible."

Johnson, in his History of the Jews, describes this new attitude, particu-  
larly as it affected the rise of the radical nationalist "Land of Israel"  
movement:

There were many Jews who saw Israel's repeated victories as a moral  
mandate for wider boundaries. For pious Jews it was the hand of  
providence, for secular Jews, a form of manifest destiny. In 1968 the  
Sephardi Chief Rabbi argued that it was a religious obligation not to  
return the newly conquered territories. The same year the Kibbutz Dati,  
representing the religious collectives, intoned a prayer for Independence  
Day: "Extend the boundaries of our land, just as Thou has promised our  
forefathers, from the river Euphrates to the river of Egypt. Build your  
holy city, Jerusalem, capital of Israel; and there may your temple be  
established as in the days of Solomon." Dr. Harold Fisch, rector of Bar-  
Ilan University, insisted: "There is only one nation to whom the land  
belongs in trust and by covenant promise, and that is the Jewish people.  
No temporary demographic changes can alter this basic fact which is the  
bedrock of the Jewish faith; just as one wife does not have two husbands  
so one land does not have two sovereign nations in possession of it." The  
1967 victory also produced a multi-party movement known as the J^and  
of Israel, which argued that it was not within the moral authority of the  
Israeli state, representing only Israeli citizens, to give up any conquered  
portion of the Promised Land, since this was the property of the entire  
Jewish people, and must be preserved for their eventual ingathering or  
Aliya. [Emphasis supplied]

the october 1973 war

Six years had passed since the U.N. Resolution 242 was adopted, which  
required Israel to withdraw its forces from the lands conquered and occu-  
pied in the 1967 war.

Although Israel had ostensibly accepted the resolution, no effort was  
being made by Israel to comply with its terms or to withdraw its forces  
from the Sinai and the West Bank and Gaza.

Anwar Sadat, then President of Egypt following Nasser's death, was  
under great pressure from the Egyptian militarists to renew the war with  
Israel and recapture the Sinai.

On October 6, 1973, the Egyptian army crossed the Suez Canal in force  
and attacked and broke through the Israeli "Bar Lev Line." Simultaneously,  
the Syrians broke through the Israeli lines on the Golan Heights. This brief  
war is described by Johnson:

An element of technological surprise in the effectiveness of Arab anti-  
tank and anti-aircraft missiles enabled them to inflict disturbing losses on  
Israeli planes and armor. For the first time in the quarter-century of the  
state's existence, Israel faced the possibility of a major defeat and even of  
a second holocaust. But the Syrian advance had been stemmed on 9  
October; the next day, in response to desperate Israeli pleas, the Amer-  
ican President, Richard Nixon, began an emergency airlift of advanced  
weapons. Two days afterwards the Israeli forces began an audacious  
counter-attack on Egypt, crossing on to the West Bank of the Canal, and  
threatening to cut off all the advancing Egyptian forces in Sinai. This was  
the turning-point and Israel moved swiftly towards a victory as decisive  
as that of 1967, when a cease-fire came into force on 24 October.

The last of the five Israeli wars, "The War in Lebanon," 1982-83, will be  
discussed briefly in Chapter X in its chronological sequence.

CHAPTER V

The Search for Peace

N

OT LONG AFTER the October 1973 war between Israel, Syria,  
and Egypt, President Gerald Ford took office with the Middle East  
situation high on his agenda. The failure of previous administrations to  
achieve a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict had not been for  
any lack of effort on the part of the U.S. Every administration since and  
including Nixon's has vainly tried to develop a plan or program to bring  
about a peaceful solution to the dangerous deadlock between Israel and the  
Palestinians, which poses a constant threat to world peace.

While it may appear that the issues dividing the Palestinians and the  
Israelis are highly complex, the chief problem is not their "complexity," but  
the simple fact that the fundamental positions of the two antagonists, as  
they stand, are irreconcilable. Given the situation, the repeated efforts of  
the U.S. to mediate the dispute have been frustrated because there never  
has been any prospect of success.

Without exception, each new administration has begun with high hopes  
of bringing about a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian impasse—  
but finally gives up in the face of Israeli "intransigence," or Palestinian  
"factionalism"—but mostly because of the lack of political will on the part  
of the U.S. This continuing exercise in futility is referred to euphemistically  
as the "peace process."

The humiliation suffered by Egypt in the Six-Day War of 1967 was eased  
by the fact, mentioned earlier, that the Egyptian army, in the 1973 war, hadsuccessfully crossed the Suez Canal, breached the Israeli defenses, inflicted  
heavy casualties, and might have won the war had not the U.S. come to  
Israel's rescue by a massive airlift of arms, armor, and planes from the U.S.  
and from our NATO military arsenal.

It is generally agreed that only because of Egypt's initial military suc-  
cesses in the war, which saved Egypt's pride, could Sadat, in 1977, have  
made his dramatic peace overtures to Israel without appearing as a  
supplicant.

Following the 1973 war, Israel intensified its colonization efforts in the  
occupied West Bank, Gaza, and Sinai by hastening the building of new  
settlements.

The Arabs were powerless to do anything other than to ask the U.N. to  
condemn the Israeli West Bank settlements as being against international  
law and the U.N. Resolution 242 and to request the U.S. to require Israel  
to return the occupied territories—all of which Israel simply ignored.

At the same time, the Arabs played into Israel's hands by carrying out  
sporadic acts of terrorism and by allowing the extreme faction of the PLO  
to continue to demand the destruction of Israel.

PLO Chairman Arafat was prepared to recognize Israel's existence in  
exchange for the Israeli withdrawal from the occupied lands. He was  
fearful, however, that if he made such an open concession without an Israeli  
commitment in return, his life, or at least his leadership of the PLO, would  
be in jeopardy. For that reason, Arafat was forced to perform a high wire  
act that frustrated all efforts of mediators to pin him down to a specific and  
firm position.

While Arafat's vacillations exasperated the forces working toward peace,  
it was the best of both worlds for the Israelis. The Israeli strategy was to  
win the game by "ball control."

By simply holding on to the ball (the occupied territories) and by pro-  
gressively increasing their grip on the territories by building new settlements  
on Palestinian lands, they would eventually win the game. With enough  
settlements, the West Bank and Gaza would belong to Israel by a fait  
accompli. Israel didn't need or want a peace conference, because it could only  
result in Israel having to give up something it had already decided to keep.

With lavish help from the U.S., Israel had now become, by far, the  
strongest military power for its size in the world and it had defeated the  
Arabs in four wars. As we have seen in Chapter III, the Jewish underground  
had "written the book" on "terrorism" and how to rid a country of an op-  
pressive occupying power without the use of conventional military forces.

Begin and Shamir have gained a well-deserved reputation as the most

Now that the Israeli army of occupation was in the same position as the  
British army of occupation had been, and the Palestinians were in the same  
position that the Jewish underground had been, it seemed to the Palestini-

Encouraged by the successful example of the Irgun terrorists under  
Begin, and the Lehi terrorists under Shamir, the Palestinians tried to  
imitate their success, hoping that terrorist acts would have the same effect  
of driving out the Israeli occupiers as the Jewish terrorists had on driving

The plan was a failure mostly because the rules of the game had changed.  
Begin and Shamir had now decided that terrorism was a bad thing and  
loudly and constantly condemned it at every opportunity. Since Israel has  
unparalleled access to the world media, the Palestinians got a bad press.

the ford administration

During the Ford administration, a great deal of time and diplomatic  
effort were involved in shuttle diplomacy on the part of Secretary of State  
Henry Kissinger, for the purpose of stabilizing the temporary frontiers of  
the belligerents in the 1973 war along the cease-fire lines.

Unfortunately little was, or could be, accomplished in resolving the basic  
territorial issues existing among the belligerents. U.S. policy, also favored  
by the U.N., consisted of making efforts to reconvene the Geneva confer-  
ence at which, hopefully, all parties and issues would be at the negotiating  
table so that a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problems could

Since the principal issues to be resolved concerned the Palestinian  
situation (1) in the West Bank and Gaza, (2) the refugee problem, and  
(3) the status of Jerusalem, the Palestinians would necessarily have to be  
represented at any such conference. For this purpose the Palestinians  
regarded the Palestine Liberation Organization as their proper representa-  
tive. Israel, as usual, flatly refused to attend any meeting or conference with  
representatives of the PLO on the grounds that they were a "terrorist"  
organization bent upon the destruction of Israel.

the carter peace offensive

As the Carter administration took office in January of 1977, the respec-  
tive positions staked out by the belligerents had not changed since the end

1. Israel still occupied the Sinai, the West Bank and Gaza, all of  
   Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights.
2. Israel refused to return any of the captured territories (with the  
   possible exception of part of the Sinai) on the grounds that the  
   possession of the occupied territories was required in order to provide  
   "defensible borders" necessary for Israel's security.
3. Under no circumstances would Israel allow a Palestinian state to exist  
   next to it, also for reasons of security.
4. Israel could not and would not give up a single foot of the West Bank  
   and Gaza because these were part of Eretz Israel, land given by God  
   to Abraham in perpetuity.

Hardly anyone outside of Israel considered this last argument as a serious  
contention and assumed that, since Israel had accepted (or pretended to  
accept) Resolutions 242 and 338, which called for a return of the occupied  
territories, it was only a bargaining stance.

The main Arab position, in simple terms, was to insist:

* 1. That the occupied territories be returned pursuant to U.N. Resolu-  
     tions 242 and 338.
  2. That the West Bank and Gaza be the basis for an independent  
     Palestinian state[[4]](#footnote-4)
  3. That the Israeli settlements on the West Bank were an obstacle to  
     peace and contrary to international law, which prohibited an occupy-  
     ing power from settling its own citizens on occupied land.

Israel's strategy was (1) to deflect or fend off any peace overtures from any  
source by refusing even to appear in the same room with representatives  
of the PLO, and (2) to express a ready willingness to negotiate a peaceful  
settlement of the Palestinian questions, "if only there was someone to  
negotiate with."

Begin was even more emphatic in confusing matters. In a memorable  
statement, he announced that everything is "negotiable," but there are  
certain things he would never agree to. (This comment certainly deserves  
a place beside Samuel Goldwyn's famous remark, "An oral contract is not  
worth the paper it is written on.")

As Jimmy Carter's inauguration day approached, January 20, 1977, the  
media was full of reports proclaiming that the political climate in the  
Middle East was more favorable for peace than it had been for twenty-five  
years, and that the problems of the Middle East were ripe for a solution.

Both President Carter and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance (and Zbigniew  
Brzeszinski, National Security Advisor) were eagerly looking to the Arab-  
Israeli stalemate as an opportunity for a major foreign policy coup. Carter's  
idealism and Vance's and Brzeszinski's experience seemed to complement  
each other so that it was thought that the U.S. was in a strong position to  
accept the leadership of a peace offensive in the Middle East.

Accordingly, almost immediately after the Carter inauguration, Secretary  
of State Vance left on a peace mission to the Middle East.

On February 7, 1977, the Wall Street Journal carried a report of Vance's

vance's mideast trip may lead to path  
for renewal of arab-israeli peace talks

Damascus—The Carter administration's first foray into Middle East  
diplomacy apparently has produced some new ideas about how to get

But so far, what has come out is more a sense of direction than a  
specific plan to get Arabs and Israelis into a Geneva conference later this  
year. And because fresh ideas often fail in this troubled region, this effort,  
too, may never produce concrete results.

"There is a very hard and difficult road ahead," Secretary Vance  
cautioned at a news conference here early Monday, before he was to  
return to Washington to report on his trip to President Carter.

Some Old Facts: According to Mr. Vance, his fact-finding journey  
rediscovered some rather old facts. The main ones are that Arabs and  
Israelis disagree sharply about the "core" issues of a possible final Middle  
East settlement, namely the nature of what peace means, the extent of  
Israeli withdrawals from occupied territory, and how to settle the Pales-

Still, Secretary Vance professed some muted optimism at the end of

There also seems to be a serious effort under way among Arab leaders  
to overcome Israel's refusal to have the PLO at the Geneva conference,  
which Mr. Vance hopes will begin in the second half of 1977. Israel con-tends the PLO is merely a terrorist organization without political stand-  
ing rather than the sole spokesman of the Palestinian cause, as Arab  
governments assert publicly.

Procedural Problem: Unfortunately, all this involves mainly a proced-  
ural problem that must be settled before a Geneva conference can begin.  
It does little for the central issues of Middle East peace, which apparently  
remains as intractable as ever. For example, the Arabs still insist upon  
complete return of all occupied territory while Israel, just as adamantly,  
insists it will never return everything.

Thus, the best the Americans hope for this year is to get the negoti-  
ation process started. They don't expect any substantial issue to be settled  
during 1911}

On February 14,1977, the Los Angeles Times published a news item on  
the Vance trip from which the following excerpt is taken:

As Kissinger used to say and Carter advisers now repeat, "moderates"  
are in control in the key Arab states confronting Israel, and this alone  
presents an opportunity Israel cannot afford to miss.

As a result, Israel is likely to find that Vance and the Carter adminis-  
tration, again following the lead of Kissinger and the Ford administra-  
tion, perceive the key obstacle to a settlement no longer as the question  
of Arabs refusing to grant Israel the right to exist.

Instead, the crux of the problem is being defined in terms of the  
seventeen-year-old dilemma of the Palestinians: how to devise a formula  
in which the "legitimate interests" of the Palestinians can be preserved  
side by side with the integrity of Israel.

In a recent interview with the New York Times, Vance noted that the  
Palestinians have begun to show signs of moderating their position that  
their own rights of nationhood demand Israel's destruction.

Vance said, "Such moderation would be a helpful step, if true."

On paper, therefore, there appears to be an unprecedented degree of  
flexibility among Arab leaders, who have advertised their willingness to  
negotiate in a sustained "peace offensive" which has kept the Israelis off  
balance diplomatically and has cast them in an uncomfortable posture of  
intransigence.

Depending on his perspective, Vance is likely to find an accumulation  
of signals from Arab leaders indicating that the momentum toward a  
settlement is irresistible and that the only missing ingredient is U.S.

pressure to bring the Israelis to Geneva negotiations. [Emphasis sup-  
plied]

The above Los Angeles Times report has been quoted simply to em-  
phasize the point that, if the reader were not aware that the date of the  
report was February 14, 1977, it would read like yesterday's newspaper.  
Even in 1977, these issues, which grew out of the 1967 Six-Day War, had  
been festering for more than ten years. They have now remained unre-  
solved for more than twenty-two years.

In a thoughtful and persuasive article appearing in the Los Angeles  
Times on March 9, 1977, Ira Handelman, a professor at the University of  
Southern California, and Yoav Peled, an Israeli and a professor of political  
science at UCLA, addressed a plea to the American supporters of Israel (in  
particular the Jewish community) to recognize the new climate and oppor-  
tunities for peace and to support the U.S. negotiating efforts.

The article entitled Time for an Eye Checkup, Israel Watchers is set forth  
here in part:

Momentum seems to be building for a peace settlement in the Middle  
East. Both the Arab nations and Israel have expressed a desire to  
reconvene the Geneva conference this year, as have the United States,  
the Soviet Union, and U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim.

However, a major stumbling block remains: the role of the Palestine  
Liberation Organization.

The Arab states insist that the PLO must have a part in the peace  
conference, whether as an independent delegation, as part of a combined  
Palestinian-Jordanian group or within a unified Arab mission.

Israel, on the other hand, adamantly refuses to negotiate with the  
PLO, insisting that the Palestinian issue should be resolved through  
bilateral talks with Jordan.

The only country capable of breaking this stalemate is the United  
States. While the Carter Administration would like to see the talks  
resume after the Israeli elections in May, it still supports Israel's refusal  
to deal with the PLO—unless the Palestinians modify their covenant  
(constitution) to recognize Israel's right to exist.

Many observers now believe that the Palestinian National Council,  
when it meets this month, will attempt to accommodate the American  
demand.

If that occurs, the United States might well abandon its opposition to  
PLO participation. But since the Israeli government is unlikely to go

along, the result could be a confrontation between Jerusalem and  
Washington.

Israel's American supporters could help to obviate such a confronta-  
tion, but to do so, many among them will have to overcome their  
preconceptions about the Middle East.

For years, many of Israel's friends in this country—Jews and non-Jews  
alike—have entertained a simplistic, black-and-white view of the Arab-  
Israeli conflict. In their minds, Israel was an almost perfect state, a close-  
knit democracy struggling for survival against overwhelming forces of  
darkness and barbarism. The Arabs, on the other hand, were perceived  
as a single-minded horde of 100 million, determined to destroy Israel and  
drive the Jews into the sea. Paradoxically, Israel—particularly after  
1967—was thought to be militarily invincible, while the Arabs, though  
numerically superior, were portrayed as militarily incompetent pawns of  
the Soviet Union.

Thus, for Americans sympathetic to Israel, taking a position on every  
issue connected with the conflict was easy. Whatever Israel did was right;  
whatever the Arabs did was wrong.

More recently, the public perception of Israel has been shaken by  
revelations of internal dissension, acute social problems and corruption  
in high places.

Americans whose support of Israel has been based on an idealized  
vision of the Jewish state can react to these developments in one of three  
ways. They can "punish" Israel for not living up to their fantasies by  
withholding their support, they can cling to the old myths and fight  
every differing viewpoint as anti-Zionist or anti-Semitic propaganda, or  
they can take a more realistic view of the Middle Eastern situation and  
try to understand the legitimate fears, aspirations, and grievances of both  
sides.

Clearly, the best interests of both the United States and Israel would  
be served by the latter response. One way to express this new view is to  
drop the simplistic notion that the PLO is nothing more than a gang of  
terrorist murderers.

True, like other national liberation movements, the PLO has fre-  
quently resorted to violence but, notwithstanding the reprehensible  
nature of some of its actions, it is a mistake to confuse the PLO's political  
ends with its violent means.

The primary purpose of the terrorist acts was to bring the Palestini-  
ans' cause to world attention. Now that their position has been almost

universally recognized—the PLO maintains offices in about 150 capi-  
tals—the number of violent incidents has drastically declined.

American supporters of Israel who deny the reality of this develop-  
ment—or belittle its significance—are doing Israel a great disservice.

In any future American-Israeli confrontation over PLO participation  
at Geneva, it would be impossible for Israel's supporters to play a  
constructive role if they fail to recognize the changes that have occurred  
in PLO thinking since 1973.

If pro-Israel groups in the United States fail to face up to this new  
reality, public debate and discussion will be left to the ideologists and  
extremists. [Emphasis supplied]

The valuable advice given and the wisdom shown in the foregoing article  
was ignored by the Israeli partisans in this country at a crucial time when  
the course of Israel's foreign policy was about to undergo a radicalization  
with the election, several months later, of the Likud party under the  
leadership of Menachem Begin. As Handelman and Peled predicted, the  
ideologists and extremists took over.

In the spring of 1977, Israel was in the midst of a strongly contested  
election campaign between Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, of the Labor  
party, and Menachem Begin, of the Likud.

Prime Minister Rabin was eager to meet the new U.S. president. A  
report on Prime Minister Rabin's meeting with President Carter was  
carried in the Los Angeles Times of March 8, 1977, a portion of which is  
set out below:

rabin reaffirms desire  
for peace—on israel s terms

Washington—Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, apparently  
buoyed by his first meeting with President Carter, reaffirmed Tuesday his  
nation's willingness to press toward a Middle East peace settlement later  
this year—but only terms favorable to Israel.

Only "defensible borders" between Israel and her Arab neighbors will  
be acceptable, Rabin told a news conference after his two days of talks  
here. "And those borders in no way coincide with the boundaries at the  
beginning of the six-day war."

"Fake solutions" would be unacceptable, Rabin told a crowd of Amer-  
ican and Israeli reporters crammed into a reception room at Blair House,  
the official guest house across the street from the White House. "We are  
talking about genuine peace."

In almost every respect, the requirements for genuine peace" that  
Rabin prescribed reflected bedrock Israeli positions that have been  
unchanged since the six-day war of 1967. They surprised nobody:

All boundaries to be negotiated and "defensible," no acceptance of U.S.  
guarantees of security as a substitute for self-defense, no negotiation with  
Palestinians except within the framework of Israeli talks with Jordan.[Emphasis supplied]

In the late spring of 1977, a drastic change occurred in the political  
climate and power structure in Israel. To the surprise and shock of most  
observers, the Labor party, which had dominated the government since the  
foundation of Israel, had been defeated by the militant Likud party headed  
by Menachem Begin.

In July of 1977, Prime Minister Begin made his first official visit to  
Washington to meet President Carter. The meeting ended with broad  
smiles and optimistic remarks by both Begin and Carter, which surprised  
Carter aides since they knew that little, if any, progress had been made.  
This was somewhat puzzling, since only a few weeks before, the White  
House had issued stern warnings to Begin that he must be more flexible in  
his upcoming meeting with Carter.

Time magazine, in an article appearing in the August 1, 1977, edition,  
asked rhetorically what had happened to Carter's announced firm position  
on the Middle East, and then proceeded to answer its own question:

Ever since his meeting with U.S. Jews (TIME, July 18) Carter had  
softened his attitude toward Israel without technically changing his  
position. Example: lately there has not been any mention of a "home-  
land" for Palestinians but instead reference to a Palestinian region tied  
to Jordan. He obviously wanted to avoid a meeting with Begin that  
ended in open disagreement. Besides, recalling Carter's earlier disastrous  
encounter with Rabin, one official explained, "Carter must have realized  
that his tough attitude toward Rabin did not pay off. Instead of move-  
ment, he got Israel to dig in its heels. Carter must have seen that to get  
the best results, he must play the pussycat—and he was the pussycat."

But what results Carter got, apart from a friendly atmosphere that  
might prove to be useful later, is not clear. As far as is known, Carter  
simply did not choose to press his earlier prescriptions for Israeli  
concessions, including the Palestinian homeland and substantial withdra-  
wal from occupied territories to pre-1967 boundaries. Begin in turn side-  
stepped the thornier issues. [Emphasis supplied]

It is obvious from the results of President Carter's meetings with Rabin  
and Begin, that the Israeli partisans in this country were not heeding the  
advice of Handelman and Peled, to the effect that Israel's best interest  
would be served by supporting U.S. efforts in the Middle East, and that  
failure to do so would be a great disservice to Israel.

In late summer 1977, Secretary Vance made a second trip to the Middle  
East where his worst fears were confirmed. The results of his trip are  
summarized in a report appearing in U.S. News & World Report entitled  
"After Vance's Trip: Peace No Closer in Mid-east":

Despite six months of intensive work, with President Carter deeply  
involved, the U.S. still is as far away as ever from achieving a negotiated  
peace between Israel and the Arab countries.

Hard line in Israel. In terms of significant agreements, nevertheless,  
Vance collected no more this time than from his first Mideast trip last  
February. He told a news conference in Jerusalem: "In the discussions  
here in Israel, we did not narrow the gap any further."

Vance had hoped that he could move the two sides close enough  
together to warrant a full-scale peace conference in Geneva in October,  
a development Carter optimistically had predicted after his meeting in  
Washington in July with Israel's new and conservative Prime Minister,  
Menachem Begin.

Instead, Begin greeted the Secretary in Jerusalem with a hard-line  
stance that seemed to rule out a return to the Geneva talks any time  
soon.

Israel, Begin insisted, would never sit down at the conference table  
with the Palestine Liberation Organization, as demanded by Arab  
nations, even if the PLO formally recognizes Israel's right to exist as an  
independent country.

The Prime Minister was equally adamant in declaring that Israel  
would never give up the occupied West Bank of the Jordan River for  
creation of a Palestinian homeland, an Arab proposal publicly supported  
by Carter.

Said one Israeli Foreign Ministry official after the Vance-Begin talks:  
"We will never give back the West Bank to anybody. If Washington  
pressures us to do so, the peace process collapses, and the United States  
loses." [Emphasis supplied]

The Wall Street Journal of August 11, 1977, summarizes the results of  
Secretary Vance's trip in an article entitled "Vance Concedes That Talks

With Begin Didn't Narrow Gap Between Israel, Arabs ," the pertinent  
portion of which is quoted as follows:

jerusalem—Chances of a Mideast peace conference this year—never  
bright—seem dimmer than ever as Secretary of State Cyrus Vance  
concludes a six-nation tour of the region today.

His effort to close the negotiating gap between Arabs and Israelis has  
had only limited success. Substantial, perhaps irreconcilable, differences  
remain on key issues. These include the extent of Israeli withdrawal  
from occupied territories, how to resolve the Arab Palestinian problem,  
and the nature of future peaceful relations between the two sides.

The peacemaking effort hasn't halted. Next month at the United  
Nations General Assembly meeting, Mr. Vance will hold a series of  
meetings with Arab and Israeli foreign ministers in hopes of closing the  
gaps between their positions.

His chances of success, however, are problematical. Despite progress  
on some matters, two days of talks here with Prime Minister Menachem  
Begin, who is deeply suspicious of Arab motives, didn't bring the sides  
much closer, Mr. Vance conceded. [Emphasis supplied]

The U.S. News & World Report, September 5, 1977, edition, gives its  
analysis of the reason for Prime Minister Begin s uncompromising attitude:

Carter's public statements on the shape of a Mideast agreement appar-  
ently have done much to convince the Arabs that the U.S. is genuinely  
interested in a "just peace" and that they can expect fair treatment from  
Washington. As a result, the Arab position today appears more moder-  
ate than ever before. "We believe," Vance said in Israel, "that the Arabs  
are sincere in their desire for peace, and we conveyed this to Mr. Begin."

Keys to Be gin's stand. What is behind the uncompromising attitude  
Vance found in Israel\ a nation that only a few weeks ago worried over  
worsening relations with the U.S.?

The amiable reception that Carter gave Begin in Washington did  
much to strengthen the new Prime Minister's position at home. Polls  
show him riding high, and his image as a statesman continues to grow—  
enabling him to stand firm in his position.

Also, Israeli officials are convinced Begin has the support of a large  
part of the Jewish community in the U.S. They believe, therefore, that  
Begin can successfully resist Carter, even in Congress, if the U.S.

attempts to pressure Israel into making concessions to the Arabs.

The same edition of U.S. News & World Report, September 5, 1977,

Secretary of State Vance returns from Mideast making plain he feels  
Israel is being obstructionist. Carter tells the nation at his press confer-  
ence that Israel acts illegally in settling West Bank.

Why hasn't Carter reacted more strongly to Israeli Prime Minister  
Begins tough independent line? Best guess: President is unwilling just  
now to risk provoking U.S. Jewish Community. [Emphasis supplied]

This strange and sudden reticence of the Carter administration was not

A report to the Los Angeles Times from Cairo datelined September 4,

Amid signs of growing Arab disillusionment with the Carter Adminis-  
tration, foreign ministers of the Arab League met in Cairo Saturday to  
hammer out a unified strategy. In the words of one observer, it "will  
force President Carter to the moment of truth" on the issues of Israeli  
settlements and dialogue with the Palestinians.

Although the Carter Administration has condemned Israel's recent  
establishment of new West Bank settlements and made conditional  
overtures to the PLO, which the Palestinians rejected, even the moderate  
Arab countries, such as Egypt, have expressed disappointment that the  
American stance so far has appeared to be more talk than action.

"We admire President Carter's statements—even Yasser Arafat (the  
PLO leader) has spoken admiringly of them—but we are beginning to  
see what he said as more posturing than policy," an Arab source said.  
"The Americans condemn the Israeli settlements, but instead of punish-  
ing Israel with pressure that only America can exert, they reward Israel

Arab anger over the establishment of more Israeli settlements on the  
West Bank was further exacerbated here Friday by word from Israel that  
Ariel Sharon, the Israeli agriculture minister, was proposing an intensive  
long-range West Bank settlement policy, coupled with a doubling of the  
Israeli population to sustain it. [Emphasis supplied]

Notwithstanding Carter's condemnations, Israel continued to accelerate  
the pace of the settlement program on the West Bank in order to advance  
its policy of putting "facts on the ground."

In its September 19, 1977, edition, Time magazine reflects upon the  
discouragement and disillusionment of the Carter administration:

Time learned last week that despite official denials Israel has started, in  
addition to the three officially declared new settlements, another three  
new settlements in the past month, and a fourth is in the process of  
being manned. Moreover, the controversial plan of Agriculture Minister  
Ariel Sharon to settle 2 million Jews in occupied lands has the official  
support of Premier Menachem Begins government. "We will continue  
to settle, and settling is a long process which must be carried out," said  
Sharon in an interview last week with Jerusalem Bureau Chief Donald  
Neff and Correspondent David Halevy. "Anyone who thinks that this  
government is going to withdraw from the West Bank is suffering  
delusions

Even though Carter says he has private assurances from all of the  
leaders that they will be more flexible than their public stance, hopes for  
a renewed Geneva are dimmer than ever. In an interview with Syndi-  
cated Columnist Trude B. Feldman that appears in a number of Jewish  
publications around the country this week, the President seemed sobered  
by the procedural difficulties in bringing the two sides together. "Dozens  
of other foreign policy matters have suffered to some degree because I've  
expended so much time on this issue," he said. "If our efforts fail this  
year, it'll be difficult for us to continue to devote that much time and  
energy to the Mideast."

Nevertheless, Carter continued doggedly to pursue his hopes for a  
Geneva conference that would somehow include Palestinian represen-  
tation.

Time magazine, in the October 10, 1977, edition reports:

the palestinian problem

geneva: U.S. policy is shifting on whether to deal with the PLO.

"It is obvious to me that there can be no Middle Eastern peace  
settlement without adequate Palestinian representation." So said Presi-  
dent Carter at his Washington press conference, echoing a theme he had  
stated many times before. But then Carter went a significant step further.

If the Palestine Liberation Organization endorsed United Nations reso-  
lutions that implicitly accept Israel's right to exist, he promised, "then we  
will begin to meet with them and to search for some accommodation and  
some reasonable approach to the Palestinian question."

Arabs hailed the President's statement: Israelis were furious. In Jeru-  
salem's view, Carter was backing away from a long-standing agreement  
that the U.S. would never deal with the PLO as long as it was committed  
to the destruction of Israel. More than that, the Israelis detected that they  
were coming under heavy pressure from their closest ally in the world—  
an ally that was significantly modifying its policy in the Middle East.

The Israeli perception is basically correct. Ever since his Clinton,  
Mass., call last March for a Palestinian "homeland," Jimmy Carter has  
become more and more convinced that the Palestinian issue is, as  
President Hafez Assad of Syria calls it, "the mother question" in the  
Middle East. Carter also feels that answering that question is of vital  
importance to America's "national interests" and the key to a successful  
resumption of peace negotiations in Geneva. [Emphasis supplied]

Notwithstanding the virtual impossibility of a "negotiated" peace at  
Geneva, the U.S. still was pushing both sides to the conference table.

In a report in the October 24, 1977, issue Newsweek concludes by  
saying:

U.S. officials remained confident that a Geneva conference could still be  
launched before the end of the year. "We have a 40-60 chance of seeing  
all the Arab parties accept the working paper more or less unscathed,"  
one top U.S. aide said last week. Experienced Middle East diplomats  
were less optimistic. They feared that the Dayan-Carter working paper  
had disillusioned more militant Arab leaders, persuading them that no  
U.S. President—regardless of his expressed sympathy for the Arab  
cause—could withstand pressure from a powerful pro-Israel lobby. Con-  
sequently, Carter may have to do a lot more persuading before Arabs and  
Israelis sit down together at Geneva. [Emphasis supplied]

In an article in the Los Angeles Times entitled "The Fairy Tale Status of  
U.S.-Israeli Ties," Arie Lova Eliav, a member of the Israeli Parliament,  
offers some perceptive observations:

After Secretary of State Vance's recent visit to Israel, I rose to deliver a

speech to the Knesset. Opening a volume of Hans Christian Andersen  
fables, I read aloud to my colleagues the well-known story "The

This fairy tale, unfortunately, reflects the status of current U.S.-Israel  
relations. Because both the Israeli and American governments want  
fervently to believe that their mutual interests are growing ever greater  
and that peace in the Mideast is looming ever closer, they pretend it is  
so, just as the emperor's subjects pretended that he was arrayed in  
expensive finery. But behind the outward trappings of mutual respect  
and goodwill—exhibited by government officials in flattering eulogies  
and carefully worded proclamations of optimism—stands the all-too-  
naked truth: The policies of Prime Minister Begin and his Likud Party  
have headed Israel on a collision course not only with America but with  
the Arabs and the rest of the world as well, [Emphasis supplied]

Earlier in the Carter administration, a red alert had been flashed to Israel  
and to the Jewish community in America. Carter had been heard to say that  
the Palestinians had some "legitimate rights" and Brzeszinski had said that  
the U.S. has a direct interest in the outcome of the Middle East conflict and  
had a legitimate right to exercise its own leverage with Israel and the Arabs

For the benefit of its readers, the October 11, 1977, edition of the  
Jerusalem Post explained this latest development and goes on to reassure  
its readers that there is no cause for concern to Israel:

But should we be all that surprised by the current tilt in U.S. policy?  
Maybe not, according to one respected Washington observer of the

I.L. Kenen, the honorary chairman of the American-Israel Public  
Affairs Committee, pointed out some days ago that the first years of new  
administrations in Washington have usually proved to be difficult ones  
for Israel. Testifying before a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee,  
Kenen said that "a review of U.S. policy in the Middle East reveals a  
recurrent quadrennial exercise." [Emphasis supplied]

Behind the [U.S.] Administration's zealousness is the rosy report on  
Arab intentions which Vance brought back from his August trip to the

Middle East. His message was clear: The Arab states are ready to sign  
peace treaties with Israel in exchange for a return essentially to the pre-  
1967 lines and the creation of a Palestinian "entity" of one type or  
another on the West Bank. Thus, the U.S. has a "historic" opportunity to  
achieve peace—an opportunity that must not be missed.

As mentioned above, the first years of new administrations have  
traditionally seen new U.S. peace initiatives in the Middle East. Re-  
election time is still three years away.

The Begin Government is clearly trying to avoid such a split with  
Washington. But the Carter Administration at this stage may feel that it  
can risk some strains with Israel in order to promote the Geneva peace  
talks.

If historical experience is anything to go by, the President and his  
advisers will soon learn that the domestic price is too high to pay. An  
organized, articulate, and vocal interest-group operating in America's  
democratic system can cause the executive branch of government a lot of  
headaches if aroused, as happened last week after the Vance-Gromyko  
statement. [Emphasis supplied]

During the balance of 1977, the Carter administration never ceased its  
efforts to reconvene a Geneva conference, including an offer to the Soviet  
Union to resume its former position as co-chairman. This caused an almost  
"hysterical" response from Israel. In the meantime, however, events in  
Israel were developing which would play a critical role in later peace  
negotiations.

The Likud victory had opened the flood gates to the extremist religious  
parties who had supported the Likud and claim to believe, as Begin does,  
that the West Bank and Gaza are "sacred territories," part of "Eretz Israel,"  
and that not a foot of it can be bargained away. The October 17, 1977,  
edition of U.S. News & World Report contains the following report,  
datelined Nablus, and entitled "Israel Is in No Mood to Give Up Anything,"  
and is quoted in part below:

Here on the West Bank of the Jordan River, President Carter faces his  
toughest task in mediating an Arab-Israeli peace: persuading Israel to  
turn over this land to the Palestinians.

Israel is in no mood to give up anything to anybody. Instead, Israelis  
are digging in everywhere on the West Bank and on the other Arab  
territories seized in the 1967 Mideast war.

From the Golan Heights, Israeli settlements march down the length  
of the West Bank and into the Sinai Desert. They range in size from tiny  
farming villages to huge apartment complexes on the Arab side of  
Jerusalem. There are 46 settlements on the West Bank alone. In all, about  
55,000 Jews live on land that belonged to the Arabs before 1967.

Push by Gush Emunim. Now, an ultranationalist religious group  
named Gush Emunim—Bloc of the Faithful—is urging Prime Minister  
Menachem Begin to permit even more Israeli towns in occupied areas.

Begin shared Gush Emunim's convictions that the West Bank and  
Gaza Strip are part of the biblical Jewish homeland and that Israelis  
should be free to settle anywhere in the regions.

Hostility toward Israelis is evident in Arab towns. Cars with Israeli  
plates often are stoned, and military officials caution Jewish visitors to  
carry guns. It's not uncommon to see Israelis on the West Bank riding  
bicycles with machine guns strapped to their backs.

Despite the hostility and danger, the debate in Israel is not over  
whether to settle the occupied territories but how fast to proceed with  
new towns. Even into crowded Hebron itself. They say the ancient city,  
an important Jewish center in biblical times, should belong to Jews, not  
Arabs. [Emphasis supplied]

A critical analysis of the then state of American Middle East diplomacy  
was published in the Los Angeles Times, written by Edward R.F. Sheehan,  
a research Fellow at Harvard's Center for International Affairs. His article  
entitled, "Is Carter Counting on a Geneva Miracle?" is quoted below:

U.S. policy in the Middle East has assumed dream-like dimensions.  
There exists an almost phantasmagoric contradiction between American  
theory and practice in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The theory, pronounced consistently by President Carter since he took  
office, is commendable. He has spoken lucidly of Israeli withdrawal to  
the 1967 frontiers and the creation of a Palestinian "homeland"—in  
exchange for which the Arabs must confer full peace on Israel. Already,  
to an extent few of us thought possible only six months ago, the Arabs  
have expanded their definition of peace in keeping with Carter's wish.

Having come this far, the President is now in the process of demol-  
ishing his own policy. Plagued by the pressures of domestic politics and  
the protestations of Israel's American constituency, the President has  
openly contributed to Prime Minister Menachem Begins public-relations triumph in Washington—fostering the illusion that Israel and  
the United States agree on goals at Geneva.

Privately, Carter made it clear to Begin that the American and Israeli  
positions on territory and the Palestinians are wide apart, but publicly he  
seemed to endorse Vice President Mondale's ecstatic declaration that  
Israeli-American relations have never been more harmonious, and he  
has cast Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and other moderates into a  
crisis from which they may not recover.

There is, as the result of the positions enunciated by Begin in  
Washington, particularly on the Palestinians, no basis for going to  
Geneva. And yet the President seems resolved to convene the peace  
conference and to persuade the Arabs to attend, in the Micawberish hope  
that once the parties get there some miracle will happen.

It is, however, vain to expect that Begin will bend unless he is  
subjected to intense American pressure. The entire history of American-  
Israeli relations illustrates that Israeli concessions will come only under  
the threat of sanctions. Carter's peace plan will become a hollow word  
game unless it is enforced, unless theory is linked to practice, unless the  
laudable American legal position is functionally applied.

We are in grave danger of repeating the errors that helped to produce  
the October war. In the several years before that conflict we exhorted the  
Israelis to be reasonable and gave them guns to resist our exhortations.  
Israel, the argument went, needed "confidence" to negotiate, but it took  
the guns and rejected our advice. Now the president promises never to  
withhold military aid as a means to prevail on Israel to accept the  
American concept of peace. [Emphasis supplied]

camp david

It was at this point, November 9, 1977, that Anwar Sadat, president of  
Egypt, made his dramatic overture to Israel and offered to negotiate peace  
terms. Israel responded favorably to this offer and began negotiations with  
Egypt.

However, by February 1978, negotiations between Sadat and Begin had  
ground nearly to a halt and President Sadat in desperation flew to Washing-  
ton to seek President Carter's aid in breaking the deadlock with Israel. Time  
magazine, February 13, 1978, reports on the stalled Egyptian-Israeli peace  
talks:

the problems sadat left behind

One of them is the settlements that block a settlement.

When Egyptian President Anwar Sadat flew to Washington last week,  
he left behind him a peace process that had ground very nearly to a halt.  
As one Egyptian official put it, "The two sides have gone as far as they  
can in bilateral negotiations. The time has come for the U.S. to step in

Sadat left for the U.S. at a time of rising tension between the U.S. and  
Israel over the establishment of new Israeli settlements in the occupied  
West Bank of the Jordan River. There are only about 45,000 Israelis in  
the West Bank (compared with 700,000 Arabs). Nonetheless, the U.S.  
has always opposed the settlements, partly because they violate Article  
49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits a country from  
moving its own people into occupied territories, and partly because the  
pioneer communities are a provocation to the Arabs. On the other hand,  
Israeli Premier Menachem Begin has always insisted upon the right of  
Jews to live in Judea and Samaria (the biblical lands that encompassed  
the West Bank) and their historical obligation to settle it. On separate  
visits to Washington last year, Begin and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan  
assured U.S. officials that there would be no new civilian settlements in  
the West Bank and that any new pioneers in the area would live within

Dayan insisted last week that he had made no such promise about the  
settlements, but a U.S. official snapped: "Our notes [from the September  
meeting] differ." Another Administration official was more blunt.  
"They're lying," he said. "There's no other way to call it." [Emphasis

The February 13, 1978, edition of Newsweek describes the nature and

Sadat told a Newsweek correspondent on board that he was "disap-  
pointed and discouraged" by the slow progress toward peace in the  
Middle East. Now he wanted the U.S. to play a much more forceful role  
as an "arbiter"—and as a source of pressure on Israel.

The Middle East "peace process" had clearly stalled, and Sadat was  
playing one of his few remaining cards. He had come to Washington to  
enlist the support of Carter, Congress, and the American public.

"Truth Squad": Israeli officials admitted they were a bit anxious about  
the outcome of Sadat's trip, and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan was

dispatched to the U.S. to head an Israeli "truth squad." We're not too  
worried about Congress, where we have many good friends, and we're  
convinced that Sadat will fall on his face if he tries to weaken our ties  
with American Jewry," said a policymaker in Jerusalem. "But we are  
apprehensive about what will come out of Sadat's meetings with Carter,  
who likes to please his guests by saying something they want to hear."

Israel's anxiety was heightened by the dispute with the Carter Admin-  
istration over its new settlement on the West Bank at Shiloh, the site of  
a biblical city. When members of the militant Gush Emunim movement  
began erecting prefab houses there, Carter sent a blunt message to  
Jerusalem: "I am confident that Prime Minister Begin will honor the  
commitment personally made to me and thus will not permit this

Message: As Washington interpreted it, Begins promise—conveyed  
by Dayan last fall—was that Israel would authorize no further settle-  
ments for a year. Speaking in the Knesset, Dayan said the promise  
covered only the rest of 1977. But Newsweek learned that Begin recently  
sent Carter a message assuring the President that Shiloh was merely a  
temporary archaeological project and that Israel would live up to the U.S.  
interpretation of the original pledge—an implied promise that the Gush  
Emunim settlers would be withdrawn. The settlers themselves, however,  
insisted that they were not archaeologists, [Emphasis supplied]

Prime Minister Begin was scheduled to arrive in Washington for talks  
with President Carter on March 14 and 15 for another attempt to break the

Although the Israeli position with respect to the West Bank continued to  
shift between Israel's "need for security" and its "historic or religious  
rights" to the land, it was considered by all parties that Resolution 242,  
adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations on November 22,  
1967, calling for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, was the

begin rejects u.n. resolution 2.42.

Suddenly, in early March 1978, Begin declared that U.N. Resolution 242  
did not apply to the West Bank and Gaza because Israel had a historical  
biblical right to the territories, and was not committed to return them to  
anyone. (U.S. News & World Report, March 20, 1978.)

He also advanced a novel theory that the "occupied lands" referred to in

Resolution 242 were not "occupied" by Israel since she owned them as part  
of Eretz Israel.

Carter was astounded at this reversal and stated in a news conference  
that Israel's rejection of Resolution 242 was a change in the policy of the  
Israeli government from what it had been for the past ten years. Further-  
more, it was contrary to the interpretation of Resolution 242 by all the  
other governments involved.

By this time, the atmosphere surrounding the forthcoming meeting  
between Carter and Begin started to heat up. The political situation is  
described in an article appearing in the March 20, 1978, edition of News-  
week entitled "Carter and the Jews":

When they arrived for Friday night services last week, 1,000 members of  
the Stephen S. Wise Temple in an affluent district of West Los Angeles  
found their temple geared up for an all-out assault on the Middle East  
policies of President Jimmy Carter. First, they were steered to the  
synagogue's social hall where a dozen tables were set up with sample  
letters to be copied and sent to Carter, Senators Alan Cranston and S.I.  
Hayakawa of California and the rest of the state's Congressional delega-  
tion. LET YOUR VOICE BE HEARD, said brightly lettered signs on the  
tables. When the worshipers gathered for the traditional prayers, they  
heard an angry sermon from Rabbi Isaiah Zeldin about Administration  
pressure on Israel and Carter's proposal to sell jet fighters to Saudi  
Arabia and Egypt. Said Robert Feldman, the temple's social-action chair-  
man: "We are crazy about this thing, just fighting mad."

A Big Question Mark: All around the U.S. last week, in their syn-  
agogues and out among their friends and colleagues, a growing number  
of American Jews were saying just about the same thing. Their anxiety  
over Carter's policy was heightened by the resignation of White House  
staffer Mark Siegel, Carter's main liaison with the Jewish community,  
and by the expectation that Carter himself would be taking a tough line  
with Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin when they meet.

Not all Jews think Carter's approach is incorrect, however, and many  
more have their doubts about Prime Minister Begin's increasingly con-  
troversial hard-line position. Ultimately, they say, some compromise by  
Israel is inevitable. "Begin has not seized this really historic opportunity  
to do something," said millionaire Democratic contributor Max Palev-  
sky. [Emphasis supplied]

As expected, the meeting between Begin and Carter failed to resolve any  
of the issues. Finally, on the initiative of President Carter, a special summit  
conference was called to be held at Camp David. After thirteen days of  
intense negotiations, Carter, Begin, and Sadat reached a historic agreement,  
the Camp David Accords of September 1978, from which emerged the  
Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty under which Israel agreed to return the Sinai

Under the terms of the Camp David Accords, which are primarily  
concerned with the Sinai, the issues concerning the status of the West Bank,  
Gaza, and the Palestinian refugees, were not resolved—but, rather, swept  
aside as an insoluble problem to be dealt with in the future.

By concluding the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, the Likud had succeeded  
in securing its southern front. This enabled it to proceed to achieve its most  
important objective—the permanent occupation and annexation of all of

To understand this development in terms of the highly complex Israeli  
political structure, we quote again from Perlmutter's book, Israel: The

The fervor of fundamentalists, especially as embodied by Gush, sprang  
up in once-fertile but now rather sterile intellectual ground. Historical  
Labor and Revisionist Zionism had become intellectually exhausted,  
clinging to pragmatic Zionism. Not even Begin was quite in the main-  
stream of the new Revisionism and in one sense could be included in the  
bloc of exhausted pragmatic Zionists. Small wonder then that the new  
activist Zionists, the new Revisionists and the new fundamentalists  
flourished after 1967, turning into the most vital, aggressive realizers of  
Zionism's iron law: the settlement of Complete Zion.

There is a new revival of Zionism in the land, wearing the mantle of  
fundamentalism, driven by a single-minded belief in Eretz Israel, thriv-  
ing in an emotional and intellectual vacuum left by the intellectual  
bankruptcy of the secularist Labor party and the Revisionist nationalists.  
It is a kind of Zionism hardly envisioned by the sturdy kibbutzim leaders  
of years gone by, but is a fundamentalist, activist Zionism that is on the  
rise. There is no real opposition in sight.

The rejectionist front is also representative of the Begin era.  
Although opposed to Begins pragmatism, it nevertheless represents a  
most significant intellectual and political foundation for Begin-Herut-  
Likud and its ultimate aspiration—Shlemut Ha-Moledet, the unity of

the land—and total rejection of any sort of partition. [Emphasis

SECOND BEGIN GOVERNMENT: 1981-1983

Begins coalition government represented a new alignment of the polit-  
ical, social, and cultural forces replacing the Socialist Zionist Center, the old  
progressive and nationalist alignment composed of Jews of European and  
American origins (the Ashkenazim). The second Begin government was  
supported by an element in the electorate even more radical and militant  
than the government itself. It was an emerging electorate that was politi-  
cally aggressive, inflexible on territorial concessions, and militant in its

The ten years which have elapsed since the Camp David Accords have  
witnessed profound changes in the Middle East, all of them dangerous and  
inimical to the cause of peace. Among these developments were the  
assassination of Anwar Sadat, the disastrous invasion of Lebanon by the  
Israeli hawks led by Ariel Sharon, the resignation of Prime Minister Begin,  
and his place taken by his even more extreme terrorist, Yitzhak Shamir.

Another highly significant change, in the past ten years, has been the  
emergence of Israel's Oriental Jews (Sephardim). The Oriental Jews were  
strongly attracted to the militant radical Zionism doctrines personified by  
Begin, Shamir, and Sharon. Contributing to this phenomenon has been  
distinct alteration of the demographics in Israel's society. The Oriental Jews  
now outnumber the Jews of European origin, a trend that is continuing and

The old parties which founded Israel and the images of Ben-Gurion, Levi  
Eshol, and Golda Meir no longer have the popular appeal that "Eretz

In 1982 the Begin government had no serious opposition from the Labor  
party which was in political disarray. Likud had no internal restraining  
forces to exert a moderating influence on the Begin-Sharon government.

The single most important force that could have restrained the excesses  
of Israel's extreme right and prevented a new "March of Folly," was the  
government of the U.S., which, as we shall see in the discussion in the next  
chapters, has been paralyzed by the economic and political power of the

In the meantime, however, in the ten years since Camp David, the West  
Bank situation has continued to deteriorate, and attitudes to polarize. At the  
urging of the Israeli government and with strong financial aid, manythousands of settlers were induced to migrate to the West Bank to fill the  
new settlements being constructed. As the new Israeli settlements  
proliferated, the hatreds and fears on both sides grew deeper. Finally, these  
pent-up emotions burst forth in the Palestinian uprising (Intifada) only to  
be met by the equally fierce emotion of the Israeli settlers and brutal  
repression by the Israeli army.

The position of the religious right has continued to harden. The unthin-  
kable is not only being "thought," but loudly advocated. In the minds of the  
far right parties, the final solution to the Palestinian problem is expulsion  
of the entire population from the West Bank and Gaza.

Throughout the frustration of the past twenty-two years, it has been the  
position of the moderate Arab countries, as well as our friends and allies,  
that the U.S. government is the one party which is on good terms with  
both Israel and the Arab moderates, and only it has the power and authority  
to influence Israel toward a constructive solution to the Palestinian  
problem.

Other nations have assumed that, because the U.S. gives enormous sums  
to Israel, amounting to almost four billion dollars per year (equivalent to  
$1,000 for every man, woman, and child in Israel), and provides it with the  
best military equipment in the world, the U.S. should be in a position to  
require Israel to modify its position which is necessary if peace in the  
Middle East can ever be achieved.

The entire world remains incredulous that Israel can, and does with  
impunity, defy or oppose American foreign policy and that America meekly  
continues to support and finance Israel in its adventures, even when its  
actions are against the best interests of the U.S. and against Israel's own  
best interests.

How this paradox is explained is the subject of the following chapter on  
the "Israeli Lobby."

CHAPTER VI

The Israeli Lobby

T

I HE YEARS 1977 through 1979 marked a turning point in the  
JL prospects for peace in the Middle East.

On the positive side was the signing of the Camp David Accords  
between Israel and Eygpt, which settled the Sinai issue. On the negative  
side was the ascendancy of the Likud party to power, which effectively  
destroyed any further chance for an overall peace settlement.

With the Likud came an abrupt radicalization of the Israeli government  
and a new attitude on the part of the government of Israel toward the U.S.  
This new attitude has manifested itself in a variety of ways. Frequently, it  
has taken the form of total indifference to U.S. opinion. At other times, it  
can be seen as a special delight in "nose thumbing" the U.S. Recently, it has,  
on occasion, become an outright and calculated defiance of the U.S. and its  
policies.

This deterioration in the relationship between the U.S. and Israel's Likud  
government can be traced directly to the uncritical, unwavering, and often  
unreasoning support of what has come to be known as the "Israeli Lobby."  
It is the power and political influence of this Lobby that is the source of the  
arrogance displayed by the Likud government of Israel toward the U.S. and  
the rest of the world.

As will be shown in this and subsequent chapters, the activities of the  
Lobby have done incalculable damage to Israel, and the Israeli people, as  
well as to the cause of peace.

This view parallels that expressed by Yehoshafat Harkabi[[5]](#footnote-5) in his latest  
book, referred to earlier, entitled Israel's Fateful Hour. In it, Harkabi  
accuses the U.S. government of failing to act as Israel's true friend, by not  
speaking out frankly and forcefully against the reckless politics of the  
Begin-Shamir government. He says, "That's what friends are for—to tell

Harkabi explains that former Prime Minister Begin has been idolized in  
Israel, because the Israeli people were misled by the U.S. into believing that  
the U.S. supported and approved of the reckless and disastrous policies of  
the Likud and the Gush Emunim in settling the West Bank. He says the  
U.S. has been too fearful and timid in not criticizing the Israeli government  
and that the U.S. has failed in its duty to speak out forthrightly to make its  
opposition clear. As a result, he says, the U.S. is largely responsible if Israel  
suffers the calamity which he fears is on the way.

The root cause of the failure of the U.S. to speak out concerning the  
conduct of the Likud government is not simple "fear" and "timidity," it is  
a matter of the political paralysis of American government. The U.S.  
government has no will of its own where Israel is involved. What the U.S.  
can and cannot do in the Middle East is determined by the Israeli  
government through the power and influence of the Israeli Lobby.

If the Israeli people have been betrayed, as Harkabi says, it is the Israeli  
Lobby in this country that bears the sole responsibility.

On July 5, 1977, on the front page of The Wall Street Journal, an article  
appeared entitled the "Potent Persuaders," a portion of which article is set

washington—Congressman Thomas Downey, the young and liberal  
Democrat from Long Island, considers himself a good friend of Israel.

But last year he had doubts about a foreign-aid bill even though it  
contained more than $1.7 billion for the Jewish state. His mail was  
running strongly against foreign aid in general, and Mr. Downey was

So some concerned rabbis came to call, they wanted a positive vote on  
Israel's behalf. As the congressman remembers, he said he would  
suppress his qualms if there was a "show of support" from his own  
district, where only 5 percent of the voters are Jewish.

Two days later, he received 3,000 telegrams from constituents, and

That is the so-called Israeli Lobby in action, mobilizing support  
whenever it thinks interests of the Jewish nation are at stake. It may well  
be the most effective of the many pressure groups in Washington—  
variously admired or feared. It zealously guards Israeli interests against  
the vicissitudes of U.S. presidents and legislators whose perceptions  
don't always square with those of Jerusalem or of the influential  
American Jewish community. Its main goal is to get the maximum  
possible political\ economic and military support for Israel.

Achievements and Criticisms: The Lobby's achievements are numer-  
ous. But critics contend that it sometimes undermines broader U.S. goals  
by its fervent backing of one side in the long-running Middle East  
dispute and thus hinders the cause of peace. There are also complaints  
that the Lobby's tactics can be abrasive, eroding sympathy for the Israeli

The debate over Israel's future will intensify this summer. That is  
because some basic policy differences between Washington and Jerusa-  
lem have become obvious as Mid-east negotiations grow more serious.  
Many Israelis and American Jews fear that President Carter is trying to  
impose American-made peace terms on the region—terms that they feel  
might be extremely dangerous to Israel. A serious confrontation looms,  
and this prospect has already activated the worried Lobby.

New Government in Israel: Preventing such a showdown is the  
Lobby's current task. The assignment seems especially urgent now that  
a conservative government has taken office in Israel, after 29 years of  
Labor Party dominance. Its ideas about peace terms differ sharply from  
those of Mr. Carter. Most notably, the new prime minister, Menachem  
Begin, considers the occupied West Bank of the Jordan River—the  
biblical Judea and Samaria—to be Israeli land by historical right; he calls  
it "liberated territory," although President Carter says most or all should  
be returned to Arab control. The degree of difference will be tested when  
Mr. Begin meets President Carter here beginning July 19.

A campaign to muffle potential disputes is underway. Leaders of  
American Jewish organizations, politicians friendly to Israel, Israeli dip-  
lomats and the official registered lobbying organization—the American  
Israel Public Affairs Committee—are all in action.

One broad goal is to convince the White House, Congress and the U.S.  
public that neither Mr. Begin nor his policies are really outlandish andthat he is a moderate man with broad support at home. Although he  
once led a violent urban guerrilla force, Israel's friends insist that Mr.  
Begin isn't a bomb thrower who will sabotage peace efforts.

Bridging the Gap: Another goal of Israel's supporters is to convince  
President Carter to talk less and, in particular, to stop calling for major  
Israeli territorial withdrawals and an unspecified "homeland" for Arab  
Palestinians.

To a degree, it is working. Mr. Carter last week promised to "refrain  
from additional comments on specifics" until he meets Mr. Begin. But  
earlier, the administration repeated its insistence that peace terms must  
include major withdrawals and a Palestinian homeland.

Mr. Begins position is that Israel won't under any conditions  
withdraw to the borders that existed before the 1967 war, and won't  
agree to the establishing of a Palestinian state on the West Bank and in  
Gaza.

American Jewish leaders are counseling Mr. Begin to cool it a bit.  
They want him to stress flexibility when discussing peace talks and avoid  
pinning himself down to hard and controversial positions. Thus, he says  
he will discuss anything with the Arabs even though there is much he  
will never agree to. Jewish leaders also want him to drop such terms as  
"liberated territories," which can have an adverse impact with the U.S.  
public.

Israel's supporters, of course, include most of this nation's six million  
Jews, who feel strong religious, ethnic or political ties to the tiny nation.  
Because of this affinity, many are willing to work for Israel's cause—by  
sending cables to Congressmen or making political contributions, for  
example.

As a group, they also have unusual political savvy. "They are plugged  
into the Washington-based network," a veteran congressional staffer  
says. "They are well-armed with the usual vehicles that lobbyists need,  
they are adept and intelligent—and they know how these cats meow."

Stressing Moderation: The American Israel Public Affairs Committee,  
led by its aggressive if not abrasive director, Morris Amitay, is cranking  
out a flood of press releases and statements that stress Mr. Begins  
moderation.

The pro-Israel operatives here are working closely with the new  
government in Israel. Some met recently with Schmuel Katz, who was  
sent to the U.S. as Mr. Begins personal representative. Democratic Sen.  
Richard Stone of Florida, one of Israel's staunchest friends, visited Mr.

Begin in Israel to counsel caution after conferring here with seven  
concerned Senators who regularly support Israel.

"Begin policy as enunciated so far can only lead to disorder," an  
influential ally of Israel worries. "It would create, for the first time, a deep  
schism between Israel and the American Jewish community."

Rallying Behind Begin: For now, however, Jewish leaders are rallying  
behind Mr. Begin, stressing—as does Rabbi Schindler—that he has been  
"for 29 years a responsible leader of the loyal opposition," and isn't by  
nature a fanatical terrorist. "There is emerging in the American Jewish  
community a feeling that we have to be supportive of Begin," the rabbi  
says. He argues that the prime minister will prove flexible on all major  
peace issues—including withdrawal from West Bank territories.

If a confrontation does come nonetheless, much of the Israeli Lobby's  
efforts will be focused on Congress, where it is often possible to thwart  
the Executive Branch. The most conspicuous action might well occur in  
the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This committee and its staffers can make things happen. When the  
Ford administration began a "reassessment" of Mideast policy in 1975,  
staff members got 76 Senators to sign a letter of support for Israel,  
effectively squelching the administration move for policy changes. When  
Mr. Carter's new arms-sales policy didn't specifically promise special  
treatment for Israel, a Senate committee uproar caused him to revise it  
hurriedly. And in secret bill-writing sessions, staffers often get aid terms  
for Israel modified, as by lowering loan interest rates.

Arousing Anger: All this has angered successive administrations.  
Aides to former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger say the Lobby's  
opposition forced him to drop thoughts of seeking a comprehensive  
Mideast peace settlement last year. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance is  
unhappy about Senate leaks of secret information he made available in  
May: two days later, it appeared in the Israeli press. And when President  
Carter recently planned to meet secretly with four key Senators who back  
Israel, the word was somehow passed to lobbyist Amitay—who called on  
each one to shore up his support before the meeting occurred.

Critics contend that such tactics don't always serve either American or  
Israeli long-term interests. Some think a confrontation between Wash-  
ington and Jerusalem, possibly leading to a schism within the American  
Jewish community, could damage chances for Mideast peace and radical-  
ize the Arab world. Sen. Abe Ribicoff of Connecticut, a leading supporter  
of Israel, has expressed this fear publicly.

Several congressional sources contend that opposition to a particular  
pro-Israel measure, such as a plan to send deadly concussion bombs to the  
Jerusalem government, can bring suggestions that the opponents are  
secretly anti-Semitic. Several legislators and staffers strongly resent such  
suggestions. "That's the pervasive fear they strike in the hearts of  
members up here," one Capitol Hill aide says. "Ifyou're in opposition, you  
get a big white paintbrush that says you're anti-Semitic." As Democratic  
Rep. David Obey of Wisconsin sees it, "If you question their programs,

they say you are for their enemies and against them I defend Israel

but not irrational policies that will lead to war for both of us."

Trying to Discredit Kissinger: Israeli lobbyists have even used this line  
to try to discredit Mr. Kissinger, himself a Jew. They have contended  
that he was tough on Israel because he was ashamed of his own  
background and wanted to ingratiate himself with a non-Jewish estab-  
lishment. But if some eloquent speeches by Mr. Kissinger about his  
heritage are any measure, this charge hasn't any foundation. [Emphasis  
supplied]

It is difficult to believe that more than ten years have passed since The  
Wall Street Journal article was written—but the "Potent Persuaders" are, if  
anything, more potent today. The power and influence of the Israeli Lobby  
is as broadly based under the leadership of Yitzhak Shamir as under  
Menachem Begin.

JEWS AND POLITICAL ACTIVISM

To understand the Israeli Lobby and its various levels of activity it is first  
necessary to have some idea of the relationship of the American Jewish  
community to our political system and the nature and extent of its involve-  
ment in the political process. An excellent work on this subject is a book  
entitled Jews and American Politics, by Stephen Isaacs, which is the source  
of much of the information on the subject presented in the next several  
pages of this chapter.

The Jewish people wield political power in America far beyond their  
numbers. Historically, this power has been used to a large extent in support  
of liberal causes and the Democratic party, and has been in the highest  
tradition of American democracy. Indeed, it should be emphasized that, in  
the past, Jewish participation in American political life has redounded  
greatly to the benefit of our nation.

As a general rule, Jews in the past have been reluctant to run for politicaloffice and, as a result, there have been relatively few Jews in the Congress  
or in the governorships. The reasons, according to Isaacs, are twofold.

One, they have perhaps underestimated the willingness of the people to  
elect a Jew to high office and two, they prefer to avoid the high visibility of  
public office and would rather exert their influence behind the scenes.  
While this attitude is beginning to change and more Jews are now running  
for office, particularly at the state and local levels, the strong preference is  
still to be "kingmaker" rather than king.

Jewish political power and influence derive from a number of sources,  
one of which (but not necessarily the most important) is money. Jews  
normally donate more than half the large gifts to national Democratic  
campaigns. Although they are less of a financial factor in the Republican  
party, they are, nevertheless, of considerable significance.

Another and perhaps equally important source is political activism.  
Jewish political activism is found at all levels, from the ballot box to the  
highest councils of government and politics. It is estimated that Jews now  
comprise between 10 percent and 20 percent of those actively involved in  
the Democratic side of American politics.

They were prominent in the top management entourage of nearly all of  
the principal Democratic presidential contenders in 1972: Edmund S.  
Muskie was managed by Berl I. Bernhart; Henry S. Jackson had Ben J.  
Wattenberg; Hubert Humphrey used Max Kampelman; George McGovern  
had Frank Mankiewicz.

Of the Richard Nixon "political enemies" list, released by the Senate  
Watergate Committee, seven out of the first eight, and a total of twelve out  
of the first twenty were Jewish.

Of the three principal national public opinion surveys, two (Louis Harris  
and Daniel Yankelovich) are Jewish. Pollsters have discovered that an  
extraordinarily high percentage of people, who ask to do their interviewing,  
are Jewish.

One of the nation s most prominent political reporters, David S. Broder,  
is Jewish, as was the late Theodore White, our most popular political  
historian and author of The Making of the President. There have been  
innumerable Jewish speech writers for virtually all candidates and presi-  
dents, including the former Chairman of the Democratic National Commit-  
tee, Robert Strauss.

It is a fact that Jews are simply more active and interested in politics than  
their fellow Americans. Nearly four times as many Jews as non-Jews  
protested American-Vietnam military policy.

Another source of power is the media. The major television networks  
were founded by David Sarnoff, William S. Paley, and Leonard Goldenson.  
These organizations are heavily Jewish, as are their reportorial staffs.

The fact that no network "anchor man" is Jewish is explained by Isaacs  
as an effort to avoid the appearance to the viewing public of being too  
"Jewish." "Jews could be the 'back room' presidents of the network news  
divisions, while the non-Jewish anchor man could project a comforting  
WASP image to an overwhelmingly WASP audience."

The newspaper industry, as such, is neither owned nor controlled by  
Jewish interests. However, the newspapers in which Jews occupy senior  
editorial positions are especially influential in national politics. These  
include the New York Times, Washington Post, The Wall Street Journal,  
and New York Post. The late Walter Lippman, perhaps the greatest of  
modern political journalists, was Jewish, as were Arthur Krock and David  
Lawrence. These have been succeeded today by such prominent and capable  
political journalists as Joseph Kraft, Max Lerner, and William Safire.

A further and very effective source of political power is the presence of  
Jews in the government itself. While the number of Jewish office holders,  
at the national level, do not exceed the relative proportion of Jews to the  
general population, the number of Jews in staff positions in Congress and  
in many of the federal administrative agencies far exceeds their proportion-  
ate representation in the population. Many of these are key positions which  
can be, and are, effectively used to accomplish specific objectives.

An example of such objectives is the amendment to force the Soviet  
Union to ease restrictions on the emigration of Soviet Jews (The Jackson-  
Vanik Amendment). This was devised and drafted by Jewish activist sena-  
torial staffers. The same holds true of the Arab boycott legislation. One  
staffer is quoted as saying that a certain Jewish senator, who "cares deeply  
about Jewish affairs," has enough seniority now to place some sixty of "his"  
people in key committee jobs around the Senate.

Why this effort to place activist Jews in key positions is important,  
according to the same Jewish staffer, is that "There are only six million of  
us' [Jews] and two hundred million of 'them.' "

How the "us" (Jewish minority) manages to get things done, according  
to the staffer, is explained by the fact that senators "have a million things  
to do and generally take the recommendations of their administrative  
assistants." If the senator does not cooperate, the next step is to call for  
"outside help" which means direct pressure on the senators from their  
Jewish constituents.

In this way, according to Stephen Isaacs, the apparatus is able to generate  
a flood of letters to Congress or the president, or to deluge the editorial  
offices of the nation's newspapers with letters to the editor giving the  
impression of overwhelming popular support for or against any given  
measure.

Another Senate staffer says, "What you have in this country is a fantastic  
untapped reservoir of Jews who are in influential positions ... relatively  
wealthy, well-educated, professional, politically active, who when organized  
can get the support of three-quarters of the Senate."

In an editorial in The Wall Street Journal, entitled "The Hired Hands,"  
the power of these congressional staffers is discussed:

A few years ago, people who worried about making government ac-  
countable for its actions used to point to the federal bureaucracy as the  
major obstacle standing between hapless citizens and the elected officials  
they're supposed to control. These days, as Congress takes an increas-  
ingly active role in setting national policy, observers are shifting their  
attention and concern to another group of unelected decision-makers—  
congressional staffs.

In two recent articles in The Public Interest, Michael J. Malbin and  
Michael Andrew Scully have described the growing power of these staffs  
and the special problems that arise from this power.

Even more important than the growth in staff numbers has been the  
kind of jobs they have come to do for their congressmen. Mr. Scully  
points out that today staffers not only set the agenda for our legislation  
and organize the hearings and negotiations that shape it, but actually  
draft the laws themselves and write the reports of legislative intent that  
accompany them.

And when they do all these things, the staffers are not just mirroring  
the congressional will. For one thing, their very numbers and levels of  
activity change the shape of the lawmaking process; instead of merely  
carrying out a legislative program, they also help create one, inventing  
things to do where there were none before. For another, they are highly  
partisan: they tend to seek not dispassionate knowledge but the knowl-  
edge that brings advantage. And to add to these problems that Mr.  
Malbin and Mr. Scully describe, too many of these staffers seem to have  
been schooled to the assumption that the private sector may best be  
thought of as an insidious disease requiring a federal remedy.

To hear all of this it would seem congressional staffs are good candi-

dates for the next leading example of the arrogance of irresponsible

This means that some of the most important legislation affecting our  
foreign and domestic policies, our most sensitive relations with the Soviet  
Union, the Arab world, and even world peace itself is being devised,  
drafted, and promoted by the same congressional staffers who are un-

Finally, the ballot box itself is a source of power. Jews vote in numbers  
far out of proportion to their percentage of population. This is not only due  
to the fact that the vast majority of Jews vote, but to the fact that a far lesser  
percentage of non-Jews exercise their franchise.

The eight states where Jews are most concentrated—California, Mary-  
land, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut,  
and Florida—are big electoral vote states where the Jewish vote can be

An Israeli diplomat claims: "President Ford's defeat on November 2,  
1976, can be attributed to his reassessment of U.S. policy toward the  
Mideast in 1975, when he squeezed us to make concessions to the Arabs.  
Many Jews have not forgotten that—or forgiven." The diplomat points out  
that a small shift to Mr. Ford in voting among the 2 million Jews in New  
York City would have reversed the election result in New York State and

The umbrella organization for lobbying for the Jewish state in this  
country is the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC).

AIPAC coordinates its activities with other Jewish organizations, such as  
the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai  
B'rith. AIPAC works to influence Congress and the executive branch on  
issues of importance to Israel, such matters as the Middle East problem and  
economic and military aid, the Arab boycott, and Soviet Jews' emigration. A  
Senate staff member says that, "AIPAC has a strong grass-roots operation  
that can deliver letters and phone calls to members of Congress from their  
home states. At any given moment, it can mobilize."

Thus, we have a situation where Israel can exert almost irresistible  
political influence upon the Congress and executive branch of the U.S. gov-  
ernment by mobilizing Americans, from the grass-roots to the highest  
levels of government, in support of its policies even when these policies areagainst the best interests of the U.S. and its citizens and, in fact, against the  
best interests of Israel itself.

The "Farm Lobby" is obviously no match for the Israeli Lobby when an  
American farmer's ability to sell his glut of grain to Russia depends on the  
number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union (The Jackson-  
Vanik Amendment). Nor is the "Business Lobby" any match for the Israeli  
Lobby when the proposed rules and regulations, under which an American  
company can carry on trade with friendly Arab countries, are being drafted  
by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith. This matter is discussed  
later in the chapter entitled "The Arab Boycott."

The extraordinary effectiveness of the Israeli Lobby is a classic in the use  
of power politics. Its performances in the election year 1976 was awesome.  
Throughout the campaign, both presidential candidates (Carter and Ford)  
desperately tried to out-promise each other in concessions to Israel.

The humiliating spectacle of the president of the U.S., within ten days of  
Election Day, suddenly bypassing the objections of the defense department  
and announcing that the U.S. would provide Israel with the ultra-modern  
CBU 72 anti-personnel bombs, infrared night vision devices, M60 tanks  
and artillery, (the approval for all of which had previously been withheld by  
the military) seems to be taken for granted as part of the American political  
scene.

Within the same week, President Ford also ignominiously abandoned  
the administration's position on the Arab boycott and capitulated to the  
Israeli Lobby, which had coerced a frightened Congress into imposing tax  
penalties on American companies who were honestly trying to do business  
with the Arab countries. It is no wonder that Israel's foreign minister, Yigal  
Allon, after watching the presidential debates on TV, is reported as saying,  
"I don't know if Carter or Ford won. All I know is that Israel won."

In the chapter entitled "Jewish Power" of his book Jews and American  
Politics, author Isaacs exults in the newfound ability of the Jewish commun-  
ity to influence political events in America:

With unprecedented vigor they brashly and openly spoke up for their  
fellow Jews in Israel, bombarding the White House and Congress with  
telegrams, letters and calls insisting that America continue its staunch  
support of Israel.

Heedless of "whether they might seem to the goyim' to be causing too  
much trouble," Isaacs goes further to say:

The Jews' new confidence in their Americanism and in their use of these  
tools was spelled out quite specifically, for instance, in an article in the  
February 1974 issue of The National Jewish Monthly, a publication of  
B'nai B'rith. The article, by Franklin R. Sibley, a congressional aide,  
blatantly called Jewish contributors' attention to Jews' "friends" and  
enemies who were up for election in 1974:

One-third of the Senate comes up for re-election this coming fall:

among them are vigorous friends of Jewish causes

A few senators consistently opposed to Jewish concerns are also up for  
re-election. Foremost among these is J.W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), who has  
lent respectability to the Arab cause and given it a voice in the Senate it  
never enjoyed before. A believer in detente with the Soviets to the  
detriment of Israel's interests, he has labored diligently against legisla-  
tion offered by Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), linking preferential trade  
terms to the relief of Soviet Jewry. Other members of the Senate seeking  
re-election this year who chose not to sponsor the Jackson Amendment  
are Henry L. Bellmon (R-Okla.), and Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.). [Em-  
phasis supplied]

One cannot fail to be struck by the irony of this quoted statement. The  
new confidence of the Jews in their "Americanism" is demonstrated by an  
"enemies list." They call for the defeat of Senator Fulbright because he is a  
believer in detente with the Soviet Union to the "detriment of Israel's"  
interests. Nothing is said about whether detente (a creation of Henry  
Kissinger) might be in America's interest.

Senator Fulbright was attacked and defeated for re-election because he  
lent "respectability to the Arab cause, and a voice in the Senate it never had  
before."

The enormous and acknowledged influence of the Israeli Lobby is some-  
times rationalized by saying that everybody in America has a "lobby," and  
therefore Jews have the American right to use whatever muscle they can  
muster toward their special interests. What is lost sight of in this argument  
is that we are not talking about a "Jewish" Lobby but an Israeli Lobby. In  
the past, the "Jewish" Lobby has, in fact, functioned appropriately as a  
lobby, i.e., in supporting civil rights causes, opposing school prayers, prom-  
oting liberal abortion laws, opposing capital punishment, and other liberal  
positions. In doing so, it has operated as a legitimate special interest group  
in American society.

However, in the past twenty or more years, the Jewish Lobby for themost part has become the Israeli Lobby which has become involved in  
matters transcending domestic issues and politics. Indeed, and we  
emphasize again, its principal thrust and orientation has been toward the  
support, by any means, of the policies of the government of Israel regard-  
less of the best interests of the U.S., its allies, or that of world peace—or,  
for that matter, the best interests of the Israeli people.

THE TABOO

There is a second and even more crucial distinction between the Israeli  
Lobby and the typical lobby. If one disagrees with or opposes the Farm  
Lobby, for example, he is free to say so. He can write his congressman—  
send a letter to the editor, march on Washington, or write a book.

No such freedom exists in America so far as opposition to Israeli policy  
or the Israeli Lobby is concerned. It is simply "taboo." To do so, automat-  
ically exposes one to being branded "anti-Semitic," a "Fascist," a "Nazi," or  
part of the lunatic fringe. Prudent people simply will not take such a risk.  
Thus the effectiveness of the highly vocal and articulate Israeli partisans is  
multiplied by the fact that they operate in a vacuum of opposition. The  
following example will illustrate what is meant by this:

Assume, for instance, that a congressman has received a thousand letters  
on the subject of emigration restrictions on Soviet Jewry, and assume  
further that 975 of these letters urge the congressman to support the  
legislation (the Jackson-Vanik amendment) while only 25 urge non-  
support.

If the congressman is naive he might consider this response as an  
accurate reflection of the opinions of his constituency. On the other hand,  
in all probability, he would recognize that the 975 supporters are mostly  
Jewish and prompted by an organized campaign and thus not a true sample  
of the views of the electorate. However, the fact that only 25 non-Jews  
wrote at all would seem to indicate to the congressman that the vast  
majority of his constituents who did not write were indifferent and that  
only the Jews felt strongly enough to write. But in this assumption, the  
congressman would be dead wrong. He would have failed to take into  
consideration the known fact that most Americans have become so condi-  
tioned and intimidated by the "taboo" that they prefer to remain silent—  
rather than risk the accusation of being called "anti-Semitic," if they frankly  
and openly express their views.

The same holds true for letters to the editor. From a reading of letters  
to the editor in any metropolitan newspaper, when an issue involving Israelis in the news, one would conclude that 95 percent of the people of the U.S.  
passionately support the Israeli position on the issue. This again is a gross  
error. Most non-Jews simply do not write to the editor or say or write  
anything publicly which can be construed by Jewish sensitivities or the  
Anti-Defamation League as "anti-Semitic." As far as the greater part of the  
Jewish community is concerned, anything less than wholehearted support  
for any Israeli position, however unreasonable, is by definition "anti-  
Semitic." Indeed, there is a serious question whether, if such letters to the  
editor were written, they would even be published, because many news-  
paper editors are even more sensitive to the taboo than their readers.

So programmed have our leaders become that the very instant the buzz  
word "anti-Semitic" is heard there is an automatic "knee jerk" reaction—a  
hasty attempt to retract, apologize, placate—anything to avoid the awful  
charge of anti-Semitism. Thus, it is not simply the financial and political  
power of the Israeli Lobby that is the source of its influence—but also the  
pervasive, quiet, unspoken censorship of the taboo, which the Israeli Lobby  
exploits to the fullest.

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT

The Anti-Defamation League was originally formed many years ago as  
a defense against slanderous and libelous attacks on Jews and the Jewish  
community. Its record over the years, in this respect, has been highly  
successful. However, inasmuch as there is little, if any, slander, libel, or  
defamation against Jews anymore, the league in recent years has extended  
its activities to monitoring the various media, to detect and react against  
any utterances which the league considers might be "anti-Semitic." This can  
be anything which is judged by the league as unfriendly, unflattering, or  
critical toward a Jew, Jews, Zionism or Israel, or even if a congressman or  
senator votes for only three billion dollars instead of four billion dollars in  
grants to Israel.

Needless to say, simply having the power to define "anti-Semitism" in  
any particular context (which the league freely asserts) is a highly effective  
method of stifling even the most legitimate criticism or comment.

Thus, all that is required to smother any objective consideration of issues  
involving say, for example, Israel, is simply to define any contrary position  
as "anti-Semitic." Since there is absolutely no defense against the charge of  
"anti-Semitism," most prudent people have long since preferred silence on  
sensitive issues to the risk of exposing themselves to the accusation of  
"anti-Semitism," with its inevitable "Hitler" and "Holocaust" associations.

This not too subtle form of intimidation operates as a de facto abridg-  
ment of freedom of speech. In other words, it is a highly effective form of  
censorship, which imposes a clear "prior restraint" on what can safely be  
said in this country on certain and often highly important subjects.

In an article entitled "A Certain Anxiety" appearing in the August 1971  
issue of the prestigious Jewish magazine, Commentary, Norman Pod-  
horetz, editor and publisher, explains the "taboo" as follows:

Now it is perfectly true that anti-Zionism is not necessarily anti-  
Semitism. But it is also true, I fear, that the distinction between the two  
is often invisible to the naked Jewish eye, and that anti-Zionism has  
served to legitimize the other expression of a good deal of anti-Semitism  
which might otherwise have remained subject to the taboo against anti-  
Semitism that prevailed in American public life from the time of Hitler  
until, roughly, the Six-Day War, and it is more than anything else the  
breaking of the taboo, the taboo against the open expression of hostility  
to Jews, which has caused some of us to feel a certain anxiety about the

Jewish population in America It is so long since overt hostility to

Jews has been regarded as a permissible attitude in America that we  
cannot say what consequence, if any, might follow this inhibition.[Emphasis supplied]

A similar concern was expressed in another article by Podhoretz appear-  
ing in the February 1972 issue of Commentary, entitled "Is It Good For The  
Jews?":

During the period running from the end of the Second World War to the  
middle or late 60s, Jews had no need to ask whether anything was good  
for the Jews, for the simple and sufficient reason that in America at least  
almost everything was good for the Jews. Anti-Semitism still existed,  
mainly on the political Right, but so discredited had it become through  
its association with the name of Hitler that no-one who aspired to  
respectable status in American public life dared voice anti-Semitic senti-  
ments openly or dared make any use of anti-Semitism in appealing for  
the support of others. For the penalty was instant banishment from the  
world of acceptable opinion.

Whether or not, then, the actual level of anti-Semitic feeling declined  
in America, the sheer number of anti-Semitic statements, or indeed of  
statements hostile to Jews in any way or to any degree, most certainly diddecline in the public prints, on the airways, in political speeches, and  
probably even in private conversationZ/ [Emphasis supplied]

The taboo, thus described, raises some disturbing questions, as well as  
some novel concepts, as far as our First Amendment freedoms are con-  
cerned. We have assumed that the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)  
had long ago made clear to Americans the meaning of our sacred guaran-  
tees of freedom of speech and press, as well as the evils of censorship.

True, the taboo referred to by Podhoretz is not "censorship" imposed by  
the government. However, if one dares not voice any statements hostile to  
Jews in any way or to any degree, even in private conversation, the  
operative restraint on free speech is even more insidious.

The very concept of a "taboo" is, of course, a negation of the essential  
spirit of our Constitution. In the language of the U.S. Supreme Court:

The command of the First Amendment is that falsehoods and fallacies  
must be exposed not suppressed. American Communication Assn. C.I  
O.U. Douds, N.Y. 70 S. CT. 674 339 U.S. 382.

Surely the ACLU, which is a champion of unpopular causes, would find  
enormous difficulty in reconciling its concept of civil liberties with the  
existence of a taboo. From any viewpoint, as has been said, it constitutes a  
de facto infringement upon freedom of speech and press with all of the  
evils inherent therein.

If in this country, one dare not make any statement that is in any way or  
to any degree "hostile" to Jews—what is hostile?—who is to judge? Podho-  
retz himself points out that the distinction between "anti-Semitism" and  
"anti-Zionism," to the naked Jewish eye, is often invisible.

Since the accusation of "anti-Semitism" can be made in disregard of such  
"invisible" distinctions, (without risk to the accuser, or defense to the  
accused), the power exists to deny "respectable status in American public  
life" to anyone who voices any opinion or expresses any view unpopular  
with the Jewish community or the Anti-Defamation League (ADL).

This, however, is not the only penalty to be suffered by anyone breaking  
the taboo. According to Podhoretz, they will suffer instant banishment  
from the world of acceptable opinion. But what is "acceptable" opinion?  
Acceptable to whom? Both Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia have always  
offered total freedom to voice "acceptable opinions."

A good example of what can happen when someone dares to express an  
"unacceptable opinion" is the case of General George Brown, formerchairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. In a press interview, the text of  
which was released on October 17, 1976, he was asked by a reporter the

Speaking about the Middle East, are Israel and its forces more of a

burden or more of a blessing to the U.S. from a purely military point of

General Brown's frank and honest answer was, "Well, I think it's just got  
to be considered a burden." He answers the question more fully by explain-  
ing that someday Israel might actually be a tremendous asset. General  
Brown's answer was that, from a military standpoint, Israel was a burden  
at that time because the vital U.S. tank reserve in Europe had been depleted  
to replace Israel's losses in The Yom Kippur War, leaving the U.S. with less  
than 50 percent of the tanks necessary for the defense of NATO. Also, that  
the U.S. is sending certain new weapons systems to Israel, which we have  
not yet supplied to our own armed forces.

The Los Angeles Times the following day, in a calm and reasoned  
editorial, pointed out that Brown was right. He had merely acknowledged  
that U.S. military support of Israel is costing billions of dollars annually.  
That, the Times said, "clearly adds up to a burden rather than a blessing,  
and no good purpose would be served by pretending otherwise."

Nowhere, it should be emphasized, did General Brown say or imply that  
we should not continue to support and supply Israel with weapons. He  
merely said (having been asked to express his opinion) that, from a military  
standpoint, Israel was not a "blessing." However, no sooner did the text of  
General Brown's interview reach the media than a wave of hysteria swept  
the country. Letters flooded the editorial offices of the nation's newspapers  
condemning General Brown's remarks as "anti-Semitic." President Ford  
hurriedly apologized for General Brown, obviously concerned that this

Many voices, including such usually sensible people as Senator Howard  
Baker, demanded that General Brown be fired. Leaders of major Jewish  
organizations called on President Ford to "censure" General Brown. After  
a special meeting of the Conference of Presidents of major American  
Jewish organizations it was announced, rather ominously, that "The Jewish  
community does not consider the matter of General Brown to be closed "  
General Brown's heinous offense was that he failed to say that Israel was

One lonely voice dared to risk the awful "banishment." Senator Barry  
Goldwater is quoted in the Los Angeles Times:

"I agree with him [General Brown]," Goldwater said in an address to the  
Inland Daily Press Assn.s annual fall meeting. "We can't continue to  
give any country equipment from our own inventory and not deplete our  
own war machine." Later, in explaining his remark, he said, "Israel has  
gotten everything she ever wanted [from the U.S.] .. .in some catego-  
ries, more than she can use." He said that it was all right with him, but  
"if we give Israel $2 billion [in equipment], then let's buy $2 billion for  
ourselves. Unless we regain our military superiority," he said, "the only  
choice can be nuclear war or surrender." Goldwater said, "That was what  
Brown was trying to say, only he was misunderstood." [Emphasis

The Wall Street Journal tried to restore some semblance of common  
sense into this irrational scene and offered the following editorial comment:

Various overeager New York politicians, unfortunately including Senator  
James Buckley, are demanding General Brown's ouster as a result. Sena-  
tor Mondale, who is not supposed to be the hatchet man on his team, is  
likening General Brown to a "sewage commissioner."

But an honest appraisal of the drift of his remarks would have to  
indicate he is not suggesting Israel's abandonment and that his observa-  
tions are probably clear-eyed and correct.

It looks to us as if General Brown's real sin is excessive candor, which  
leaves us confused, since we thought everyone agreed our leaders needed  
to be more candid, not less so. If Governor Carter wants to pursue the  
matter and set a "higher standard," he may as well announce that in a  
Carter administration no interviews will be granted except by officials

What must be resisted and overcome is simply this kind of covert and  
overt intimidation; the mischievous result of the "taboo"; the existence of  
a gag rule on discussing openly, and disagreeing frankly, with the Israeli  
partisans. There is obviously no freedom of speech on the subject of Israel  
when the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces of the U.S. cannot say that  
Israel is not a military blessing, without causing a national uproar and  
suffering the threat of being fired. The intimidation has worked, as in-  
tended; General Brown has been apologizing ever since.  
These successful efforts to intimidate the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, as well as the president of the United States, clearly defeat and  
frustrate the very purpose of the guarantees of freedoms of speech and  
press. These freedoms are just as effectively curtailed by intimidation and

Expression of opinion is entitled to protection no matter how unor-  
thodox or abhorrent it may seem to others. The basis of the free speech  
guarantee of the First Amendment is the hypothesis that speech can  
rebut speech, that propaganda will answer propaganda and that free  
debate of ideas will result in the wisest governmental policies.

The right of free speech and free press guaranteed by the Constitu-  
tion extends to all subjects which affects ways of life, without limitation  
to any particular field of human interest, and includes in the main  
freedom of expression on political, sociological, religious, and economic

Freedom of discussion must embrace all issues about which informa-  
tion is needed or appropriate to enable the members of society to cope  
with the exigencies of their period. Thornill vs. State of Alabama, 60, S.

Never has our society been in greater need of a full discussion of critical  
issues so that we can "cope" with the "exigencies of the time." There are  
few issues now confronting our country that do not directly or indirectly  
involve a solution to the Middle East problem. If freedom of speech and  
press have any meaning or value at all, it is here and now.

The paralyzing fear of violating the taboo, which grips the Congress as  
well as the executive branch of the government, is nowhere better illus-  
trated than in the case of Senator Fulbright.

senator fulbright speaks out

On April 15, 1973, Senator J. William Fulbright appeared on the CBS  
"Face The Nation" program. In the nationally televised interview, he said,  
that the "administration was unable to exert pressure on Israel for a Middle  
East settlement because the U.S. Senate was subservient to IsraelHe  
added that "despite the fact that the U.S. provided Israel with a major part  
of the wherewithal to finance or pay for everything Israel does, leverage  
could not be applied," he said, "because Israel controls the Senate

Fulbright declared, "We should be more concerned about the U.S. inter-est rather than doing the bidding of Israel." On May 30, at the opening of  
two-day hearings that his committee initiated on the energy situation,  
Fulbright charged that U.S. policy was to give Israel unlimited support for  
unlimited expansion; he urged U.S. cooperation with oil-producing

In a return appearance on "Face The Nation," October 7, 1973, Senator  
Fulbright repeated his assertion that the Israelis control Mid-Eastern policy  
in the Congress and the Senate. When the program monitor called Ful-  
bright's statement a "fairly serious charge," the Senate Foreign Relations  
Committee chairman countered, "The charge is a fact of life."

Here we have the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee  
charging publicly, on two separate occasions, that the Senate of the U.S. was  
"subservient to a foreign power," a charge vastly more serious than any-  
thing involved in the Watergate scandal. Either the charge was true or  
Senator Fulbright (who was certainly in a position to know) was lying to

If the latter was the case, then Senator Fulbright grossly insulted and  
impugned the integrity of the U.S. Senate. If so, why was not an immediate  
investigation called for? Why was there no public outcry and a demand for  
censure by the Senate? Senator Joe McCarthy's charges were nothing com-  
pared with the gravity of Senator Fulbright's accusation. There is, of course,  
no mystery. There was nothing for the Senate to investigate because every  
senator knew full well that Senator Fulbright's charge was indeed the truth.

But Senator Fulbright paid the price for truth. He was courageous (or  
foolhardy) enough to violate the "taboo" and was put on the Jewish  
"enemies" list and was banished from public life by being defeated for re-

Incredible as it sounds, there is more freedom of speech and press in  
Israel than in the U.S. Senate or the American media. Yet the Israeli Lobby  
continues relentlessly to be more "Israeli" than the Israelis in Israel where  
there is strong opposition to the Likud policies.

In his recent work entitled Israel's Fateful Hour; referred to earlier in this  
chapter, Yehoshafat Harkabi, Israel's foremost expert in Arab relations and  
former chief of military intelligence and advisor to Prime Minister Begin,  
makes certain bitter criticisms of the U.S. which are shocking in their

Harkabi complains that the U.S. government has allowed Israel to  
pursue policies which will inevitably be calamitous for Israel. He points out  
that by not speaking out against the Israeli government's policies, such asthe West Bank settlements, the U.S. has misled the Israeli public into  
thinking that the U.S. supports the settlements.

He begs the U.S. to speak frankly and to make its position clear instead  
of speaking "timidly" as it always has. He emphasizes that the U.S. not only  
has the right—but the duty to speak out.

He is bitter that the behavior of the U.S. was such that it was interpreted  
by many Israelis as meaning that the annexation policy of Mr. Begin was  
correct, leading them to idolize, to vote for, and support the approach of the  
Likud and the Gush Emunim. He believes that the U.S. has not been a true  
friend of Israel, because "a real friend is one who does not endorse all our  
views," but, on the contrary, despite the anger it may incur, draws our  
attention to our errors and insensitivities.Finally, he expresses this lament:

I fail to understand why they [the U.S.] are so apprehensive of speaking  
out and saying that the present policy of annexation will miscarry, that  
it is bound to fail, that it will end in national bankruptcy or that it is  
suicidal—whatever is their evaluation. By such diffidence Americans do  
a disservice to Israel and to themselves. [Emphasis supplied]

Were Yehoshafat Harkabi to read this and the following two chapters he  
would learn that the "timidity" and "apprehension" is no mystery. He  
would learn that those in our government with the courage to speak frankly  
and as a "true friend" of Israel are no longer with the government—they  
have been banished.

All of Harkabi's charges and complaints are valid and true. The strange  
aspect of his criticisms is that they are aimed at the "puppets" (our  
congressmen and president), not the "puppeteer" (the Israeli Lobby).

Since a man of the stature of Harkabi is mystified at U.S. conduct in the  
Middle East and doesn't apparently understand why officials of the U.S.  
government don't speak out, don't criticize Israel, and are timid and  
apprehensive, there must be many more people in the dark concerning the  
direction and formulation of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. The  
next chapter, "The Israeli Lobby in Action," will, if nothing else, enlighten  
Harkabi and other well-meaning people who are baffled and confused  
about America's Middle East policies.

CHAPTER VII

The Israeli Lobby in Action

I

NATELECASTofthe popular CBS show "60 Minutes," on October  
23, 1988, a 15-minute segment of the program was devoted to the  
political activities and the power and influence of the Israeli Lobby.

The distinguished interviewees included: Charles Percy, former Senator  
and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; George Ball, former  
Under-Secretary of State and U.S. Ambassador to the U.N.; Rabbi Miller,  
Vice President of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC);  
and Senator Daniel Inouye.

The following excerpts are taken from the official transcript of the  
program:

aipac

mike wallace: There are few lobbies working the corridors of Capitol  
Hill with as much clout as AIPAC, the American Israel Public Affairs  
Committee. They're the people who tell the Congress which legisla-  
tion affecting Israel they like, and which they don't. They are not  
agents of the Israeli government, but out of personal conviction as  
American Jews they lobby the Congress and the administration for  
measures that support the State of Israel. But the charge is that apart  
from lobbying, AIPAC also gets involved in election campaigns by  
setting the tone, the line for about 80 pro-Israel political action  
committees around the country, pro-Israel PACs that have given $6

million this year to a variety of candidates. One race they're focusing  
on is the senatorial contest in Rhode Island, where they say  
Republican Senator John Chaffee has a poor record on Israel. And

AIPAC says it is the spearhead for support for Israel here in  
Washington. It is not a political action committee, it does not make  
campaign contributions. But the clout of AIPAC here on Capitol Hill

george ball: Practically every congressman and senator says his  
prayers to the AIPAC lobby. Oh, they've done an enormous job of  
corrupting the American democratic process. It's the most effective  
lobby in the United States today, and I would put that ahead of the

wallace: What's wrong with picking a candidate to support on the  
way he has voted? Isn't that the American way?

ball: / think it's—it's a caricature of the American way.

rabbi israel miller: The word power when it's used for AIPAC is  
a myth. It's baloney. AIPAC is powerful only because the American

WALLACE: Rabbi Israel Miller is a Vice President of AIPAC. AIPAC is

In recent years, AIPAC and the pro-Israel PACs have helped defeat,  
among others, Congressmen Paul Findley and Pete McCloskey,  
Senators Harrison Schmidt of New Mexico, Walter Huddleston of  
Kentucky, and Chuck Percy of Illinois. Like Senator Chaffee, Percy,  
too, came out in favor of that sale of AWACs to the Saudis.

senator charles percy: I finally reached the stage where, as  
chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I saw our foreign  
policy totally turned around with a Moslem world—800 million  
people—looking askance at the United States of America, what is  
happening, who is running the foreign policy. Can Israel and the  
prime minister have more power than the entire Senate of the United  
States or the President of the United States? And that to me—/

wallace: That particular AWAC sale to Saudi Arabia did manage to  
pass the Congress, and in 1984, pro-Israel PACs and other individuals  
spent millions to unseat the powerful Senator Percy.

Let me quote to you the words of the executive director of AIPAC.  
After the defeat of Chuck Percy, a few years back, he said to a Jewish

group in Toronto, quote, "All the Jews in America, from coast to coast,  
gathered to oust Percy. And the American politicians, those who hold  
positions now and those who aspire, got the message ."

rabbi miller: It was an infelicitous expression of that which Tom felt  
in his enthusiasm and in his zeal. I think if he had it to say all over  
again he would have put it altogether differently.

wallace: Rabbi Miller, about a year ago, the New York Times wrote,  
"AIPAC has become a major force in shaping U.S. policy in the  
Middle East. The organization has gained the power to influence a  
presidential candidate's choice of staff, to block practically any arms  
sale to an Arab country, and to serve as a catalyst for intimate military  
relations between the Pentagon and the Israeli army." How did

rabbi miller: Again, I'll say that that's very flattering, but it's a myth.  
It's just not so. The American people support Israel, and therefore

wallace: One of Israel's staunchest supporters is Senator Daniel  
Inouye of Hawaii, who says that AIPAC has nothing to do with his

senator daniel inouye: If I can help Israel—help herself, in every  
instance I do so. I'm also convinced it's in our national interest. I've yet  
to see any country in that part of the world that is as reliable, as far  
as our strategic requirements are concerned, as Israel is.

ball: I don't believe it's an ally at all. We have no alliance with it. I  
mean, they insist on total freedom of action, and they insist on our  
subsidizing their total freedom of action.

wallace: The amount of that subsidy is remarkable, and a testament  
to AIPAC's clout on Capitol Hill. Altogether, Israel gets more than $3  
billion a year in assistance from the United States.

senator percy: Sometimes the votes go through without a single  
debate. Involving billions of dollars. You couldn't spend that kind of  
money in this country without a huge debate going on. But a foreign  
government gets this money without debate because, simply, it's—it's

The response by AIPAC to the CBS telecast was made by Morris Abram,  
chairman of the Conference of Presidents and Major American Jewish  
Organizations and reported in the Jerusalem Post of November 5, 1988.

Abram said that "the program was filled with distortions, innuendoes,  
and inaccuracies that made it a piece of shabby journalism."

It is important to note that in response to two different questions Rabbi  
Miller, Vice President of AIPAC, made the astonishing statements that the  
political "power" of AIPAC is a "myth" "it's baloney," "It's just not so."

After hearing these remarkable statements of Rabbi Miller, the vast  
viewer audience of "60 Minutes" and the rest of the American people are  
entitled to know and determine for themselves whether Rabbi Miller is  
right in characterizing the political power of AIPAC as a myth, or shabby  
journalism as the Lobby calls it, or whether it is a matter with which the  
American public should be seriously concerned as we enter a critical period  
when the fate of Israel and world peace may be in the balance.

For this chapter, "The Israeli Lobby in Action," we have relied heavily  
upon the text and sources contained in the book entitled They Dare to  
Speak Out, by ex-Congressman Paul Findley. Having served in Congress  
for twenty-two years before being defeated by an AIPAC-organized  
campaign, Mr. Findley is in a unique position, as a former congressman, to  
shed light directly from the halls of Congress on the operation of the Israeli  
Lobby and the dangers it poses to our political process.

is the political power of aipac a myth?

It is generally acknowledged in Congress that AIPAC is the pre-eminent  
lobbying power in Washington. However, the Washington presence is only  
the most visible tip of the Lobby. Its effectiveness rests heavily on the  
foundation built nationally by U.S. Jews, who function through more than  
200 national groups.

Actually, those who provide the political activism for all organizations in  
U.S. Jewry probably do not exceed 250,000. The Lobby's most popular  
newsletter, AIPAC's "Near East Report," has a distribution that the  
organization believes is read by most Jewish citizens who have an interest  
in pro-Israel political action, whether their primary interest is AIPAC,  
B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation  
League, the Jewish National Fund, the United Jewish Appeal, or any of the  
other main national groups. The newsletter is sent without charge to news  
media, congressmen, key government officials, and other people prominent  
in foreign policy. AIPAC members get the newsletter as part of their  
annual dues.

In practice, the Lobby groups function as an informal extension of the  
Israeli government. This was illustrated when AIPAC helped draft theofficial statement defending Israel's 1981 bombing of the Iraqi nuclear  
reactor and then issued it at the same hour as Israel's embassy. In the past,  
no Jewish organization has ever publicly taken issue with positions and  
policies adopted by Israel.[[6]](#footnote-6) AIPAC's charter defines its mission as legislative  
action, but it now also represents the interests of Israel whenever there is  
a perceived challenge to that country's interests. Because AIPAC's staff  
members are paid from contributions by American citizens, they need not  
register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. *In effect, however, they  
serve the same function as foreign agents.*

Over the years, the Israeli Lobby has thoroughly penetrated this nation's  
governmental system, and the organization that has made the deepest  
impact is AIPAC, to whom even the President of the U.S. turns for advice  
on matters relating to the Arab-Israeli issue. Most congressional actions  
affecting Middle East policy are either approved or initiated by AIPAC.

To accomplish these feats for Israel, AIPAC director Thomas A. Dine  
utilizes a team of hard-driving, able professionals and keeps them working  
together smoothly. He keeps policy lines clear and the troops well-  
disciplined. AIPAC's role is to support Israel's policies, not to help  
formulate them, so AIPAC maintains daily telephone communications with  
the Israeli embassy, and Dine meets personally with embassy officials at

Though AIPAC has a staff of less than one hundred—small in  
comparison to other major U.S.Jewish organizations—it taps the resources  
of a broad nationwide network of unpaid activists. Annual membership  
meetings in Washington are a major way to rally the troops. Those  
attending hear prominent U.S. and Israeli speakers, participate in work-  
shops and seminars, and contribute financially to the cause. The conferen-  
ces attract top political figures including the Israeli Ambassador, senior  
White House and State Department officials, and prominent Senators and

AIPAC's outreach program is buttressed by a steady stream of publica-  
tions. In addition to "Action Alerts" and weekly "Near East Report," it issues  
position papers designed to answer or often discredit critics, and advance  
Israel's objectives. The most controversial publication of all is an "enemies  
list" first issued in the spring of 1983 entitled "The Campaign to Discredit  
Israel," which provides a "directory of the actors": twenty-one organizations

and thirty-nine individuals AIPAC identified as inimical to Israeli interests.

Included in the list are such distinguished public servants as former  
Under-Secretary of State George W. Ball, retired Ambassadors Talcott  
Seelye, Andrew Killgore, John C. West, James Akins, and former Senator  
James Abourezk. There are also five Jewish dissenters and several scholars  
on the list.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith also issues its own "enemies  
list": Pro-Arab Propaganda in America: Vehicles and Voices lists 31  
organizations and 34 individuals. These books are nothing more than  
blacklists, reminiscent of the worst tactics of the McCarthy era. A similar  
"enemies list" is employed in AIPAC's extensive program at colleges and  
universities.

Through "Action Alert" mailings AIPAC keeps more than one thousand  
Jewish leaders throughout the U.S. informed on current issues. An "Alert"  
usually demands action to meet a legislative challenge on Capitol Hill,  
requesting a telephone call, telegram, or, if need be, a personal visit to a  
recalcitrant congressman. The network can have almost instantaneous  
effect.

This activism is carried out by an elaborate system of officers, commit-  
tees, and councils which give AIPAC a ready, intimate system for political  
activity from coast to coast. Its nineteen officers meet once a month to  
confer with Dine on organization and management. Each of its five vice-  
presidents can expect eventually to serve a term as president. A large  
executive committee totaling 132 members is invited to Washington every  
three months for briefings. A national council lists over 200 names. These  
subgroups include the leadership of most U.S. Jewish organizations.

The AIPAC staff is not only highly professional and highly motivated  
but also thoroughly experienced. Director Dine worked in several Capitol  
Hill jobs, first on the staff of Democratic Senator Edward Kennedy, later on  
the Foreign Relations Committee under Democratic Senator Frank Church  
of Idaho, and finally as staff director on foreign policy for the Senate budget  
committee. Among AIPAC's four lobbyists are or have been Douglas  
Bloomfield, Ralph Nurnberger, Esther Kurz, and Leslie L. Levy. All but  
Levy worked in foreign policy for a senator or congressman before joining  
AIPAC.

Bloomfield, once an intern under Democratic Senator Hubert Humphrey  
of Minnesota, worked for ten years for Democratic Congressman Ben  
Rosenthal of New York. Nurnberger worked for several years on the  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee and for Republican Senator James

Pearson of Kansas. Kurz worked, in succession, for Democratic Congress-  
man Charles Wilson of Texas, and Republican Senators Jacob Javits of New  
York and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

The four divide up the membership of the House and the Senate.  
Actually, only a handful of legislators are keys to success, so each of the four  
lobbyists needs to watch carefully only about thirty lawmakers. They  
concentrate on legislators from the twelve states which have a Jewish  
population of at least three percent: New York, New Jersey, California,  
Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware,  
Florida, and Connecticut.

The movement from congressional staff job to AIPAC also occasionally  
works the other way. A few veterans of AIPAC have moved to government  
assignments, among them Jonathan Slade, now with Democratic Congress-  
man Larry Smith of Florida, and Marvin Feuerwerger, who was with  
Democratic Congressman Stephen Solarz of New York before he joined the  
policy planning staff at the State Department. Both Smith and Solarz are  
members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and both are passionate  
supporters of Israel.

AIPAC has convinced Congress that it represents practically all Jews  
who vote. Columnist Nat Hentoff reported this assessment in the New  
York Village Voice in June 1983, after a delegation of eighteen dissenting  
rabbis had scoured Capitol Hill trying to convince congressmen that some  
Jews oppose Israeli policies. The rabbis reported that several congressmen  
said they shared their views but were afraid to act. Hentoff concluded: "The  
only Jewish constituency that's real to them [congressmen] is the one that  
AIPAC and other spokesmen for the Jewish establishment tell them  
about."

An Ohio congressman speaks of AIPAC with concern:

But what distresses me is the inability in American policymakers,  
because of the influence of AIPAC, to distinguish between our national  
interest and Israel's national interest. When these converge—wonderful!  
But they don't always converge.

After the 1982 elections, Thomas A. Dine summed up the significance of  
AIPAC's achievements: "Because of that, American Jews are thus able to  
form our own foreign policy agenda "

Later, when he reviewed the 1984 election results, Dine credited Jewish  
money, not votes: "Early money, middle money, late money." He claimedcredit for defeating Republican Senators Charles Percy of Illinois and Roger  
Jepson of Iowa, and Democratic Senator Walter Huddleston of Kentucky,  
all of whom incurred AIPAC wrath by voting for the sale of AWAC planes  
to Saudi Arabia. Dine said these successes "defined Jewish political power  
for the rest of this century.'

THE McCLOSKEY CASE

Real debate is almost unknown in the Congress on the subject of aid to  
Israel, most congressmen fearing Lobby pressure carefully avoid statements  
or votes that might be viewed as critical of Israel. A young congressman,  
Pete McCloskey, in 1980 (not fully aware of the rules), called for an end to  
the building of Israeli settlements in the occupied territory of the West  
Bank which the U.S. and all other countries except Israel considers as illegal  
and contrary to international law.

To put pressure on Israel to stop, McCloskey wanted the U.S. to cut aid  
by $150 million—the amount he estimated Israel was annually spending on  
these projects. In the end, tough realities led him to drop his plan to bring  
the matter to a vote. Representative James Johnson, a Republican from  
Colorado and one of the few to support McCloskey, was aware of the  
pressure other congressmen were putting on him. Johnson declared that  
many of his colleagues privately opposed Israels expansion of settlements  
but said Congress was "incapable" of taking action contrary to Israeli policy:  
"I would just like to point out the real reason that this Congress will not  
deal with this matter is because [it] concerns the nation of Israel"

Most committee action, like the work of the full House, is open to the  
public, and none occurs on Israeli aid without the presence of at least one  
representative of AIPAC. His presence ensures that any criticism of Israel  
will be quickly reported to key constituents. The offending congressman  
may have a rash of angry telephone messages to answer by the time he  
returns to his office from the hearing room.

Lobbyists for AIPAC are experts on the personalities and procedures of  
the House. If Israel is mentioned, even behind closed doors, they quickly get  
a full report of what transpired. These lobbyists know that aid to Israel on  
a roll call will get overwhelming support.

Still not aware of the political danger of his position, McCloskey, after a  
trip to the Middle East in 1979, concluded that new Israeli policies were not  
in America's best interests. He was alarmed over Washington's failure to  
halt Israel's construction of West Bank settlements—which the administra-  
tion itself had labeled "illegal"—and to stop Israel's illegal use of U.S.-supplied weapons. The congressman asked, "Why?" McCloskey had raised  
a provocative question: "Does America's Israeli Lobby' wield too much  
influence?" In an article for the Los Angeles Times he provided his answer:

"Yes, it is an obstacle to real Mideast peace." McCloskey cited the risk of  
nuclear confrontation in the Middle East and the fundamental differen-  
ces between the interests of Israel and the U.S. He observed that  
members of the Jewish community demand that Congress support Israel  
in spite of these differences. This demand, he argued, "coupled with the  
weakness of Congress in the face of any such force, can prevent the  
president, in his hour of both crisis and opportunity, from having the  
flexibility necessary to achieve a lasting Israeli-Palestinian peace."[Emphasis supplied]

On the next election day, all three of McCloskey's opponents received  
Jewish financial support. Stephen S. Rosenfeld, deputy editorial page editor  
of the Washington Post, drew a definite conclusion: "Jewish political  
participation defeated McCloskeyZ'

McCloskey's troubles, however, were not over. A tracking system initi-  
ated by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith assured that  
McCloskey would have no peace, even as a private citizen. The group  
distributed a memorandum containing details of his actions and speeches to  
its chapters around the country. According to the memo, it was designed to  
"assist" local ADL groups with "counteraction guidance" whenever  
McCloskey appeared in public.

Trouble followed him even on the campus. McCloskey accepted an  
invitation from the student governing council of Stanford University to  
teach a course on Congress at Stanford. Howard Goldberg—a council  
member and also director of the Hillel Center, the campus Jewish club—  
told the group that inviting McCloskey was "a slap in the face of the Jewish  
community."

the quintessential lobbyist

Stephen Solarz, a highly visible Congressman who represents a heavily  
Jewish district in Brooklyn, prides himself on accomplishing many good  
things for Israel. Since his first election in 1974, Solarz established a  
reputation as an intelligent, widely-traveled, aggressive legislator, totally  
committed to Israel's interests.

In a December 1980 newsletter to his constituents, he provided an un-precedented insight into how Israel—despite the budgetary restraints under  
which the U.S. government labors—is able to get ever-increasing aid. Early  
that year he had started his own quest for increased aid. He reported that  
he persuaded Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to come to his Capitol Hill  
office to talk it over. There he threatened Vance with a fight for the increase  
on the House floor if the administration opposed it in committee. Shortly  
thereafter, he said Vance sent word that the administration would recom-  
mend an increase—$200 million extra in military aid—although not as

His next goal was to convince the Foreign Affairs Committee to increase  
the administration's levels. Solarz felt an increase approved by the com-  
mittee could be sustained on the House floor—he was right.  
Solarz summed it up in his letter as follows:

Israel as a result will soon be receiving a total of $660 million more in  
military and economic aid than it received from the U.S. government last  
year. Through a combination of persistence and persuasion we were able  
to provide Israel with an increase in military-economic aid in one year  
alone which is the equivalent of almost three years of contributions by  
the national UJA [United Jewish Appeal]. [Emphasis supplied]

In his newsletter, Solarz explained to his constituents that he had sought  
membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee because "I wanted to be in

Proof of his dedication was evidenced in September 1984 when, as a  
member of the House-Senate conference on Export Administration Act  
amendments, he demanded in a public meeting to know the legislation's  
implications for Israel. He asked Congressman Howard Wolpe, "Is there  
anything that the Israelis want from us, or could conceivably want from us  
that they weren't able to get?" Even when Wolpe responded with a clear  
"No," Solarz pressed, "Have you spoken to the [Israeli] embassy?" Wolpe  
responded, "I personally have not," he admitted, "but my office has." Then  
Solarz tried again, "You are giving me an absolute assurance that they [the  
Israelis] have no reservation at all about this?" Finally convinced that Israel  
was content with the legislation, Solarz relaxed. "If they have no problem  
with it, then there is no reason for us to," he said.

To put this in perspective: If the eighty or more military bases and  
installations around the country (which Congress is in the process of  
closing for economic reasons) are in fact closed, the estimated annual

savings (of six hundred million dollars) is less than the increase arranged  
by Congressman Solarz in military and economic aid to Israel in 1980.  
Adjusted for inflation the increase in Israel aid is almost twice as much.  
A veteran Ohio congressman observes:

When Solarz and others press for more money for Israel, nobody wants  
to say "No." You don't need many examples of intimidation for  
politicians to realize what the potential is. The Jewish Lobby is terrific.  
Anything it wants, it gets. Jews are educated, often have a lot of money,  
and vote on the basis of a single issue—Israel. They are unique in that  
respect. [Emphasis supplied]

congressman dymally's dilemma

Democratic Congressman Mervyn W. Dymally, former lieutenant-  
governor of California, came to Washington in 1980 with perfect creden-  
tials as a supporter of Israel.

In his successful campaign for lieutenant-governor, he spoke up for Israel  
in all the statewide Democratic canvasses. He co-founded the "Black  
Americans in Support of Israel Committee," organized pro-Israel advertis-  
ing in California newspapers, and helped to rally other black officials to the  
cause. In Congress, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he  
became a dependable vote for Israeli interests.

Nevertheless, in 1982, the pro-Israeli community withdrew its financial  
support, and the following year the AIPAC organization in California  
marked him for defeat and began seeking a credible opponent to run  
against him in 1984. Explaining this sudden turn of events, Dymally cites  
two "black marks" against his pro-Israeli record in Congress. First, he  
"occasionally asked challenging questions about aid to Israel in committee";  
although his questions were mild and infrequent, he stood out because no  
one else was even that daring. Second—far more damning in the eyes of  
the AIPAC—he met twice with PLO leader Yasser Arafat. Both meetings  
were unplanned and of no international significance. Nevertheless, it  
created an uproar in the Jewish community.

Dymally found intimidation everywhere. Whenever he complains, he  
says, "he receives a prompt visit from an AIPAC lobbyist, usually accom-  
panied by a Dymally constituent." He met one day with a group of Jewish  
constituents, "all of them old friends," and told them that, despite his  
grumbling, in the end he always vot£d for aid to Israel. He said, "Not once,  
I told them, have I ever strayed from the course." One of his constituentsspoke up and said, "That's not quite right. Once you abstained." "They are  
that good," marveled Dymally. "The man was right."

Dymally considers membership on the Foreign Affairs subcommittee on  
the Middle East a "no win" situation. He says of many of his Jewish critics  
in California, "What is tragic is that so many Jewish people misconstrue  
criticism of Israel as anti-Jewish or anti-Semitic ." He speaks admiringly of  
the open criticism of Israeli policy that often occurs within Israel itself: "It  
is easier to criticize Israel in the Knesset [the Israeli parliament] than it is  
in the U.S. Congress, here in this land of free speech."

Dymally notes that 10 out of the 37 members of the Foreign Affairs  
Committee are Jewish and finds it "so stacked there is no chance" for  
constructive dialogue. He names Republican Congressman Ed Zschau of  
California as the only member of the Subcommittee on Europe and the  
Middle East who "even shadow boxes."

At one hearing on economic aid to foreign countries, only Dymally  
complained that aid to Israel was too high. "How can the United States  
afford to give so much money in view of our economic crisis.. .to a country  
that has rejected the President's peace initiatives, and stepped up its  
settlements in the occupied territories?" he demanded.

the case of congressman ed zschau

At the same hearing referred to by Congressman Dymally, Ed Zschau, a  
freshman Republican from California, provided the only other break from  
the pro-Israel questioning: "Do you think," he asked, "there should be  
conditions [on aid to Israel] that might hasten the objectives of the peace  
process?" Getting no response, he pressed on: "Given that we are giving  
aid in order to achieve progress in peace in the area, wouldn't it make sense  
to associate with the aid some modest conditions like a halt in settlement  
policy?" He received no support on his questions. Although Congress-  
man Zschau did not then know it, his political fate was sealed. In 1986,  
Representative Edwin Zschau was defeated for the Senate by Senator Alan  
Cranston, financed in part by AIPAC.

According to a report in the June 24, 1987, edition of The Wall Street  
Journal, a key figure in Zschau's defeat may have been Michael Goland, a  
Los Angeles developer, who is one of the largest donors to AIPAC who has  
been active in opposing candidates he views as being unfriendly to Israel.Mr. Goland recently agreed to pay a $5,000 fine for his role in running  
television commercials attacking former Senator Charles Percy of Illinois  
who was defeated in his 1984 race for re-election. According to the Los

Angeles Times, the commercials were illegal because the source of the

According to The Wall Street Journal, at a reception held for Zschau,  
Goland is quoted as saying to Zschau, Tm going to get you just like I got

Since the establishment of modern Israel in 1948, only a handful of  
senators have said or done anything in opposition to the policies of the  
government of Israel. Those who break ranks find themselves in difficulty.  
The trouble can arise from a speech, an amendment, a vote, a published  
statement, or a combination of these. It may take the form of a challenge  
in the next primary or general election. Or the trouble may not surface until  
later—after service in the Senate has ended. Such was the unfortunate

the adlai e. stevenson iii candidacy

The cover of the October 1982 edition of the monthly magazine Jewish  
Chicago featured a portrait of Adlai E. Stevenson III, Democratic candidate  
for governor of Illinois. In the background, over the right shoulder of a  
smiling Stevenson, an Arab, rifle slung over his shoulder, glared ominously  
through a kaffiyeh that covered his head and most of his face. The headline  
announcing the issue's feature article read, "Looking at Adlai Through  
Jewish Eyes." The illustration and article were part of an anti-Stevenson  
campaign conducted by some of the quarter-million people in Chicago's  
Jewish community who wanted Stevenson to fail in his challenge to

Thompson, a Republican, was attempting a feat sometimes tried but  
never before accomplished in Illinois history—election to a third term as  
governor. Normally, a Republican in Illinois can expect only minimal  
Jewish support at the polls. A crucial part of the anti-Stevenson campaign  
was a caricature of his Middle East record while he was a member of the  
U.S. Senate. Stevenson was presented as an enemy of Israel and an ally of

This was astonishing to Stevenson since the make-up of his campaign  
organization, the character of his campaign, and the support he had  
received in the past in Jewish neighborhoods provided little hint of trouble

Several of the most important members of his campaign team were  
Jewish: Philip Klutznick, President Emeritus of B'nai B'rith and an  
organizer of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations,agreed to organize Stevenson's main campaign dinner. Milton Fisher,  
prominent attorney, was chairman of his finance committee; Rick Jasulca,  
a public relations executive who became Stevenson's full-time press  
secretary. Stevenson chose Grace Mary Stern as his running mate for the  
position of lieutenant-governor. Her husband was prominent in Chicago  
Jewish affairs.

Stevenson himself had received several honors from Jewish groups in  
preceding years. He had been selected by the Chicago Jewish community as  
1974 Israel Bonds "Man of the Year," and was honored by the government  
of Israel—which established the Adlai E. Stevenson III Chair at the  
Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot. Stevenson had every reason to  
expect that organized Illinois Jewry would overlook his occasional mild  
position critical of Israeli policy.

But trouble developed. A segment of the Jewish community quietly  
launched an attack that would cost him heavily. Stevenson's detractors were  
determined to defeat him in the governor's race and thus discourage a  
future Stevenson bid for the presidency. Their basic tool was a document  
provided by AIPAC in Washington. It was presented as a summary of  
Stevenson's Senate actions on Middle East issues—though it made no  
mention of his almost unblemished record of support for Israel and the  
tributes the Jewish community had presented to him in testimony of this  
support.

For example, AIPAC pulled from a 21-page report Stevenson prepared  
after a 1967 trip to the Middle East just one phrase: "There is no  
organization other than the PLO with a broadly recognized claim to  
represent the Palestinians." This was a simple statement of fact. But the  
writer of the Jewish Chicago article, citing the AIPAC "summary," asserted  
that these words had helped to give Stevenson "a reputation as one of the  
harshest critics of both Israeli policy and of U.S. support for the Jewish  
state." Stevenson's assessment of the PLO's standing in the Palestinian  
community was interpreted as an assault on Israel. In fact, the full  
paragraph in the Stevenson report from which AIPAC took its brief  
excerpt is studied and reasonable:

The Palestinians are by general agreement the nub of the problem.  
Although badly divided, they have steadily increased in numbers,  
economic and military strength, and seriousness of purpose. They cannot  
be left out of any Middle East settlement. Their lack of unity is reflected  
in the lack of unity within the top ranks of the PLO, but there is noorganization other than the PLO with a broadly recognized claim to  
represent the Palestinians.

The Stevenson report was critical of certain Israeli policies but hardly  
hostile to Israel. "The PLO," he wrote, "may be distrusted, disowned and  
despised, but it is a reality, if for no other reason than that it has no rival  
organization among Palestinians."

Stevenson went on to issue a challenge to the political leaders of  
America:

A new order of statesmanship is required from both the Executive and  
the Legislative Branches. For too long Congress has muddled or gone  
along without any real understanding of Middle Eastern politics. Neither  
the U.S., nor Israel, nor any of the Arab states will be served by  
continued ignorance or the expediencies of election year politics.

None of this positive comment found its way into the AIPAC report or  
into the Jewish Chicago article or into any of the anti-Stevenson literature  
which was distributed within the Jewish community during the 1982  
campaign.

The anti-Stevenson activists noted with alarm that in 1980 Stevenson  
had sponsored an amendment to reduce aid to Israel and the year before  
had supported a similar amendment offered by Senator Mark O. Hatfield,  
Republican of Oregon. The Hatfield amendment proposed to cut, by 10  
percent, the amount of funds available to Israel for military credits.

Stevenson's amendment focused on Israeli settlements in occupied  
territories, which President Carter and earlier administrations characterized  
as both illegal and an obstacle to peace but did nothing to discourage beyond  
occasional expressions of regret. Stevenson proposed withholding $150  
million in aid until Israel halted both the building and planning of  
additional settlements. The amendment did not cut funds; it simply  
withheld a fraction of the $2.18 billion total aid authorized for Israel that  
year. In speaking for the amendment, Stevenson noted that the outlay for  
Israel amounted to 43 percent of all U.S. funds allocated for such purposes  
worldwide:

This preference for Israel diverts funds from the support of human life  
and vital American interests elsewhere in an interdependent and  
unstable world If it could produce stability in the Middle East orenhance Israel's security, it could be justified. But it reflects continued  
U.S. acquiescence in an Israeli policy which threatens more Middle East  
instability, more Israeli insecurity, and a continued decline of U.S.  
authority in the world. Our support for Israel is not the issue here.  
Israel's support for the ideals of peace and justice which gave it birth are  
at issue. It is, I submit, for the Israel government to recognize again that  
Israel's interests are in harmony with our own and, for that to happen,  
it is important that we do not undermine the voices of peace in Israel or  
justify those, like Mr. Begin, who claim U.S. assistance from the  
Congress can be taken for granted. [Emphasis supplied]

The amendment was overwhelmingly defeated.

Of course, all that Senator Stevenson was trying to do was exactly what  
Yehoshafat Harkabi is begging America to do—he spoke up frankly as a  
true friend of Israel. The members of Congress who are afraid to speak out  
are not (as Harkabi says bitterly) real friends of Israel. Obviously, their  
actions are not prompted by any genuine friendship for Israel\ or special  
concern for its well-being—they are motivated simply by political

All that a real enemy of Israel needs to do is to support enthusiastically  
the pied pipers of the Likud and watch Israel march blindly into—as

A flyer distributed by an unidentified "Informed Citizens Against  
Stevenson Committee," captioned "The Truth About Adlai Stevenson,"  
used half-truths to brand Stevenson as anti-Israel during his Senate years  
and concluded: "It is vitally important that Jewish voters be fully informed  
about Stevenson's record. Still dazzled by the Stevenson name, many Jews  
are totally unaware of his antagonism to Jewish interests." The committee  
provided no names or addresses of sponsoring individuals. The message on

Don't forget. It is well-known that Stevenson considers the governor's  
chair as a stepping-stone to the presidency. Spread the word—Let the

A major problem was the unprinted—but widely whispered charge of  
"anti-Semitism" against Stevenson—a man, who, like his father, had spent  
his life championing civil rights for all Americans. "I learned after election  
day there was that intimation throughout the campaign," recalls Stevenson.

Stevenson's running mate, Grace Mary Stern, recalls: "There was a very  
vigorous [anti-Stevenson] telephone campaign in the Jewish community."  
She says leaflets charging Stevenson with being anti-Israel were distributed  
widely at local Jewish temples, and adds there was much discussion of the  
"anti-Semitism" accusation. "There was a very vigorous campaign, man to  
man, friend to friend, locker room to locker room. We never really came to  
grips with the problem."

Campaign fund raising suffered accordingly. The Jewish community had  
supported Stevenson strongly in both of his campaigns for the Senate.  
After his remarks in the last years of his Senate career, some of the Jewish  
support dried up. In the end, Thompson was able to outspend Stevenson  
by better than two to one.

The only Jews who tried to counter the attack were those close to  
Stevenson. Philip Klutznick, prominent in Jewish affairs and chairman of  
the Stevenson Dinner Committee, said, "It is beneath the dignity of the  
Jewish community to introduce these issues into a gubernatorial campaign."  
Stevenson's campaign treasurer, Milton Fisher, said, "Adlai's views are  
probably consistent with 40 percent of the Knesset [Israeli parliament]."

Stevenson was ultimately defeated in the closest gubernatorial election in  
the state's history. The margin was 5,074 votes—one-seventh of one  
percent of the total 3.5 million votes cast.

Thomas A. Dine, Executive Director of the American Israel Public  
Affairs Committee, gloated, "The memory of Adlai Stevenson's hostility  
toward Israel during his Senate tenure lost him the Jewish vote in Illinois—  
and that cost him the gubernatorial election."

Stevenson too believes the effort to discredit him among Jews played a  
major role in his defeat: "In a race that close, it was more than enough to  
make the difference." Asked about the impact of the Israeli Lobby on the  
U.S. political scene, he responded without hesitation:

There is an intimidating, activist minority of American Jews that  
supports the decisions of the Israeli government, right or wrong. They  
do so very vocally and very aggressively in ways that intimidate others so  
that it's their voice—even though it's a minority—that is heard and felt  
in American politics. But it still is much louder in the U.S. than in Israel.  
In other words, you have a much stronger, more vocal dissent in Israel  
than within the Jewish community in the U.S.. The prime minister of  
Israel has far more influence over American foreign policy in the Middle  
East than over the policies of his own government generally.

a profile in courage

In 1963, Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, chaired an investiga-  
tion that brought to public attention the exceptionally favorable tax  
treatment of contributions to Israel and thereby aroused the ire of the  
Jewish community. The investigation was managed by Walter Pincus, a  
journalist Fulbright hired after reading a Pincus study of lobbying. Pincus  
recalls that Fulbright gave him a free hand, letting him choose the ten  
prime lobbying activities to be examined and backing him throughout the  
controversial investigation. One of the groups chosen by Pincus, himself  
Jewish, was the Jewish Telegraph Agency—at that time a principal  
instrument of the Israeli Lobby. Both Fulbright and Pincus were accused of  
trying to destroy the Jewish Telegraph Agency and of being "anti-Semitic."  
Pincus remembers, "Several senators urged that the inquiry into the Jewish  
operation be dropped. Senators Hubert Humphrey and Bourke Hicken-  
looper [then senior Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee] were  
among them. Fulbright refused."

The Fulbright hearings also exposed the massive funding illegally  
channeled into the American Zionist Council by Israel More than five  
million dollars had been secretly poured into the council for spending on  
public relations firms and pro-Israel propaganda before Fulbright's com-  
mittee closed down the operation.

Despite his concern over the Israeli Lobby, Fulbright took the excep-  
tional step of recommending that the U.S. guarantee Israel's borders. In a  
major address in 1970, he proposed an American-Israeli treaty under which  
the U.S. would commit itself to intervene militarily if necessary to  
"guarantee the territory and independence of Israel" within the lands it  
held before the 1967 war. The treaty, he said, "should be a supplement to  
a peace settlement arranged by the United Nations." The purpose of his  
proposal was to destroy the arguments of those who maintained that Israel  
needed the captured territory for its security.

Fulbright saw Israeli withdrawal from the Arab lands it occupied in the  
1967 war as the key to peace. Israel could not occupy Arab territory and  
have peace too. He said Israeli policy in establishing settlements on the  
territories "has been characterized by lack of flexibility and foresight."

As referred to earlier in the previous chapter, Fulbright, on CBS  
television's "Face The Nation" in 1973, declared that the Senate was  
"subservient" to Israeli policies which were inimical to American interests.  
He said, "The U.S. bears a very great share of the responsibility for the  
continuation of Middle East violence. It's quite obvious that without the all-out support by the U.S. in money and weapons, the Israelis couldn't do  
what they've been doing."39 Fulbright was saying fifteen years ago what  
Yehoshafat Harkabi is now saying in his book Israel's Fateful Hour—  
namely, that the U.S. is at fault for Israel's desperate situation because the  
U.S. allowed Israel and the Likud to do whatever it wanted to do, and that  
the U.S. is responsible for the oncoming disaster to Israel.

Fulbright said the U.S. failed to pressure Israel for a negotiated  
settlement, because:

The great majority of the Senate of the U.S.—somewhere around 80  
percent—are completely in support of Israel, anything Israel wants. This  
has been demonstrated time and time again, and this has made it difficult  
for our government.

His criticism of Israeli policy caused concerns back home. Jews who had  
supported him in the past became restless. After years of easy election  
victories, trouble loomed for Fulbright for his Senate seat. Fulbright was  
defeated. He was on the "enemies list." Several Jewish organizations  
claimed credit for Fulbright's defeat.

Since his defeat, Fulbright has continued to speak out, decrying Israeli  
stubbornness and warning of the Israeli Lobby. In a speech just before the  
end of his Senate term, Fulbright warned, "Endlessly pressing the U.S. for  
money and arms—and invariably getting all and more than she asks—  
Israel makes bad use of a good friend." His central concern was that the  
Middle East conflict might flare into nuclear war. He warned somberly that

"Israel's supporters in the U.S by underwriting intransigency, are

encouraging a course which must lead toward her destruction—and just  
possibly ours as well."

Fulbright sees little hope that Capitol Hill will effectively challenge the  
Israeli Lobby:

It's suicide for politicians to oppose them. The only possibility would be  
someone like Eisenhower who already feels secure. Eisenhower has  
already made his reputation. He was already a great man in the eyes of  
the country, and he wasn't afraid of anybody. He said what he believed.

Then he adds a somewhat more optimistic note: "I believe a president  
could do this. He wouldn't have to be named Eisenhower." Fulbright cites  
a missed opportunity:

I went to Jerry Ford after he took office in 1975.1 was out of office then.  
I had been to the Middle East and visited with some of the leading  
figures. I came back and told the president, "Look, I think these Arab  
leaders are willing to accept Israel, but the Israelis have got to go back to  
the 1967 borders. The problem can be solved if you are willing to take  
a position on it." Ford, he said, did not take his advice.

senator william hathaway's defeat

In the spring of 1978, AIPAC unceremoniously abandoned another  
Senate Democrat with a consistent pro-Israeli record, Senator William  
Hathaway of Maine (who had, without exception, cast his vote in favor of  
Israel's interests), in favor of William S. Cohen, his Republican challenger.

Hathaway had cooperated in 1975 when AIPAC sponsored its famous  
"spirit of 76" letter. It bore Hathaway's name and those of 75 of his  
colleagues and carried this message to President Gerald R. Ford: "We urge  
that you reiterate our nation's long-standing commitment to Israel's  
security by a policy of continued military supplies, and diplomatic and  
economic support." Previously, Hathaway, on occasion, declined to sign  
certain "sense of the Senate" resolutions prepared by AIPAC.

Ford, dissatisfied with Israeli behavior, had just issued a statement  
calling for a "reappraisal" of U.S. policies in the Middle East. His  
statement did not mention Israel by name as the offending party, but his  
message was clear—Ford wanted better cooperation in reaching a com-  
promise with Arab interests, and "reappraisal" meant suspension of U.S.  
aid until Israel improved its behavior. It was a historic proposal, the first  
time since Eisenhower that a U.S. president even hinted publicly that he

Israel's response came, not from its own capital, but from the U.S.  
Senate. Instead of relying on a direct protest to the White House, Jerusalem  
activated its Lobby in the U.S., which, in turn, signed up as supporters of  
Israel's position more than three-fourths of the members of the U.S.

A more devastating—and intimidating—response could scarcely be con-  
ceived. The seventy-six signatures effectively told Ford he could not carry  
out his threatened "reappraisal." Israel's loyalists in the Senate—Democrats  
and Republicans alike—were sufficient in number to reject any legislative  
proposal displeasing to Israel that Ford might make, and perhaps even  
enact a pro-Israeli piece of legislation over a presidential veto.

The letter was a demonstration of impressive clout. Crafted and circu-lated by AIPAC, it had been endorsed overnight by a majority of the Senate  
membership. Several senators who at first had said "No" quickly changed  
their positions. Senator John Culver admitted candidly, "The pressure was  
too great. I caved." So did President Ford. He backed down and never again  
challenged the Lobby.

This wasn't the only time Hathaway answered AIPAC's call to oppose  
the White House on a major issue. Three years later, Ford's successor,  
Jimmy Carter, fought a similar battle with the Israeli Lobby. At issue this  
time was a resolution to disapprove President Carter's proposal to sell F-15  
fighters to Saudi Arabia. The White House needed the support of only one  
chamber to defeat the resolution. White House strategists felt that the  
House of Representatives would overwhelmingly vote to defeat the sale, so  
they decided to put all their resources into the Senate.

The Israeli Lobby pulled out all the stops. It coordinated a nationwide  
public relations campaign which revived, as never before, memories of the  
genocidal Nazi campaign against European Jews during World War II. In  
the wake of the highly publicized television series, "Holocaust," Capitol Hill  
was flooded with complimentary copies of the novel on which the TV  
series was based. The books were accompanied by a letter from AIPAC  
saying, "This chilling account of the extermination of six million Jews  
underscores Israel's concerns during the current negotiations for security  
without reliance on outside guarantees."

The pressure was sustained and heavy. Major personalities in the Jewish  
community warned the fighter aircraft would constitute a serious threat to  
Israel. Nevertheless, a prominent Jewish Senator, Abraham Ribicoff of  
Connecticut, lined up with Carter. This was a hard blow to Morris Amitay,  
then director of AIPAC, who had previously worked on RibicofFs staff.  
Earlier in the year, Ribicoff, while keeping his own counsel on the Saudi  
arms question, took the uncharacteristic step of sharply criticizing Israeli  
policies as well as the tactics of AIPAC. In an interview with The Wall  
Street Journal, Ribicoff described Israel's retention of occupied territory as  
"wrong" and unworthy of U.S. support. He said AIPAC does "a great  
disservice to the U.S., to Israel and to the Jewish community." Ribicoff could  
now tell the truth, he did not plan to seek re-election.

The Senate approved the sale, 52 to 48, but in the process Carter was so  
bruised that he never again forced a showdown vote in Congress over  
Middle East policy.

Hathaway was one of the group who stuck with AIPAC, but this was not  
sufficient when election time rolled around. AIPAC wanted a senator whosesignature—and vote—it could always count on. Searching for unswerving  
loyalty, the Lobby switched to Cohen. Hathaway was defeated in 1978.

THE LOSS TO THE SENATE OF CHARLES PERCY

One of the leading lights of the Senate has been Senator Charles Percy  
of Illinois, who began his first term in 1967.

In his first election, 60 percent of Jewish votes—Illinois has the nation's  
fourth largest Jewish population—went to his opponent. But in the next six  
years, Percy supported aid for Israel, urged the Soviet Union to permit  
emigration of Jews, criticized PLO terrorism, and supported social causes so  
forcefully that Jews rallied strongly to his side when he ran for re-election.  
In 1972, Percy accomplished something never before achieved by carrying  
every county in the state and, even more remarkable for an Illinois Protest-  
ant Republican, received 70 percent of the Jewish vote.

His honeymoon with Jews was interrupted in 1975 when he returned  
from a trip to the Middle East to declare, "Israel and its leadership, for  
whom I have a high regard, cannot count on the U.S. in the future just to  
write a blank check." He said Israel had missed some opportunities to  
negotiate and he described PLO leader Yasser Arafat as "more moderate,  
relatively speaking, than other extremists such as George Habash." He  
urged Israel to talk to the PLO, if the organization would renounce terror-  
ism and recognize Israel's right to exist behind secure, defensible borders,  
noting that David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, had said that  
Israel must be willing to swap real estate for peace.

A week later Percy received this memorandum from his staff: "We have  
received 2,200 telegrams and 4,000 letters in response to your Mideast

statements [They] run 95 percent against. As you might imagine, the

majority of hostile mail comes from the Jewish community in Chicago. They  
threaten to withhold their votes and support for any future endeavors."

That same year Percy offended pro-Israel activists when he did not sign  
the famous "spirit of 76" letter through which seventy-six of his Senate  
colleagues effectively blocked President Gerald R. Ford's intended "reap-  
praisal" of Middle East policy. This brought another flood of protest mail.

Despite these rumblings, the Israeli Lobby did not mount a serious  
campaign against Percy in 1978. With the senator's unprecedented 1972  
sweep of the state fresh in mind, they did not seek out a credible opponent  
either in the primary or the general election.

However, the 1984 campaign was dramatically different. Pro-Israel forces  
targeted him for defeat early and never let up. Percy upset Jews by votingto support the Reagan administration sale of AWACS radar planes to Saudi  
Arabia (a sale also supported by the Carter administration). These  
developments provided new ammunition for the attack already under way  
against Percy. Percy's decision was made after his staff members who had  
visited Israel said they had been told by an Israeli military official that the  
strategic military balance would not be affected, but that they did not want  
the symbolism of the U.S. doing business with Saudi Arabia.

Early in 1984, AIPAC decided to mobilize the full national resources of  
the Israeli Lobby in a campaign against Percy. In the March primary, it  
encouraged the candidacy of Congressman Tom Corcoran, Percy's chal-  
lenger for the nomination. One of Corcoran's chief advisers and fundraisers  
was Morris Amitay, former executive director of AIPAC. Corcoran's high-  
decibel attacks portrayed the senator as anti-Israel. His fundraising appeals  
to Jews cited Percy as "Israel's worst adversary in Congress." A full-page  
newspaper advertisement, sponsored by the Corcoran campaign, featured a  
picture of Arafat and headlined, "Chuck Percy says this man is a moderate."  
A letter to Jewish voters defending Percy and signed by fifty-eight leading  
Illinois Jews made almost no impact.

Although Percy overcame the primary challenge, Corcoran's attacks  
damaged his position with Jewish voters and provided a strong base for  
AIPAC's continuing assault. Thomas A. Dine, executive director of AIPAC,  
set the tone early in the summer by attacking Percy's record at a campaign  
workshop in Chicago. AIPAC encouraged fund raising for Paul Simon and  
mobilized its political resources heavily against Percy. It assigned several  
student interns full time to the task of anti-Percy research and brought  
more than one hundred university students from out-of-state to campaign  
for Simon.

Percy undertook vigorous countermeasures. Former Senator Jacob Javitz  
of New York, one of the nation's most prominent and respected Jews, and  
Senator Rudy Boschwitz, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Com-  
mittee subcommittee concerning the Middle East, made personal appearan-  
ces for Percy in Chicago. In addition, one hundred Illinois Jews, led by  
former Attorney General Edward H. Levi, sponsored a full-page advertise-  
ment which declared that Percy "has delivered for Illinois, delivered for  
America and delivered for Israel."

This support proved futile, as did his strong legislative endeavors. His  
initiatives as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee brought  
Israel $425 million more in grant aid than Reagan had requested in 1983,  
and $325 million more in 1984, but these successes for Israel seemed tomake no difference. A poll taken a month before the election showed a  
large majority of Jews supporting Simon. The Percy campaign found no  
way to stem the tide and was defeated. Thousands of Jews, who had voted  
for Percy in 1978, left him for the Democratic candidate six years later. And  
these votes fled to Simon mainly because Israel's Lobby worked effectively  
throughout the campaign year to portray the senator as basically anti-Israel.  
Percy's long record of support for Israel's needs amounted to a repudiation  
of the accusation, but too few Jews spoke up publicly in his defense. The  
senator found that once a candidate is labeled anti-Israel, the poison sinks  
so swiftly and deeply it is almost impossible to remove.

AIPAC's Dine told a Canadian audience: "All the Jews in America, from  
coast to coast, gathered to oust Percy. And American politicians—those  
who hold public positions now, and those who aspire—got the message."

GEORGE BALL'S WORDS OF WISDOM

George Ball, a lifelong Democrat, twice campaigned for Adlai E. Steven-  
son for president. In 1959, he became a supporter of John F. Kennedy's  
presidential ambitions. His diplomatic experience and prestige were  
diverse and unmatched. He had served as number two man in the State  
Department under Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. In  
those assignments he dealt intimately with the Cuban missile crisis and  
most other major issues in foreign policy for six years during which he held  
the post of ambassador to the U.N.

Ball was one of America's best-known and most admired diplomats, but  
he probably destroyed his prospects of becoming Carter's secretary of state  
when he wrote an article entitled "The Coming Crisis in Israeli-American  
Relations" for the winter 1976-77 issue of Foreign Affairs quarterly. It pro-  
voked a storm of protest from the Jewish community.

In the article, Ball cited President Eisenhower's demand that Israel  
withdraw from the Sinai as "the last time the U.S. ever took, and persisted  
in, forceful action against the strong wishes of an Israeli government." He  
saw the event as a watershed. "American Jewish leaders thereafter set out  
to build one of Washington's most effective lobbies, which now works in  
close cooperation with the Israeli embassy." He lamented the routine  
leakage of classified information:

Not only do Israel's American supporters have powerful influence with  
many members of Congress, but practically no actions touching Israel'sinterests can be taken, or even discussed, within the executive branch  
without it being quickly known to the Israeli government.

He considers as incredible Israel's rejection of U.S. advice at a time when  
Israel's dependence on U.S. aid had "reached the point of totality." Yet he  
was not surprised that Israel pursued an independent course:

Israelis have been so long conditioned to expect that Americans will  
support their country, no matter how often it disregards American  
advice and protests and America's own interests.

Despite such sharp criticism, candidate Jimmy Carter, for a time, consi-  
dered Ball his principal foreign policy advisor and a good choice for  
secretary of state.

A number of Jewish leaders, however, urged Carter not to name Ball to  
any significant role in his administration. The characteristic which made  
Ball unacceptable to the Israeli Lobby was his candor; he wasn't afraid to  
speak up and criticize Israeli policy. Carter removed Ball from con-  
sideration.

After Carter's cabinet selection process was completed, Ball continued to  
speak out. Early in 1977, he wrote another article in Foreign Affairs, "How  
to Save Israel in Spite of Herself," urging the new administration to take  
the lead in formulating a comprehensive settlement that would be fair to  
the Palestinians as well as Israel. For a time Carter moved in this direction,  
even trying to communicate with the Palestine Liberation Organization  
through Saudi Arabia. When this approach floundered, Carter shifted his  
focus on attempting to reach a settlement between Egypt and Israel at  
Camp David, where Ball believes Carter was double-crossed by Begin. "I  
talked with Carter just before Camp David. We had a long dinner together.  
He told me he was going to try to get a full settlement on Middle East  
issues, and he seemed to understand the significance of the Palestinian  
issue. On this I have no doubt, and I think he desperately wanted to settle  
it." As we have seen after Camp David, Israel frustrated Carter's goals,  
continuing to build settlements in occupied territory and blocking progress  
toward autonomy for Palestinians in the West Bank. Ball has frequently and  
publicly stated his position:

When leading members of the American Jewish community give  
[Israel's] government uncritical and unqualified approbation and encour-  
agement for whatever it chooses to do, while striving so far as possible  
to overwhelm any criticism of its actions in Congress and in the publicmedia, they are, in my view, doing neither themselves nor the U.S. a  
favor.

They've got one great thing going for them. Most people are terribly  
concerned not to be accused of being anti-Semitic, and the lobby so often  
equates criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism. They keep pounding away  
at that theme, and people are deterred from speaking out

THE ARAB TRADE BOYCOTT

Perhaps the most impressive display of raw power by the Israeli Lobby  
was the rapid mobilization, not only of Congress, but virtually the entire  
federal bureaucracy in support of its attack on the Arab trade boycott. It was  
a great triumph for the Lobby, and lingering disaster for the American  
economy.

Shortly after the first Arab-Israeli war in 1948, the Arab countries  
imposed a trade boycott as a means of economic warfare against Israel with  
which they were, and have been ever since (with the exception of Egypt),  
in a state of belligerency. The trade boycott, which has remained in effect  
with certain exceptions until the present time, was, and is, intended by the  
Arab nations to restrict trade or business dealings between Arab countries  
and those foreign companies or individuals who help Israel. In other words,  
the purpose of the Arab countries was simply to avoid subsidizing their  
enemy.

A trade boycott, of course, is not an Arab invention. It is a hallowed and  
perfectly legitimate weapon of economic warfare accepted as such by all  
nations. The cold war was waged by the U.S. with trade boycotts of global  
scope as a primary weapon. For over 25 years, the U.S. boycotted Russia  
and all of Eastern Europe, as well as China and Cuba. It not only forbade  
trade with these countries—but boycotted other countries which did not  
observe the U.S. boycott.

The United Nations also has imposed several far-reaching trade boy-  
cotts, including one against Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and another against  
South Africa, in which the U.S. is a leading participant.

Notwithstanding this, the Arab trade boycott against Israel was vigor-  
ously attacked by Israeli partisans in the Congress as a form of racial  
prejudice and religious discrimination.

Arab spokesmen vainly tried to make their voices heard to counter the  
"anti-Semitic" charges by explaining that Henry Kissinger, a Jew, has been  
welcomed throughout the Arab world; and that the trade boycott is against  
the State of Israel and its allies and supporters, not the Jewish people assuch. However, there was no way that the simple truth could break through  
the cordon of taboo and intimidation established by the Israeli Lobby.

The legitimacy of the Arab position was clear and unambiguous.  
Mohammed Mahgoub, head of the boycott office in Damascus, stated the  
Arab position:

The boycott is not based on racism or religion. We only boycott whoever  
supports Israel militarily or economically regardless of nationality.

Arab countries do deal with Jewish friends. While there are some  
Moslem companies that are on the blacklist, the boycott is aimed at Israel  
and at those companies which contribute to the promotion of Israel's  
aggressive economy or to its war effort. In general, the blacklist applies  
to companies and individuals who have invested in Israel, contributed  
substantially to it or sold strategic goods to it. The sale of consumer  
goods to Israel is not cause for blacklisting.

The large and continuous infusion of money into Israel from the world  
Jewish community, is a great tribute to Jewish generosity, loyalty, and  
solidarity. However, from the Arab point of view, to trade with Jewish-  
controlled businesses is simply to subsidize one of the main sources of the  
enemy's power.

This same philosophy is behind the U.S. Code sections, entitled "Trading  
With The Enemy Act." For a U.S. citizen, trading with the "enemy," or an  
ally of the enemy, or carrying on trade which benefits an enemy, or ally of  
an enemy, is a federal crime.

The identical reasoning applies to the boycott imposed by the Arab  
countries on trading with Israel and is nothing more sinister than the  
obvious fact that one does not feed the mouth whose hand is feeding one's  
enemy. Certainly, nobody can deny that the Arabs have a perfect right to  
decide with whom they will do business.

However, suddenly, in 1976, the Arab boycott assumed the proportions  
of a major issue. Candidate Jimmy Carter, looking toward the 1976 election,  
called it a "disgrace." This, incidentally, is the same Jimmy Carter who, as  
President, led the fight to repeal the Byrd amendment and impose a total  
trade boycott on Rhodesia. How did the Arab boycott, which had been in  
effect against Israel since 1948, suddenly, in 1976, become a "disgrace"?

The answer appears to be that in the presidential election year 1976  
the Israeli partisans in Congress and the Israeli Lobby decided it was time  
for a political showdown—an all-out attempt to shatter the Arab boycott  
by involving the U.S. government and its various agencies and depart-ments in a concerted effort to destroy it. The tactics were simple and  
time-tested—call it "religious or racial discrimination" or, better still—  
"anti-Semitic."

Under this banner of righteousness, the campaign began. The opening  
barrage came from the Commerce Oversight and Investigation Subcommit-  
tee, under the chairmanship of John E. Moss (D-Cal.), which reported that  
inadequate steps by executive agencies in dealing with the Arab trade  
boycott of Israel have compromised U.S. principles of "free trade and  
freedom from religious discrimination."

Following this, Rep. Bella Abzug, Chairwoman of a House Government  
Operations Subcommittee on Information and Individual Rights, demand-  
ed that the Securities and Exchange Commission disclose publicly any  
information it had on boycott participation by U.S. companies and to  
formally require every company to disclose whether or not it is observing  
the boycott.

This disclosure requirement was a transparent attempt to involve the  
SEC in matters wholly extraneous to its jurisdiction, simply to harass  
American companies who were doing business with the Arab countries, the  
only apparent reason being to find out their names so that the Israeli Lobby  
could bring pressure on them. Nonetheless, the SEC quickly got into the  
spirit of things and, among other steps, sternly warned brokerage houses  
and financial institutions not to discriminate against any particular "ethnic  
groups," nor comply with boycotts in underwriting securities.

Next, the Department of Justice filed suit against the Bechtel Corpora-  
tion and four related companies on charges of violating the federal anti-  
trust laws by cooperating with the Arab boycott in dealing with sub-  
contractors.

Suddenly, out of the blue, Arthur Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve  
Board, called for diplomatic action against the boycott and urged that if that  
fails then to consider legislation against it. How the Arab boycott affects the  
Federal Reserve and why this suddenly became important was not made  
clear by Chairman Burns.

Under intense pressure on October 6, 1976, during the presidential  
debates, President Ford ordered the Commerce Department to release the  
names of American businesses that participate in the Arab trade boycott of  
Israel (presumably so that the Israeli Lobby could boycott them).

After the names were released, the Secretary of Commerce, Eliot  
Richardson, was reported by The Wall Street Journal as saying:

The program of disclosure has helped dispel the widespread impression  
that there has been some element of discrimination against American  
companies that have Jewish personnel or Jewish ownership.

In addition, according to the department's general counsel... most  
boycott requests. involve some relatively straightforward commercial  
certifications regarding transports and origins of goods. A department  
spokesman also said that they are revising the reporting form and will  
bounce [the new questionnaire] off Jewish groups and such congres-  
sional critics of the boycott as Democratic Reps. John Moss of California  
and Benjamin Rosenthal of New York? [Emphasis supplied]

Meantime, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission filed  
sweeping "Commissioner's Charges" against Standard Oil alleging having

The biggest coup, however, came with the Treasury Department, and the  
Internal Revenue Service. Heavy pressure was exerted on Congress by the  
Israeli Lobby to include in the Tax Reform Bill of 1976 a provision  
imposing a huge tax penalty upon companies doing business abroad who  
observe the Arab boycott of Israel. The forces behind the amendment were  
led by Ze'ev Sher, economic minister of the Israeli embassy in Washington.  
In the course of the hearings on the Bill, the Ford administration properly  
warned that the action wouldn't stop the boycott and actually could hurt the

Other testimony at the committee hearings warned that this legislation  
could jeopardize the security of U.S. oil supplies in the Middle East. It was  
also opposed by others on the grounds that it was a distortion and misuse

None of this had any effect on the committee members who were  
admonished by Senator Abraham Ribicoff s (sponsor of the bill) warnings  
that the "Arab boycott had become an important political issue in the 1976  
election campaignThe Senate, in a panic and without debate, passed the  
bill overwhelmingly. The Israeli Lobby had marshaled almost every impor-  
tant federal agency but the Post Office.

U.S. News & World Report, September 27, 1976, summarizes the situa-  
tion in the House committee in these words:

What is happening, say critics of the new legislation, is that lawmakers  
are attempting to make political points in an election year by portraying  
the boycott as a vehicle for religious discrimination against those of the

Jewish faith. However, the House commerce subcommittee's study found  
that only 15 of 4,000 boycott requests examined had clauses of a religious  
or ethnic nature. Arab leaders justify their boycott as an economic  
sanction against Israel applied in the same way that the U.S. had curbed

While it may be somewhat irrelevant, it seems only fair to ask, at this  
point, where did the interests of the U.S. lie in this matter of the Arab  
boycott? As we know, the U.S. currently imports more than half of the oil  
consumed in this country. Approximately one-third of our oil imports come  
from Arab countries. As much as 90 percent of all the oil used by some of  
our allies comes from Arab countries. Our bill for foreign oil has increased  
enormously. Historically, most of the money spent by American consumers  
for petroleum products found its way into the pockets of other Americans  
in Texas, California, Oklahoma and other oil-producing states. The money  
stayed in the U.S. and both the producers and the consumers of the oil were  
part of our domestic economy, and the money spent was simply recycled  
among Americans. However, as America's oil production declines and  
imports of foreign oil increase, and at higher prices, a whole new and  
unprecedented economic factor enters the picture.

The tens of billions of dollars annually paid for foreign oil imports,  
which continues to increase year by year, no longer stays in this country—  
but is drained off mostly to the OPEC nations.

This drain, unless offset by exports to the OPEC nations and others, or  
by foreign investments in the U.S., seriously affects the American economy  
and has a significant impact on the U.S. balance of trade.

That this was a matter of indifference to the Israeli partisans is evident  
from the following report appearing in the September 12, 1977, issue of

After the Commerce Department later this month proposes regulations  
to implement the new U.S. anti-boycott law, business finally will begin  
to get a picture of the impact the legislation will have on trade with the  
Arab world. Comments now flowing into the department not only  
suggest the effects could be dramatic but also point up the continuing  
division between business and Jewish groups over the politically charged

Already, the shaky alliance between the Business Roundtable and the  
B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League that resulted in a joint statementof principles on how to deal with the boycott seems to have come  
undone. That agreement, which had collapsed during congressional  
hearings only to be quickly patched up, helped mute the debate in  
Congress and speed the passage of legislation that both sides hailed as a

Bad faith. But now, suggested regulations submitted to Congress by  
the ADL and other Jewish groups have prompted DuPont Co. Chairman  
Irving S. Shapiro, who also chairs the Roundtable, to charge the groups,

Business concerns run deeper than the tiff over the agreement. "The  
proposals would seem to demonstrate a purpose of making US. trade  
with Arab countries so difficult as to be impossible " Shapiro wrote. "We  
do not believe it to be in the national interest to choke off Arab-  
American trade" Adds the Rule of Law Committee, a group composed  
primarily of major U.S. banks and oil companies: "The overall result of  
the ADL submission, if accepted, would be the disruption or termination  
of U.S. business activities in the Arab world."

Although business and the Jewish groups diverge on a number of  
points, these issues are at the heart of the dispute. [Emphasis supplied]

Yet, heedless of the consequences to the U.S. economy, the Israeli  
partisans were not only trying to destroy trade relationships between  
American businesses and the Arab countries—but they were, at the same  
time, doing everything in their power to discourage and oppose Arab funds  
from being invested in this country. As a result, the Arab nations, tired of  
this hostility, are channeling billions of dollars (our dollars) into invest-  
ments in European and other more hospitable countries.

The Israeli Lobby has defended its actions on the grounds that it doesn't  
want Arab investment in this country because of the fear that Arabs would  
gain too much "control" of American business. The argument is a sham.  
The best thing for the U.S. would be to encourage large Arab investments  
in this country, not only because of the favorable effect on our balance of  
payments, but because the Arab countries would thereby have a much  
greater stake in American prosperity, which could have an important  
bearing upon the price of oil. Moreover, it would be the Arabs then who  
would be vulnerable to expropriation in the event of hostilities.

While the U.S. continues to insult the Arab countries, who have chosen  
to be friends of the U.S. rather than the Soviet Union, by spurning their  
investments and charging them with religious and racial discrimination, thenations of Western Europe, Germany, France, England, Italy, and also  
Japan have moved into the Middle East market and taken our place.

The warning was there for all to see. As Soliman A. Solaim, a Johns  
Hopkins graduate who served as Saudi Arabia's Minister of Commerce,

Western Europe and Japan stand ready to replace the U.S. as Saudi  
Arabia's principal trading partner should the U.S. deny this market to  
itself and in certain cases this has already happened.

The Arab position was summed up by Farouk Ashdar, General Director  
of a royal Saudi commission responsible for spending some 30 billion  
dollars in development funds, as follows:

We will not allow anyone to dictate to us how we shall conduct our  
affairs. We must make it plain. Any interference with the Arab boycott  
will negatively affect the U.S. position. We will not do business with  
companies which substantially improve the economy of our enemy.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of the matter is that the anti-  
boycott legislation seriously hurts the U.S. without in any way helping  
Israel. There is no one in or out of government, except for the Israeli  
spokesman, who feels that the anti-boycott legislation has any chance  
whatever of affecting the Arab determination to maintain the trade boycott

Thus, it was nothing but a reckless and irresponsible action by Congress,  
an ignominious yielding to political pressure and intimidation by the Israeli  
Lobby, which could not help Israel but is doing incalculable, perhaps  
irremediable, damage to the interests of the U.S.

Both Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary of the Treasury Simon  
(neither of which, we assume, is "anti-Semitic") strongly opposed the bill

We believe the effect of such pressure will harden Arab attitudes and  
potentially destroy the progress we have made.

In an article appearing in Forbes magazine, October 1, 1976, entitled  
"How to Legislate a Disaster," Forbes states that, after sampling opinions  
from both business leaders and government officials, the view was con-  
firmed that, rather than abandon the boycott, the Arabs will abandon the

Wrecking U.S. trade with the Arabs and diminishing U.S. credibility  
among the moderate Arabs would seem a strange way to help Israel.

How can something so manifestly against America's interests and the  
cause of peace, and of doubtful value, if not contrary, to Israel's own inter-  
est, have been literally railroaded through Congress?

Again, the answer is obvious; our timid lawmakers, as always, are in  
mortal fear of the Israeli Lobby. In the May 24, 1976, issue of Business  
Week magazine, an item entitled "Taking Aim at the Arab Boycott,"

Stiff legislation to discourage U.S. companies from complying with the  
Arab boycott of Israel now seems certain to become law. Key reason:  
Business opponents are afraid to work against it.

The outcome could be costly. A proposal by Senator Abraham A.  
Ribicoff (D-Conn.) to deny foreign tax credits to companies complying  
with the boycott is gaining support. It will pass unless it is blocked by  
Senate Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D-La.). At the  
very least, Congress will approve the package pressed by Senator Adlai  
E. Stevenson III (D-Ill.) requiring companies to make public any com-

Business lobbyists are staying on the sidelines. Corporate representa-  
tives and Congressional sources say the issue is too hot to handle.  
Companies are afraid they will be labeled anti-Semitic, and possibly face  
stockholder complaints if they fight anti-boycott bills. [Emphasis

So arrogant had this intimidation of Congress by the Israeli Lobby become,  
that no effort was made even to disguise it.

In reporting on the final stages of the bill's consideration, the Los Angeles

Impassioned oratory by Senator Abraham Ribicoff[[7]](#footnote-7) (D-Conn.) on behalf  
of this provision (the anti-boycott amendment)... led Senator Russell B.  
Long (D-La.) to warn that unless the Treasury Dept. and other opponents  
of the measure came up with a compromise proposal acceptable to the  
[Congressional] supporters of Israel, the entire tax bill could be scuttled,,

We have become so inured to seeing and hearing incredible things of this  
nature that the shock effect has worn off.

Senator Long, committee chairman, was actually saying, as quoted above,  
that perhaps the most important piece of legislation passed by the Congress  
in 1976 (The Tax Reform Act) affecting every person in the U.S. might be  
defeated unless a proposal acceptable to the supporters of Israel is adopted.

The economic impact on the U.S. balance of trade over the past twelve  
years by this kind of anti-Arab legislation is immeasurable.

We do know that the U.S., for various reasons including the anti-boycott  
legislation, has the largest trade imbalance in history and is now, by far, the  
worlds largest debtor nation.

An Associated Press release, dated July 9,1988, reports as follows:

britain, saudi arabia ink huge arms pact  
LONDON (AP)—Britain announced Friday it had signed its biggest-ever  
arms deal with Saudi Arabia.

A Defense Ministry statement gave no details, but official sources said  
the deal—which includes mine sweepers and some 50 Tornado fighters—  
was worth more than $17 billion. That dwarfed a $7.5 billion contract won  
by Britain in 1986 to supply Saudi Arabia with 72 Tornado fighters and  
other aircraft.

The ministry statement said the deal, signed Sunday in a memorandum  
of understanding, was a new phase of the previous contract and involved  
the supply "of additional aircraft, a construction program and specialized  
navy vessels."

The deal, a huge boost for the British armaments industry in the next  
decade, followed years of British lobbying.

Unlike the U.S. administration, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's  
government is not constrained by lawmakers protesting that weapons  
sales to Saudi Arabia may endanger or offend Israel. [Emphasis  
supplied]

In the July 25,1988, edition of Time magazine, the following item appeared:

Congressional resistance to Arab arms sales is having an increasingly  
harmful effect on U.S. diplomacy in the region. In a pair of setbacks, Saudi  
Arabia has turned to Britain for a $12 billion purchase of Tornados  
fighter-bombers and other equipment, and Kuwait has announced it will  
buy weapons from the Soviet Union. Both countries have lost arms battlesin Congress because of pressure from Israel's lobbyists. Similarly, Jordan  
is believed close to buying France's Mirage 2000. Some Arab nations are  
turning to China. Even some Israeli experts think Israel's lobby has gone  
too far in opposing the sales, because sales of U.S. arms would at least  
improve some safeguards on the use of the weapons.

Former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci estimates that the trade lost  
to the Arab countries because of the Israeli Lobby's actions exceeds 75 billion  
dollars.

THE LOBBY AND THE JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT

It is also impossible to estimate the full damage to the American farm  
economy and long-term effects on the U.S. balance of trade by the passage,  
in 1974, of the so-called Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the 1974 Trade Act,  
which was sponsored by the Israeli partisans in Congress and pushed  
through by the Israeli Lobby.

This law cut off the Russians from Export-Import Bank financing and  
denied them most favored nation tariff treatment until emigration for  
Russian Jews was made easier and substantially increased in numbers.

The Soviets reacted by sharply reducing the number of Jews allowed to  
leave and simply bought their wheat and other agricultural products from  
other countries.

Nobody explained to the American farmer why he could not sell his  
wheat, or why the American taxpayer had to buy his surplus from him and  
store it at enormous cost, or how this is related in any way to how many  
Jews emigrate from the Soviet Union.

CHAPTER VIII

Israel and the United States

The Special Relationship

O

UT OF THE combination of the activities of the Israeli Lobby  
and the effect of the "taboo," there has developed a unique  
relationship between the U.S. and Israel. It is often described by Israeli  
diplomats, and American politicians, as a "special relationship," and indeed  
it is.

Although it appears superficially to be an alliance between the U.S. and  
Israel, it is not. Not only is there no treaty of alliance between the U.S. and  
Israel, but Israel does not want one! Under the special relationship, Israel  
has all of the benefits of a formal alliance and none of the restraints or  
responsibilities of an ally. Israel determines its own foreign policy unilater-  
ally and makes no bones about it. Its policies may be regarded by the U.S.  
and the rest of the world as dangerous, or in violation of international law  
or as an "obstacle to peace"—but this does not deter Israel nor do these  
circumstances, strangely enough, have any adverse effect upon the special  
relationship with the U.S.

However, under the unwritten terms of the special relationship, the U.S.  
gives Israel its latest, most advanced, and secret weapons (often before they  
are available to our own armed forces), while Israel remains so secretive  
that it has flatly refused admittance to a committee of the U.S. Senate to  
visit its "peaceful" nuclear reactor installations at Dimona. Israel has also

refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty sponsored by the U.S.

Customarily, allies are required to respect each other's strongly held  
views in critical areas affecting international peace. Israel, however, de-  
fiantly continues to build new settlements on confiscated Arab lands on the  
West Bank despite pleas from the U.S. that these actions violate interna-  
tional law and create additional and serious obstacles to any Middle East  
peace settlement. Is it conceivable that the U.S. would tolerate conduct of  
this kind from such "allies" as Britain, Germany, or Japan?

THE MYSTERY OF THE USS LIBERTY

The first clear indication of the special nature of the relationship with  
Israel came with the notorious Israeli attack on the USS Liberty.

During the 1967 Six-Day War between Israel and Egypt, the U.S.  
electronic and intelligence research vessel Liberty was cruising in interna-  
tional waters in the Mediterranean and was suddenly attacked by Israeli  
torpedo boats and jet aircraft. The attack, which lasted almost two hours,  
killed 34 American sailors and wounded 171.

A U.S. naval court of inquiry found that the Liberty was, without  
question, in international waters; the weather was clear; the ship's identity  
plainly marked and the U.S. flag waving in the wind.

The attack was apparently ordered by Moshe Dayan to prevent the U.S.  
from intercepting Israeli messages. When the circumstances of the attack  
became known, an elaborate conspiracy of secrecy was organized from  
President Johnson on down to cover up the extent of Israel's involvement  
and to keep from the American people the deliberate nature of the Israeli  
attack.

Israel, of course, protested its innocence and promised to pay for the  
damage to the ship. But even this small reparation was not forthcoming,  
despite repeated efforts and requests by the State Department over the last  
twenty years.

The story of the intentional attack on the USS Liberty and the shameful  
efforts of the U.S. government to cover up Israel's duplicity, is told in a  
book entitled Assault on the Liberty, by the cypher officer of the USS  
Liberty, James M. Ennes, Jr., published after his retirement from the navy  
in 1980.

However, the U.S. has more than held up its end of the special  
relationship. At the beginning of the October 1973 war against Egypt,  
Israel had suffered severe losses in tanks and planes and was on the verge  
of defeat when the U.S., under Nixon and Kissinger, swiftly mounted anenormous military airlift which, according to Prime Minister Golda Meir,  
"saved Israel."

Another well-known incident of Israels indifference to, or defiance of, its  
obligations to the U.S. was reported in the April 8,1979, edition of the Los  
Angeles Times.

According to the Times, a State Department spokesman announced that  
the circumstances, scale, and duration of Israels incursion into Southern  
Lebanon, in which over one thousand (mostly civilian) casualties were  
inflicted, raises serious questions as to whether U.S. arms supplied to Israel  
were used illegally. Israel, in violation of its agreement with the U.S., used  
the latest high tech, anti-personnel (cluster) bombs which break into  
hundreds of fragments capable of massive killing.

These bombs were received by Israel from the U.S., on the condition that  
they would be used only in an all-out defensive war where Israels survival  
was at stake. The Lebanon incursion was totally offensive and many targets  
were Palestinian refugee camps.

A Los Angeles Times editorial appearing in the April 9, 1979, edition  
comments on the matter:

... the basic issue, rather is Israels violation of its agreement with the  
U.S. that was meant to control how and when the CBUs (cluster bombs)  
could be used.

This goes very much to the value and enforceability of the conditions  
that the U.S. often attaches to its arm transfers abroad and at least in the  
immediate case it goes as well to the reliability of Israel's pledges.[Emphasis supplied]

It is the irrational nature of this special relationship with Israel that our  
allies and the other nations of the world cannot comprehend. What they  
are unable to understand is that Israel decides for itself what it will and will  
not do in its relations with the rest of the world, and the U.S. provides and  
finances the military weaponry and technology necessary to support those  
policies, even though the U.S. may be in total opposition to them. If such  
Israeli policies result in war, the U.S. immediately mobilizes all available  
military equipment and weaponry, depleting in the process of its own  
critical reserves in order to give Israel whatever is necessary to achieve  
victory. It makes no difference that in doing so the U.S. may be severely  
straining the bonds between us and our allies in Western Europe and Japan  
and jeopardizing our relationship with the Arab world, not to mention  
running the grave risk of a nuclear confrontation.

After Israel's war is over, it is then the duty of the U.S., under our special  
relationship, to provide new billions of dollars' worth of the most  
sophisticated and advanced weapons available to maintain Israel's con-  
tinued defiance of the rest of the world and of the U.S. To make the  
situation even more bizarre, Israel has copied much of the advance weapons  
technology given to it by the U.S. and has been marketing it around the  
world. In effect, the U.S. has become the research and development division  
of the Israeli armament industry, which is now an important international  
arms supplier. One of its best customers is South Africa against whom the  
U.S. is trying to lead a world boycott.

OUR LEAKY FORTRESS

One of the most insidious consequences of the special relationship is the  
demoralizing effect it has had on the personnel in our State and Defense  
Departments.

The Pentagon houses most of the Department of Defense and is the core  
of American military security. Across the Potomac is the Department of  
State, the nerve center of our nation's worldwide diplomatic network.  
These buildings are channels through which flow, each day, thousands of  
messages dealing with the nation's top secrets. No one can enter either  
building without special identification or advance clearance, and all entran-  
ces are heavily guarded.

These buildings are, in effect, fortresses where the nation's most precious  
secrets are carefully guarded by the most advanced security technology.

How safe are those secrets? As far as Israel is concerned, they are an  
open book.

According to an American ambassador, who had a long career in the  
Middle East: "The leaks to Israel are fantastic. If I have something I want  
the Secretary of State to know but don't want Israel to know, I must wait  
till I have a chance to see him personally.

"It is a fact of life that everyone in authority is reluctant to put anything  
on paper that concerns Israel, if it is to be withheld from Israel's knowl-  
edge," says the Ambassador. "Nor do such people even feel free to speak in  
a crowded room of such things."

The Ambassador offers an example from his own experience. He had  
received a call from a friend in the Jewish community who wanted to warn  
him, as a friend, that all details of a lengthy document on Middle East  
policy, that he had just dispatched overseas, were out. The document wasclassified "top secret," the diplomat recalls. "I didn't believe what he said, so  
my friend read me every word of it over the phone."

In the view of this diplomatic source, leaks to pro-Israel activists are not  
only pervasive throughout the two departments but "are intimidating and  
very harmful to our national interests." He says that, because of the ever-  
present Xerox machine, diplomats proceed on the assumption that even  
messages they send by the most secure means will be copied and passed on  
to eager hands. "We just don't dare put sensitive items on paper." A factor  
making the pervasive insecurity even greater is the knowledge that leaks of  
secrets to Israel, even when noticed—which is rare—are never investigated.

Whatever intelligence the Israelis want, whether political or technical,  
they obtain promptly and without cost at the source. Officials, who  
normally would work vigilantly to protect our national interest by  
identifying leaks and bringing charges against the offenders, are demoral-  
ized. In fact, they are disinclined even to question Israel's tactics for fear this  
activity will cause the Israeli Lobby to mark them as trouble-makers and  
take measures to nullify their efforts, or even harm their careers.

The Lobby's intelligence network, having numerous volunteer "friend-  
lies" to tap, reaches all parts of the executive branch where matters  
concerning Israel are handled. Awareness of this seepage keeps officials—  
whatever rung of the ladder they occupy—from making or even proposing  
decisions that are in the U.S. interest.

If, for example, an official should indicate opposition to an Israeli request  
during a private interdepartmental meeting—or, worse still, put it in an  
intraoffice memorandum—he or she must assume that this information  
will soon reach the Israeli embassy, either directly or through AIPAC. Soon  
after, the official should expect to be mentioned by name critically when the  
Israeli ambassador visits the secretary of state or other prominent U.S.  
official.

The penetration is all the more remarkable, because much of it is carried  
out by U.S. citizens on behalf of a foreign government. The practical effect  
is to give Israel its own network of sources through which it is able to learn  
almost anything it wishes about decisions or resources of the U.S.  
government. When making procurement demands, Israel can display better  
knowledge of Defense Department inventories than the Pentagon itself.

Richard Helms, Director of the CIA during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war,  
recalls an occasion when an Israeli army request had been filled with the  
wrong items. Israeli officials resubmitted the request complete with all the  
supposedly top-secret code numbers and a note to Helms that said the

Pentagon perhaps had not understood exactly which items were needed. "It  
was a way for them to show me that they knew exactly what they wanted,"  
Helms said. Helms believes that during this period no important secret was  
kept from Israel.

Not only are the Israelis adept at getting the information they want—  
they are masters at the weapons procurement game. A former deputy  
assistant secretary of defense, who is a specialist in Middle East policy,  
recalls Israeli persistence:

They would never take no for an answer. They never gave up. These  
emissaries of a foreign government always had a shopping list of wanted  
military items, some of them high technology that no other nation  
possessed, some of it secret devices that gave the United States an edge  
over any adversary. Such items were not for sale, not even to the nations  
with whom we have our closest, most formal military alliance—like  
those linked to us through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. [Em-  
phasis supplied]

He learned that military sales to Israel were not bound by the guidelines  
and limitations which govern U.S. arms supply policy elsewhere. He says,  
"Sales to Israel were different—very different."

This Department of Defense official has vivid memories of a military  
liaison officer from the Israeli embassy who called at the Defense  
Department and requested approval to purchase a military item, which was  
on the prohibited list because of its highly secret advanced technology. "He  
came to me, and I gave him the official Pentagon reply. I said, Tm sorry,  
sir, but the answer is no. We will not release that technology.' "

The Israeli officer took pains to observe the bureaucratic courtesies and  
not antagonize lower officials who might devise ways to block the sale. He  
said, "Thank you very much, if that's your official position. We understand  
that you are not in a position to do what we want done. Please don't feel  
bad, but we're going over your head." And that, of course, meant he was  
going to the office of the secretary of defense, or perhaps even to the White  
House. Yet this Department of Defense official has high respect for the  
efficiency of Israeli procurement officers:

You have to understand that the Israelis operate in the Pentagon very  
professionally, and in an omnipresent way. They have enough of their  
people who understand our system well, and they have made friends atall levels, from top to bottom. They just interact with the system in a  
constant, continuous way that keeps the pressure on.

The Carter White House tried to establish a policy of restraint. Zbigniew  
Brzezinski, Carters assistant for national security, remembers in an  
interview Defense Secretary Harold Brown's efforts to hold the line on  
technology transfer. "He was very tough with Israel on its requests for  
weapons and weapons systems. He often turned them down." But that was  
not the final word. For example, Brzezinski cites as the most notable  
example Brown's refusal to sell Israel the controversial anti-personnel  
weapon known as the cluster bomb. Despite written agreements restricting  
the use of these bombs, Israel used them twice against populated areas in  
Lebanon, causing death and injury to many civilians. Brown responded by  
refusing to sell the deadly replacements. But even on that request, Israel  
eventually prevailed. President Reagan reversed the Carter administration  
policy, and cluster bombs were returned to the approved list.

Others who have occupied high positions in the executive branch have  
been willing to speak candidly (but only with the promise of anonymity) on  
the astounding process through which the Israeli Lobby is able to penetrate  
the defenses at the Defense Department—and elsewhere.

An official recalls one day receiving a list of military equipment Israel  
wanted to purchase. Noting that "the Pentagon is Israel's stop and shop,' "  
he took it for granted that the Israelis had obtained clearances. So he  
followed usual procedure by circulating it to various Pentagon offices for

One office instantly returned the list to me with a note: "One of these  
items is so highly classified you have no right to know that it even  
exists." I was instructed to destroy all copies of the request and all  
references to the particular code numbers. I didn't know what it was. It  
was some kind of electronic jamming equipment, top secret. Somehow  
the Israelis knew about it and acquired its precise specifications, cost and  
top secret code number. This meant they had penetrated our research  
and development labs, our most sensitive facilities? [Emphasis supplied]

Despite that worrisome revelation, no official effort was launched to  
discover who had revealed the sensitive information.

Israel's agents are close students of the U.S. system and work it to their  
advantage. Besides obtaining secret information by clandestine operations,  
they apply open pressure on executive branch offices thoroughly andeffectively. A weapons expert says the embassy knows exactly when things  
are scheduled for action:

It stays on top of things as does no other embassy in town. They know  
your agenda, what was on your schedule yesterday, and what's on it today  
and tomorrow. They know what you have been doing and saying. They  
know the law and regulations backwards and forwards. They know when  
the deadlines are.

He admires the resourcefulness of the Israelis in applying pressure:

They may leak to Israeli newspapers details of their difficulty in getting  
an approval. A reporter will come in to State or Defense and ask a series  
of questions so detailed they could be motivated only by Israeli officials.  
Sometimes the pressure will come, not from reporters, but from AIPAC.

If things are really hung up, it isn't long before letters or calls start  
coming from Capitol Hill. They'll ask, "Why is the Pentagon not  
approving this item?" Usually, the letter is from the Congressman in  
whose district the item is manufactured. He will argue that the re-  
quested item is essential to Israel's security. He probably will also ask,  
"Who is this bad guy in the Pentagon—or State—who is blocking this  
approval? I want his name. Congress would like to know." [Emphasis  
supplied]

The American defense expert pauses to emphasize his point: "No  
bureaucrat, no military officer likes to be singled out by anybody from  
Congress and required to explain his professional duty." He recalls an  
episode involving President Carter's Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown:

I remember once Israel requested an item on the prohibited list. Before  
I answered, I checked with Secretary Brown and he said, "No, absolutely  
no. We're not going to give in to the bastards on this one." So I said no.

Lo and behold, a few days later I got a call from Brown. He said, "The  
Israelis are raising hell. I got a call from [Senator Henry] 'Scoop'Jackson,  
asking why we aren't cooperating with Israel. It isn't worth it. Let it go."

This attitude sometimes causes official restrictions on sharing of infor-  
mation to be modified or conveniently forgotten. As one defense official  
puts it, the rules get "placed deeper and deeper into the file.":

A sensitive document is picked up by an Israeli officer while his friend,  
a Defense Department official, deliberately looks the other way. Nothingis said. Nothing is written. And the U.S. official probably does not feel  
he has done anything wrong. Meanwhile the Israelis ask for more and  
more.

During the tenure of Atlanta Major Andrew Young, as U.S. Ambassador  
to the U.N. during the Carter administration, Young recalls, "I operated on  
the assumption that the Israelis would learn just about everything instantly.  
I just always assumed that everything was monitored, and that there was a  
pretty formal network."

Young resigned as Ambassador in August 1979, after it was revealed that  
he had met with Zuhdi Terzi, the PLO's U.N. observer, in violation of  
Kissingers pledge to Israel not to talk to the PLO. Press reports on Young's  
episode said Israeli intelligence learned of the meeting and that Israeli  
officials then leaked the information to the press, precipitating the diplo-  
matic wrangle which led to Young's resignation.

Israel denied that its agents had learned of the Young-Terzi meeting. The  
press counselor at the Israeli embassy went so far as to tell the Washington  
Star, "We do not conduct any kind of intelligence activities in the U.S." This  
denial must have been amusing to U.S. intelligence experts, one of whom  
talked with Newsweek magazine about Mossad's (Israel's Foreign Intelli-  
gence Agency) activities here: "They have penetrations all through the U.S.  
government. They do better than the KGB," said the expert, whom the  
magazine did not identify. The Newsweek article continued:

With the help of American Jews in and out of government, Mossad looks  
for any softening in U.S. support and tries to get any technical intelli-  
gence the administration is unwilling to give to Israel.

"Mossad can go to any distinguished American Jew and ask for his  
help," says a former CIA agent. The appeal is a simple one: "When the  
call went out and no one heeded it, the Holocaust resulted."

The U.S. tolerates Mossad's operations on American soil partly  
because of reluctance to anger the American Jewish community. [Em-  
phasis supplied]

Penetration by Israel continued at such a high level that a senior State  
Department official who has held the highest career positions related to the  
Middle East confides, "I urged several times that the U.S. quit trying to keep  
secrets from Israel. Let them have everything. They always get what they  
want anyway. When we try to keep secrets, it always backfires."

An analysis prepared by the CIA in 1979, entitled "Israel: Foreign  
Intelligence and Security Services," demonstrates how the U.S. continues to

In carrying out its mission to collect positive intelligence, the principal  
function of Mossad is to conduct agent operations against the Arab  
nations and their official representatives and installations throughout the

world, particularly in Western Europe and the United States

Objectives in Western countries are equally important (as in the  
U.S.S.R. and East Europe) to the Israeli intelligence service. Mossad  
collects intelligence regarding Western, Vatican and U.N. policies toward  
the Near East; promotes arms deals for the benefit of the IDF, and  
acquires data for silencing anti-Israel factions in the WestP [Emphasis

Under "methods of operation," the CIA booklet describes the way in  
which Mossad makes use of domestic pro-Israeli groups. It states that  
"Mossad over the years has enjoyed some rapport with highly-placed  
persons and government offices in every country of importance to Israel."  
It adds, "Within Jewish communities in almost every country of the world,  
there are Zionists and other sympathizers who render strong support to

Such contacts are carefully nurtured and serve as channels for informa-  
tion, deception material, propaganda, and other purposes Mossad

activities are generally conducted through Israeli official and semiofficial

The Israeli intelligence service depends heavily on the various Jewish  
communities and organizations abroad for recruiting agents and eliciting  
general information. The aggressively ideological nature of Zionism,  
which emphasizes that all Jews belong to Israel and must return to Israel,  
has had its drawbacks in enlisting support for intelligence operations,  
however, since there is considerable opposition to Zionism among Jews

Aware of this fact, Israeli intelligence representatives usually operate  
discreetly within Jewish communities and are under instructions to  
handle their missions with utmost tact to avoid embarrassment to Israel.  
They also attempt to penetrate anti-Zionist elements in order to neutral-

The theft of scientific data is a major objective of Mossad operations,  
which is often attempted by trying to recruit local agents. The CIA report  
continues:

In addition to the large-scale acquisition of published scientific papers  
and technical journals from all over the world through overt channels,  
the Israelis devote a considerable portion of their covert operations to  
obtaining scientific and technical intelligence. This had included attempts  
to penetrate certain classified defense projects in the U.S. and other  
Western nations.

Leaks of classified information remain a major problem for policy-  
makers. One official says that during the Carter administration his col-  
leagues feared to speak up even in small private meetings. When Israeli  
requests were turned down at top secret interagency meetings, "the Israeli  
military attache, the political officer, or the ambassador—or all of them at  
once—were lodging protests within hours. They knew exactly who said  
what, even though nothing had been put on paper." He adds, "No one  
needs trouble like that."

He says that the assistant secretary of defense for international security  
affairs was often subjected to pressure. Frequently the Israeli embassy  
would demand copies of documents that were still in the draft stage and  
had not reached his desk.

To strike back at government officials considered to be unsympathetic to  
Israeli needs, the Israeli Lobby singles them out for personal attack and  
even the wrecking of their careers. In January 1977, a broad-scale purge was  
attempted immediately after the inauguration of President Carter. The  
perpetrator was Senator Richard Stone of Florida, a Democrat, a passionate  
supporter of Israel. When he was newly installed as Chairman of the Senate  
Subcommittee on the Middle East, he brought along with him a "hit list"  
on a call at the White House. In his view, fifteen officials were not  
sufficiently supportive of Israel and its weapon needs, and he wanted them  
transferred to positions where their views would create no problems for  
Israel. Marked for removal were William Quandt, Brzezinski's assistant for  
Middle East matters, and Les Janka, who had served on the National  
Security Council under Ford. The others were career military officers, most  
of them colonels. Stone's demands were rejected by Brzezinski and, accord-  
ing to a senior White House official, "after pressing reasonably hard forseveral days," the senator gave up. Although unsuccessful, his demands  
caused a stir. One officer says, "I find it very ironic that a U.S. Senator goes  
to a U.S. President's National Security Advisor and tells him to fire  
Americans for insufficient loyalty to another country

Admiral Thomas Moorer recalls a dramatic example of Israeli Lobby  
power from his days as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. At the time  
of the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, Modecai Gur, the defense attache at the Israeli  
embassy, who later became commander-in-chief of Israeli forces, came to  
Moorer demanding that the U.S. provide Israel with aircraft equipped with  
a high technology air-to-surface anti-tank missile called the Maverick. At  
the time, the U.S. had only one squadron so equipped. Moorer recalls telling  
Gur:

I can't let you have those aircraft. We have just one squadron. Besides,  
we've been testifying before the Congress convincing them we need this  
equipment. If we gave you our only squadron, Congress would raise hell  
with us.

"Do you know what he said? Gur told me, 'You get us the planes; I'll take  
care of Congress.' " Moorer pauses, then adds, "And he did." America's only  
squadron equipped with Mavericks went to Israel.

Moorer, now a senior counselor at the Georgetown University Center for  
Strategic and International Studies, says he strongly opposed the transfer—  
but was overruled by "political expediency at the presidential level." He  
notes President Richard Nixon was then in the throes of Watergate. But,  
he adds:

I've never seen a President—I don't care who he is—stand up to them  
[the Israelis]. It just boggles your mind.

They always get what they want. The Israelis know what is going on  
all the time. I got to the point where I wasn't writing anything down.

If the American people understood what a grip those people have got  
on our government, they would rise up in arms. Our citizens don't have  
any idea what goes on. [Emphasis supplied]

Jewish groups in the U.S. are often pressed into service to soften up the  
Secretary of State and other officials, especially in advance of a visit to the  
U.S. by the Israeli prime minister. A senior defense official explains, "Israel  
would always have a long shopping list for the prime minister to take up.

We would decide which items were worth making into an issue and which  
were not. We would try to work things out in advance." There was the  
constant concern that the prime minister might take an arms issue straight  
to the President, and the tendency was to clear the agenda of everything  
possible.

On one such occasion, Ed Sanders, President Carter's adviser on Jewish  
affairs, brought a complaint to the National Security Council offices: "I'm  
getting a lot of flack from Jewish congressmen on the ALQ 95-J. What is  
this thing? And why are we being so nasty about it? Shouldn't we let Israel  
have it? The President is getting a lot of abuse because the Pentagon won't  
turn it loose." It was a high technology radar jamming device, and soon it  
was approved for shipment to Israel.

In advance of Carter's decisions to provide a high technology missile to  
Israel, a procession of Jewish groups came, one after another to say:

Please explain to us why the Pentagon is refusing to sell AIM 9-L  
missiles to Israel. Don't you know what this means? This missile is  
necessary so the Israelis will be able to shoot down the counterpart  
missile on the Mig 21 which carries the Eight Ball 935.

A former high-ranking official in security affairs cites the intimidating  
effect of this procession on career specialists:

When you have to explain your position day after day, week after week,  
to American Jewish groups—first, say, from Kansas City, then Chicago,  
then East Overshoe—you see what you are up against. These are people  
from different parts of the country, but they come in with the very same  
information, the same set of questions, the same criticism.

They know what you have done even in private meetings. They will  
say, "Mr. Smith, we understand that in interagency meetings, you fre-  
quently take a hard line against technology transfers to Israel. We'd like  
you to explain yourself[Emphasis supplied]

Jewish groups in turn press Capitol Hill into action:

We'll get letters from Congressmen: "We need an explanation. We're  
hearing from constituents that Israel's security is threatened by the  
refusal of the Pentagon to release the AIM 9-L missile. Please, Mr.  
Secretary, can you give me your rationale for the refusal?"

Every official of prominence in the State and Defense departments  
proceeds on the assumption—and certainty—that at least once a week he  
will have to deal with a group from the Jewish community. One of them  
summarizes:

One has to keep in mind the constant character of this pressure. The  
public affairs staff of the Near East bureau in the State Department  
figures it will spend about 75 percent of its time dealing with Jewish  
groups. Hundreds of such groups get appointments in the executive  
branch each year. [Emphasis supplied]

In acting to influence U.S. policy in the Middle East, the Israeli Lobby has  
the field virtually to itself. Other interest groups and individuals who might  
provide some measure of counterbalancing pressure have only begun to get  
organized.

THE POLLARD SPY CASE

For many years, the penetration of our Defense and State Departments'  
secrets by the Israelis has been denied vigorously and dismissed as prepos-  
terous, until the sensational Pollard spy case was broken.

Pollard, a Jewish American citizen, was caught in 1987 after a long  
record of espionage activities on behalf of Israel. He was captured just as he  
was entering the Israeli embassy in Washington seeking refuge. He and his  
wife were convicted of espionage and he was sentenced to life in prison.

The American Jewish community's reaction was of horror and embar-  
rassment. The Israeli government passed it off as a "rogue operation"  
which the Israeli government, they swore, did not know anything about.  
This was too much for almost anyone in the U.S. Jewish community to  
swallow.

Henry Siegman, the Executive Director of the American Jewish Con-  
gress, summed up his reaction in these words, published in the Los Angeles  
Times:

The Pollard spy scandal has played itself out as a tragedy in three acts:  
stupidity, arrogance and cover-up.

When the information about Israeli spying against the U.S. first came  
to light it was seen as unbelievably stupid. It was difficult to imagine  
what conceivable gain would justify jeopardizing the massive economic  
and military support that Israel receives from the U.S.

Then came Act 2 as we watched in disbelief the rewarding of thoseresponsible for what Israel has insisted was an illicit operation. Nothing  
but arrogance could account for what appeared as Israel's nose thumbing  
at America's sense of a friend betrayed. One of the spy masters received  
a fat job as head of a major government enterprise, the other was  
promoted to the command of Israel's second largest air force base, since  
in the real world rogues are not rewarded.\* [Emphasis supplied]

Joseph Jaffee, who is the foreign editor and columnist of the Suddeutsche  
Zeitung in Munich, in an article reprinted in the Los Angeles Times,  
explains his reactions:

Many American Jews have given vent to anxieties thought to be safely  
buried. We've had it so good in America and now there is Jonathan  
Pollard (like the Rosenbergs decades ago) to provide the goyim with  
their best ammunition against us—"the dual loyalty" smear. In Israel, on  
the other hand, widespread shame and anger directed at the government  
has been mixed with defiance toward the American Jewish Commun-  
ity [Emphasis supplied]

He adds that, instead of cringing, American Jews should draw comfort  
from the fact that they will not be held accountable for the stupidities of  
Israel's government, which has added cowardice to chutzpah, in the han-  
dling of Pollard and the aftermath.

Hyman Bookbinder, special representative in Washington for the Amer-  
ican Jewish Committee, and other Jewish leaders have called the Pollard  
case the most serious breach ever between Israel and America and its six  
million Jews. The following are excerpts from an article appearing in the  
Los Angeles Times by Richard B. Straus datelined Washington:

Some call it the Teflon country, but Israel, like the U.S. President  
associated with the term, finds the going sticky these days.

First came the Iran arms scandal. Although the Tower Commission  
went to great lengths to differentiate between Israeli involvement and  
ultimate American responsibility for decision-making, the impression  
lingers that Israelis pushed and prodded the Reagan Administration into  
disaster. As Vice President George Bush was quoted as saying to the  
commission, "We were in the grips of the Israelis." Even an Administra-  
tion official considerably more sympathetic to Israel than Bush, Secretary  
of State George P. Shultz, expressed concern about Israel promoting  
interests not coincidental with the U.S.

But now the Israelis find themselves on the receiving end of some of  
the harshest criticism in recent years from those very same congressional  
friends—and the issue is not Iran-related. The trouble is the notorious  
spy case involving Jonathan Jay Pollard. When the former U.S. Navy  
Department analyst with high-level security clearance was nabbed last  
year passing classified information to Israel, the Israeli government  
disclaimed all responsibility, claiming that Pollard's activities were part

Things have not turned out that way. First, the smuggled intelligence  
data turned out to be extremely sensitive. Second, two Israelis behind this  
"rogue operation" were promoted rather than punished by the Israeli

Most important, Pollard-related events have ignited a growing storm  
of outrage from Israel's most important backers—Congress and the

If, as one congressman complained, the promotion of Pollard's Israeli  
handlers "rubbed our noses into it," American Jewish leaders were in  
an even less enviable position. A group of them visiting Israel last  
week made their displeasure unmistakably clear and unexpectedly

But instead of chastening their Israeli hosts, the American Jewish  
leaders' remarks only prompted more tough talk from Jerusalem. Said  
one well-connected official, "It is very wrong for the American Jewish  
community to go as far as it did. You don't put Israel on trial because a  
few people have been accused." Other Israelis went even further, accus-  
ing American Jews of responding harshly because of their fears of being  
accused of dual loyalty. The respected Israeli political theorist Shlomo  
Avinieri told an Israeli newspaper that "American Jews, despite their  
material success and intellectual achievements, fear they may not be seen

As the internecine battle raged, American Jews, who within the last  
decade have attained important posts in the U.S. foreign-policy bureau-  
cracy, have begun to join the angry chorus. They charge that their views,  
not their identities, were being compromised. Said one Jewish State  
Department official, "What Pollard shows is not that Jews, but Israel is

In many ways, the Israeli government's arrogance is the human response  
to the years of blind support by a highly activist part of the American

Jewish community for anything Israel does, even if it ultimately hurts Israel.  
Israel "right or wrong," is wrong for everybody.

Alexander Cockburn, columnist for Nation, in the March 18, 1987,  
edition of The Wall Street Journal expresses his views of the matter:

American Jews nervously ponder the fact that other spies for Israel may  
be brought to book and fear the revival of the old charges of "dual

They have sent a high-level delegation to Israel to impress upon that  
country's government the delicacy of the situation and the damage  
inflicted on U.S.-Israeli relations. They and others have asked how it is  
that the Israeli government could have acted with such careless arro-  
gance, first to enter into such a relationship with Pollard and finally to  
promote the two men identified as Pollard's senior Israeli handlers,

The answer is simple enough. Israel as represented by its recent  
governments, has acted with careless arrogance because it had every  
reason to believe that its carelessness would be unchecked and its

So it had nothing to do with the loaded phrase "dual loyalty" to say  
that the furious resistance among many of Israel's admirers in this  
country to any criticism or any act of any Israeli government in recent  
times has inevitably fostered in the minds of many Israeli officials the  
notion that they can get away with anything.

Fortified by their "yes men" here, Israeli officials no doubt conceived  
that they would remain immune from sanctions concerning such activ-  
ities as the bombing of the U.S. intelligence ship, Liberty, continued  
occupation of the territories, illegal settlements, sabotage of any realistic  
peace process, invasion of Lebanon, bombing of Tunis, and so forth.

The lesson, however, is never learned. Some Israelis are lashing out  
bitterly at U.S.Jews for failing to stand up for the Pollards and have started  
a "Citizens for Pollard" fund to free them. A strongly-worded letter from  
an American Jewish physician was published in the September 8, 1987,  
edition of the Jerusalem Post, which is critical of American secular Jews.

Legal opinion offers no hope for the Pollards. The answer has to be  
political. Jewish citizens of the U.S., must impress upon their political

leaders the need for an independent, impartial tribunal to re-evaluate the  
case without resort to secret briefs and frenzied appearances by State  
Department representatives. It is just possible that without the hysteria,  
an independent court will see the truth of the case and finally free these  
two individuals whose main crime was Jewish patriotism.

Hyman Bookbinder, in the March 30, 1988, edition of Time magazine,  
has replied bluntly, "Pollard is a criminal found guilty in our system of  
justice, it's as simple as that. If it was perceived in America that we had  
come to the defense of Pollard our credibility as a Jewish community would  
be down to zero overnight and Israel would be the loser."

In Washington, the staunchly pro-Israel New Republic called the Jerus-  
alem government behavior, in the Pollard affair, "morally unworthy and  
politically stupid"—adding that "if the smart asses in the corridors of Israeli  
power think that Israel is a 'Teflon nation,' they may be in for a shockZ\*

As we have said, the fault does not lie entirely with the Israelis. For many  
years they have led a teflon existence. The political cowardice of the U.S.  
government, in the face of provocation after provocation, has emboldened  
the Israeli government to think that they could do what they pleased and  
the "special relationship" and the Israeli Lobby would protect them from  
any accounting for their actions. They have become addicted to teflon. The  
Likud government's attitude toward the U.S. and the Jewish community in  
this country is best described as a "patronizing contempt."

THE ISRAELI LOBBY AND "DUAL LOYALTY"

So-called "dual loyalty" is not an issue here. Whether or not it exists and,  
if so, to what extent, is extraneous to the purposes of this book.

If a charge is to be made against the Israeli Lobby in this respect, it is

If Harkabi and others are right when they say that the "Friends of Israel"  
(a term which AIPAC uses when referring to its constituents) are not true  
friends of the Israeli people; that they have failed in their duty to speak out  
against the abuses of the Likud government; that they have misled the  
Israeli people and caused them to believe that America supported the  
disastrous policies of the Likud with respect to the occupied territories; and  
that these false friends are responsible for the catastrophe which Harkabi  
feels may overcome Israel, to whom, then, is the Israeli Lobby's loyalty

George Ball does not exaggerate when he said on the "60 Minutes"interview (see Chapter VII) that the Israeli Lobby has "done an enormous  
job of corrupting the American democratic process."

This is not to say that the motives which prompted and underlay the  
activities of the Lobby are "corrupt," or that there is anything inherently  
wrong in these activities as they view them.

There are many rationalizations for the zeal with which the Israeli Lobby  
pursues its objectives—"the end justifies the means"—"there are only six  
million of us and 200 million of them," and the ever-present spectre of the  
Holocaust. Jewish fears (often to the point of paranoia) must be recognized

However, the concern, which is central to the thesis of this book, is that  
these fears are being exploited and tragically misdirected by the Israeli  
Lobby, which is responsible for the strange attitude of the American Jewish  
community of "non-involvement in Israel's internal affairs." In the mean-  
time, the real dangers are being ignored.

As will be discussed in subsequent chapters, the Lobby's activities and its  
blind and uncritical attitude toward the Likud government has brought

It is often said that Israel is the earthly embodiment of the spirit of the  
Jewish people; and that the fate of the Diaspora is bound up with the fate  
of Israel. How, then, can the Jewish establishment in America take the  
attitude that it is "not our concern how Israel is governed?"

American Jewry not only have the right but the obligation to become  
involved with the fate of Israel before it is too late. While there is still time,  
the Lobby ought to use its power and influence to lobby the Knesset. Let it  
use its abundant campaign funds to support and elect candidates to defeat  
the Likud government. Never before has the need been so great for the  
moral support of the American Jewish community on behalf of the voices

In an article appearing in the Jerusalem Post, December 31, 1988,  
edition, "The Diaspora's Right to Intervene," Henry Siegman, Executive  
Vice President of the American Jewish Congress, provides the answer to  
the mystery of the strange reluctance of American Jews to become actively  
involved in Israel's fate—they are intimidated by the political ploy of the  
Likud government which shouts down any attempt by American Jews to  
offer constructive criticism by accusing them of "collaboration with Israel's  
enemies." Any bona fide efforts for peace coming from the Diaspora are  
rejected as "outrageous interference in the internal affairs of Israel."

This Likud technique is as effective in silencing Jewish criticism from the

Diaspora as the "anti-Semitic" charge is in stifling Gentile expressions of  
opinion. Since everybody is either a Jew or a Gentile, the Likud cleverly  
makes itself immune to any outside criticism.

The Israeli Lobby's party line, that there should be no criticism of Israel  
from American Jews, is no surprise since the Likud is the Lobby's client, to  
which the Lobby's loyalty is obviously pledged.

Siegman claims that, were the Labor government in power and negotiat-  
ing to exchange land for peace, the Likud would "not hesitate for a fraction  
of a moment to seek Diaspora Jewry intervention including appeals to U.S.

They would do so despite their insistence today that to invoke such  
outside intervention constitutes outrageous interference in the internal  
affairs of Israel. And I would understand and accept their actions in those  
circumstances, for they would be acting out of a genuine conviction that  
they are preventing Israel's dissolution. What I do not accept is their  
unwillingness to grant to those who disagree with them as to where  
Israel's real security lies the Jewish legitimacy that they arrogantly claim

The revelation that the survival of Israel is being held hostage to the

In the same article, Siegman points out that the time has now come for  
the Diaspora to play a new and vital role and that the responsibilities of  
American Jewry have now changed dramatically in the face of the new  
challenges. These, he says, are of a quite different nature for American

Now, however, a new situation has been created, for the goal is no longer  
outlasting the Arabs. At least half of Israel—half its government, half its  
people and considerably more than half its military experts—has con-  
cluded that to do nothing may invite disaster. Israel's security and  
survival, according to this view, now depend not on maintaining the  
status quo but on changing it. Maintaining American Jewish unity in  
support of the status quo has thus become a politically irrelevant goal  
insofar as Israel's security and survival are concerned—if those who see  
the status quo as Israel's deadliest enemy are correct.

American Jewry has thus entered a new and terribly unsettling phase  
in which the old slogans have become irrelevant. Unity is hardly an end

in itself. Inevitably, American Jews who care passionately about Israel's  
survival must deal with the substance of the issues, and cannot satisfy  
themselves with "maintaining Jewish unity" if that unity serves to  
perpetuate the status quo. If the status quo were, in fact, to lead to Israel's  
undoing, it would be scant comfort for American Jews to point out that  
at least they preserved Jewish unity—while Israel went down the tube!

There are some who maintain that despite these changes American  
Jews—for a variety of reasons—have no moral right to interfere in  
questions that affect Israel's security. In real life, however, Jews who care  
passionately about Israel will seek to influence what happens there  
precisely on issues that affect its existence, because their conscience and  
guts will not permit them not to. They will not stop to ask whether there  
exists theoretical justification for their intervention; their deep caring is,  
for them, sufficient cause.

American Jews no longer enjoy the luxury that they once had of  
avoiding policy debates on Israel which might detract from their central  
preoccupation with the maintenance of a united political front in the  
U.S. Given the new realities in Israel, it could hardly be otherwise. If  
Israelis are deeply divided over what policies serve their country's well-  
being and, indeed, its very survival, those divisions will inevitably be  
reflected in the life of American Jewry as well, [Emphasis supplied]

CHAPTER IX

American Jewry  
and Free Speech

F

ROM THE foregoing chapters, the reader would be justified in  
assuming that the extensive and superbly organized Israeli Lobby,  
jointly with AIPAC, speak for the entire American Jewish community.

Fortunately, this is not true but, nevertheless, they pretend to so speak  
and succeed in this pretension only because open dissent in the American  
Jewish community is not allowed. Any breaking ranks or public disagree-  
ment with the policies of the Likud government is considered equivalent to  
"treason."

The government of Israel gives high priority to maintaining a show of  
unity among U.S. Jews. This unity is regarded as a main line of Israel's  
defense—second in importance only to the Israeli army—and essential to  
retaining the support Israel must have from the U.S. government.

It is scarcely believable, but the average American Jew is subject to more  
restraints on what opinions he can express publicly about the Israeli  
government's policies than a non-Jew. More importantly, the penalties for  
violating these rules are drastic. The Gentile may have to endure the  
consequences of the charge of "anti-Semitism," but the Jewish dissenter in  
America is "exiled." An Israeli Jew is free to write or say things for which  
an American Jew would be ostracized. Few Jews are foolhardy enough to  
break ranks, no matter how strong their opinions.

The Jewish community is, of course, united in their support of the State  
of Israel but this does not mean that the Israeli government's actions or  
policies are approved by all, or even most, Jews. However, the Jewish  
establishment insists that what must be avoided, at all costs, is the  
appearance of "disunity." In its efforts to quell criticism, the Israeli Lobby's  
first goal is to still Jewish critics. In this quest it receives strong support

Therefore, for an individual Jew to speak out against the Israeli  
government is unthinkable—the Jewish version of hara-kiri. The Jewish  
community, as is true of many ethnic groups, is socially and businesswise  
relatively close and cohesive. There are many interwoven and interdepend-  
ent relationships which must be maintained and Israel has served, for many  
years, as a great unifier of the Jewish people and a focal point for Jewish

Many major social events revolve around fund-raising campaigns for  
various Israeli causes. Exclusive social gatherings are often held to meet  
some special dignitary from Israel. Jewish clubs are demanding on the  
allegiance of their membership to the Jewish establishment. An ill-chosen  
or too frank a remark can cause a total loss of status in the community.

This artificial unity, however, has been self-defeating and has caused  
great damage to Israel. As Harkabi says, the Likud has stayed in power only  
by convincing the Israeli people that American Jewry is behind them 100  
percent. This has created the bizarre situation where it appears that  
approximately 50 percent of Jews in Israel support the Likud, while nearly

This, of course, can only happen because the Likud cannot control free

In his courageous book entitled They Dare To Speak Out, former  
Congressman Paul Findley recalls an event involving his friend, Phil

The world was horrified when it learned of the massacre of hundreds of

civilians in the Sabra and Shatila Palestinian camps at Beirut. After four

months of silence, Klutznick spoke at a luncheon in New York in

February 1983. He launched a new crusade, pleading for the right of Jews

We cannot be one in our need for each other, and be separated in our  
ability to speak or write the truth as each of us sees it. The real

strength of Jewish life has been its sense of commitment and  
willingness to fight for the right [to dissent] even among ourselves.

In November, Klutznick took his crusade to Jerusalem, attending,  
along with forty other Jews from the U.S. and fifteen other countries, a  
four-day meeting of the International Center for Peace in the Middle  
East. Klutznick drew applause when he told his audience, which included  
several Israelis: "If you listen to us when we speak good of Israel, then  
you must listen to us when we speak ill. Otherwise we will lose our  
credibility, and the American government will not listen to us at all."

Despite his proven commitment to Israel, his leadership in the Jewish  
community, and his unquestioned integrity, Philip Klutznick was  
rejected or scorned by many of his establishment contemporaries. Two  
professionals in the Jewish Lobby community, for example, say simply  
that Klutznick is not listened to any longer. One of them adds sadly, "I  
admire Phil Klutznick, but he is virtually a non-person in the Jewish  
community." The other is harsh and bitter, linking Klutznick with other  
critics of the Israeli government as "an enemy of the Jewish people."

Charles Fishbein, for 11 years a fundraiser and executive of the Jewish  
National Fund, provides a partial explanation for the treatment Klutz-

When you speak up in the Jewish community without a proper forum,  
you are shunted aside. You are dismissed as one who has been "gotten  
to." It's nonsense, but it is effective. The Jewish leaders you hear about  
tend to be very very wealthy givers. Some give to Jewish causes  
primarily as an investment, to establish a good business and social  
relationship. Such people will not speak up for a non-conformist like  
Klutznick for fear of jeopardizing their investment.

These thoughts echo that of Klutznick himself: "Try to understand.  
See it from their standpoint. Why should they go public? They don't  
want any trouble. They are part of the community. They have neighbors.  
They help out. They contribute." He pauses, purses his lips a bit, then  
adds, "They have standing. And they want to keep it."

Klutznick smiles. "They say to me, 'You are absolutely right in what  
you say and do, but I can't. I can't stand up as you do.' "

In private, however, many American Jews hold positions in sharp  
disagreement with official Israeli policies. A 1983 survey by the American  
Jewish Committee revealed that about half of the U.S. Jews favor a  
homeland for the Palestinians on the West Bank and Gaza, and recommend  
that Israel stop the expansion of settlements in order to encourage peace  
negotiations. Three-fourths want Israel to talk to the Palestine Liberation  
Organization, if it recognizes Israel and renounces terrorism. Only 21  
percent want Israel to maintain permanent control over the West Bank. On  
each of these propositions, the plurality of American Jews takes issue with  
the policies and declarations of the Israeli government.

A plurality also holds that American Jews individually, as well as in  
organized groups, should feel free to criticize Israeli policy publicly. Of  
those surveyed, 70 percent say U.S. Jewish organizations should feel free to  
criticize. On this question, even Jewish leaders say they welcome criticism;  
40 percent say organizations should feel free to criticize; 37 percent dis-  
agree. This means that only one-third of the leaders say they want to stifle  
organizational criticism of Israel. The vote by individual Jews for free and  
open debate is even stronger. Only 31 percent declare that American Jews  
individually should not criticize Israeli policy publicly; 57 percent disagree.  
On this question, leaders and non-leaders vote exactly alike. While  
American Jews say they strongly oppose some Israeli policies and believe  
that organizations and individuals should feel free to criticize these policies  
openly, the simple fact is that public criticism is almost non-existent.

The explanation for this seeming contradiction is that publicly Jews must  
speak unanimously, but privately they can speak anonymously. Indeed, the  
premise upon which this book is written is that there is a large Jewish  
constituency in this country, as well as in Israel, which will support a peace  
plan which both ensures Israel's security and is acceptable to its enemies.

In the past, all attempts to break the grip of AIPAC have failed. Of the  
more than 200 principal Jewish organizations functioning on a national  
scale, only the Jewish Agenda and its predecessor, Breira, have challenged  
any stated policy of the Israeli government.

In return for their occasional criticism of Israel's policies, the two  
organizations were ostracized and kept out of the organized Jewish  
community. Breira lasted only five years. Organized in 1973, its peak  
national membership was about 1,000. Named for the Hebrew word  
meaning "alternative," it called on Jewish institutions to be "open to serious  
debate," and proposed "a comprehensive peace between Israel, the Arab  
states, and a Palestinian homeland that is ready to live in peace alongside

Israel." Prominent in its leadership were Rabbis Arnold Jacob Wolf, David  
Wolf Silverman, Max Ticktin, David Saperstein, and Balfour Brickner.

The counterattack was harsh. The National Journal reports that Breira  
was "bitterly attacked by many leaders of the Jewish establishment" and  
that a Breira meeting was "invaded and ransacked" by members of the  
militant Jewish Defense League. Some members of Breira came under  
intense pressure to quit either the organization or their jobs. Jewish leaders  
were warned to avoid Breira, or fund-raising would be hurt.

Israeli officials joined rabbis in denouncing the organization. Carolyn  
Toll, a reporter for the Chicago Tribune and formerly on the board of  
directors of Breira, quotes a rabbi: "My bridges are burned. Once you take  
a position like this [challenging Israeli positions], the organized Jewish  
community closes you out." Officials from the Israeli consulates in Boston  
and Philadelphia warned Jews against attending a Breira conference.

It was soon barred from associating with other Jewish groups. In June  
1983, its Washington, D.C. chapter was refused membership in the Jewish  
Community Council, a group which included 260 religious, educational,  
fraternal, and social service organizations.

Toll laments the "suppression of free speech in American Jewish  
institutions—the pressures that prevent dovish or dissident Jews from  
organizing in synagogues, the Jewish community centers, and meetings of  
major national Jewish organizations" and denunciations of American  
Friends Service Committee representatives as "anti-Semitics" and "dupes of  
the Palestine Liberation Organization" for insisting that "any true peace  
must include a viable state for the Palestinians."

Journalism is the occupation in which Jews most often and most  
consistently voice criticism of Israel. Richard Cohen of the Washington

During Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon, Cohen warned: "The admin-  
istration can send Begin a message that he does not have an infinite line of  
credit in America—that we will not, for instance, approve the bombing of

In a later column, Cohen summarized the reaction to his criticism of  
Israeli policy: "My phone these days is an instrument of torture. Merely to  
answer it runs the risk of being insulted. The mail is equally bad. The letters  
are vicious, some of them quite personal." He noted that US. Jews are held  
to a different standard than Israelis when they question Israel's policies?

Mark Bruzonsky, a persistent journalistic critic of these Israeli excesses,  
writes, "There's no way in the world that a Jew can avoid a savage andpersonal vendetta if his intent is to write a truthful and meaningful account

Similar questions are raised by Nat Hentoff, a Jewish columnist who  
frequently criticizes Israel and challenges the conscience of his fellow Jews  
in his column for the Village Voice. During the Israeli invasion of Lebanon

At no time during his visit here [in the U.S.] was Prime Minister Begin  
given any indication that there are some of us who fear that he and Ariel  
Sharon are destroying Israel from within. Forget the Conference of  
Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and the groups they  
represent. They have long since decided to say nothing in public that is

Hentoff deplored the intimidation that silences most Jewish critics:

I know staff workers for the American Jewish Congress and the  
American Jewish Committee who agonize about their failure to speak  
out, even on their own time, against Israeli injustice. They don't, because

Peer pressure does not always muffle Jewish voices, especially if the voice  
is "peerless." Such a man was Nahum Goldmann, who pioneered in  
establishing the State of Israel and helped to organize its crucial underpin-  
nings of support in the U.S. and who later became a frequent critic of Israeli  
policy. He played a crucial role in the founding of Israel, meeting its early  
financial problems, influencing its leaders, and organizing a powerful  
constituency for it in the U.S. His service to Zionism spanned nearly fifty  
years. During World War I, when Palestine was still part of the Ottoman  
Empire, Goldmann tried to persuade Turkish authorities to allow Jewish  
immigration. In the 1930s, he advocated the Zionist cause at the League of  
Nations. During the Truman administration, he lobbied for the United  
Nations resolution calling for partition of Palestine and the establishment

When Israel was struggling to build its economy, Goldmann negotiated  
with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer the agreement under  
which the Germans paid $30 billion in compensation and restitution to

Goldmann's disagreement with Israeli policy toward the Arabs was his  
central concern. To those who criticized his advocacy of a Palestinian state,

If they do not believe that Arab hostility can some day be alleviated, then  
we might just as well liquidate Israel at once, so as to save the millions

of Jews who live there There is no hope for a Jewish state which has

to face another 50 years of struggle against Arab enemies.

In 1980 he warned:

Blind support of the Begin government may be more menacing for Israel  
than any danger of Arab attack. American Jewry is more generous than  
any other group in American life and is doing great things.... But by  
misusing its political influence, by exaggerating the aggressiveness of the  
Jewish Lobby in Washington, by giving the Begin regime the impression  
that the Jews are strong enough to force the American administration  
and Congress to follow every Israeli desire, they lead Israel on a ruinous  
path which, if continued, may lead to dire consequences.

He blamed the Israeli Lobby for U.S. failures to bring about a com-  
prehensive settlement in the Middle East. "It was to a very large degree  
because of electoral considerations, fear of the pro-Israeli Lobby, and of the  
Jewish vote."

He warned of trouble ahead if the Lobby continued its present course. "It  
is now slowly becoming something of a negative factor. Not only does it  
distort the expectations and political calculations of Israel, but the time may  
not be far off when American public opinion will be sick and tired of the  
demands of Israel and the aggressiveness of American Jewry."

In 1978, two years before he wrote his alarmed evaluation of the Israeli  
Lobby, New York magazine reported that Goldmann had privately urged  
officials of the Carter administration "to break the back" of the Lobby:  
"Goldmann pleaded with the administration to stand firm and not back off  
from confrontations with the organized Jewish community as other  
administrations had done." Unless this was done, he argued, "President  
Carter s plans for a Middle East settlement would die in stillbirth." His  
words were prophetic. The comprehensive settlement Carter sought was  
frustrated by the intransigence of Israel and its U.S. Lobby.

There are, however, voices in Israel and the U.S. which are trying to  
change these attitudes. Indicative of this is an article appearing in The Wall  
Street Journal, January 7, 1987, edition, entitled "American Jews are  
Increasingly Divided in Stance Toward Israel," from which the following is  
excerpted:

Twenty years ago, Israel's stunning victory in the June 1967 Six-Day War  
united American Jews behind the tiny Mideast nation as never before.  
But today, a younger generation has begun openly to criticize Israeli  
society and its leaders, signaling the end of the era of unquestioning

"Once, there was a kind of uneasiness on the part of American Jews  
about interfering in the internal affairs of Israel" says Rabbi Wolfe  
Kelman, the executive vice president of Conservative Judaism's Rabbin-  
ical Assembly. "But now there's a growing readiness to say, 'Hey, wait a  
minute, what's going on over there?'"

What's going on is that Israel is changing. It is increasingly dominated  
by religiously fundamentalist and politically militant Jewish immigrants  
from Arab countries, rather than the European Holocaust survivors who  
built the Israel most American Jews identify with.

"In the past, American Jews had an undifferentiated, passionate,  
idealized, romanticized view of Israeli society. But that has broken down  
as they have become more aware of Israel's conflicts between left and  
right, religious and secular, Jew and Arab, rich and poor," says Steven  
Cohen, a sociologist at New York's Queens College. A nationwide survey  
he took last year found that only 63 percent of U.S. Jews say that caring  
deeply about Israel is an important part of their Jewishness, down from

Attitudes began to change noticeably after Israel's 1982 invasion deep  
into Lebanon; many U.S. Jews complained that the push to the outskirts  
of Beirut went far beyond Israel's need to defend itself. Recently,  
American Jews have been disturbed by disclosures that Jerusalem  
recruited an American spy, Jonathan Pollard. Israel's reaction to the spy  
case, generally perceived as uncooperative, and its reluctance to cooperate  
with investigations of its role in the Iran-Contra scandal also rankled

Indeed, anger and disappointment with Israel have been so intense  
that some worry that these feelings could eventually translate into a  
gradual weakening of Jerusalem's political influence in Congress. To be  
sure, it is generally agreed that any effort to cut the $3 billion a year in  
U.S. aid to Israel would be resoundingly defeated by legislators. And  
support for Israel's survival and national security remains rocksolid

However, the excesses and incompetence of the Likud government, and  
the recognition among many Jews that Israel is in grave peril, has caused  
several new organizations to speak out. A recent report appearing in the  
Jerusalem Post, by Charles Hoffman, mentions one of them under the  
heading "Left Wing Jews in U.S. Hit at Shamir Policy":

Woody Allen, Arthur Miller, Philip Roth, Betty Friedan and a group of  
other prominent American Jewish intellectuals have published a full-  
page advertisement in the New York Times denouncing the policies of  
Prime Minister Shamir as "immoral, contrary to what is best in our  
Jewish tradition and destructive to the best interests of Israel and  
American Jewry."

"No Mr. Shamir " the ad, which appears today, reads, "don't assume  
that American Jews support your policies toward the PalestiniansThe  
statement calls on Shamir to start negotiations with the PLO and not to  
rule out the possibility that these talks might lead to the establishment  
of a Palestinian state.

The ad is the first public act of the Committee for Judaism and Social  
Justice, a national group organized during the past few months by  
Tikkun magazine. The committee, which plans to open an office in  
Washington, describes itself as a liberal, progressive alternative to  
AIPAC and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish  
Organizations.

Other signatories to the statement include scholar Michael Walzer,  
journalist Carl Bernstein, Tikkun editor Michael Lerner, former "Yippie"  
leader Abbie Hoffman, novelist Marge Piercy, producer Norman Lear,  
Rabbi Marshall Meyer, Rabbi Arthur Waskow, and scholar Irving Howe.  
The list also incudes Stanley Sheinbaum of Los Angeles, who was one of  
the five American Jews to meet last year with Yasser Arafat in  
Stockholm; and Prof. Jerome Segal of the University of Maryland, who  
drafted a plan for Palestinian statehood last year.

The Jerusalem Post of June 4, 1988, contains the following report,  
datelined New York, and entitled "Aloni Blasts Jewish Leaders in U.S. for  
'Keep Quiet' Policy."

Citizens Rights Movement MK Shulamit Aloni has blasted the Confer-  
ence of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations as "rich and  
fat people ... who go to Israel to rub shoulders with important people atnice dinners, and then come back to the U.S. and rub shoulders with  
more important people."

Aloni, who has just completed a two-week North American speaking  
tour, said she was convinced by the warm reception she had received that  
most American Jews opposed the positions of Prime Minister Shamir.  
She said they are also turning against the view of Morris Abram,  
chairman of the Presidents' Conference, that American Jews should not  
take a public stand on issues relating to the Middle East peace process.

Discussing the American Jewish leadership, Aloni said, "I never  
respected Abram and the rest of these rich and fat people, because I don't

know who they represent They say that [American] Jews should

keep quiet about what is happening in Israel and take a position of 'My  
country right or wrong.' But they never tell the right wing to keep quiet.  
It is only the liberals who are told to shut up."

Aloni said that she had received warm receptions from synagogue  
audiences and UJA-Federation groups in cities like New York, Miami,  
Montreal, and Toronto. "The Federation people in Miami, Toronto and  
Montreal were against me when I came. But as I spoke, the whole  
atmosphere changed. People came up to me afterwards and thanked me  
for giving them back their dignity and pride in being Jewish."

Aloni told Jewish audiences: "If you have the right to speak out on  
human rights in countries all around the world—including Jews in the  
Soviet Union—you certainly have the right to speak out on human  
rights in Israel. How wrong does Israel have to be before you speak  
up?"

We have previously referred to, and quoted from, an article written by  
Henry Siegman, Executive Vice President of the American Jewish Con-  
gress, appearing in the December 31, 1988, edition of the Jerusalem Post.  
The article is entitled "The Diaspora's Right to Intervene," in which  
Siegman points out that Jewish "unity" is pointless if the result is that  
"Israel goes down the tube."

The unanswered question is whether enough voices will be raised loudly  
enough and soon enough to deal with the crisis at hand.

CHAPTER X

Israel in Crisis

nr

I HE WAR IN Lebanon differed from other Israeli wars in that it  
JL was, without any doubt, an offensive war, fought less for the benefit  
of Israel than for the personal aggrandizement of certain of its leaders,  
Menachem Begin and Ariel Sharon.

THE LEBANESE WAR: 1982.-1983

Perlmutter, in his book entitled Israel: The Partitioned State, discusses it  
under the caption "Sharon's War in Lebanon," from which the following is  
quoted:

The start of the war was planned with measured debate by a government  
which set itself a limited and specific goal in response to what it  
perceived as an intolerable and continued threat to its national security.  
The man whose responsibility it was to conduct that war, in order to  
accomplish his own plans set about to manipulate his own prime  
minister, the cabinet, and the armed forces, thus extending the scope and  
duration of the war and its tremendous potential for larger tragedy,  
political fiasco, and disaster. Just as important, he misled Israel's  
American allies.

The blame for the Lebanese war does not rest solely with former  
Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon; understanding the situation and  
events defies that kind of simplicity. But if there is a single person whobears the lion's share of the responsibility for the war's steady descent  
into disaster; it is Sharon. His plans led directly to the involvement of  
Syria in the war, to the tragedy at Sabra and Shatila, to the diplomatic  
and military entry of the United States into the swamplike arena of  
Lebanon, and to the final collapse of Menachem Begin. Indirectly his  
actions led to the disaster that befell the contingent-without-a-mission of  
U.S. Marines who died in a bomb attack on their barracks in Beirut.[Emphasis supplied]

Perlmutter points out that Begins motives fitted Sharon's ambitions:

Sharon was helped in his ambitions by Begins vision of fulfilling the old  
Revisionist-Jabotinsky dream of Eretz Israel. Begin saw the Lebanon  
operation as his crowning achievement, and he therefore did not need  
much persuading. Begin probably envisioned the strike as ensuring that  
he could be the prime minister who, by destroying the PLO, created a  
secure and united Eretz Israel. Sharon probably saw himself riding in  
triumph like some Roman praetor entering Jerusalem, the next king of  
Israel. [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi's judgment is even harsher. In his book, Israel's Fateful Hour,

under the heading of "The Wages of Deception," Harkabi writes:

The Lebanon War was accompanied by lies and deceit at the highest  
political levels. Defense Minister Sharon has been repeatedly accused of  
having misled Begin and the cabinet. This explanation was disseminated  
not by the opposition but by sources within the Likud who are close to  
Mr. Begin. The accuracy of official announcements by Israel's military  
spokesmen, which had always been considered trustworthy, now became  
suspect. The Israeli Army is a people's army, and the home front soon  
became aware that army and government communiques contradicted  
what the public learned from first-hand observers.

To provide a justification for the war the Likud government also lied  
to the public by grossly exaggerating the terrorist acts conducted from  
Lebanon. Responding to a question in the Knesset, Defense Minister  
Rabin said that during the eleven months of the cease-fire that preceded  
the war the northern settlements were attacked only twice, and that  
during this period Israel had suffered a total of two killed and six  
wounded from terrorist attacks. Moreover these attacks were preceded  
by Israeli air force strikes in response to the planting of a bomb on a bus  
and the attack on the Israeli ambassador in London, Shlomo Argov. Itwas distortion at the highest political level to present terrorism as  
Israel's chief problem, when the major threats are in fact the  
demographic balance and the menace of war. Even the official pretext

The attack on Ambassador Argov was at bottom a lie, since it was not  
carried out by the PLO, but by the secessionist faction of Abu Nidal that  
had also assassinated PLO leaders. [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi repeats what he has said elsewhere in his book, namely, that  
calls for a war against "terrorism" are often used by demagogues to distract  
attention from the real issues. In Harkabi s words:

Terrorism is grist for the demagogue's mill, the perfect topic for inciting  
public opinion, arousing popular fury, acquiring popularity. It is all too  
easy to harp on motifs like "the right of Israelis to live in peace," and "we  
must use strong-arm tactics against terrorism," and so on. As I have  
already said, the problem is that there is no quick fix for terrorism; no  
military operation can put an end to it.

The most damning indictment of Begins motives in starting the war in  
Lebanon is found in these words from Harkabi's account of the war.

Begin's principal motive in launching the war was his fear of the  
momentum of the peace process—that he might yet be called upon to  
honor his signature to the Camp David Accords and withdraw from the  
territories. Calling the Lebanon War "The War for the Peace of Galilee"  
is more than a misnomer. It would have been more honest to call it "The  
War to Safeguard the Occupation of the West Bank." [Emphasis

The disastrous war in Lebanon accelerated the decline in Israeli society  
from the zenith it had reached at the end of the 1967 war. Prior to the  
November 1988 elections, the moderates in Israel had expected, or at least  
hoped, that the fierce emotional fires that had been fueled by the preachings  
of the religious radicals and the demagoguery of the Likud, would die down  
and be brought under control. As the November 1988 elections proved, it  
was a vain hope. The election results came as a shock to many people  
because of the significant political gains made by the religious nationalist  
extremist factions in the Likud party.

Earlier, Amos Perlmutter had made a pre-election forecast, which  
appeared in the Los Angeles Times edition of September 28, 1988. In it,  
Perlmutter offers some profound observations concerning the political  
scene in Israel and expresses his feelings of nostalgia for the Israel of the  
past and his sense of foreboding for the Israel of the future.

Perlmutter s article is entitled " 'Beautiful Israel' Wanes, Youthful Dream  
is Shed in a Hard Shift to Right." His observations are, in part, as follows:

The 1988 Israeli elections, and their aftermath, will be a thunderous sea  
change in the 40-year history of Israeli politics.

Even though the early polls seem to show a virtual deadlock, very  
much reflective of the American election, the end result will be the  
culmination of a trend that will mark a solid turnabout in Israeli politics  
and society.

The era of the "beautiful Israel"—dominated by such symbols as the  
Kibbutzim, the pioneer spirit, the leading political and philosophical  
tenets of socialist Zionism—is on the wane, if not over altogether.

That era reached its apogee with the 1967 war, but it was the results  
of the war that also laid the seeds of its decline—a decline that began in  
the wake of the 1973 war, continued into 1977 with Menachem Begins  
startling electoral victory and remains on a steady downward pace to this  
day. The values of socialist Zionism are no longer dominant. Instead, one  
can find in Israel today the new values—a spirit of continued territorial  
expansionism, shrill patriotism, an exaggerated confidence in the mil-  
itary might of the Israeli Defense Force, a rigid fundamentalist belief in  
Israeli moral righteousness and a deep suspicion that amounts to a denial  
of the peace process, especially after Camp David and the disastrous  
invasion of Lebanon. "Complete Israel" not peace with the Arabs, is the  
determining political issue.

The outright cynicism that prevails about the peace process seems to  
be justified by ongoing events

The uprising has also had the result of offering ripe ground for  
political opportunists who are very much to the right of Likud, which is  
basically a right-of-center party. They have gone so far as to advocate the  
transfer of Arabs from the West Bank.

The difference between the extremes in the Labor and Likud parties  
is that the Laborites want to somehow extricate themselves from the  
West Bank and the Palestinians, while the Likudites want to transfer the  
Palestinians bodily out of the occupied Territories and move them to

Lebanon's Bekaa Valley. There is no love held for the Arabs in Israel. The  
suspicion is growing about the loyalty of Israeli Arabs who themselves,  
in the uprising's wake, have undergone a Palestinianization process.

The uprising, the bankruptcy of the peace process, the daily atrocities  
and violence have helped accelerate the change of direction in Israeli  
politics. Israel's electorate appears to be moving to the right of center,  
and the 1988 election may institutionalize that change, taking the last  
giant leap—begun in 1981 and continued in 1984—of establishing a  
Likud hegemony for the next three decades.

A huge shift—demographic, intellectual, political and ideological—is  
taking place as a new Israeli generation—different in leaders, ideas,  
orientation and action—takes over. [Emphasis supplied]

Israels crisis is deeply rooted in the moral, economic, political, and  
international chaos created by twelve years of Likud misrule. Among the  
multiplicity of ills, from which Israel is suffering, are the following:

1. Israel's economy continues to deteriorate. At best, it survives only on  
   a life support system which requires enormous annual transfusions  
   from the U.S. and the American Jewish community.
2. The Intifada, and the government's attempts at repression, are  
   destroying the esprit de corps of the Israeli army and are a continuing  
   drain on Israel's resources, estimated at two and a half million dollars  
   per day. Israel's military leaders (with the exception of Ariel Sharon)  
   know, and have said, that the battle against the Palestinian uprising  
   is unwinnable.
3. There has been a significant defection and disillusionment among the  
   intellectuals, both in Israel and the Diaspora, and support among  
   them for the Likud government has largely eroded away.
4. Immigration to Israel has slowed to a trickle as most Soviet Jews have  
   spurned Israel in favor of other countries.
5. The emigration of educated and talented Israelis to the U.S., and a  
   disproportionate increase of the Oriental Jewish population (Sephar-  
   dim), are changing the demographic composition of the population of  
   Israel in favor of the less educated and more radical Sephardim.
6. The Likud years have seen a rapid increase in corruption at all levels  
   of government, as well as in the private sector.
7. The brutality of the Likud's "iron fist" policy in the West Bank and Gaza  
   has strained, perhaps irretrievably, the loyalty of the Arab populations  
   of Israel proper and has shocked most of the civilized world.

The international situation is even more grim.

Menachem Begin, during his regime, earned the distinction of being  
perhaps the most hated head of government in the world. The world  
leaders recently have expressed their feelings toward the Likud government  
of Israel, and its arrogance, by inflicting the worst humiliation ever suffered  
by a member nation, when they voted (150-2) to move the U.N. session  
from New York to Geneva just to hear Yassar Arafat speak. Much of the  
sympathy of the world for the Jewish people, generated by the tragedy of  
the Holocaust, has been dissipated by the Likud leadership of Israel and its  
treatment of the Palestinians who now have the moral support of most of

None of Israel's desperate problems, internal and external, can be solved  
without peace. With peace can come solutions—without it, Israel's situation

In its hour of peril, its leadership, the Likud party, is bankrupt, domi-  
nated by a clique of religious nationalist extremists who are destroying  
Israel from within and isolating it from without. The Israeli ship of state is  
a rudderless, storm-tossed vessel with a battery of loose cannons crashing  
about the deck, while Captain Yitzhak Shamir and Steersman Ariel Sharon  
are shouting conflicting and incomprehensible orders.

Yehoshafat Harkabi, in his book Israel's Fateful Hour, expresses his

In recent years Israel has experienced massive decline: a worsening of  
the public mood, the vulgarization of political thought and language, a  
degeneration of norms of public conduct, permissiveness in state affairs,  
demagoguery—the good of the country shunted aside in the pursuit of  
short-term party gains—the domination of mediocrity, the proliferation  
of falsehoods and rampant deception of the people by their rule, a  
magnification of domestic tensions. The responsibility for this decline  
belongs to a great extent to the Likud government. This is the most  
serious result of the Likud's misrule, much more serious than either the

economic crisis or the Lebanon War

Israel was never perfect, but nevertheless it earned a reputation as a  
symbol of cultural and social innovation; even its military excellence was  
attributed to its citizens' public-spiritedness.

Today, however, unethical conduct in public life arouses no surprise in  
Israel: it has become the normal state of affairs. Brutal criticisms of  
government activities in the press makes no stir in the public, as thewritten word has been greatly devalued, along with everything else.  
When a responsible newspaper like Haaretz can open its editorial  
column with the statement "The fraudulent acts of Ariel Sharon and  
Menachem Begin dragged the country into Lebanon on the basis of a  
false claim" [May 27, 1985] without a political earthquake's ensuing, the  
national conscience is clearly deadened, and perhaps dead. [Emphasis  
supplied]

None of Israels crises compares in gravity with the crisis of leadership  
from which all else flows. The State of Israel, the earthly symbol of the  
Jewish people, has fallen into the hands of demagogues and fanatics who,  
in the name of religion, are leading the people of Israel headlong toward  
catastrophe.

Since support for the above-stated position is found in facts and circum-  
stances, which both Jews (Reformed and Conservative) and non-Jews will  
find difficult to believe, it is necessary to rely upon sources whose credibility  
and authority are beyond question.

In an article appearing in the Jerusalem Post, December 3,1988, entitled  
"The Threats Are from Within," Abba Eban, one of the few statesmen left  
in Israel, summarizes his views in this respect:

The existential threats to Israel and Zionism arise from within. They  
flow from disintegrative tendencies in Israeli society, illustrated by the  
spread of religious intolerance, chauvinism, fundamentalism, the eclipse  
of Enlightenment values, the retreat from scientific rationalism and,  
above all, by the incongruous and untenable structure dictated by the  
exercise of coercive rule over a foreign nation which inflicts more harm  
on Israel than upon its adversaries.

The first two years of the national unity government opened horizons  
of potential peace which the last two years have blocked. The solitary  
hope is that the Israeli public and the Jewish world may have been  
shocked by the atmosphere of the past few months into the realization  
that Israel's body has grown stronger while its soul has been  
undermined.

RELIGIOUS FANATICISM

In his book entitled Israel's Fateful Hour, to which we have several times  
earlier referred, Yehoshafat Harkabi discusses the awakening of National-  
istic Religious Extremism and the coming crisis in the occupied territories.  
Harkabi quotes many sources to support his theses:

Many in the religious camp find justification for an annexation of the  
occupied territories, or at least a prohibition against withdrawal, in  
Nachmanides's (1194-1270) commentary on Maimonides's (1135-1204)  
Book of Commandments: "We are commanded to inherit the land that  
God gave to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and must not leave it in the hands

of any other nation We must not leave the Land in the hands of the

[seven Canaanite nations] or of any other people in any generation."  
Rabbi Zvi Yehudah Kook, the mentor of Gush Emunim, commented as

follows: "These are explicit words of halakha The main thrust of the

commandment is conquest by the state, Jewish national rule in this holy  
territory."

Nachmanides's words, then, are the starting point for the politico-  
religious conceptions of a broad stratum of Orthodox Jews. For them,  
halakha is binding, except in rare cases where life is threatened. Relig-  
ious ordinances have absolute validity; historical circumstances cannot  
contradict the Creator of the Universe. The very existence of such a law  
is a guarantee that reality will not contravene it, and so there is no need  
to trouble oneself with calculations of feasibility.

The awakening of a nationalistic Judaism was a slow, evolving process,  
following the victory in the Six Day War, which was interpreted as a  
manifestation of God's intervention. For religious Jews, the conquest of  
parts of the historic land of Israel in this war cast a brilliant light on the  
Zionist enterprise. Taken together with the victory of 1967, the achieve-  
ments of Zionism were now seen as the harbinger of a new age of great  
religious and national eminence. Significant sectors of Israeli Judaism  
adopted Herut's position of entitlement to the occupied lands, which  
were now referred to by their biblical names, Judea and Samaria. The  
religious Gush Emunim movement assumed the principal role in pio-  
neering settlement activities in the occupied territories. The bond  
between religious Judaism and the state was changing. Whereas in its old  
borders the state had been merely a secular refuge, for many religious  
circles its new boundaries, which included the holy places in Jerusalem,  
Hebron, and elsewhere, endowed it with a theological significance. The  
Yom Kippur War and withdrawal from territory on the Egyptian and  
Syrian borders did not controvert the notion that a new age had begun—  
the "beginning of the Redemption."

Thus, within the Jewish state, Orthodox Judaism has changed its  
stance in recent years: instead of being content to be a follower it has  
demanded a role of leadership, insisting that both domestic and foreignpolicy be derived from religious law. Where Herut opposes conceding  
and withdrawing from the West Bank for nationalist reasons (with  
security considerations as a secondary factor), many religious circles offer  
religious arguments against withdrawal. *For them, the security problems  
associated with withdrawal are secondary to the religious behests:*because of the achievements of the Six Day War in recovering holy  
places, militant Jewish nationalism has become a significant factor in  
bringing closer the ultimate expression of Judaism—Redemption. The  
relationship between religion and policy has become more intimate;  
religion in the service of national policy and national policy as the  
implementation of religious right from a position of relative influence.

Harkabi quotes a public statement by the prominent Rabbi Zvi Yehudah

I tell you explicitly that the Torah forbids us to surrender even one inch  
of our liberated land. There are no conquests here and we are not  
occupying foreign lands; we are returning to our home, to the inherit-  
ance of our ancestors. There is no Arab land here, only the inheritance  
of our God—and the more the world gets used to this thought the better  
it will be for them and for all of us ("Year by Year," 1968). [Emphasis

In this view, violating the prohibition against withdrawal will hurt not

In generations past, the fundamental concept of being the Chosen  
People served the Jews as a shield against persecution and a consolation  
in distress. Since 1967 it has taken on an aggressive significance as a  
license to act in contradiction to accepted political norms. The idea of  
being "a people that dwells apart, not reckoned among the nations"  
(Numbers 23:9) has become sanctioned for deviant behavior in the  
international arena. International law, public opinion, the United  
Nations, the superpowers—for the religious extremists none of these  
matter. In the world at large, religion cannot provide legal title to a  
territory. But for those religious extremists who believe it does, the  
biblical promise of the Land of Israel for the people of Israel is trans-  
formed from a religious and spiritual matter into a necessity that  
requires immediate implementation In the world view of the relig-ious extremists.. .as they see it, the Arabs lived in the land throughout  
the centuries in contravention of the Law, and their assertion of a right  
of residence is no better than that of a squatter.™ [Emphasis supplied]

As typical of this viewpoint, Harkabi quotes Rabbi Shlomo Aviner, the  
former rabbi of Bet El (the Jewish settlement established in Samaria), and  
today the rabbi of the Ateret Kohanim Yeshiva:

Let me draw you an analogy. It's as if a man goes into his neighbor's  
house without permission and stays there for many years. When the  
original owner returns the invader claims: "It's my house, I've been  
living here for years!" All of these years he's been nothing but a thief!  
Now he should make himself scarce and pay rent on top of it. Some  
people might say that there's a difference between living in a place for  
thirty years and living in a place for 2,000 years. Let us ask them: Is there  
a statute of limitations that gives a thief the right to his plunder? ...

Everyone who settled here knew very well that he was living in a land  
that belongs to the people of Israel, so the ethnic group that settled in  
this place has no title to the land. Perhaps an Arab who was born here  
doesn't know this, but nevertheless the fact that a man settles on land  
does not make it his. Under the law, possession serves only as a proof of  
a claim of ownership; it does not create ownership. The Arabs' posses-  
sion of the land is therefore a possession that asserts no rights. It is the  
possession of territory when it is absolutely clear that they are not its  
legal owners, and this possession has no juridical or moral validity (Artzi,  
p. 10). [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi continues:

For Rabbi Aviner and his followers, then, the first Arabs to settle in the  
Holy Land were thieves, and the crime has been bequeathed from father  
to son down to the present generation. Perhaps he is referring to  
collective ownership of the land and not to the ownership by each  
individual Arab of his own small plot. But he says that all the title deeds  
for land recorded in government registers have "no juridical and moral"  
force. [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi then asks—Is there a court in the world who would endorse  
such an argument?

The better answer to this question is that, not only would no court  
endorse this argument—no court would listen to it. Rabbi Aviner, howeverlearned, is out of his depth on his "analogy." The applicable law is not the  
"statute of limitations" but the law of "adverse possession." Under English  
common law, the foundation of American jurisprudence, and under the law  
of most jurisdictions, a party in possession can acquire title to unoccupied  
land if his "possession" (for the stipulated period established by statute) is  
open, adverse, notorious and hostile to any other claim of title.

A "thief' could get title to vacant land by occupying it for the statutory  
prescriptive period. Nor would he have to possess it for two or three  
thousand years. Five years of adverse possession would suffice to confer title  
in California, and not more than twenty-one in most other jurisdictions.  
Harkabi continues by quoting Rabbi Zvi Yehudah Kook:

We find ourselves here by virtue of the legacy of our ancestors, the basis  
of the Bible and history, and no one can change this fact. What does it  
resemble? A man left his house and others came and invaded it. This is  
exactly what happened to us. Some argue that there are Arab lands here.  
It is all a lie and a fraud! There are absolutely no Arab lands here

Under the subtitle, "From Expulsion to Annihilation," Harkabi continues:

If Jews see the Arabs' residence in the land of Israel as making them  
criminals, the conclusion that they should be expelled is quick to follow.  
Knesset member Rabbi Meir Kahane has given widespread publicity to  
this idea, but he did not invent it. It is based on ancient sources, and first  
and foremost the biblical verse "You shall dispossess all the inhabitants  
of the land" (Numbers 33:53) and the interpretations of it given by  
classical commentators. The eleventh-century scholar Rashi, for exam-  
ple, explained: "You shall drive out the land and you shall dispossess it  
of its inhabitants, and then you will dwell in it, i.e., you will be able to  
remain in it [if you dispossess it of its inhabitants], but if not, you will  
not be able to remain in it." Thus the biblical verse was interpreted not  
as a commandment directed to the Jews in the past, when they came out  
of Egypt, but as a standing order binding for the future. [Emphasis

Harkabi quotes Rabbi Yisrael Ariel as explicitly demanding expulsion of  
the Arabs as entailed by Jewish religious law:

On the one hand there is a commandment to settle Eretz Israel, defined  
by our sages also as the commandment of "inheritance and residence"—  
a commandment mentioned many times in the Torah. Even the new  
student understands that "inheritance and residence" means conquering  
and settling the land. The Torah repeats the commandment—"You shall  
dispossess all the inhabitants of the land"—many times, and Rashi  
explains that this means to expel them. The Torah itself uses the term

expulsion a number of times The substance of this commandment is

to expel the inhabitants of the land whoever they may be This is also

how Rashi understands the commandment. In the Talmudic passage that  
mentions the commandment to settle the land Rashi explains: "Because  
of the commandment to settle Eretz Yisrael—to expel idol worshipers  
and settle Jews there." Thus according to Rashi the commandment to  
settle the land means to expel the non-Jew from Eretz Yisrael and settle  
it with Jews. ("Zeffiyya.") [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi continues:

Note the association of idol worshipers and non-Jews. This identification  
has a basis in Jewish tradition.

In Rabbi Kahane's version, expulsion of the Arabs would fulfill two  
functions: The first is political, preventing the Arabs from becoming the  
majority and thereby undermining Israel from within; the second is  
religious—it would provide a proven means to hasten the Redemption  
and the coming of the Messiah. [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi quotes Rabbi Kahane:

The Arabs of Israel are a desecration of God's name. Their non-  
acceptance of Jewish sovereignty over the Land of Israel is a rejection of  
the kingdom. Removing them from the land is therefore more than a  
political matter. It is a religious matter, a religious obligation to wipe out  
the desecration of God's name. Instead of worrying about the reactions  
of the Gentiles if we act, we should tremble at the thought of God's  
wrath if we do not act. Tragedy will befall us if we do not remove the  
Arabs from the land, since redemption can come at once in its full glory  
if we do, as God commands us Let us remove the Arabs from Israeland hasten the Redemption ("Thorns in Your Eyes," pp. 244-245).[Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi cites Rabbi S.D. Wolpe for the following:

According to halakha it is forbidden for a non-Jew to live in Jerusalem,  
and in accordance with the ruling by Maimonides it is forbidden to

permit even a resident alien in Jerusalem True, this applies when

Israel has the upper hand, but today too, although it is not possible to  
expel them by force, this does not mean that we have to encourage them  
to live there! [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi also quotes Rabbi Eliezer Waldenberg, winner of the 1976 Israel  
Prize (given for outstanding achievement):

It is forbidden for gentiles to live in Jerusalem. I, for example, favor  
upholding the halakhic prohibition on a gentile's living in Jerusalem. If  
we would uphold this halakha as we should, we would have to expel all  
non-Jews from Jerusalem and purify it absolutely (cited in "The Zionist  
Dream Revisited," p. 117). [Emphasis supplied]

According to this interpretation of divine law, the failure to expel the  
Palestinians from their homeland, and all non-Jews from Jerusalem, is a  
transgression of religious law.

The tragic irony of this situation is pointed out by John K. Roth[[8]](#footnote-8) in an  
article appearing in the Los Angeles Times, November 12, 1988, entitled  
"Kristallnacht Formula Haunts Today's Unwanted." In the article, Roth  
describes the situation in Germany in 1938 regarding the "Jewish problem."  
Strenuous efforts were being made by Eichmann to expel the Jews from  
Germany. At the same time, because of Hitler's conquests in Austria and  
Czechoslovakia, more Jews came under Nazi control.  
The following are excerpts from Roth's article:

Meanwhile the presence of nearly 70,000 Polish Jews in German terri-  
tory remained an embarrassment for the Nazis' promise of "Judenrein"  
(a state "cleansed" of Jews). By late October these Jews, rounded up by  
the Gestapo, were being deported to the Polish frontier. The Poles,  
however, were not ready to accept them. Blocked from Poland, unable toreturn to Germany, detained in hideous conditions, these unwanted Jews  
found themselves in a hapless no-man's land.

When policies of forced emigration proved insufficient to solve the  
Jewish question, those same experts would move on to organize the  
Final Solution. Thus, the ultimate significance of "Kristallnacht" was  
that it hastened the approaches to Auschwitz.

"Kristallnacht"—the event itself, the conditions that brought it on  
and, even more important, the results it produced—should provoke  
reflection 50 years later. For early November, 1988, it has portents, too.  
Some of them can be seen in Israel's election returns, which signify a  
turn to the right, religiously and politically.

Peace for Israel in exchange for land, the hope of a viable Palestinian  
state on soil voluntarily relinquished by Israel—such possibilities are less  
likely now that Israel has voted. Instead, Israeli voices advocating a  
purely Jewish state are going to be more determined and strident than  
ever. Among them are those of the Moledet (Homeland) Party, which  
advocated the "transfer" of Palestinian Arabs from the occupied

"Kristallnacht" happened because a political state decided to get rid of  
people unwanted within its borders. It seems increasingly clear that  
Israel would prefer to rid itself of Palestinians if it could do so. Their  
presence in Gaza and the West Bank is a liability and a threat to many  
Israeli intentions. Thus, the voice of Moledet, euphemistic and muted  
though it may be, is not to be taken lightly. This is particularly true when  
it seems equally clear that not many other nations in the world want the  
Palestinians either. As much as any other people today, they are being  
forced into a tragic part too much like the one played by the European

The anniversary of "Kristallnacht" has become an occasion for re-  
asserting "Never again!" That cry signals commitment to ensure the  
safety of Jews wherever they may be. At its best, "Never again!" signified  
that and much more. It is a cry to forestall tragedy wherever people are  
unwanted. As a Holocaust scholar, as one who has lived and taught in  
Israel and who loves that country deeply, during this year's remembrance  
of "Kristallnacht" my thoughts are on Palestinian plight at least as much  
as on Israeli security. [Emphasis supplied]

Hitler failed in efforts to solve the "Jewish problem" by expulsion. He  
then decided on the "final solution" which was extermination.

Incredible as it may seem, this is the same "final solution" which the  
religious extremists are suggesting as far as the Palestinians are concerned.

GENOCIDE AND THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM

Harkabi is deeply disturbed by what he sees as an ominous movement  
among the religious extremists:

Some nationalistic religious extremists frequently identify the Arabs  
with Amalek, whom the Jews are commanded to annihilate totally  
(Deuteronomy 25:17-19). As children, we were taught that this was a  
relic of a bygone and primitive era, a commandment that had lapsed  
because Sennacherib the Assyrian king had mixed up all the nations so  
it was no longer possible to know who comes of the seed of Amalek. Yet  
some rabbis insist on injecting a contemporary significance into the  
commandment to blot out Amalek.

Rabbi Yisrael Hess, formerly the campus rabbi of Bar-Ilan University,  
published an article in the student newspaper, Bat Koll (February 26,  
1988) entitled "The Commandment of Genocide in the Torah," which  
ended as follows: "The day will yet come when we will all be called to  
fulfill the commandment of the divinely ordained to destroy Amalek "

Knesset member Amnon Rubinstein citing this article adds: "Rabbi  
Hess explains the commandment to blot out the memory of Amalek and  
says that there is no mercy in this commandment: the commandment is  
to kill and destroy even children and infants. Amalek is whoever declares  
war against the people of God." [Emphasis supplied] In the same article  
quoted by Rubinstein, Hess writes:

Against this holy war God declares a counter jihad In order to

emphasize that this is the background for the annihilation and that  
this is what the war is all about, that it is not merely a conflict between

two peoples God does not rest content that we destroy Amalek—

blot out the memory of Amalek"—he also mobilizes personally for  
this war ... because, as has been said, he has a personal interest in the  
matter, it is a prime goal for us as well. [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi continues with an alarming statement:

Hess implies that those who have a quarrel with the Jews instantly  
become Amalek and ought to be destroyed\ children and all. Amalek is  
identified with the Arabs: the use of the term jihad (holy war) is but oneallusion to this meaning. Amalek is not an ancient extinct tribe but a  
generic enemy that each generation may identify for itself.

Rabbi Yisrael Ariel, in a collection of articles intended to justify the  
religious terrorist Underground that emerged in Israel in the mid-1980s,  
explained that the killing of a non-Jew is not considered murder. [Em-  
phasis supplied]

Harkabi continues his quote from Rabbi Yisrael Ariel:

Anyone who looks through the code of Maimonides, which is the pillar  
of halakha in the Jewish world, and searches for the concept "thou shalt  
not murder" or the concept "holy blood" with regard to the killing of a

non-Jew will search in vain, because he will not find it It follows

from Maimonides' words that a Jew who killed a non-Jew was exempt  
from human judgment, and has not violated the prohibition on murder.  
As Maimonides writes in the Laws of Murderers: "A Jew who killed a  
resident alien is not sentenced to death by a court of law" ("Zeffiyya").[Emphasis supplied]

If the "annihilation" and destruction of "Amalek," including his children  
and infants, is carried out "without mercy," will there be a "Nuremberg"  
trial of Rabbi Hess, Rabbi Yisrael Ariel, and Rabbi Meir Kahane on  
charges of genocide? If they should escape, will there be a Simon Wies-  
enthal to track them down and bring them to justice? What have all the  
Holocaust studies and Holocaust memorials and pilgrimages to Auschwitz  
accomplished? Has mankind learned nothing?

THE RACIAL SUPERIORITY OF THE JEWS

The fate of the Palestinians and other non-Jews under Jewish rule is  
described in detail by Harkabi and others cited:

A reasoned analysis of the status of non-Jews in a Jewish state can be  
found in an article entitled "A New Approach to Israeli-Arab Peace"  
published in Kivvunim 24 (August 1984), an official publication of the  
World Zionist Organization. The author is Mordechai Nisan, a lecturer  
on the Middle East at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. According to Dr.  
Nisan, Jews are permitted to discriminate against foreigners in a way  
that Jews would angrily denounce were it done to them. What is  
permissible to us is forbidden to others. [Emphasis supplied]

While it is true that the Jews are a particular people, they nonetheless are  
designated as a "light unto the nations." This function is imposed on the  
Jews who strive to be a living aristocracy among the nations, a nation  
that has deeper historical roots, greater spiritual obligations, higher  
moral standards, and more powerful intellectual capacities than others.  
This vision, which diverges from the widely accepted egalitarian  
approach, is not at all based on an arbitrary hostility towards non-Jews,  
but rather on a fundamental existential understanding of the quality of

Thus the concept of the Chosen People" as an aristocracy provides  
sanction for the unequal and discriminatory treatment 'of non-Jews, who  
are inferior. Nisan does not consider the possibility that other nations  
might also claim aristocratic status for themselves.

One can only wonder whether the "light unto the nations," referred to  
by Nisan is being held in Shamir's iron fist. Abba Eban, in an article  
appearing in the Jerusalem Post of November 19, 1988, entitled "The  
Issues That Won't Go Away," comments on the rise of Kahanism:

To unfreeze the diplomatic deadlock is a more urgent task than to form  
a united front against the dangers of religious fundamentalism. In point  
of fact, the two issues are linked to each other. Ruling a foreign nation  
without according total equality or rights is a policy that can only be  
defended by attitudes of self-assertion and exclusivism which are incom-  
patible with prophetic Judaism and classical Zionism.

It is the maintenance of a non-democratic structure for over 20 years  
which enabled Kahanism to flourish and which has now given birth to

Thousands of Jewish voters have given their mandate to the idea of  
making the lives of thousands of people in their own homes so intoler-  
able that they will "agree" to leave. Transfer is a euphemism for the kind  
of enforced or induced uprootings of which Jews were the main victims  
in history. This idea enters the Israeli bloodstream two centuries after  
Jews in Europe fought successfully to defend the principle of equal rights  
for all who live under any jurisdiction. That was the principle whichenabled Jews to become emancipated from their previous humiliation.

Nisan continues in a passage that Harkabi says must be presented in its  
entirety to register the tribalism of this mindset:

The Land was the special divinely granted territorial promise to Abra-  
ham and his seed Non-Jews, without a role on the highest plane of

religious endeavor, are thus without a role on the plane of public activity.  
The linkage of politics and religion in the Jewish experience is supported  
by the equally tight connection between kinship and politics. Those of  
"the tribe" are the sole bearers of authority to determine national affairs

... The laws that grant equal rights to all citizens of Israel were passed

Today, in contrast, the demand is voiced that all non-Jewish residents  
of the Jewish state be dealt with according to halakhic regulations—  
which, not incidentally, support the nationalist aim of decreasing the  
number of Arabs living in the country by making their lives difficult.  
Supporters of this view willfully ignore international norms, having to  
do with racial non-discrimination and with civil\ economic, and social  
rights as formulated in international conventions, even where Israel has

What is in store for the Palestinians under Israeli rule becomes clear.

Rabbi Meir Kahane... asserts that: "A non-Jew who lives in the Land  
of Israel can obtain only the status of resident alien (Ha'aretz, August  
13, 1983). Citizenship, political status... the right to vote and hold  
office, all of these are reserved exclusively for Jews." Again, these ideas  
are not without foundation in traditional sources. Maimonides himself is  
a major source on the treatment of non-Jews who have been conquered  
and have come under Jewish rule, a category that is clearly applicable to  
the Arabs of Israel proper, Judea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip. [Empha-

Rabbi Meir Kahane is quoted by Harkabi as follows:

If the inhabitants make peace and accept the Seven Commandments

enjoined upon the descendants of Noah, none of them is slain, but they  
become tributary, as it is said: "They shall become tributary unto thee,  
and shall serve thee" (Deut. 20:11). If they agree to pay the tribute levied  
on them but refuse to submit to servitude, or if they yield to servitude but  
refuse to pay the tribute levied on them, their overtures are rejected.  
They must accept both terms of peace. The servitude imposed on them  
is that they are given an inferior status, that they lift not up their heads  
in Israel but be subjected to themy but they be not appointed to any office  
that will put them in charge of Israel. The terms of the levy are that they  
be prepared to serve the king with their body and their money (Hilkhot

The category of ben-noah [son of Noah] defines the non-Jew who has  
accepted the seven Noachide laws. In return for being permitted to live  
in the country of sacred history and religious purpose, the ben-noah must  
accept to pay a tax and to suffer the humiliation of servitude (see Deut.  
20:11). Maimonides, in his legal code on the Laws of Kings, states  
explicitly that he be "held down and not to raise his head against Jews."  
Non-Jews must not be appointed to any office or position of power over  
Jews. If they refuse to live a life of inferiority, then this will signal  
rebellion and the unavoidable necessity of Jewish warfare against their  
very presence in the Land of Israel.... [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi discusses the implication of this view, if applied to the Arab

Nisan is not presenting merely a theoretical analysis: he offers practical  
suggestions as well. A non-Jew must not be appointed to any public post  
in Israel. With regard to the "autonomy" concept of letting the Arabs  
have self-rule only under Israeli supervision, he writes: "This political  
solution is thus in the spirit of the traditional Jewish approach, both with  
regard to the land of Israel and with regard to non-Jewish minorities

If Canada, of which he was formerly a citizen, treated Dr. Nisan as a  
ben-noah, a member of the servant class with restricted rights, he would  
have protested it as deplorable discrimination, but he sees no contradic-  
tion in the Jews, as the chosen people, having a license to treat non-Jews  
in just this way. This is tribal morality given theological justification. I do  
not know how many Jews share his belief, but the publication of the

article in a leading Zionist periodical is cause for great concern,[Emphasis supplied]

Israel frequently prides itself on being the only democracy in the Middle  
East. Rabbi Kahane plans to change that, says Harkabi:

Meir Kahane does not mince words. "There is an absolute and irresolu-  
ble contradiction between the State of Israel... and the modern nation-  
state that sees all of its citizens as possessing equal rights.... There is a  
potential confrontation ... between the Zionist Jewish state ... and  
modern ideas of democracy and citizenship" (p. 109). Can we as Jews  
confront the world with such an assertion? Certainly there is much  
discrimination and repression in the world, but few openly proclaim the  
right to treat others as inferior and laud themselves for doing so. The  
claim can now be made that Khomeinism has appeared among us?[Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi acknowledges that he may be inviting criticism by exposing the  
beliefs and intentions of the religious extremists. He feels strongly that the  
conspiracy of silence among Jews must be broken, so that these positions  
can be challenged openly:

A case can be made against me that by revealing these tendencies of the  
Jews and Israel I am providing ammunition to enemies. I find myself in  
a painful conflict. There is no escape from it, though there is comfort in  
knowing that I am not alone and am not divulging any secrets. Much of  
what I have written here has been aired elsewhere, including the prob-  
lem of the identification of Amalek with the Arabs. Amnon Rubinstein's  
book, from which I have taken a number of citations, has appeared in  
English (though we should not pretend that non-Jews do not read  
Hebrew and follow what is published in the Israeli press). The article by  
Rabbi Yisrael Hess, "The Commandment of Genocide in the Torah,"  
received widespread publicity and was even discussed in an English-  
language publication of the University of Cape Town. The burning of the  
New Testament was discussed in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the  
Knesset (Ma'ariv, July 5, 1985) and debated on Israeli television. Meir  
Kahane publishes his views in English. A conspiracy of silence about  
these beliefs and this use of the tradition allows them to go unchallenged  
and encourages those who propagate them. There can be no remedy  
without first identifying the problem. By hiding our shame from outsid-  
ers we hide it from ourselves as well. The Torah says many times, "Youshall sweep out the evil from your midst." At the very least we must cry

The apologists who claim that non-Jews understand that Jews, like  
every human society, have lunatic fringes who should not be taken  
seriously are being irresponsible. Kahane won election to the Knesset,  
and support for his position in Israel has been rising. The same applies  
to other religious extremists; they are not a negligible element.

IDOLATRY AND THE FATE OF THE CHRISTIAN ARABS

According to the religious extremists, Christians are classed as idolators.

The classification of Christians as idolators has apparently become  
widespread and accepted in religious literature. This is not merely a  
theoretical matter, since practical conclusions flow from it. For example,  
in 1979 Rabbi Yosef issued a ruling that copies of the New Testament  
should be torn out of any edition of a Bible owned by a Jew and destroyed  
(Ha'aretz, October 23, 1979). This ruling did not remain a dead letter.  
An item in the newspaper Ma'ariv (June 14,1985) reported the burning  
of a copy of the New Testament found in the library at the base of a chief

These manifestations of hostility—the designation of Christians as  
idolators, the demand to invoke "resident alien" ordinances, and the  
burning of the New Testament—are distressing. Outside the Land of  
Israel Jews never dared behave in this fashion. Has independence made  
the Jews take leave of their sensesP [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi continues by quoting Maimonides on the two different legal

systems—one when the Gentiles are predominant and another when the

It is forbidden to show them mercy, as it was said, "nor show mercy unto  
them" (Deut. 7:2). Hence, if one sees one of them who worships idols

perishing or drowning, one is not to save him Hence you learn that

it is forbidden to heal idolators even for a fee. But if one is afraid of them  
or apprehends that refusal might cause ill will, medical treatment may be  
given for a fee but not gratuitously The foregoing rules apply to thetime when the people of Israel live exiled among the nations, or when  
the Gentiles' power is predominant. But when Israel is predominant  
over the nations of the world, we are forbidden to permit a Gentile who  
is an idolater to dwell among us. He must not enter our land, even as a  
temporary resident; or even as a traveler, journeying with merchandise  
from place to place, until he has undertaken to keep the seven precepts  
which the Noachides were commanded to observe (Hilkhot Avodah  
Zara, ch. 10:8). [Emphasis supplied]

Clearly, the soul of Israel is being corroded from within. The crisis of  
leadership infects the entire society. As quoted, Harkabi says that there is  
a conspiracy of silence to keep the knowledge of the intentions of the  
religious extremists from the rest of the world.

The only solution, Harkabi emphasizes, is to expose and challenge the  
religious fanatics because "by hiding our shame from outsiders we hide it  
from ourselves as well."

CHAPTER XI

Saving Israel from Suicide

T

HERE ARE MANY THINGS in the relationship between  
American Jews and Israel that have very little to do with Israel's  
best interests.

THE ISRAELI MYSTIQUE

The unquestioning devotion of American Jews to anything and every-  
thing "Israeli," including the fallible human beings who make up its  
government at any given time, did not always exist.

Prior to World War II, there was a deep division among Jews as to the  
feasibility, or even the desirability of Zionism. After the war, the weight of  
opinion shifted dramatically toward the Zionist cause and support for the  
State of Israel. The Holocaust, and the subsequent founding of the State of  
Israel in 1948, understandably brought about many changes in the attitude  
of world Jewry toward Zionism. With each succeeding Arab-Israeli war, the  
Jewish world rallied, with greater and greater will and determination, to the  
side of Israel. The survival of Israel, and its development into a military  
power, became an obsession with the Jewish people throughout the world.  
All other divisions and differences were forgotten.

Financial support from the Jews in the U.S. continued to flow in ever-  
increasing volume and the resources of the American Jewish community in  
political and economic power and influence were marshaled to the service  
of Israel.

The spectacular victory of the Israeli army in the 1967 Six Day War was  
followed by great joy and jubilation and the belief by many Israelis that they  
were invincible.

Out of this emotional crucible the "Israeli mystique" emerged. The  
American Jewish community became, by stages, captivated, seduced and,  
finally, blinded by the mystique.

The non-Jewish population of the U.S. was, and still is, arbitrarily and  
simplistically classified by Jews as for or against Israel, completely ignoring  
the fact that there are at least 17 political parties in Israel. Some want peace,  
some want war, some want to expel the Arabs and resettle all of ancient  
Israel; others are willing to give up all occupied Arab territories for peace.  
Some are "hawks" and some are "doves." American Jewry, however,  
became more militant than the Israelis themselves. On some issues, when  
the Prime Minister of Israel could muster the support of a bare majority of  
the Knesset, the Israeli Lobby could deliver almost the entire Senate and  
President of the U.S.

A number of reasons have been suggested by Jewish writers for the  
consuming passion which has characterized the attitude of many American  
Jews toward the Israelis. One of the most challenging is that suggested by  
James Yafee in his book, The American Jews. Yafee points out that it is  
often said all Jews are cowards, that no Jew has the guts to fight. However,  
he writes:

The Jew today can invoke Israel to convince the world that this  
stereotype is false. This is why even the most un-warlike American Jews  
delight in stories about the impact of Israel's military prowess... it is  
Israel's power, its guts, which impress American Jews. The implied, and  
sometimes spoken, conclusion is "That'll show the gentiles what kind of  
stuff we're made of." He sees Israel as a vicarious extension of himself.  
By identifying with those bronzed invincible heroes, he somehow takes  
on some of the bravery, some of the strength, that he feels he could  
never possess unaided. "There is a strong strain of magic in this—the  
superstitious magic of primitive people who believe that by drinking the  
tiger's blood or wearing his skin they can assume the characteristics of  
the tiger."

Of course, if either the Jew, or the Gentile (he supposedly is trying to  
impress), knew anything about Jewish history (some of which appears in  
the first chapter of this book), they would know that the Hebrew tribeswere among the most warlike people in the ancient world. As we have  
seen, even after they were occupied by the Romans, the Jews of Judea, as  
well as those in the Diaspora, became the most belligerent, rebellious,  
intractable people in the entire Roman Empire. Throughout most of  
history, the Jews have been an indomitable, determined and aggressive  
people. Today's Israeli army, with the advantage of some of the finest  
weaponry in the world, is no more "heroic," and their exploits no more  
remarkable, than those of the Maccabees, who fought and won a guerrilla  
war against the Syrian armies with simple weapons and abundant courage.  
Viewed over the immense span of Jewish history, it becomes clear that the  
"ghetto Jew" (particularly as caricatured in 18th and 19th century Russia  
and Poland) is a historic anomaly.

Unfortunately in the past, the American Jewish community has not  
limited its relationships with Israel simply to a supporting role. It has often  
been openly militant—to the point of inciting and provoking even a harder  
line by the Israeli hawks in the government. Past efforts to convince  
American Jews of their important role in the search for peace have been  
rebuffed, and labeled as "anti-Semitic "

Such an effort was made by the Quakers who, after an exhaustive analysis  
of the Middle East situation, made the following plea:

We appeal to the leaders of the powerful American Jewish community,  
whose hard work and generous financial support have been so important  
to the building and sustaining of Israel, to reassess the character of their  
support and the nature of their role in American politics. Our impres-  
sion ... is that there is a tendency for the American Jewish establish-  
ment to identify themselves with the more hard-line elements inside the  
Israeli cabinet, "to out-hawk the hawks," and to ignore or discount the  
dissident elements in and out of the Israeli Government that are  
searching for more creative ways to solve the Middle East problems.

This appeal by the Quakers was quoted in the book, The New Anti-  
Semitism, by Forster and Epstein, as an example of an "anti-Semitic"  
attitude by the Quakers.

In the same book, Forster and Epstein describe the feeling of Jews  
toward Israel in these words:

For, excepting the Jewish religion itself, Israel represents the greatest  
hope and the deepest commitment embraced by world Jewry in twomillennia. Just as Israel's survival depends in substantial measure on  
support from Jews in the United States and elsewhere, Jews in the  
Diaspora have come to feel that their own security and the only hope for  
their survival as a people, in a world from which anti-Semitism has  
never disappeared, depends in large measure on the survival of Israel}  
[Emphasis supplied]

In view of the enormous stake which world Jewry has in the survival of  
Israel, is it not too important a matter to be left entirely in the hands of  
whatever politicians happen to be in power when Israel's fate may be  
decided?

Fortunately, in recent years, there has been a change in viewpoint on the  
part of many Israeli intellectuals and some prominent members of the  
American Jewish community. They are urging and, indeed, pleading with  
American Jewry to use its influence to reverse the course that the Likud  
government is taking which they firmly believe can only lead to disaster.  
These include Abba Eban, Simha Flapan, Amos Perlmutter, Yehoshafat  
Harkabi, etc., and many other thoughtful and loyal Israelis who are  
appealing to the American Jewish community to act as true friends of  
Israel.

Many concerned Jews in America recognize that the survival of Israel  
cannot be taken for granted, if the present policies of the Likud government  
are allowed to continue. Yet, as we have seen, they are intimidated by the  
Likud from speaking out for fear of being charged with "collaborating with  
the enemy."

The consternation and anger of the American Jewish establishment, in  
response to the recent attempt of the Orthodox Rabbis to change the Law  
of Return (the "Who is a Jew?" issue), is rooted in the fear that Israel might  
not be a haven or refuge to the Reformed and Conservative Jews of  
America, if there should be a revival of "anti-Semitism" and persecution in  
the Diaspora. There is no doubt that the searing trauma of the Holocaust  
experience has left an indelible mark on every Jewish soul, often to the  
point where calm thinking gives way to irrational fears. This is the only  
explanation, it seems, that could account for the actions of Jewish leaders in  
rushing to Israel in a panic for fear that the Orthodox Rabbis in Israel  
might change the Law of Return in a manner that could deny American  
Jews, or their descendants, entry into Israel some day.

But, clearly, that is not where the danger lies. The Right of Return is a  
false promise if there is no place to return to.

The American Jewish community is divided on the question of exerting  
its influence on the Israeli government toward peace. Unfortunately, it  
seems that a substantial number of Jews in America prefer to leave the  
matter to Israel, "because Israel knows best what is best for Israel." Nothing  
could be further from the truth. Leaving it to Israel is to leave it to the  
Likud government and its irrational and irresponsible leadership.

The great lesson of the Holocaust is that Jews cannot afford to sit idly by  
until a threat to their survival gets out of control, and that fanatics and  
demagogues ought to be feared, not ignored—are being lost in an attitude  
of dangerous complacency. It is well and good to say "never again," but,  
unless prompt action is taken by responsible elements of the Jewish  
community in the U.S. and in Israel, "never" will soon be here. If it is true,  
as Santayana is so often quoted as saying, "that those who do not learn from  
history are doomed to repeat it," Israel, under the Likud, is doomed.

Abba Eban, in an article in the Jerusalem Post of November 9, 1988,  
states the case eloquently. He is quoted in part:

There is no need of many words to explain why the 1,500,000  
Palestinians under military rule have an interest in a different condition.  
They do not have a single one of the conditions that give fulfillment or  
dignity to a nation's life.

It should now be equally apparent that Israeli rule over that vast and  
growing population weighs no less heavily on the rulers than on the  
ruled. The present situation endangers our national and individual  
security, our economy, our international relations, our democratic princi-  
ples, our Jewish majority, our image in the eyes of the world, our  
prospect of attaining peace, our probability of avoiding war, our  
universal Jewish unity, our national consensus, and above all, our most  
cherished values.

It would be reasonable for Diaspora Jewish leaders to be longing more  
passionately and audibly for a Jewish state that will embrace the values  
which enabled Diaspora Jews to flourish in freedom.

When Diaspora Jewish leaders proclaim that "American Jews do not  
care" by whom Israel is governed, they sacrifice Jewish principles in  
behalf of an institutionalized docility that comes close to moral apathy.

It is incongruous to imply—correctly—that Diaspora Jews are entitled  
to combat the attempt to disqualify a majority of the Jewish congrega-  
tions, rabbis, temples and ceremonials from the pride of their Jewish  
identity—and then declare indifference about Israel's government.

The reluctance on the part of many American Jews to assert their  
influence upon the Likud government, even though the survival of Israel is  
at stake, is even more incredible when one considers the character of the  
Likud leadership. It should be asked: who are these leaders that the "non-  
interventionist" Jews are entrusting with the fate of Israel? What creden-  
tials do they have for such an awesome responsibility? What wisdom have  
they shown that they should be elevated above the criticism, advice or  
influence of the Jews of the Diaspora whose fate is bound up with that of  
Israel? What justifies this trust and confidence in the Likud that they are  
left to make these life or death decisions for Israel? Simply stated, who are

Harkabi, former Chief of Israeli Military Intelligence and advisor to  
Prime Minister Menachem Begin, says that most of the desperate problems  
which face Israel today are the result of the Begin-Jabotinsky ethos, which  
has determined Israel's domestic and foreign policies since the Likud  
assumed power in 1977. He thinks that Begin was incompetent to lead a  
government and blames the U.S. "Friends of Israel" for pushing Begin

Harkabi blames Israel's misfortunes directly on the Likud government,  
and Prime Minister Begin particularly as leader of the Herut (the center

The Likud government presided over a series of great failures: the peace  
treaty with Egypt, which loomed initially as a great achievement; the  
Lebanon War, which turned into a fiasco; which has become a quagmire;  
de facto annexation; Israel's economy, which nearly collapsed; the  
conduct of politics that degenerated into demagoguery; the worsening in  
the relations between various segments of the population—those of  
North African and Middle Eastern origin (the Sephardim) against those  
of European backgrounds (the Ashkenazim), as well as religionists  
against secularists. Generally, the national confidence was undermined by  
this widespread deterioration of Israel's situation. What caused all these  
failures? Were they purely accidental and unrelated, or were they all of a  
piece? Were they the result of unforeseen problems and bad luck, or were  
they built in? Did they have a common denominator in some erroneous  
policy? Were the failures rooted in the personalities of the leaders, in  
their lack of ability or unsuitability for office? Or did they result from a  
political philosophy, aspects of these leaders' mentality and basic  
concepts that influenced both their personalities and their policies?

My answer is that there was a common denominator: a misperception  
of reality or an insufficient regard for it. The accumulation of failures  
cannot be explained in isolation from the Jabotinsky-Begin ethos. They  
all stemmed from a pattern of thought that was influenced by this ethos:  
a superficial approach that searched for shortcuts to great accomplish-  
ments by means of a single dramatic event or policy, a focusing on  
intentions instead of outcomes and an exaggerated belief in the power of

Taken in the aggregate, these failures constituted a veritable national  
tragedy, since they critically worsened Israel's condition and weakened  
the basis of its existence. Many Israelis have begun to wonder whether  
their country can endure, whether the nation can climb down safely from  
the slippery cliff face to which successive Likud governments have led  
them. This will depend on recognition by both the public at large—and  
not only by a minority within it—of both the severity of the situation  
and its causes. Recognition that Israel's problems were intensified by its  
leaders' errors and not by unavoidable circumstances will bring energy  
for change. On the other hand, refusing to recognize the severity of the  
situation will encourage the mindset that brought these calamities upon  
Israel and pave the way for further disasters. [Emphasis supplied]

At a symposium of the National Unity Government held at Hebrew  
University of Jerusalem in May 1985, Professor Shlomo Avineri noted that  
Begin had become hated throughout the world (despite his having received  
the Nobel Peace Prize), implying that Israel's status throughout the world  
has declined because of foreign reaction to the arrogance and insufferability

Aside from earning the hatred of much of the world and grossly  
mismanaging the affairs of Israel, what has Menachem Begin accomplished

In Teddy Preuss's book, Begin, His Regime, he compares Begin with

Ben-Gurion stood with his face to the future, looked ahead and was ready  
to pay with earnings from the past. Begin behaved quite the opposite: he  
stood with his face towards the past, looked backward, and was ready to

Ben-Gurion's apocalyptic prophecy, found in a letter he wrote to  
Moshe Sharett on May 31, 1963, resounds today like a heavenly voice  
from beyond the mountains of darkness: "I have no doubt that Be gin's  
rule (Mapai is bringing his rule of Israel closer) will lead to the  
destruction of the state. In any case his rule will turn Israel into a  
monster." After six and a quarter years of his rule, Ben-Gurion's warning  
is not far from realization. The peace treaty with Egypt—his one and  
great accomplishment—was emptied by Begin of all content and  
squandered through settlement activities and the Lebanon War. With  
the erasure of this accomplishment from the balance sheet, Prime  
Minister Begin's resignation remains the sole service that he performed

As discussed in Chapter III of this book, Begins successor, Yitzhak  
Shamir, has even less credentials except that he had a bloodier terrorist  
career than Begin. How much confidence can be placed in the leadership of  
such a man? As discussed in the chapter on Zionism, Shamir succeeded  
Stern as the head of the "Stern Gang," or "Lehi."

In Israel's historical self-reckoning there is nothing bleaker than Lehi's  
attempts to establish relations with the Nazis. At the end of 1941, seven  
years after Hitler had come to power and more than two years after the  
outbreak of the Second World War, when the anti-Semitic atrocities of  
the Nazis were well-known, Lehi sought an alliance with Nazi Germany.  
The memorandum transmitted from Lehi to the Germans asserted that  
"according to its world view and structure [Lehi] is very close to the  
totalitarian movements of Europe." Not only did it claim to share with  
Germany "common interests for a new order in Europe and the  
authentic aspirations of the Jewish people," but it also claimed to be close

This attempt to make a deal with the Nazis was no isolated incident:  
it continued a political line that began with attempts to make contacts  
with the Italian Fascist government. Words of praise to Hitler appeared  
in the Revisionist press, provoking a sharp rebuke from Jabotinsky  
himself. The Germans' response was negative but Lehi was not deterred:  
a few months later, it sent Nathan Yellin-Mor to the Balkans to arrange  
a meeting with the Germans and persuade them of the benefit to them  
of an alliance with the Jews against Britain.

When this affair became known, after the German diplomat von  
Hantig published his memoirs in 1974, Eldad and Yellin-Mor had to  
defend their actions. Eldad described them as a far-sighted scheme to  
rescue the Jews of Europe, since at the time the Final Solution had yet to  
be adopted. Yellin-Mor reported that Abraham Stern, the leader of Lehi,  
had anticipated a German defeat and feared that Britain would dominate  
the entire Middle East. Did Stern and his colleagues truly believe that  
assistance from Lehi could tip the scales in favor of Germany, and that  
it was better for the Jews that Germany win the war?

It is doubtful whether the long history of the Jews, full as it is of  
oddities and cruel ironies, has ever known such an attempt to make a  
deal with rabid enemies—of course, ostensibly for reasons of higher  
political wisdom. But how could cooperation with the Nazis have  
furthered the establishment of the "Kingdom of Israel"? What could  
have induced the Nazis to cooperate with the Jews and so radically  
change their entire ideology to the point of intimate partnership with  
them?

Perhaps, for peace of mind, we ought to see this affair as an aberrant  
episode in Jewish history. Nevertheless, it should alert us to how far  
extremists may go in a time of distress, and where their manias may  
lead,, [Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi's admonition that we should be alert to how far extremists may  
go and where their "manias may lead" must be taken seriously.

To be alert is to recognize that the "manias" of the extremists are leading  
Israel—which is leading the Israeli Lobby—which is leading the govern-  
ment of the United States—which will lead, if not stopped, to a war of  
unthinkable consequences. The possibility that Ariel Sharon may realize his  
ambition to succeed Shamir is too appalling to contemplate.

The reckless and irrational policies of the Likud are alienating the  
nations of the world, and destroying any chance for peace. Moreover, the  
alliance between the Likud and the religious extremists, with their religious  
and ethnic hatreds, threatens to undermine a century of amity and friend-  
ship with the Gentile population of the West. From this, the Jews of the  
Diaspora cannot afford to remain aloof. Harkabi writes:

For many Jews, Israel has become the prime focus and symbol of Jewish  
identity.

Jews, especially in the United States, are disposed to liberalism. When  
liberal public opinion is critical of Israel, they experience a cognitivedissonance, and this gnaws at their Jewish identity. The future of the  
reputation of the Jewish people throughout the world now depends on  
Israel's good name and international stature. More than any other state,  
Israel is a hostage to world public opinion. Israelis must remember this.  
We Israelis must be careful lest we become not a source of pride for Jews  
but a distressing burden.

Moreover, Israel is the criterion according to which all Jews will tend  
to be judged. Israel as a Jewish state is an example of the Jewish  
character, which finds free and concentrated expression within it.[Emphasis supplied]

If Israel today is the example of the "Jewish character which finds free  
and concentrated expression in it," the religious extremists and fanatics are  
making a mockery of World Jewry.

Harkabi asks why the Jews allow the religious extremists in Israel to  
spread religious and racial hatred without protest:

Religious Jews seem unaware how much explosive material is latent in  
the assertion that Halakha takes precedence over the law of the land.

If, as Meir Kahane and many others assert, Jews have the right to  
expel Arabs and aliens from the Land of Israel, why do the nations of the  
world have to allow Jews to live in their countries? The same reasoning  
applied to Rabbi Yosef's ruling that the New Testament should be  
burned and the unfortunate case of the actual burning of a copy thereof:  
it provides retroactive legitimacy to the burning of Jewish holy books by  
Christians.

The most revolting manifestations of this trend—even if it involves  
only a tiny minority in Israel—is the revival of the command to blot out  
the memory of Amalek and the identification of Amalek with the Arabs.  
How can a rabbi's assertion that the killing of a non-Jew is not murder  
be justified? Christians might say that killing Jews isn't murder, thereby  
providing sanction for all the pogroms of history. How can Jews hold up  
their heads when they hear such claims and not actively combat them?[Emphasis supplied]

More important, how can the Anti-Defamation League sit idly by and  
allow this defamatory and calumnious attack on Jewish principles and  
ethics? This is real "anti-Semitism."

IS ZIONISM RACISM?

As indicated in the previous chapter, Revisionist Zionism, championed  
by Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, and the central philosophy of the  
Likud party, is not reticent on the subject of the superiority of the Jewish  
race as compared with the rest of mankind.

Harkabi describes the ideology of the Likud: "It attributes supreme value  
to the concept of nation or race. Its natural extension is the idea that the  
'whole world is against us.' In its most extreme form it presents  
nonsegregation and openness toward strangers as 'treason against Judaism.'  
This view of a unique essence also breeds the belief that the Jews are  
allowed what is forbidden to others.

"On a political level, the idea that the greatness of the Jews stems from  
their essence is translated into self-righteousness: Israel is not responsible  
for untoward development in the Arab-Israeli conflict and indeed cannot  
be. It is no accident that Begin promoted this attitude and found immediate  
support for it, and himself, among religious circles."

Harkabi continues with a summary of the religious extremists' concept  
of the Chosen People:

The Jews as the Chosen People are superior in their essence to all other  
human beings. Their divine election is a fact, an absolute fact. The  
difference between Jews and non-Jews is thus part of the very nature of  
things. "[God] separated between the profane and the holy, between the  
light and the darkness, between Israel and the nationsThe sages have  
provided us with passages in this spirit too: "Israel is dear, having been  
called sons of the holy one"; anyone who preserves a single life of Israel  
is considered to have preserved an entire world; "all Israel has a share in  
the world to come" (not only as a reward for fulfilling the command-  
ments); "no non-Jew has a share in the world to come." In this view,  
Jews and non-Jews were molded from different matter. True, a non-Jew  
can convert to Judaism, but by doing so he changes his essence. The  
attitude toward the non-Jew is closed, and the emphasis is on strict  
segregation. The greatness expressed by chosenness is embodied in the  
Jewish collective essence. [Emphasis supplied]

Statements by Israeli government officials condemning apartheid in  
South Africa as "completely contrary to the very foundations in which  
Jewish life is based," are the ultimate in hypocrisy.

Mark A. Bruzonsky,[[9]](#footnote-9) in an article entitled "Israel Is Too Much Like South  
Africa," appearing in the Los Angeles Times, August 20, 1985, makes the  
point convincingly:

I first encountered the charge that Zionist racism makes Israel compar-  
able to South Africa in the early 1970s, while I was chief representative  
of the International Student Movement for the United Nations. I  
protested vehemently in a long personal letter to an assistant of the U.N.  
secretary-general, Kurt Waldheim. Officials of the American Zionist  
Youth Foundation sent copies of that letter to Jewish university students  
in the United States and Israel, and then commissioned me to write  
monthly articles on Zionism for their newsletter.

I next confronted the Israel/South Africa comparison at Princeton  
University while obtaining a master s degree in international affairs.  
Prof. Richard Falk, himself Jewish, repeatedly linked the situations of the  
two countries in his course on international law. I remember sharing the  
outrage of my Israeli student colleagues. Once again I protested  
vehemently.

I provide my own history on the issue to make it clear that for many  
years I aggressively challenged comparisons of South Africa and Israel.  
Now I have come to conclude that the similarities between the two  
outweigh the differences.

Tragically, Israel today has become precisely what many of its liberal  
founders feared—a besieged, divided, polarizing country whose methods  
of repression against the Palestinians parallel those of white South  
Africa against the blacks.

Here are what I view as the important points of similarity:

—In both cases, self-determination is being sought by a mistreated,  
oppressed, abused ethnic group—the blacks of South Africa, the  
Palestinians in the territories occupied by Israel since the 1967 war.

—Both governments are engaged in escalating militarism, intimida-  
tion and brutality.

—Both oppressed groups have resorted to open challenge and  
increasing violence.

—In both cases the potential for escalating conflict is growing.

... the Israeli government has further stepped up a campaign against

its Palestinian subjects that over the years has included deportation,  
imprisonment, collective punishment and, occasionally, documented  
torture. Emergency regulations left over from British Mandate days in  
what used to be called Palestine, similar to those imposed in South  
Africa, are enforced by Israel in the occupied territories.

Looked at historically rather than through the obscuring lens of day-  
to-day headlines, the white minority of South Africa and the Jewish  
minority in the Middle East are both coming up against their own  
inescapable contradictions. In an era of non-discrimination and secular-  
ism they are ideologically wedded to principles that many in the world  
term racist.

The situation is more confused in the case of historic Palestine, a land  
that the world community voted to partition in 1947 between the same  
two nationalist movements that are in conflict today. Jewish ethnicity  
and chauvinism in combination with Zionist nationalism have created a  
mix that is discriminatory in spirit if not in actual laws.

The greatest distinction between Israel and South Africa is that  
Zionism is legally non-discriminatory while apartheid is legally racist.  
And yet, if we are to be honest, in practice the results are comparable.

The most hopeful difference between the two may be that an  
acceptable solution is still conceivable for Israel and the Palestinians—  
peaceful coexistence and mutual recognition of both peoples' national  
rights. However, increasing attacks of Jewish settlers on the West Bank  
and rising Israeli support for extremists are signs that time may also be  
running out in the Middle East.

More recently the Israeli government said that it "unconditionally  
objects to the policy of apartheid in South Africa," although it took no  
steps to alter the substantial trade, arms and security relationship that  
exists between the two countries. Prime Minister Shimon Peres con-  
demned apartheid as "completely contrary to the very foundations on  
which Jewish life is based."

But around the world today people who speak in one way and act in  
another have little credibility. Vigorous protest of apartheid while  
acquiescing in Israel's continuing campaign to intimidate the Palestinian  
people into submission is hypocrisy. [Emphasis supplied]

In the Los Angeles Times, June 5,1989, edition, the following news item  
appeared, datelined Jerusalem:

Jewish settlers yesterday attacked and beat Israeli peace activists trying to  
deliver food and medicine to Palestinian children in Gaza Strip refugee  
camps. In the West Bank, soldiers reportedly shot and killed a Palestin-  
ian teen-ager.

The developments followed a raid Monday by Jewish settlers on a  
Palestinian refugee camp. A 13-year-old girl was shot to death in the  
rampage.

An Israeli court in Kfar Saba, near Tel Aviv, yesterday ordered five  
Jewish seminary students suspected in the rampage jailed pending  
further investigation. The seminary's spiritual leader, Rabbi Yitzhak  
Ginsburg, justified the slaying and said the blood of Jews and non-Jews  
cannot be equated. [Emphasis supplied]

Is this from Mein Kampf?

Unless the moderate Jews in Israel and the Diaspora speak out against  
this arrogant perversion in the name of religion, they should remain silent  
when the United Nations equates Zionism with racism.

Old Jewish doctrines that were thought dead and buried are being  
revived by the religious extremists. The pernicious doctrine that there are  
two standards of morality—one when the Jews are weak and another when  
the Jews are dominant—is being raised again in the name of Maimonides  
(the great Jewish philosopher of the late Middle Ages). Harkabi explains:

The victory of 1967 led certain extremists to the belief that the age had  
in fact come when Israel was stronger than the nations of the world, or  
nearly so. Maimonides explained that the restrictions on idolaters  
(identified with non-Jews in general) are applicable only in such a  
period: "The foregoing rules applied to the time when the people of  
Israel lived reviled among the nations, or when the gentiles' power is  
predominant. But when Israel is predominant over the nations of the  
world, we are forbidden to permit a gentile who is an idolater to dwell  
among us" (Avoda Zara, 10:6). Thus Maimonides distinguished between  
two periods: when "the nations of the world are stronger than Israel"  
and their wrath is to be feared, and when "Israel is stronger than the  
nations of the world " and may treat them in a high-handed manner,[Emphasis supplied]

Harkabi continues:

Jewish religious extremism has been associated with a startling deterio-  
ration in the quality of theological thought. Its leaders usurp God's roleand decide what his position should be, claiming that... they know"  
that God has signed up to hack the Israel cause, is angry with gentiles,  
can no longer restrain his wrath, and is about to explode against them.  
Meir Kahane has explained that the establishment of the State of Israel  
was "the beginning of God's wrath, his vengeance on the gentiles who  
ignored his existence "

The pattern of thinking implied by Rabbi Zvi Yehudah Kook's  
statement that the entire world will have to get accustomed to the idea  
that Israel will not yield a single inch of the occupied territories, and it  
will be better for them when they do so, is also distressing. The  
statement implies a threat that if the world does not accept annexation  
it will be punished, [Emphasis supplied]

THE RISE OF XENOPHOBIA

Harkabi cites Mordechai Nisan's The Jewish State and the Arab Problem

as indicating an alarming increase in hostility to the Gentile world:

There is no need for compensation in case an ox owned by a Jew gores  
an ox owned by a gentile, whereas there is need for compensation in the  
opposite case (Hilkhot Nizkei Mammon, ch. 8:5). An article lost by a Jew  
should be returned but not one lost by a gentile (Hilkhot Gzeilah  
VeAvedah, ch. 11). Dr. Nisan justifies these discriminations on the  
grounds of "cultural differences" (ibid.) These discriminatory laws can  
now be transposed from the private to the political domain. Thus, Israeli  
Jewish claims to Eretz Yisrael are superior, and the Palestinian claims  
can be summarily rejected, thus there is no need for a compromise with  
them. The West Bank should be annexed by Israel forthwith, and the  
ensuing demographic problem be solved by a "transfer" of the Arabs to  
other countries (p. 124).

Judaism has been radicalized in two ways: politically, in supporting  
extreme nationalism and annexation of the West Bank; socially, in  
fostering hostility to gentiles in general and Arabs in particular. We find  
ourselves in a grave predicament. True, expressions of hostility and  
discriminatory enactments existed earlier, but until now they were moot.  
Since 1967, they are no longer so and the possibility has been breathed  
into them by the demand that such laws should be applied here and now.  
Thus, they have been actualized and made plausible. We can no longer  
shrug our shoulders at the hostile material on the pretext that it is a very  
minor as well as extinct part of the Judaic tradition. Indeed, I suspect that

the new developments in the Jewish religion constitute transmutation of  
great significance. As these changes occur before our eyes we may fail to  
appreciate how revolutionary they are. What has surfaced cannot again

The argument that "Kahanism" is an aberration is disposed of by Harkabi

After Rabbi Meir Kahane's election to the Knesset, many religious Jews  
began to describe him as an anomaly, an aberrant weed that had grown  
in the garden of Judaism. It seems to me that this explanation is  
simplistic and evasive. First, Kahane is not alone in holding these views.  
Focusing exclusively on him distorts the true picture: significant parts of  
his platform are shared by many others, including important rabbis and  
heads of yeshivas. The Kahanist phenomenon extends far beyond the  
narrow confines of his declared supporters, even if most religious Jews  
have grave doubts about many of his positions. Second, Kahane and  
other religious extremists certainly do not represent all of Judaism (who  
does?) but they do represent certain elements found within it. They  
mark the extreme of traditional Jewish concepts. As has been said, their  
stand is based on texts drawn from the greatest sages of our tradition.  
Citing "good" texts for humane attitudes toward "the stranger" does not

Kahane's use of the tradition hinders the religious moderates'  
campaign against the extremists, for fear that opposition to him will be  
taken as an attack on the great sages upon whom he relies, which would  
disqualify the moderates in the eyes of the religious public. If Kahane is  
twisting and distorting the texts and the meaning of halakha, the rabbis  
ought to prove it. The assertion that Kahane and his ilk are perverting  
the spirit of Judaism is rather far-fetched. It is hard to say what the true  
spirit of Judaism is; ultimately this is a matter of subjective impres-

David Shipler, in his masterwork and Pulitzer Prize-winning book  
entitled Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land, also points out  
the tendency of the religious extremists to cite only scriptural texts that

Gush Emunim activists take what they wish from the contradictory  
sources. As the eleven- and twelve-year-old boys in Kiryat Arba  
explained, they are learning in their yeshivas that the Arab is Amalek,

the enemy tribe that God instructed the Jews to fight eternally and  
destroy: "Amalek was the first of the nations; but his latter end shall be  
that he perish for ever." (Numbers 24:20.) Hagai Segal, a settler from  
Ofra, was quoted in the settlers' paper Nekuda as declaring, "The Torah  
of Israel has nothing to do with modern humanistic atheism. The Torah  
yearns for revenge. Such a Torah is not humanistic."

Expressions of bellicose intolerance are given religious sanction and  
rationalization, which then filter into some segments of the lay popula-  
tion. Some rabbis, such as Eliezer Waldenberg, winner of the 1976 Israel  
Prize, declared that Halakha, Jewish law, required strict separation of  
Jews from Arabs, preferably an apartheid system or, better yet, the  
expulsion of the "goyim " all non-Jews, from Jerusalem. An American  
correspondent and his family became targets of some of this chauvinism  
in the Jerusalem neighborhood where they lived; the word "goy" was  
scratched into the paint of their car, and the children were hassled by  
Israeli youngsters on the street. Zohar Endrawos, an Arab in the mostly  
Christian Galilee town of Tarshiha, remembered Jewish youngsters in  
neighboring Maalot making crosses with their fingers and spitting on  
them. Another rabbi, writing in the student newspaper of Bar-Ilan  
University, near Tel Aviv, argued that the Torah prescribed genocide  
against the modern Amalek. At the Gush Emunim settlement of Elon  
Moreh, when security men went to investigate the murder of an eleven-  
year-old Arab girl by settlers, they were met with signs reading "Ishmaeli  
Police." [Emphasis supplied]

Shipler also sees Kahanism as a serious threat:

In the year after his Kach movement's election to the Knesset with one  
seat, Kahane's popularity soared to the point where, by the autumn of  
1985, the public-opinion polls recorded enough support for him to win  
ten or eleven seats in a new election. Even allowing for Israelis'  
propensity to vent their frustration and anger more extensively on  
questionnaires than at the ballot box, the Kahane phenomenon alarmed  
the liberal-minded establishment enough to prompt President Chaim  
Herzog to tell a group of high-school students in a Tel Aviv suburb, "I  
think it is a disgrace to the Jewish people—and that is how it looks to the  
whole world—that a person could rise in the Jewish state and present a  
program that is very similar to the Nuremberg laws"—the measures  
promulgated by Nazi Germany in 1935 to strip Jews of their rights.

Kahane satisfied the lust for simplicity that is fed by rage. He offered  
order as an antidote to uncertainty, complexity.

It is clear that a malignancy is growing within the body politic of Israel.  
The Israeli people cannot be fully alerted to the seriousness of this threat  
if they are lulled into the belief that the powerful and influential American  
Jewish community either supports the policies of the Likud and the  
religious extremists, or is indifferent to them. Begin clung to office on the  
strength of the boast that he "could handle the Americans." Shamir is  
playing the same game.

An article appearing in the Los Angeles Times February 2,1989, edition,  
entitled "Jewish Doves See Need to Criticize Israel," again calls attention to  
the critical need for Diaspora Jews to speak out:

THE HAGUE—Dovish members of the international Jewish community  
agreed here Wednesday that there is a need to speak out against Israeli  
policy in dealing with the Palestinian uprising in the occupied territories.

Drora Kass, director of the New York office of the International  
Center for Peace in the Middle East, was a member of the American  
Jewish delegation that met last December in Stockholm with leaders of  
the Palestine Liberation Organization. She recalled the criticism she  
received at the time from fellow American Jews, but she said the meeting  
may have encouraged PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat to take a more  
moderate line in a speech to a meeting of the U.N. General Assembly  
later that month in Geneva.

Kass said she believes that concerned Jews have not only a right but  
also a duty to speak out for peace in the occupied territories—the West  
Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip.

And she argued that American Jews should articulate their disagree-  
ment with Israels tactics in suppressing the nearly 14-month-old  
Palestinian uprising. Otherwise, she said, Israeli leaders will not get an  
accurate impression of the anti-violence sentiments held by most  
American Jews.

Kass said it was the failure of American Jews to object to Israeli policy,  
out of what she called a misguided desire to maintain Jewish unity, that  
led Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir to say on returning from

visiting the United States that "all American Jews are behind me."

Harkabi emphasizes the seriousness of the failure of the moderates in

The absence of a strong opposition to religious extremism by recognized  
Jewish religious and lay leaders abroad and by the chief rabbis and the  
political leadership in Israel is apt to be considered a tacit tolerance of its  
views. So far the reaction of moderate religious circles has been weak.  
Stronger reactions will come only if the matter becomes urgent, if public  
debate embarrasses the religious and lay leadership. It will not move of  
its own accord, because of the roots that the extremist positions have in  
the tradition. It is not the call for a discussion of the problem that is  
damaging but rather the reluctance to grapple with it.

Let us remember that what is at stake is not some secondary question,  
or a problem that will go away if it is ignored. The struggle is for the soul  
of Judaism and its status in the world, and for the moral and political  
status of the State of Israel [Emphasis supplied]

In addition to the racial discrimination which is rooted in the religious  
concept of "The Chosen People," there is virulent and widespread racial  
antagonism which pervades the Israeli population, both religious and non-  
religious, which is "sociological." This has been discussed briefly in  
Bruzonsky's comparison of Israel to South Africa cited earlier.

The Palestinian Arabs comprise a distinct underclass politically, socially,  
and economically. India has its "untouchables"—the Israelis have the  
Palestinians. They do the menial work, jobs that Jews will not stoop to—  
garbage collectors, janitors, dishwashers, construction workers, fruit  
pickers, etc. The word "Arab" has come to have a pejorative connotation:  
"Arab work" is menial work; "Don't act like an Arab," can mean any  
number of unattractive attributes. The prevailing attitude among most  
Israelis toward the Palestinians is one of fear but mostly contempt. They  
believe that Arabs must be treated brutally because "force is the only

For many Palestinians, daily life is one of harassment, humiliation and  
intimidation. Palestinians of the professional and educated classes who  
don't fit the untouchable mode are systematically deported or imprisoned.

Shipler quotes one Palestinian's description of the situation:

We have over one thousand two hundred leaders of the community who  
have been deported. These were leaders who were not involved in any  
kind of activities that even subjectively you can call terrorist. These are  
church leaders, university presidents, union leaders—they threw them  
out. You have a thousand two hundred laws that have been imple-  
mented, arbitrarily controlling every aspect of life in a very racist and  
apartheid way. You need a permit to plant tomatoes and to plant  
eggplants and to plant vines. You have to get a permit if you want to  
plant a plum tree in front of your house. If you lose your ID [card], you  
are in vital trouble. If you do not follow all this trickery in paperwork you  
are out and the border is sealed.

Shipler points out that little is done by Israeli police to protect the  
Palestinians:

For most of the six years that Menachem Begin was Prime Minister, Jews  
could kill Arabs on the West Bank with impunity. Arrests were sometimes  
made, prosecutions sometimes begun. But somehow the cases rarely came  
to trial. The pattern of leniency was documented by an Assistant Attorney  
General, Judith Karp, who studied seventy instances of Jewish violence  
against Arabs during a year beginning in the spring of 1981. She found  
that even in cases of murder, the army, which administered the West Bank  
under Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, intervened to thwart police inves-  
tigations or, at the very least, failed to press for vigorous police action.  
Settlers came to see themselves as living amid lawlessness. In murder  
cases, the report said, "the appropriate energy and required efficiency for  
investigations of this kind were not evident." Describing two incidents in  
which settlers killed Arab boys, Karp wrote, "The suspects received a  
summons to present themselves to the police station. They announced  
that they would not appear and that they would speak only with the  
military authorities. The police did not do anything to bring the suspects  
to the police station despite the grave suspicion." Where soldiers had shot  
Arabs, she said, "the soldiers' version was believed even though it did not  
seem reasonable, and the circumstances of the incident supported the  
complainant's version." Karp's findings produced no action by the Justice  
Ministry, the police, or the army, and she therefore resigned as head of  
a committee examining the problem. The report was suppressed for a yearby the Justice Ministry. It was released only after Yitzhak Shamir became  
Prime Minister and a round of Jewish terrorism broke out.

Many Palestinians believed the Jewish settlers were laying the psycho-  
logical groundwork for the Arabs to panic and flee should warfare erupt,  
just as the massacre of Arabs at Deir Yassin led many to flee during the  
1948 war for fear that the Jews would massacre them as well. Indeed, the  
germ of this idea could even be found occasionally in the utterances of  
Jewish settlers. In 1980 Nekuda quoted a resident of the settlement of  
Ofra, Aharon Halamish, as telling a symposium on Arab-Jewish rela-  
tions, "We have to make an effort so that the Arab people have a hard  
time in this country. If we employ them and develop them, we are  
undermining ourselves. We don't need to throw grenades in the casbah  
or to kick out the Arabs, but there is nothing wrong with our giving  
them a hard time and hoping they get killed." [Emphasis supplied]

It is not difficult to understand the killings and brutalities committed by  
Israeli soldiers in the occupation forces. Shipler quotes a Hebrew University  
faculty member:

A Hebrew University faculty member, Shlomo Ariel, writes to Ha'aretz  
about disturbing attitudes in discussions with young Jews who are about  
to enter the army:

I met with about ten groups of fifty young people each, which  
represents to a certain extent a random and representative sample of  
the Jewish population of Israel of this age level, with all its strata and

ethnic origins The young participants, almost unanimously,

expressed full identification with the racist positions of Finkielshtein  
toward Arabs. To the claim that the latter are Israeli citizens with  
equal rights according to the law, the typical reaction was that Israeli  
citizenship should be denied them. In each discussion group there  
were a few who proposed physically liquidating the Arabs, right down  
to the elderly, women, and children. They received the comparison  
between Sabra and Shatila [the Beirut refugee camps] and the Nazi  
destruction favorably, and said with full candor that they would carry  
out such destruction - with their own hands with no inhibitions or  
pangs of conscience. Not one expressed shock or reservations about  
these declarations, but there were those who said that there was no  
need for physical liquidation; it would be enough to exile them acrossthe border. Many supported apartheid on the model of South Africa.  
The idea that to the Arabs of Israel this country is their country and  
birthland was received with amazement and mockery. Any moral  
claim was rejected with scorn. In each group there were not more than  
two or three holders of humanitarian, anti-racist views on this ques-  
tion, but it could be seen that they were afraid to express themselves  
publicly, and indeed those few who dared to express their unpopular  
opinions were immediately silenced by a chorus of shouts. [Empha-  
sis supplied]

If this is, as said, a representative sample of Israeli youth, the future of  
Israel is grim indeed. Human rights organizations, and the U.S. State  
Department, have condemned Israel's oppressive occupation tactics and  
brutalities as inexcusable. Today, in civilized Israel, the only capital offense  
is rock throwing.

Shipler recounts an incident which makes especially chilling reading,  
because the Israeli commander was a woman:

Troops and policemen have, on occasion, been prosecuted for brutality,  
but only half-heartedly after much public uproar, and their sentences  
have usually been light. Strict guidelines on opening fire during demon-  
strations have been promulgated, but little or no training has been given  
in crowd control, leaving every inexperienced soldier at the mercy of his  
fears with only a deadly rifle as his protection from angry stone-  
throwers. A grinding guilt works at the bowels of Israeli consciousness.  
Or, worse, a callous frustration numbs the young Jew and carries over  
into his own open democracy. He has grown up thinking the Arabs are  
good for beating.

The infectious brutality festered and then broke into an open sore in  
the Tel Aviv civilian guard, which patrols streets and watches for  
suspicious characters who might be planting bombs. Jewish high-school  
students from Herzliya, north of Tel Aviv, were shocked at what they  
witnessed when they volunteered for night duty in 1984. Under the  
supervision of Sarah Rahamim, the chief of their base, bands of volunteers  
from Tel Aviv schools drove through the city, spotted Arabs, pushed them  
into stairwells, slapped and punched them. "We were driving in the area  
of the central bus station," one girl told Ha'aretz. "Suddenly we saw three  
Arabs in front of us. One of the volunteers asked them what they were  
doing here and where they worked. He instructed them to enter a stairwell

in a nearby house and to wait there I told Sarah that I had heard that

they were beating them, and I wanted to know what was going on. Sarah  
said to me: 'Go look. When my daughter sees it, she gets a good laugh.'  
I got out of the patrol car and went to the building door. The three Arabs  
were facing the wall with their arms raised. One of the volunteers asked  
one of the Arabs: 'Where do you live?' The Arab answers, and he yells  
at him: 'Why are you lying?' and hits him. Another question and another  
shout: 'You're lying!' And a blow." During another patrol, she said, "We  
saw an Arab running. We didn't know if he was running because of us  
or because of the rain. We all got out of the patrol car and stopped him.  
Everyone was armed even though we had not passed the firing range

[test] and it's forbidden I came to the door of the apartment

house The student leader was holding the Arab's identity card. In front

of him stood the Arab with his hands up, and behind him stood a  
volunteer with drawn rifle with the cartridge in. I heard the student leader  
say to the Arab: 'If we see you again, that will be the end of you.' And  
he slapped him. They make a real thing out of the beatings. They talk  
about this experience to everyone. One guy broke an Arab's tooth, the  
second forced another Arab to crawl. Another boasted that he broke two  
of an Arab's teeth."

Another student, a boy, told the paper, "The guys on the base prepared  
me by saying that you have to beat Arabs because Arabs rape girls and  
are a criminal nuisance. When you beat them, they go away. When we  
drove in an area without Arabs, what's called a 'clean area,' the volunteers  
explained to us that it was clean because they were beaten and they fled."  
The volunteers mocked Arabs for their accents and tried to make them  
cry. The commander, Sarah Rahamin, was forced to resign, but no  
criminal action was taken.

The conscience of the country is always there, yet wrongs are done as  
a matter of routine. A system of military courts hears security and political  
cases in the occupied territories, and many of the judges are attorneys and  
law professors, not career military men, who preside during their month  
of reserve duty each year. But the ostensible judicial protections are easily  
foiled by the latitude of the Shin Beth to force confessions, by the fear of  
Arabs to charge publicly that they have been tortured, by the reluctance  
of the courts to throw out confessions that are challenged, by the inability  
of many Arab families to afford defense lawyers, by the fact that laws on  
the West Bank and Gaza Strip are made by military decree with no  
legislative input.

How common this callous and extreme cruelty may be is difficult to say,  
but from the reports of human rights agencies it is not, by any means, rare.

Moreover, it has official sanction since it furthers the government's  
policy of harassing and terrorizing the Arab population in the West Bank  
and Gaza, to the point where their lives become so intolerable that they will  
be forced to leave their homes and lands.

Whether they are forced to leave or not, the well of fear and hatred  
between Israelis and Palestinians is bottomless. It is no exaggeration to say  
that more rancor and bitterness have been engendered in Palestine in the  
past forty years than the British in North Ireland were able to create in four  
hundred years.

Shipler summarizes his conclusions which end on a note of hopelessness  
that any reconciliation between the two peoples is possible:

I found it less easy to draw the lines of cause and effect. It may be, as  
those involved think, that the racism, anti-Semitism and class prejudice  
are just corollaries to the main proposition, appendages of attitude  
attached to the essential confrontation of two peoples over one tract of  
territory. But now, after decades, just as war and terrorism have evolved  
into origins themselves, so have prejudices and stereotypes worked their  
way so thoroughly into literature, education, history, language and social  
mores on both sides that they seem to govern the conflict as much as  
they are created by it. Disease and symptoms intertwined. [Emphasis  
supplied]

The horrifying details of the Tel Aviv incident, as well as Shipler's final  
conclusion, are quoted primarily to show that so-called "peace plans" that  
talk about "autonomy" for the Palestinians under Israeli rule, or suggesting  
a trial period, during which Israelis and Palestinians "get to know each  
other better," are hoaxes. The problem is not that they don't know each  
other, but that they do know each other.

Abba Eban has made a valiant effort to appeal to Israels youth, without  
much impact.

In an article appearing in the November 19, 1988, edition of the  
Jerusalem Post, entitled "The Issues That Won't Go Away," he writes:

Likud representatives especially the younger generation will have to ask  
themselves whether they can serve the national and Jewish interests  
permanently if they make the territorial indivisibility of Eretz Israel a  
matter of rigid dogma against the historic and demographic realities,

against the opinion of all mankind and against at least half of the Israeli

Up to this point we have focused our attention primarily upon Israel's  
internal problem and its relationship with the Palestinians in the West

In the balance of this chapter, we will discuss the international situation

THE ARAB NATIONS AND ISRAELI EXPANSIONISM

Much of the attitude of the Arab nations in the Middle East toward Israel  
is rooted in the Arab perception that Israel is a predatory power, continu-  
ally seeking to expand its borders at the expense of the Arab countries.

Our purpose here is to seek and determine whether this perception has  
any basis in fact and what can be done to allay Arab fears. In this effort we  
will discuss some of the reasons why Israel's Arab neighbors are fearful of,

In Chapter III we have traced the development of Zionism from Theo-  
dor Herzl's concept of a Jewish homeland (not necessarily in Palestine) up  
to the founding of the State of Israel in 1948.

The following is a brief chronological summary of the important events  
leading up to the establishment of the Jewish state. Except where sources  
are otherwise indicated, all source references are found in Chapter III.

It has been shown that following Herzl's death, the leaders of the Zionist  
movement, Ben-Gurion, Weitzman, and Jabotinsky, were united in one  
purpose only—the establishing of a Jewish state in all of Palestine. The  
Arab inhabitants were to be replaced or overwhelmed by Jewish immigra-  
tion and dealt with in a manner as to deprive them of any political rights

The first official endorsement of the concept of a Jewish "homeland" is  
found in the British government's famous Balfour Declaration made in  
1917. This short note from Anthony Balfour, British Foreign Minister, to  
Lord Rothschild "expressed sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations"—  
"it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice  
the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in

The Zionists promptly seized upon the Balfour Declaration as justifica-  
tion for its intent to establish a completely Jewish state in Palestine. Among  
other claims it announced that "Palestine is to become as Jewish as England

This distortion of the intent and meaning of the Balfour Declaration  
caused the British to issue its "White Paper" in the spring of 1939 in which  
it stated emphatically and unequivocally that the Balfour Declaration was  
not intended and could not be used by the Zionists to justify a Jewish  
National Home in all of Palestine or the subordination of the Arab  
population.

The Zionists rejected the "White Paper" and, in 1942, began an all-out  
terrorist campaign intended to drive the British out of Palestine. As we  
have seen, the terrorist campaign succeeded and caused the British to  
surrender its "League of Nations Mandate" over Palestine to the newly  
created "United Nations."

After a lengthy study of the Palestine problem, the U.N. decided that the  
only possible solution was to "partition" Palestine into two independent  
sovereign states, one Jewish, and one Palestinian. The Jewish state, with a  
population of 650,000, was allotted approximately 55 percent of the land  
and the Palestinian state, with a population of 1,300,000, was allotted 45  
percent of the land.

The U.N. Partition Resolution enacted in 1947, to be effective in 1948,  
makes a specific point that the Partition solves the Jewish-Palestinian  
problem because the solution definitely fixes the extent of the territory to  
be allotted to the Jews. It goes further, and says that the solution carries the  
sanction of the United Nations which involves a finality which should allay  
Arab fears of further expansion of the Jewish state.

At the time that the skeptical Palestinians were being told by the U.N.  
not to worry, since the boundaries of the Jewish state, which was being  
created, were "fixed," the Zionists had no intention whatsoever of abiding  
by these fixed boundaries.

To the Zionists, the Jewish state was only a first step—a springboard to  
the goal of taking over all of Palestine. Thus, the Zionist strategy never  
wavered from its basic position that all of Palestine was to be Jewish and  
that no Palestinian state would be allowed, regardless of the U.N. Parti-  
tion Resolution. On May 14, 1948, Ben-Gurion declared the establishment  
of the State of Israel.

Immediately following this declaration, certain of the adjoining Arab  
states (but not the Palestinians) attacked Israel which repelled the Arab  
attack and, in the resulting "War of Independence," the Israeli army  
overran large areas of land that had been allotted to the Palestinians  
under the U.N. Partition plan.

By means of military action, propaganda and another campaign of  
terrorism led by Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, seven hundred  
thousand peaceful Palestinian inhabitants were driven from their homes  
and lands into refugee camps where they and their descendants live to this  
day.

Israel confiscated the Palestinian homes and lands and incorporated  
them into the State of Israel.

The myth that the Palestinians would have had their Palestinian state,  
had they not attacked Israel in 1948, has been exposed by Simha Flapan and  
other prominent Israeli historians as Israeli government propaganda.

In Israel's Six-Day War in 1967 with Egypt, Jordan and Syria, the Israelis  
achieved another quick victory as a result of which they invaded and  
occupied the remaining land inhabited by the Palestinians on the West  
Bank and Gaza. They also invaded and occupied the Egyptian Sinai and the  
Syrian Golan Heights, as well as all of Jerusalem.

Following the Six-Day War, the U.N., in 1967, adopted Resolution 242  
which requires Israel to return the occupied lands on the West Bank and  
Gaza to its Palestinian inhabitants. Israel accepted U.N. Resolution 242.

In 1977, the newly-elected Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin,  
rejected U.N. Resolution 242 on the grounds that it does not apply to the  
West Bank and Gaza because they are sacred lands given by God to  
Abraham and are the property of the Jewish people.

Israel thus has developed from the concept of a Jewish "homeland" to a  
military (including nuclear) power, technologically equal to any nation on  
earth including the NATO countries and the Soviet Union.

As might be expected, this inexorable expansion has been watched by  
the Arab countries with deepening anxiety. What the Arabs see is a  
relentless drive by Israel to invade and conquer the Arab lands from the  
Nile to the Euphrates, which includes Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq. This  
is the announced purpose of Israel's powerful Gush Emunim movement.

After seeing their worst fears come to pass and the U.N., which was  
supposed to protect them, shown to be helpless, how can the Arab  
countries not be fearful of Israel? Harkabi finds ample reasons for Arab  
concern:

The call to expel the Arabs, however, is tantamount to calling for the de-

Arabization of territories that are today Arab, and this makes the conflict

symmetrical. For the Arabs, fighting Israel then becomes an existential

imperative: the Arabs of the neighboring countries cannot remain

apathetic in the face of a possible expulsion of Arabs from the West  
Bank, if only to prevent their countries from being flooded by  
Palestinians. The mere beginning of expulsion would cause Israel's peace  
with Egypt to collapse overnight. The conflict would become a matter of  
life or death, and this would impel the Arabs to unite despite all their  
divisions. Any attempt to expel the Arabs would result in international  
repercussions of unprecedented scope, and in all-out war on the part of  
the Arab states.

This trend toward making the conflict symmetrical is to be found not  
only in overt statements about "transferring" the Arabs, but also in  
threatening remarks about Israeli intentions to expand into the territory  
of Arab countries. Such utterances have appeared in Israeli publications.  
In a similar vein are expressions of Israeli intentions to impose a Pax  
Israelica on the Middle East, to dominate the Arab countries and treat  
them harshly. A gross example of this is an article entitled "A Strategy  
for Israel in the 1980s," by Oded Yinon, which appeared in Kivvunim,  
a journal published by the information department of the World Zionist  
Organization in February 1982. It is not surprising, given the auspices  
under which it is published, that Arabs attributed great importance to its  
content and assumed that it expressed the views of official circles with  
regard to Israeli policy and goals. The article had wide repercussions in  
the Arab world, a fact that testifies to Arab feelings of vulnerability.[Emphasis supplied]

Are the Arab nations being unreasonable in not wanting a "Pax  
Israelica" in the Middle East? The question which deserves a serious answer  
is "who is threatening whom?" Harkabi discusses further the impact of  
Yinon's book:

Yinon goes on to describe in detail how to partition every Arab country,  
according to geographical and ethnic consideration. One wonders at the  
temerity of the editors who published an article in the organ of the  
World Zionist Organization describing how Israel will partition the Arab  
countries. Perhaps the failed Israeli attempt to impose a new order in the  
weakest Arab state—Lebanon—will disabuse people of similar ambi-  
tions in other territories.

Be that as it may, a symmetry has been created in the ideas of the two  
parties to the conflict. The organ of the World Zionist Organization  
presents a detailed plan for the destruction of the Arab states, albeit in  
an elegant fashion, and presents this as a prime strategic goal for Israel.

In doing so, it provides the Arabs with retroactive legitimation for their  
goal of destroying Israel, presenting their struggle against it as a life-or-  
death conflict. [Emphasis supplied]

Anything more provocative, or calculated to create fear and anxiety in the  
Arab countries, can scarcely be imagined. Moreover, there is nothing that the  
Arab nations hear from Israel that is in any way reassuring. They know that  
the Arabs are identified as Amalek, an enemy to be destroyed, and its  
memory to be blotted out. The article entitled "The Commandment of  
Genocide in the Torah," referred to in the previous chapter, was not  
something found in the "Dead Sea Scrolls," but in an article written by Rabbi  
Hess for Israeli university students in 1988. Spokesmen for the religious  
extremists are condemning the Israeli government for being too timid in  
asserting its military power. They boast that Israel is stronger than all the  
nations of the Middle East (which the Arabs do not deny); that Israel should  
be afraid of nobody (including Russia); and that Israel's problems could be  
solved in one swift blow against its enemies if the government would just  
do it. The Arab nations are not exaggerating their vulnerability. They see  
themselves defenseless against the Israeli juggernaut. They can expect no  
help from the U.S. which is rendered powerless by the Israeli Lobby.

The Arabs have the moral support of the world, which, however, is small  
consolation. They see the U.N. helpless to implement its resolutions. They  
see human rights violations flaunted by Israel with impunity. In 1948, and  
again in 1967, the Arabs could see clearly that the promise of the U.N., to  
the effect that Israel's boundaries would be fixed and guaranteed by the  
U.N., was false. The assurances made by the U.N. to the Palestinians that  
they had nothing to fear from Israeli expansionism were meaningless. It  
became apparent that Israel had never intended to abide by the boundaries  
established by the U.N. Partition Resolution.

It is obvious to the Arabs that Israel has accomplished exactly what the  
Zionists had said all along that they would accomplish, namely, the con-  
quest of all of Palestine.

The Arabs see the religious extremists (encouraged by the Likud) openly  
claiming the biblical right to all the Arab lands from the Nile to the  
Euphrates. The rabbis and the Likud have made no secret of the fate of the  
Arabs under Israeli rule. They are to be subject peoples ruled by an iron  
hand, not fit to associate with Jews.

Israeli children are being taught all about the Holocaust and their duty to  
wipe out Amalek. Thus, this poison is being dispensed at all levels of Israelisociety from the synagogues and universities, to the kindergartens. The  
mind of a child (or of anyone else for that matter) cannot absorb the  
horrors of the Holocaust without finding someone to hate. Since there are  
no Nazis around against whom vengeance can be sought, Begin, Shamir  
and Sharon have solved this problem by calling the Arabs the Nazis of  
today and a proper target for retribution. If there is any doubt in anyone's  
mind that this poison has become systemic, the survey of the opinion of  
Israeli youth quoted earlier should remove it.

As we have seen, the World Zionist Organization has presented a  
detailed plan for the destruction of the Arab states "as a prime strategic  
goal for IsraelIt may be that Israel is already preparing for this.

The Israeli government announced on September 9, 1989, a new five-  
year military budget which included a half billion shekels per year for the  
cost of suppressing the Intifada. The government report went on to say  
that the reason that a "multi-year" budget is being submitted, rather than  
an annual one, is that it is necessary in order "to counter growing threats  
from the Arab world on an increasingly high tech battlefield

ISRAEL AND THE UNITED STATES VERSUS THE WORLD

Very little has been said, or written, about one of the most remarkable  
incidents in the field of international relations in recent history.

In December 1988, the U.S. refused to grant a visa to Yasser Arafat to  
allow him to address the U.N. General Assembly convened in New York  
City.

The U.N. General Assembly responded by voting 150 to 2 (U.S. and  
Israel) to adjourn its session and reconvene in Geneva, Switzerland, for the  
sole purpose of hearing Arafat. This decision involved moving the repre-  
sentatives of nearly all the peoples of the earth more than three thousand  
miles to hear a speech by the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organiza-  
tion on the Israeli-Palestinian problem. Yet the Israelis and Palestinians  
together number less than two-tenths of one percent of the more than five  
billion inhabitants of the globe.

Who is this Arafat person? Is he a spellbinding Demosthenes or a Cicero  
that the world is so eager to hear his voice? Not at all! He is, in fact, just  
a little bald man, half-shaven, said by the Israeli government to be a  
terrorist, rather inarticulate in English, and wearing a sort of napkin on his  
head. There is none of the charm or poise of a Sheik Yamani. He has,  
however, certain distinctions. Ariel Sharon has asked to have him assassi-nated and recently one Israeli peace activist was jailed for six months for  
having talked to him.

How is this extraordinary, almost bizarre, phenomenon to be ex-  
plained? Is it possible that "anti-Semitism" has now infected a billion  
Chinese, eight hundred million Hindus, and all the multitudes of the other  
peoples of the earth who have never heard of Abraham, Moses, Jesus  
Christ, the Nazis or the Holocaust? Why this unanimous repudiation of  
Israel and deliberate humiliation of the U.S.? Can it be that "the cliche"  
(as David Shipler calls it) that "everyone is against us" has become a self-  
fulfilling prophecy?

If this is really true, some person in Israel ought to have the common  
sense to ask why.

Some reasons are, of course, evident. Although Israel owes its existence  
to the U.N., it has been a somewhat ungrateful child.

A few examples come to mind.

Israel has, as have all the members of the U.N., subscribed to the  
foundation principle of the U.N.—the inadmissibility of acquiring territo-  
ries by war, yet Israel has virtually doubled its size by conquest.

Israel accepted the Partition Resolution of the U.N., which provided for  
two independent sovereign states in Palestine—one Jewish and the other  
Palestinian—but Israel had no intention of remaining within the borders  
established by the U.N. or ever permitting a Palestinian state.

Israel originally accepted U.N. Resolution 242 calling for a return of the  
occupied territories on the West Bank and Gaza, but the Likud government  
has rejected it.

Israel is in continuous violation of international law in establishing  
Israeli settlements in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza.

In 1982, Israel launched an unprovoked war of aggression in Lebanon  
resulting in thousands of civilian casualties (mostly Palestinian refugees).  
This was the final blow which destroyed Lebanon.

Israel is also the unrepentant recipient of the condemnation of most  
human rights organizations in the world.

Not only did the U.N. vote represent an unprecedented rebuke to Israel  
and the U.S., but it is reported to have been one of the most enthusiastic  
votes on record in the General Assembly of the U.N.

Yet one suspects a deeper reason for this enthusiasm than simply the  
U.N.'s disgust and disappointment over Israel's conduct. It may indeed be  
the world's reaction to the righteous hypocrisies of the Likud leaders; the  
spectacle of terrorists condemning terrorism; racists ranting about racismand blaming the whole world for the Holocaust while preaching the  
genocide of "Amalek with his women and children."

Even these, however, may not account for the emotional nature of the  
U.N. vote. Perhaps it was the mournful sight of the United States of  
America, the standard bearer for the Free World, sitting in the U.N., head  
bent, alone and shackled to Israel.

RELIGIOUS FANATICISM IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

While the worlds attention, over the past decades of the cold war, has  
been focused upon the super power rivalry and the danger of a nuclear war,  
a far greater threat to the peace of the world has been growing almost  
without notice.

Most people have taken comfort in the belief that neither the U.S. nor  
the Soviet Union would be "crazy" enough to actually start a nuclear war.  
Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) was the essence of the deterrent. Most  
of the concern has been that one or the other of the nuclear powers might  
accidentally fire a nuclear missile. Therefore, elaborate steps have been  
taken by both governments to prevent such an occurrence.

But what kind of nightmares would the world be having if Khadafi  
possessed a large nuclear arsenal; one of the finest air forces in the world;  
the highest level of military technology existing and boasted that he could  
strike his enemies anywhere on earth and would do so if, in his judgment,  
any nation threatened his security.

Yet, this is precisely what the fanatics in the Likud government are in a  
position to do, have threatened to do, and have in fact done, in the strike  
against the Iraqi nuclear reactor.

It is abundantly clear that the Likud government is dominated by a  
dangerous group of religious fanatics, whose primary "intent and purpose,"  
according to Harkabi, is to amass political power and hold completely the  
reins of the government of Israel.

This is in preparation for the final triumph of Jewish history—  
"Redemption and Messianism"—which Harkabi says threaten Israel's  
survival:

The explicit assertion that a certain period is the beginning of the  
Redemption arouses a hope that can only be destructive. Paradoxically,  
no idea poses a greater menace to the survival of the State of Israel than  
that which links Zionism with Redemption and Messianism,, [Empha-  
sis supplied]

Harkabi believes that the ideas of Redemption and Messianism are  
portents of disaster because the disappointment caused by a failure of the  
Messiah to appear may be so unbearable that the consequences cannot be  
predicted. Harkabi explains:

The ideas of Redemption and Messianism are a portent of disaster in  
two respects. In the short term, the Messianic idea is a distraction from  
the need to consider reality and encourages unrealistic and rash policies.  
What is the benefit of a Messianism whose practical result is that  
through the annexation of territories Israel becomes an Arab country or  
nearly so? Some would defend the new Messianism by presenting  
Zionism as a manifestation of a natural, historical Redemption. But what  
is the benefit of a Messianism without a Messiah? The disappointment  
caused by disasters not mitigated by heavenly salvation can have serious  
consequences. A widespread obsession with Messianism is liable to end  
in grief.

Meir Kahane is certain that disaster is not on the cards: "The State of  
Israel is not a political creature; it is a religious creature. No power in the  
world could have prevented its establishment, and no force can destroy  
it" (p. 244). For him, "History is not a sequence of detached and chance  
events. There is a plan for history; the Jew is coming home for the third

and final time The first redemption was the redemption from

Egypt; the second was that of Ezra; and the third redemption has no  
end.'" The verses from Midrash are guarantee enough for him.[Emphasis supplied]

It is highly doubtful that the Jewish community in the U.S. is at all aware  
of the intensity of the feelings of the religious extremists and the danger  
they pose to Israel, if their plans are carried out.

Harkabi doubts that even most Israelis are fully aware of the situation:

Even many Jews fail to grasp the strength of the faith in the imminent  
arrival of the Messiah among some religious extremists, including mem-  
bers of Gush Emunim. Most Israelis are simply unaware that these circles  
deny any possibility that the Messiah might yet be long in coming, may  
even not come, and the extent to which this faith supports them through  
hardships, prepares them for catastrophes, and encourages their adven-  
tures. They scorn all who doubt that the Messiah is coming soon and see  
tangible signs of his coming in every Zionist success and military victory.

This faith also has a functional significance. Without it, there is little  
sense to the settlement movement. In addition, the more circumstances  
contradict their political ideas—the more it becomes evident that the  
territories cannot be held, that the Arabs are multiplying and will attain  
a majority, that the Arabs cannot be expelled and are rebelling—the  
more tenacious their belief that the Messiah's coming is imminent.

Placing the ideas of Redemption and Messianism at the center radi-  
cally changes the Zionist ideology and the goal of the establishment of  
the Jewish state. The goal of Zionism ceases to be the solution for the  
historical vulnerability of the Jews and becomes the establishment of a  
state that will serve as a means to bring on the Redemption.

The fact that there were Jews who plotted to blow up the Dome of the  
Rock should be a source of grave concern. It cannot be assumed that  
those who were brought to trial were alone. Might a group opposed to  
eventual negotiations for resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict plant a bomb  
in the mosques as a means to derail them? Given the psychosis prevalent  
in some circles in the country, the chance that something like this will  
happen is not negligible. In this context we cannot dismiss the signifi-  
cance of the widely disseminated aerial photograph of the Old City in  
which the mosques were airbrushed out of existence and replaced by a  
model of the Second Temple. Such a picture is apt to inspire yearnings  
for its realization. Jewish extremists call the mosques an abomination,  
and this designation itself seemingly requires action to remove them. In  
a yeshiva adjacent to the Temple Mount, garments for the Temple  
priests are already being woven in anticipation that they will be needed  
in the near future. In otheryeshivot, the detailed laws of animal sacrifices  
have become a popular topic of study, as if they will soon have contem-  
porary relevance. Before, the Messiah was a hope, now he has become a

Messianic expectations have added a whole new politico-religious ele-  
ment to the Middle East powder keg. Irrationality is now, more than ever,  
the norm in the camp of the religious extremists.

Harkabi sees it as one of the greatest threats to peace:

One belief in the religious outlook goes far beyond the evaluation of the  
Jabotinsky ethos that reality permits the Jews to behave as they wish: the  
belief that the Messiah's arrival is imminent. If the Messiah is on his way  
there is nothing to fear; he will bail us out of all misfortunes and grant

Israel the final victory. The Messianic idea serves as a sort of insurance  
policy against all complications, countering all fears that reality might be  
a stumbling block on the road to desired goals. To many religious Jews,  
the successes of Zionism are signs that the Redemption has begun.

Proponents of this view hold that Israel need have no fear of future  
wars, and can even provoke them at will. Rabbi Shlomo Aviner has  
written: "We must live in this land even at the price of war. Moreover,  
even if there is peace, we must instigate wars of liberation in order to  
conquer it" (Arzi, p. 11). He does not specify what additional territory  
should be conquered, but his words are clearly based on the assumption  
that everything is possible and all is permitted. It does not occur to him  
that going to war is a dangerous gamble.

One can understand why soldiers and other young Israelis like Meir  
Kahane's thesis that Israel is indeed a mighty power but its leadership is  
too hesitant to make proper use of its forces to solve all Israel's problems  
with one blow, eliminating terrorism and expelling the Arabs. All of this  
comes close to the spirit of the Jabotinsky-Begin ethos—the solution in  
a single energetic event. [Emphasis supplied]

The important thing that must be kept in mind is that these are not the  
rantings and ravings of a Khomeini. These are people who boast of the  
power to strike any target on earth. They can start a war against anybody,  
at any time, for any reason and they want the world to know it.

It must be recognized that a new phenomenon has appeared, unprece-  
dented in the history of the world, the consequences of which are incalcu-  
lable—fanaticism and nuclear missiles.

An example of the emotional frenzy of religious fanatics, when the  
Messiah is believed to be at hand, may be seen in the account given by  
Abram Sachar of the Bar-Kokba rebellion, which appears in the first  
chapter of this book.

Bar-Kokba had the will, if not the power, to blow up the world—Israel  
has the power. Harkabi quotes Rabbi Kahane:

"We have it in our power to bring the Messiah" {Ha'aretz, August 8,  
1984). The desires of the Almighty are merely a technical detail; the  
decisive factor is the Jews' own will. If the Jews' own will can bring the  
Messiah, who can stand against them? The Arabs? The Americans? The  
Russians?

Only those with an unshakable faith in the imminent arrival of the

Messiah could have begun to plot the demolition of the mosques on the  
Temple Mount, as the members of the so-called "Jewish Underground"  
did, without worrying about the consequences of such an act. How else  
could they ignore the strong possibility that some or all of the forty  
Muslim states, from Indonesia and Pakistan to Morocco and Mauritania,  
would retaliate by declaring a holy war against Israel, that the superpow-  
ers would intervene to prevent a general conflagration, and might even  
demand that Jerusalem be placed under international rule? Perhaps  
those who planned this deed hoped that God, confronted by the danger  
to Israel's existence from a Muslim Jihad, would be "compelled to send  
the Messiah in order to prevent the destruction of the third temple."[Emphasis supplied]

There is a mindset among Israelis which most non-Jews (particularly  
those who lived through World War II) would find incredible. The vast  
majority of Israelis apparently believe that the Allies in World War II knew  
all about the Holocaust while it was in progress and could have stopped, or  
at least interfered with, the Nazi death camps. The Jewish response to this  
strange belief is, of course, a belligerent paranoia.

In May of 1983, the Israeli polling firm of Smith Research Center  
conducted an exhaustive survey of Israeli attitudes toward the Holocaust.

The survey revealed that the overwhelming majority of Israelis (83  
percent) saw it as a major factor in how they saw the world. The report  
states that the "trauma of the Holocaust is very much on the minds of  
Israelis even in the second and third generations." An overwhelming  
majority (91 percent) believed that Western leaders knew of the mass  
killings and did little to save the Jews; only slightly fewer (87 percent)  
agreed with the following proposition:

"From the Holocaust we learn that Jews can not rely on non-Jews."Shipler says that this creates a "reverence for power which grows out of  
history's powerlessness and reverberates through Israeli-Jewish society."  
He quotes Rabbi David Spritzer in a letter to the Jerusalem Post:

One of the most important gains consequent to the establishment of the  
State of Israel has been the change in the traditional image of the Jew  
from the passive weakling who could be kicked about, robbed and  
murdered almost at will. Jewish blood has been cheap for hundreds of

years Not any longer. If someone hits us in the stomach we will

smash his head, perhaps those of his abettors too I am not altogetherdispleased that the Jew is viewed as actually dangerous, that even a small  
provocation will engender a massive reaction. We need the luxury of that  
image for at least a generation [Emphasis supplied]

Thus, we have all the elements necessary for achieving "critical mass;" a  
paranoia which extends to most of the population (not just religious  
extremists), a majority of which feel the world is against them; an attitude  
nourished by constant reminders of the Holocaust; a deep suspicion that,  
underneath, the whole world is "anti-Semitic"; that non-Jews are not to be  
trusted. Behind them is a God who is "mobilizing" against the Gentiles,  
and urging that Israelis defy any efforts to take away their "sacred lands"  
and who will punish them if they do allow it—a God who has chosen them  
as the select of mankind and expects them to live up to that responsibil-  
ity—a Messiah who is waiting for them to act—a God who will guarantee  
victory.

What happens if the Messiah does not come and Israel becomes more  
isolated from the rest of the world and the dangerous reality of Israel's  
position becomes clear, even to the religious extremists? As Harkabi says,  
no one can say what will happen but it "portends disaster."

What if the nations of the world do not permit the Israelis to expel the  
Palestinians and the Arab states do not sit idly by waiting for Israel's army  
to reach the Nile and the Euphrates?

Israeli cities are already within the range of missiles from Egypt, Saudi  
Arabia, Syria and Iraq.

THE SAMSON COMPLEX

As long ago as October 9,1977, shortly after the Likud government came  
to power, a report from Dial Torgenson, the Jerusalem correspondent for  
the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Israel Thinks The Unthinkable," was  
filed. The following is a portion of that report:

Since 1973, Israel has built up its arms-producing industrial base. It now  
makes not only its own artillery shells but its own jet fighters and tanks.  
The lessons of 1973 have not been lost upon this country. There has  
been a tremendous stockpiling of food, oil and ammunition for "the next  
time"—always, in Israel, whose people have fought four wars since 1948,  
there is talk of "the next time." Now, with hopes for Geneva peace talks  
shifting like the fitful Hamsin wind from the deserts of Jordan, there is  
talk everywhere of "the next time."

War in the Middle East could be disastrous for the Western world.  
Israeli military men have hinted darkly of taking the next war to the  
Arabs, Entebbe-style, and even the brief war Israel can afford could cause  
a disruption in oil supplies from which the industrial nations would find  
it hard to recover. The worldwide recession resulting from the 1973 Yom  
Kippur War is just now fading. Next time it may be harder. Suppose, for  
example, that the next war left the oil fields of Israel's Arab foes in

Several months earlier Torgenson had written an article for the Los  
Angeles Times entitled "Begin: How Explosive Are His Policies?"

The article from which the following is quoted provides an important  
insight into some Israeli thinking. Torgenson emphasizes the potential for

JERUSALEM—The Zealots of Masada chose suicide over slavery, and  
died on their mountaintop fortress as the Romans prepared to conquer  
them. They gave a name to national suicide: The Masada Complex.

Samson, betrayed by Delilah, blinded and brought before the Philis-  
tines in their temple of Gaza, was a different type of zealot. As the  
Philistines mocked him, he threw his might against the central columns  
of the temple and brought it down, killing all those in it—and himself.  
His was the suicide which took his tormentors with him: call it the

Israel stands today in as much danger as it once faced from the  
Romans and the Philistines. It is a nation that stands alone—except for  
its links, perhaps emanating to utter dependence, with the United States.

Israelis, to whom history has bequeathed millennia of disaster, calmly  
face their options—options which have been increased by Entebbe and  
the secrets of Dimona, Israels atomic research center.

Some of these options have been only vaguely hinted at, but they are  
terrifying to the men who guide the other nations of the world.

"If there is another war," said Israel's chief of staff, Mordechai Gur,  
"there is no guarantee it will be fought exclusively on the Golan Heights  
and the Sinai Peninsula." Israel learned at Entebbe that it could mount  
ground-air strikes over huge distances, a lesson not lost upon the Arabs.  
The Saudi Arabian government cited Gur's statement as a threat by the

It has also been widely hinted that Israel would not let countries like

Libya and Saudi Arabia finance a war against them and escape punish-  
ment. From Tel Aviv, it is 1,280 miles to Tripoli, 960 to Riyadh, and  
2,200 to Entebbe. The possibility of a strike against the Arab oilfields is  
part of the balance of terror of the Middle East. Israel, according to many  
foreign sources, has developed atomic weapons at its Dimona facility and  
Israel has planes capable, with aerial refueling, of delivering such weap-  
ons across vast distances. Is it any wonder world powers view the threat

"If the Arabs did not destroy Israel in their first strike," said a highly  
placed Israeli government official, "the Israeli counterstrike would set the  
Arabs back 50 years. The possibility terrifies the Europeans. If Israel  
destroys the oilfields, the wheels of Western Europe would soon grind to  
a halt. The Russians could just get on their tanks and drive right over—  
there would be nobody to stop them. And Japan would falter and halt,

"This is no longer an Israeli-Arab war we're talking about. It's a global

But there is the history of the Jewish people to consider and what will  
happen in the Middle East may be affected by the events of the past.

"Jews will never be led away to be killed again," said a young sabra  
woman whose mother and father, almost alone out of their families,  
survived World War II Poland. "If they leave us no choice, it will not be

What if Israel takes Europe with it when it goes?

"When I'm gone, and Israel is gone, I couldn't care less," she said.

And Western Civilization, as we know it?

The article concludes with the observation that, unless the occupied  
territories are returned, Israel and the Palestinians "will live with a balance  
of terror while the threat of disaster hangs poised in the air, a disaster in  
which Israel would be Samson, and the temple so vast that few nations  
would be unaffected by its fallZ' [Emphasis supplied]

Time magazine's issue of July 4, 1988, contains an article entitled "A  
Deadly New Missile Game," which reports on the escalating arms race in

Now that the superpowers have agreed to eliminate medium-range  
missiles from their arsenals, these weapons are fast turning into the

most sought-after items in the Middle East. In the process, they are  
changing the nature of warfare in one of the world's most volatile  
regions. True, the missiles being stockpiled by seven Middle Eastern  
nations (Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Libya, Saudi Arabia and Syria) are not  
yet nuclear—with the highly probable exception of Israel's. But the  
conventionally armed weapons have figured prominently in the eight-  
year-old gulf war between Iraq and Iran, and they threaten to make  
future conflicts in the region bloodier and more intractable than ever  
before. Writes W. Seth Carus of the Washington Institute for Near East  
Policy: "It is only a matter of time before these countries acquire  
significant inventories of accurate missiles armed with highly lethal  
warheads."

What helped touch off the current Middle East arms race, beginning  
about three years ago, was the "war of the cities," in which Iran showered  
missiles on Baghdad and Iraq later reciprocated against Tehran. To reach  
Iran's capital, which was beyond the flight capacity of their Soviet-made  
Scud-B missiles, the Iraqis managed to double the weapon's range to 360  
miles. During the latest outbreak of this war-within-a-war last winter,  
the two sides fired more than 200 missiles at each other, claiming at least  
2,000 lives. The casualties would be much greater if Middle Eastern  
nations had equipped the missiles with chemical warheads, as many  
experts predict they eventually will.

Curbing the region's missile arsenals has proved to be a difficult if not  
impossible task. U.S. officials were stunned last March by intelligence  
reports that Saudi Arabia had secretly purchased at least ten Chinese  
CSS-2 missiles, each with a range of 1,550 miles. Last week, in an  
attempt to head off yet another missile deal, the U.S. expressed "deep  
concern" at the prospect of China's selling the Syrians its M9 missiles  
(estimated range: 500 miles).

Also last week, in an incident that could damage Washington's rela-  
tions with Cairo, federal officials accused five people, including two  
Egyptian army colonels, of seeking to smuggle from the U.S. a tightly  
controlled chemical used in the manufacture of missiles. Cairo apparently  
wants the material, called carbon-carbon, to enhance the accuracy of a  
new missile, code-named Bader-2000, that Egyptian and Argentinian  
scientists are developing with Iraqi money.

Israel, which produces two classes of Jericho missiles, has grown  
increasingly alarmed as one hostile neighbor after another has begun  
collecting weapons that could reach population centers inside the Jewish

state. When asked about the rumored Syrian-Chinese deal, Prime Min-  
ister Yitzhak Shamir replied cryptically, "We shall not sit by idly." His  
words suggested a possible pre-emptive strike against a future Syrian

The U.S. has lately moved to the forefront of efforts to put a lid on  
further proliferation. Last year Washington helped form the Missile  
Technology Control Regime, an agreement with six other Western  
nations that severely restricts the export of missile-related hardware and  
technology. Speaking at June's special session on disarmament at the  
United Nations, Secretary of State George Shultz warned that "we are  
already seeing signs of a dangerous new arms race which will put at risk  
countries far removed from the gulf region itself." The irony is that both  
the U.S. and the Soviet Union, even as they seek to reduce their own  
arsenals, appear unable to contain the spread of missiles among their  
Middle East clients. [Emphasis supplied]

On May 6, 1989, an article was published in the Los Angeles Times  
entitled: "Arming the Middle East: An Ominous List Expands," written by  
Enrico Jacchia, Director of Strategic Studies at the Free University of Rome.

The quickening arms race in the Middle East is raising concerns among  
nations bordering the Mediterranean. Libya, Israel, Syria, Iraq and Egypt  
have acquired new and dangerous military technology, dramatically  
increasing the dangers of local confrontations.

Europeans, who welcomed the elimination of the SS-20, cruise and  
Pershing 2 missiles, are dismayed by the prospect of a proliferation of  
new mass-destruction weapons at their southern doorstep.

The list of hardware creating ominous risks gets longer every month:  
chemical weapons, missiles, nuclear arsenals and sophisticated bombers.

As for Col. Moammar Kadafi's chemical plant, strong U.S. pressures  
have not prevented the continuing transfer of technology and basic  
materials from industrialized countries to Libya, according to European  
sources. The Western World will soon have to decide what to do about  
it, but in the meantime a new dimension has been added to the Libyan  
threat: the Soviet supply to Tripoli of high-performance bombers and an

Allies on the southern flank of the North Atlantic Treaty Organiza-  
tion have been puzzled by the Soviet move, which contradicts the

Kremlin's claim that Moscow wants to play a more conciliatory role in  
the Arab-Israeli conflict, seeking to increase its influence in the region  
through policies that bolster stability, rather than undermine it.

The international press has focused its attention on the threat that an  
enhanced Libyan capability might imply for Israel. However, William H.  
Webster, director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, recently told a  
congressional committee that if Libya extended the range and perfor-  
mances of its warplanes, the entire balance of power in the region could  
be altered.

All the more so, given Kadafi's unpredictability. A couple of years ago  
he substantiated his threats against Italy by ordering two Scud missiles—  
which fortunately missed—to be fired at the Italian island of Lampedusa.  
Kadafi claimed a U.S. Coast Guard station on Lampedusa had guided  
American planes on their April, 1986, raid on Libya. The Italian Ministry  
of Defense has pointedly announced that new radar systems will be  
installed in the Southern part of the peninsula, acknowledging that the  
Soviet SU-24 bombers recently sold to Libya could, if refueled in the air,  
reach all of Italy—as well as parts of France and West Germany.

While the chemical weapons situation is not encouraging, recent  
developments concerning missiles and their potential payloads are no  
brighter. These weapons appear to be more freely available in the  
international arms market than was intended by the Seven industrial  
nations (the United States, Britain, Canada, France, Italy, Japan and West  
Germany) when they agreed to restrict access to missile technology in  
April, 1987, with the Missile Technology Control Regime. And now  
there is a growing risk that surface-to-surface medium-range missiles  
will be armed with nuclear warheads and spread throughout the Middle  
East.

Israeli officials have alleged that Iraq is secretly engaged in a crash  
program to build nuclear warheads for a medium-range missile under  
development with technical and financial assistance from Argentina and  
Egypt. While the missile project (called Condor 2 by the Argentines) has  
been confirmed, the allegations about the Iraqi nuclear program have  
raised doubts. Both the news and the unconfirmed allegations, neverthe-  
less, offer Israel a good reason—or a good pretext—for proceeding with  
its crash program on nuclear arms, missiles and other sophisticated  
weapons.

Estimates on the number of atomic warheads Israel possesses vary  
considerably, depending on interpretations given to data that Israeli

technician Mordecai Vanunu disclosed in his Oct. 5,1986, interview with  
the London Sunday Times. Israel might have an arsenal of 100 or 200  
nuclear devices, according to several specialists who analyzed the data  
and examined the photographs supplied by Vanunu. Accepting the  
authenticity of his technical data, Theodore Taylor, a former U.S. weap-  
ons designer, and Frank Barnaby, a British nuclear scientist who  
debriefed Vanunu extensively, also believes Israel has produced weapons

The consensus among U.S. officials who have access to the informa-  
tion provided by intelligence sources is that Israel's nuclear arsenal  
contains no more than 50 to 70 devices. Yet even an arsenal of this size  
is much bigger than all previous estimates and could enable Israel to  
develop a nuclear strategy based on a panoply of tactical, medium range

This is a distinct change in the Middle East scenario. France has been  
until now the only medium-size power to have a totally independent  
nuclear deterrent, the force de frappe—striking force—and an original  
doctrine for its employment. Has the force de frappe concept prolifer-  
ated? Israel is apparently developing a missile that can reach the Soviet  
Union. Should we conclude that Israel has a nuclear defense strategy?

If this is a plausible conclusion, then Gen. Charles de Gaulle's predic-  
tions have been proved right. De Gaulle was utterly skeptical about the  
possibility of preventing the spread of atomic weapons through interna-  
tional constraints. His nuclear doctrine was based on the assumption that  
every industrial nation would, in time, possess its own nuclear arsenal  
composed of a panoply of weapons adapted to its specific situation and

The importance of Israel's nuclear development has increased to a  
point that it might constitute an Israeli force de frappe doctrine—a  
doctrine playing a vital role in Israeli defense and strategic thinking.  
This, in turn, gives a powerful impetus to the arms buildup of the Arab  
and Muslim states in the region. Something must be done to arrest this

The September 25,1989 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an  
article on Iraq's current military buildup upon which Israel's defense min-

Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin warns that Iraq is "potentially  
the most dangerous nation in the Middle East." "Let's not even talkabout Iraqi chemical weapons, nuclear development and missiles," says a  
senior intelligence office in Tel Aviv. "They have more tanks than the  
French and enough troops to maintain security on their 1,000-mile  
border with Iran and still send 10 divisions across Jordan to attack us."

If any further proof is needed that the Middle East situation is completely  
out of control, the report appearing in the Jerusalem Post of September 23,  
1989, entitled, "Israeli Missile Capability Causes Concern in Moscow,"

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze is expected to take up the  
questioti of Israels ballistic missile capability with Foreign Minister  
Moshe Arens when they meet in New York this month.

The Israel foreign and defense ministries have both denied knowledge  
of the firing of a 1,300 km-range ballistic missile into the Mediterranean  
between Libya and Greece last week. The Soviet news agency Tass,  
quoting "Soviet Defense Ministry data," reported such a firing from the  
region of Jerusalem. (The Washington Post has quoted U.S. officials as  
saying the Soviet report was accurate.)

In the past, Moscow has shown great sensitivity to and expressed  
concern about Israel's ballistic capabilities and reports of the "Jericho-II"  
missile. The matter has been raised in bi-lateral meetings at the highest  
level, with Israel consistently trying to reassure the Kremlin on this

In July 1987, Radio Moscow's Hebrew-language service accused Israel  
of developing a nuclear-capable missile, reportedly called the Jericho-II.  
The Soviets reacted angrily to the reported launching calling the missile  
a threat to its security and warned Israel not to continue developing a  
weapon that is said was capable of reaching its southern border.

The Geneva-based International Defense Review reported at the  
same time that Israel had successfully fired the missile into the Mediter-  
ranean and that it covered 820 kilometres on the test. According to Tass,  
Israel launched a ballistic missile in January 1988.

According to Jane's Defense Weekly, Israel conducted a second secret  
test of its Jericho-II surface-to-surface tactical nuclear missile in Sep-  
tember 1988. Jane's said the missile's projected maximum range is about  
1,500 kms. The magazine pointed out that in that case it would be  
capable of hitting the capitals of all of Israel's potential enemies, includ-

Israel, which launched its first satellite on September 19 last year, has  
always refused to comment on whether it is developing missiles, let  
alone nuclear weapons.

Strategic expert Dore Gold, told the Jerusalem Post that over the last  
two years the Soviets have been "increasingly sensitive to the prolifera-  
tion of missile technology along a belt of countries from Libya to India  
close to their southern border."
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"The Soviets have been seeking areas of policy coordination on the  
Middle East with the U.S.," said Gold. "The missile proliferation issue  
could become as useful to them for this purpose as the Palestinian

issue.

In the following final chapters of this book we will attempt to define the  
crucial issues, discuss a way out of this onrushing nightmare, and propose  
a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

CHAPTER XII

The Issues

I

N DISCUSSING THE major issues between Israel and the Pales-  
tinians, an attempt will be made to clear away the accumulated  
diplomatic debris which has piled up over the years and to dispel the clouds  
of rhetoric which have obscured the facts to the point where the issues have  
been made difficult to identify and, hence, impossible to solve.

In this, we will follow a loose format consisting of a summary statement  
of the issue and, where appropriate, the position of each party with respect  
thereto, and a brief analysis of the merits of the arguments on both sides.  
Roman numerals are used simply to identify the issues, not to indicate  
relative priority or importance.

As stated earlier, this book is concerned only with the primary and  
fundamental issues dividing Israel and the Palestinians, i.e., the status of the  
West Bank and Gaza and the Palestinian refugee question.

These are the explosive issues—the Middle East time bomb on which  
time is fast running out. The question of the future status of Jerusalem,  
however important, does not have the same urgency and should be left for  
future negotiations. Similarly, the status of the Golan Heights is a separate  
question involving Syria and should also be left for future negotiations  
between the parties.

ISSUE I: THE PROBLEM OF THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEES

THE PALESTINIAN POSITION ON THE REFUGEES

In 1948, during Israel's War of Independence, some 700,000 men,  
women and children were driven from their homes in Palestine by a  
combination of Israeli military forces, roving bands of terrorists led by  
Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, combined with an orchestrated  
propaganda campaign by the Israeli government to frighten the Palestini-  
ans into fleeing their homes.

These refugees have never been allowed to return to their homes and  
lands, which were promptly confiscated by the Israeli army, and are now  
within the boundaries of Israel proper—not the West Bank Today, these  
refugees, with their descendants, number in excess of one million, many of  
which have been living in settlements and camps under wretched condi-  
tions over the past 40 years. The refugees seek to return to their lands in  
Israel or to receive just compensation.

THE ISRAELI POSITION ON THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

The Israelis contend that the Palestinian refugees left their homes and  
lands voluntarily, trusting the promises of the Arab states that they could  
return with the "victorious" Arab armies.

Israel argues that the refugees "abandoned" their lands which were then  
confiscated by Israel. The Israeli justification for this summary confiscation  
and for not allowing the refugees to return after hostilities ceased, is: "They  
lost the war—they lose the land."

ANALYSIS

1. The facts pertaining to this issue are fully discussed and detailed in  
   Chapter IV entitled "The Arab-Israeli Wars." In summary, the Palestinian  
   position is completely justified by Simha Flapan. The Israeli position,  
   according to Flapan, is a myth and pure propaganda. Flapan's position is  
   also supported by other prominent Israeli historians.
2. In further support of the Palestinian position, the United Nations  
   Charter (under which the State of Israel came into being) prohibits the  
   acquisition of land by conquest.

U.N. Resolution 242 also calls for a "just settlement" of the Palestinian  
refugee question.

ISSUE II: THE RETURN BY ISRAEL OF THE OCCUPIED

TERRITORIES ON THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

THE PALESTINIAN POSITION ON THE RETURN OF  
THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

Israel should withdraw all of its forces from the occupied lands on the  
West Bank and Gaza and return to its 1967 borders.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PALESTINIAN POSITION

U.N. Resolution 242 promulgated by the Security Council on November  
22, 1967, after the conclusion of the Six Day War, reads in part as follows:

Emphasizing the inadmissibility of acquiring territory by war and the  
need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every state in the area

Emphasizing further that the member states in accepting the Charter  
of the United Nations have undertaken a commitment to act in

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

* 1. Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in
  2. Termination of all claims or state of belligerency and respect  
     for, and acknowledgment of, the sovereignty of territorial  
     integrity and political independence of every state in the area  
     and their right to live in peace with secure and recognized  
     boundaries free from threats or acts of force. [Emphasis

U.N. Resolution 338, enacted October 22, 1973 (following the October  
1973 war), calls upon the parties concerned to start immediately after the  
cease fire to implement the Security Councils Resolution 242 in all its parts.  
Israel has done nothing to implement U.N. Resolution 242 or 338.

ISSUE III: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PALESTINIAN STATE

THE PALESTINIAN POSITION ON A PALESTINIAN STATE

The Palestinian people have an undeniable legal right to self-deter-  
mination and to a sovereign state to be established on the West Bank and  
Gaza.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PALESTINIAN POSITION

The Plan of Partition adopted by the United Nations on November 29,  
1947, which divided Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states, is the  
juridical basis upon which the State of Israel was declared and came into  
existence, and the basis upon which the Palestinian state has been declared.  
If the U.N. Partition Resolution is not valid for the Palestinians, Israel has  
no legal foundation.

The United Nations' Partition Plan adopted on November 29, 1947,  
states in part as follows:

* + 1. The basic premise underlying the partition proposal is that the claims  
       to Palestine of the Arabs and Jews, both possessing validity, are  
       irreconcilable, and that among all of the solutions advanced, partitions  
       will provide the most realistic and practicable settlement, and is the  
       most likely to afford a workable basis for meeting in part the claims  
       and national aspirations of both parties.
    2. It is a fact that both of these peoples have their historic roots in  
       Palestine, and that both make vital contributions to the economic and  
       cultural life of the country. The partition solution takes these  
       considerations fully into account.
    3. The basic conflict in Palestine is a clash of two intense nationalisms.  
       Regardless of the historical origins of the conflict, the rights and  
       wrongs of the promises and counter-promises, and the international  
       intervention incident to the Mandate, there are now in Palestine  
       some 650,000 Jews and some 1,200,000 Arabs who are dissimilar in  
       their ways of living and, for the time being, separated by political  
       interests which render difficult full and effective political co-operation  
       among them, whether voluntary or induced by constitutional  
       arrangements.
    4. Only by means of partition can these conflicting national aspirations  
       find substantial expression and qualify both peoples to take their  
       places as independent nations in the international community and in  
       the United Nations.

5. The partition solution provides that finality which is a most urgent  
need in the solution. Every other proposed solution would tend to  
induce the two parties to seek modification in their favor by means of  
persistent pressure. The grant of independence to both States,  
however, would remove the basis for such efforts. [Emphasis  
supplied]

Thus, a Palestinian state is not something thought up recently by the  
PLO and Yasser Arafat.

The right to an independent Palestinian state was granted to the  
Palestinians in 1947 in the same document in which the right to a State of  
Israel was granted to the Jewish Agency.

Israel's responses to the Palestinian Positions on Issues II and III are  
based on three alternative arguments.

ARGUMENT I

It is necessary for Israel to occupy (and annex) the West Bank and Gaza  
in order to give Israel defensible borders, otherwise Israel would be too  
vulnerable to attack from its Arab neighbors. Israel's security cannot be  
jeopardized. A Palestinian state next to Israel would destroy Israel's  
security.

ARGUMENT 1

The so-called "occupied lands" of the West Bank and Gaza are part of  
ancient Eretz Israel given by God to Abraham in perpetuity and, as such,  
are "sacred" lands which must not be returned. Therefore, they cannot  
properly be called "occupied lands" because Israel owns them. They should  
be called "Judea" and "Samaria," and not the "West Bank." Israel has not  
conquered them, it has "liberated" them. That is why Israel has rejected the  
application of U.N. Resolution 242, because it doesn't apply to lands that  
are already owned.

ARGUMENT 3

Israel has a "historic right" to all of Palestine and ancient Eretz Israel.  
ANALYSIS

On a legal basis, the Palestinian case is completely valid and incontesta-  
ble. Israel's case is based on non-legal arguments, which it contends  
overrides legalities.

ISRAEL'S ARGUMENT I—SECURITY

Obviously, no nation on planet Earth has "defensible borders," including  
the United States. The idea that a few (or many) miles of added territory  
will provide security for any nation is a primitive concept more appropriate  
to the days of castles, moats and city walls. It is "Maginot Line" thinking.  
In an age of supersonic bombers, ballistic and guided missiles, chemical and  
biological weapons and nuclear bombs and artillery, security for Israel, or  
any nation, can only come with a just and durable peace. All else is a fatal  
delusion.

Today, Israel has little to fear from the Palestinians or other Arab  
countries over which it has undisputed military superiority. Essentially,  
what is at issue is Israel's permanent security needs.

Security is the critical issue involved in any plan for peace so far as Israel  
is concerned and must be viewed on the basis of a "worst case" scenario.  
Israel's security is an absolute prerequisite to any successful peace plan.

Since we are stipulating that Israel's security is a sine qua non, discussion  
of the matter of how Israel's security can be assured will be deferred until  
we examine and analyze the details of the Plan for Peace itself.

ISRAEL'S ARGUMENT 2.—DIVINE RIGHT: ANALYSIS

Israel's claim to the West Bank and Gaza, based on "Divine right," has  
many facets to it. Admittedly, a land title issue where God is the putative  
grantor, leaves little in the way of legal precedent for guidance.

The Divine right justification for Israel's refusal to abide by U.N.  
Resolution 242 and 338 was only raised as a serious issue when the Likud  
government took power in the spring of 1977 and it dumfounded President  
Carter in his first meeting with Prime Minister Begin. This is the reason  
why Carter gave up trying to discuss with Begin the West Bank and Gaza  
(which Sadat called the "Mother Issue" of the Middle East) and concen-  
trated upon the Sinai question, which Begin did not claim was sacred land  
or part of Eretz Israel.

There is a question whether this mystical claim of Divine right should be  
seriously addressed at all. It has been decided to do so for two reasons.

First. It is the ostensible ideological or religious reason behind the Likud's  
West Bank and Gaza settlement policy—the most bitter and emotional  
issue of all. Since the beginning of the Intifada, the Likud (on behalf of the  
Israeli settlers) has been putting increasing emphasis on the biblical claim.  
As far as the West Bank settlers are concerned, the biblical claim is  
paramount, and security is secondary.

Second. If Israel's security problem is satisfactorily resolved, the "Divine  
right" and "historic right" arguments are all that the Likud has to fall back  
on in its efforts to justify holding on to and annexing the West Bank and  
Gaza. This means that these issues must be addressed at some point and  
this is the proper place.

Preliminarily, and before proceeding to more important considerations,  
the following general observations with respect to the Divine right position  
are appropriate:

1. The scriptural basis for the Divine right argument is one on which  
   biblical scholars are in hopeless disagreement, and there are a myriad  
   of interpretations, most of them contradictory.
2. Most Jews in Israel and elsewhere are secular, non-observing Jews  
   who do not interpret the Old Testament literally and would not support  
   the Divine right argument. The evidence is overwhelming that the  
   American Jewish community's dedication to Israel has been, and is,  
   based upon a perpetual fear that the State of Israel might be destroyed  
   by its enemies, and not upon any Divine mission to restore Eretz Israel.  
   What a majority of the Israeli people want is peace with security.
3. Even the relatively small minority of Jews who are "Orthodox" are  
   divided concerning Zionism and whether the modern State of Israel  
   is the fulfillment of biblical prophecy and the beginning of the  
   Messianic Age.
4. While it must be conceded that God works in mysterious ways, the fact  
   is that the founding fathers of Zionism were European socialists who,  
   for the most part, were non-religious Jews (some of them atheists)  
   whose guiding principles were to create an agrarian society based on  
   social justice related in no way to a fulfillment of Judaism. Historian  
   Paul Johnson, in his highly regarded (and pro-Israel) History of the  
   Jewsy states what is undisputed:

Zionism had no place for God as such. For Zionists, Judaism was just  
a convenient source of national energy and culture, the Bible no more  
than a State Book. That was why from the start most religious Jews  
regarded Zionism with suspicion or outright hostility and some (as  
we have noted) believed it was the work of Satan.

The Likud government insists that the media not refer to the West Bank  
as the "West Bank" but, rather as "Judea" and "Samaria." As we have seen  
in the first chapter, "Samaria" as such was inhabited, not by Jews, but by

Samaritans who, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans  
(A.D. 70), had been living in Samaria for 800 years. This is a small matter  
but, since this subject is engaging the world's attention, efforts should be  
made to eliminate even small historical inaccuracies.

Nevertheless, the implications of the Divine right argument are intrig-  
uing and, before leaving the mystical aspects of this subject, we are com-  
pelled to ask several hypothetical questions.

It is commonly known that one of the fundamental and underlying  
causes of the war with Japan was the ultimatum issued to Japan by the U.S.  
and other Western powers, to abandon its conquest of China and withdraw  
its armies or suffer a trade embargo. Japan had a clear choice of getting out  
of China, or facing economic strangulation. Since she would not, or could  
not, get out of China, the embargo was imposed on Japan and Pearl Harbor  
followed.

What if the Japanese, in 1941, had responded to our ultimatum by  
claiming that a Shinto god had promised China to the Japanese people  
2,500 years ago (China being the original homeland of the Japanese)?

Suppose, for example, the Japanese argued, as does the Likud, that they  
were not "occupying" China but were "liberating" it to make room for  
Japanese settlers, and it was necessary to torture and kill trouble-making  
Chinese to keep order.

These hypothetical questions are not as fanciful as the Likud Divine right  
argument. Indeed, the Japanese would have a better case for China than the  
Likud does for the West Bank and Gaza.

The validity of the Japanese claim to its "ancient homeland" would be  
supported by a hundred million devoutly believing Japanese, vastly more  
than the number of Orthodox Jews in the world. The Japanese also had a  
living, breathing god-Emperor with lineage going back 2,500 years, who  
could confirm, if necessary, that China had been promised to the Japanese  
people. The emperor was officially "divine" until 1945; and many Japanese  
believe he continued to be divine until his death.

What would be the response of the U.S. to the Japanese position? This  
is more than an interesting speculation; it puts the Likud's Divine right  
argument into a rational perspective.

This brings us to the final and decisive response to the Likud's Divine  
right argument.

Assuming that such a right ever existed and, over the last 3,000 years, it  
had not been abandoned; extinguished by "adverse possession"; revoked by  
"Yahve" (God) because of the transgressions of the Israelites; and was, inthe eyes of the Zionists, a valid and subsisting right in 1947, it nevertheless  
cannot be raised today and recognized as a legal or moral right of Israel to  
the West Bank and Gaza for the simple reason that it was clearly and  
indisputably forfeited when Israel accepted the Partition of Palestine in

Having never raised or asserted it at the time that Israel's statehood and  
the Partition Resolution was being debated and voted on in the U.N., Israel  
is "estopped" from doing so now. The only appropriate remedy for Israel  
might be a request by Prime Minister Shamir for a rehearing on the matter  
by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

However, the Divine right claim is a dangerous argument which Israel  
should not in any event pursue. It plays directly into the hands of the so-  
called hard-line Arab countries who believe, for some reason or another,  
that Israel is an expansionist-minded and predatory power and that even  
keeping the West Bank and Gaza would not satisfy its territorial ambitions.

President Assad of Syria makes a special point that, if the Likud and the  
Gush Emunim biblical positions are accepted as far as Eretz Israel is  
concerned, then all of the land between the "Nile and Euphrates," which  
includes Syria, as well as Lebanon, Iraq, and Jordan, would belong to Israel.

The so-called "hard-line" Arab countries have good reason to be suspi-  
cious of Israel's real intentions, if the religious extremists are controlling

Jewish religious circles also promote the expansionist tendencies of the  
State of Israel. An item in Ha'aretz (August 24, 1985) reported on the  
distribution of information sheets for school excursions to sixty princi-  
pals. The author of the document explained:

We're talking about the most convenient method for expan-  
sion From the political perspective, we have to reach the Tigris

and Euphrates. It's written in the halakha. There's no argument about  
this, the only argument is over applying it in practice—whether it  
needs to be done by force or not. As for the boundaries of the Land of  
Israel, there are no arguments; they are clear axioms.

The Arab states can conclude from this that there is no point in  
making peace with Israel because there is no limit to the territorial

ISRAEL'S ARGUMENT 3: ISRAEL HAS A HISTORIC RIGHT TO  
ALL OF PALESTINE

It is not clear whether this "historic right" is independent of Divine  
sponsorship, or whether it is claimed by the Likud only when the Divine  
right argument is not, for some reason, persuasive. In any event, its chief  
defect as an argument is that it is utterly meaningless.

However, since it regularly appears in print and on television, and the  
prime minister of Israel solemnly speaks of it for all the world to hear, it  
cannot simply be ignored. Being an argument devoid of meaning, it is only  
with some embarrassment that an attempt is made here to answer it, since  
it is logically impossible to do so.

Since no help is offered from the advocates of this nebulous right as to  
its origin, nature or significance, or how, when and by whom it can be  
invoked, acquired or lost, one must necessarily improvise and imagine what  
a "historic right" could mean, and what the consequences would be if it  
were incorporated into international jurisprudence and applied as a rule of  
law.

If it is intended to mean that there is some inherent historic right of a  
people to return to lands held by their ancestors, no matter how long ago,  
and to dispossess or expel the peoples now in possession, then there is little  
land on earth, except Antarctica, the title to which is not impaired or  
subject to challenge. If, however, it means that only the Jewish people have  
this historic right, then we come full circle back to "God."

On the other hand, if this same principle of historic right applies to  
mankind as a species, a goodly portion of the population of the U.S. are  
squatters.

THE CASE OF THE CHEROKEE NATION

The Cherokee Indian nation less than two hundred years ago occupied,  
and had occupied, from time immemorial, approximately 40,000 square  
miles of fertile land located, for the most part, in Virginia, North and South  
Carolina, and Georgia. Their right to retain these historically-held lands  
was confirmed by a treaty with the U.S. government.

The Cherokees were a highly intelligent, civilized and peaceful people.  
They were agricultural, not nomadic and, during the early part of the  
nineteenth century, were a prosperous and successful society. The Chero-  
kees had developed a thriving lumber industry, had established numerous  
schools and built an extensive network of roads. Alone among North

American Indians, they had a written language and had always maintained  
peaceful relations with their white neighbors.

However, by the year 1838, a huge influx of settlers, prospectors, and  
miners had begun encroaching on their territory, all of whom coveted the  
Cherokee lands. It was then decided, by the government of the United  
States under Andrew Jackson, that the Cherokees would really be happier  
in Oklahoma.

The Cherokees did not see it that way but did not go on the warpath.  
They simply complained bitterly about this injustice and took their case to  
the U.S. Supreme Court, where the great Justice, John Marshall, confirmed  
the title of the Cherokees to their lands. Justice Marshall did not have an  
army but Andrew Jackson did and it was then that Jackson uttered his  
famous statement—"John Marshall made his decision, let him enforce it."

Jackson dispatched the army to round up the Cherokees, all 18,000 of  
them. Not being warlike, many tried to escape into hiding but, eventually,  
nearly all were captured. The army corralled the Cherokees in military  
camps throughout a stifling summer, during which many died and many  
more fell ill. In the fall and winter, the Cherokees were moved west, some  
in flatboats, some in wagons, others on foot.

American Heritage "History of the Cherokees" describes this sad event  
in these poignant words:

A young private who watched one wagon train pull out wrote that "in  
the chill of a drizzling rain on an October morning I saw them loaded  
like cattle or sheep into six hundred and forty-five wagons and started

toward the west When the bugle sounded and the wagons started

rolling many of the children... waved their little hands good-bye to  
their mountain homes."

The Cherokees had twelve hundred miles to go before they reached  
eastern Oklahoma at the end of the trek they would forever after  
remember as the Trail of Tears. As their homeland disappeared behind  
them the cold autumn rains continued to fall, bringing disease and death.  
Four thousand shallow graves marked the trail. Marauding parties of  
white men appeared, seized Cherokee horses in payment for imaginary  
debts, and rode off. The Indians pressed on, the sullen troopers riding  
beside them.

They came at last to the Mississippi, gray and swollen under the huge  
unfamiliar sky. The ragged Indians stared across the river at the lands  
they had never seen and never wished to see. Behind them lay the East,

the graves of their ancestors, places of their birth, the land that they—

and all the other tribes—had loved well, and had struggled to hold, and

If there is such a thing as a "historic right," can there be any question that  
the Cherokees have a right to return and repossess their historic home-  
lands? The history is fresh—the facts thoroughly documented—their rights  
adjudicated by the U.S. Supreme Court. Certainly, the God of Justice must  
be on their side. What further is needed to invoke and enforce their  
"historic right" to North and South Carolina, Georgia, and parts of

Would the present inhabitants of those states, living on formerly Chero-  
kee lands, accept being called thieves, as Rabbi Aviner calls the Pales-  
tinians? Would they agree to be "transferred out," in order to make room  
for returning Cherokees? How would they respond if the Cherokees  
adopted the Likud policy of making their lives so miserable they would  
want to leave? Would they agree that the Cherokees were simply liberating

The injustice being done in the case of the Palestinians is compounded.  
The whites did steal the land; the Palestinians are innocent.

It would be a great boon to some of the oppressed of mankind if the  
Likud scholars would deign to explain and define this right of the histori-  
cally dispossessed. It may be, given the opportunity, that the Australian  
aborigines, who have a history and prehistory going back 40,000 years,  
would prefer the climate of Sydney to the Outback.

The Irish people, north and south, had lived on their lands for thousands  
of years. Beginning with Elizabeth I of England and extending through  
Cromwell's misrule, the Irish of the north were driven from their lands at  
the point of the sword to a rocky, barren, windswept county in Western  
Ireland, "Connaught." The British battle cry to the Irish was—"To Hell or  
Connaught." The Irish mistakenly thought they were being given a  
choice—the British gave them both for four centuries.

The British used the confiscated land of Ulster (North Ireland) to settle  
colonies of alien Scotch Presbyterians, who became the ruling class of  
Northern Ireland, while the real Irish were forced into living a subclass  
marginal existence, where they were persecuted religiously, economically  
and politically, a situation which persists to this day. The Northern Irelandproblem is not (despite common belief) a religious one—it is a civil right  
issue almost as bad as the blacks in South Africa and much like the  
Palestinians.

The Southern Irish, however, were not banished to Connaught but were  
simply dispossessed of their lands and made serfs. Serfs, of course, were  
necessary to work the large new estates being set up in Ireland by the  
British gentry and the land confiscators.

Do the Irish have a "historic right" to their ancient lands?

Of course, the Cherokees and the Irish are only two small peoples among  
what must be hundreds of millions of dispossessed and resettled popula-  
tions all over the world since the year 700 B.C., the last time the Israelites  
lived in what became Samaria.

What is puzzling about all this is that, in a world full of lawyers, the  
Likud can, without challenge, conjure up something called a "historic right"  
which is recognized by no code of law or system of justice from Hammurabi  
to the Charter of the United Nations, and is not part of any body of  
jurisprudence anywhere. If the "historic right" claim were pleaded in any  
cause in any court or tribunal, national or international, it would be  
summarily dismissed, on motion, as "frivolous." Yet it commands the  
enforced attention of the governments of the world, and "rights" are  
invented ad hoc by the Likud government without reason or rationale,  
heedless of the consequences to the lives of millions of unfortunate people  
clinging to a small piece of land, home to their ancestors, in mortal fear of  
being driven out.

"Historic right" is a mischievous, as well as meaningless, claim. It fires  
the passions of the Israeli settlers on the West Bank, where little Jewish  
boys, fresh from Minsk, tell little Palestinian boys, whose families have  
lived there for centuries, to "get out of our Jewish land."

Finally, Israel should be aware that both the Divine right claim and the  
historic right claim are hazardous and can have serious political ramifica-  
tions, because they effectively rip the lid off Pandora's box (as Flapan calls  
it) and bring into question the very bona fides of the foundation of Israel  
itself

Earlier in this chapter, the view was expressed that any rights to the  
West Bank and Gaza, which may have existed 3,000 years ago and were not  
abandoned or negated since, were forfeited when Israel accepted the U.N.  
Partition Plan in 1947. However, that is by no means the whole story.

It is important to read what Simha Flapan has to say on this point in his  
book, The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities:

Israel's legendary willingness to compromise and sacrifice with regard to  
the scope of the Jewish state was the foundation on which its entire  
mythology was built during the crucial period of the U.N. deliberations  
in 1947 and 1948. The myth was invoked by all of Israel's representa-  
tives—Moshe Sharett, Abba Eban, Eliyahu (Eliat) Epstein, Gideon  
Raphael, and Michael Comay—in their conversations with U.N. dele-  
gates, foreign ministers, and foreign diplomats. Typical was the argu-  
ment made by Sharett, who was Israel's first foreign minister and second  
prime minister, to the U.N. Palestine Commission on January 15,1948:[Emphasis supplied]

Sharett is quoted as saying:

The Jewish people, as represented by the Jewish Agency, have declared  
themselves willing to cooperate in the implementation of the comprom-  
ise solution [Partition] because they made an effort to approach the  
problem in a realistic spirit, to understand and admit the legitimate  
rights and interests of the other section of the population of Palestine,  
namely, the Arabs of Palestine. [Emphasis supplied]

Flapan continues:

Israel's ostensible acceptance of the resolution remained its most impor-  
tant propaganda weapon, even as it violated one section of that docu-  
ment after another. Today, with Israel controlling the West Bank, the  
Golan Heights, and southern Lebanon, the myth lingers on, engraved in  
Israel's national consciousness and in its schoolbooks. Yet throughout the  
hundred-year history of the Zionist movement and the Yishuv (the  
Jewish community in Palestine), the vision of the great majority was  
always one of a homogeneous Jewish state in the whole or at least in the  
greater part of Palestine. [Emphasis supplied]

What Flapan says in his thesis is that the representatives of the Jewish  
Agency to the United Nations, during its deliberations on creating the State  
of Israel, deceived the U.N. delegates, foreign ministers and foreign diplo-  
mats as to Israel's future territorial intentions after it acquired statehood, in  
order to get the necessary votes of the delegates to establish a Jewish state.

Thus, not only did the Jewish Agency representatives at the U.N. fail to  
raise any claim of right, Divine or historic, to the portion of Palestine  
allocated to the Palestinians in the partition—but they made positive  
disclaimers of such a right.

Had the truth been brought out when truth was called for, Israel would  
never have come into existence. The U.N. would never have countenanced  
a claim to all of Palestine, or an intent by Israel to absorb all of it.

Simha Flapan died on April 13,1987, as his book went to press. The final  
two paragraphs of the book stand as a fitting last testament:

At the same time, it must be recognized that the support of the Israeli  
peace camp for Palestinian self-determination, mutual recognition, and  
coexistence is not enough. Diaspora Jewry and friends of Israel abroad  
must realize that present Israeli policy is doomed to reproduce over and  
over again the cycle of violence that shocks our sensibilities every time  
we read or hear of wanton murder and bloodshed, whether the hand that  
perpetrates it detonates a bomb or fires a pistol. The collective revenge  
of an army is no more righteous or admirable than the individual  
revenge of a desperate youth for the murder of one of his people. It is  
only propaganda and distorted vision that labels one "terrorism" and the  
other "national defense."

It is, then, in the hope of clarifying the distorted vision on our side of  
the conflict—that is, on the Jewish, Israeli side—that I have written this  
book. [Emphasis supplied]

CHAPTER XIII

Israel's Dilemma

A

S A CONSEQUENCE of the Likud policies over the past  
thirteen years, Israel finds itself in a position where it seems that  
whatever course is followed it will lead either to failure or disaster.

It is a multi-horned dilemma. These are the apparent alternatives:

1. If Israel attempts to maintain the status quo, it will continue to have  
   more than two million enemies within its jurisdiction (including the  
   Israeli Arabs) and the Palestinian uprising will eventually escalate  
   into a guerrilla war.
2. If it annexes the West Bank and Gaza into Israel proper, the Pales-  
   tinians will, in the not-too-distant future, outnumber the Jewish  
   population and it will no longer be a Jewish state.
3. If Israel withdraws from the West Bank and Gaza and permits a Pal-  
   estinian state to come into existence, it is concerned that its boun-  
   daries will be indefensible and that it will eventually be vulnerable to  
   attack from the Palestinian state and neighboring Arab nations.
4. If it expels the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza, Harkabi fears  
   an all-out war in which Israel will still have 500,000 Israeli Palestin-  
   ians within its borders as enemies, and face a coalition of Arab and  
   Moslem countries from Mauritania to Indonesia.
5. Finally, it can continue its military occupation of the territories under  
   martial law and harass, brutalize and kill the Palestinians in the hope  
   that they will find life to be so intolerable that they will be forced to

abandon their homes and leave Palestine. This is the Israeli policy  
currently being pursued by the Likud government.

HOW DID ISRAEL GET INTO THIS EXCRUCIATING DILEMMA?

As mentioned several times, Harkabi believes that Israel is facing a  
calamity that could have been prevented if the U.S. government and the  
"Friends of Israel" in America (AIPAC) had spoken out against "Beginism"  
and the Likud's settlement policies in the West Bank and Gaza.

There can be no question that the Israeli Lobby and their collaborators  
in the U.S. Congress and the executive branch of the U.S. government bear  
a major share of the responsibility for the desperate dilemma facing Israel  
today. In fact, Israel's misfortunes can be traced directly to a fateful decision  
made by the American Jewish establishment in the early part of 1977.

As mentioned earlier, in the spring of 1977, the Likud party (led by  
Menachem Begin) scored an upset victory over the Labor party which had  
been in power for the previous 29 years, ever since the founding of the

A "summit" meeting between the new Prime Minister Begin and the  
recently elected President Carter was scheduled for July 19, 1977. At that  
time, Begin was not particularly well known to the Jewish community in  
this country and the upcoming meeting was the source of some anxiety

It was then that a crucial decision was made by the Israeli Lobby, which  
was to have a profound effect upon the course of events in the Middle East  
for the next decade. These events have culminated in the current crisis  
which threatens Israel's survival and world peace.

On July 5, 1977, The Wall Street Journal, in a front page article entitled  
"The Potent Persuaders," discusses in detail the power and influence of the  
Israeli Lobby and the Lobby's strategy for the upcoming meeting between  
the heads of state. The article has previously been quoted at length in the  
first several pages of Chapter VI of this book.

Prime Minister Begins views regarding the occupied territories of the  
West Bank and Gaza were no secret. He had long maintained the position  
that these were "sacred" Jewish lands which could never be returned, nor  
would a Palestinian "homeland" ever be considered.

The problem was that Begins position was contrary to longstanding U.S.  
policy in the Middle East and to U.N. Resolution 242, that Israel had  
ostensibly accepted, and which had recently been publicly confirmed by  
President Carter and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

The primary objective of the American Jewish leadership was to prevent,  
if possible, a showdown between Carter and Begin but, in the event that a  
confrontation did occur, to have the plans ready to put the Israeli Lobby  
into immediate action.

However, Begins career and his reputation in the Jewish community left  
something to be desired. He was clearly not another Abba Eban and, if the  
Jewish community were to be asked to rally around him, his image needed  
some polishing, which is what the establishment set about to do. This was  
not an easy task. According to The Wall Street Journal article previously  
referred to:

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee, led by its aggressive if  
not abrasive director, Morris Amitay, is cranking out a flood of press  
releases and statements that stress Mr. Begin's moderation.

The pro-Israel operatives here are working closely with the new  
government in Israel. Some met recently with Schmuel Katz, who was  
sent to the U.S. as Mr. Begin's personal representative. Democratic Sen.  
Richard Stone of Florida, one of Israel's staunchest friends, visited Mr.  
Begin in Israel to counsel caution after conferring here with seven  
concerned Senators who regularly support Israel.

"Begin policy as enunciated so far can only lead to disorder," an  
influential ally of Israel worries. "It would create, for the first time, a  
deep schism between Israel and the American Jewish community."[Emphasis supplied]

In the process of repackaging Mr. Begin, he was carefully coached "to  
cool it," and not to "appear inflexible" and to avoid being "pinned down on  
specific issues." He was also requested for the time being not to refer to the  
West Bank as "liberated" territories rather than occupied territories.

Begin's promoters assured everyone that Begin had given up "bomb-  
throwing." However, it is clear from the text of The Wall Street Journal  
article that the "new" Begin was not such an easy sell and that considerable  
skepticism still existed in the Jewish community. Therefore, it seems to  
have required an all-out effort, including some extravagant promises by  
Begin's image-makers, to overcome some of the misgivings of the Jewish  
community concerning Begin.

For now, however, Jewish leaders are rallying behind Mr. Begin,  
stressing—as does Rabbi Schindler—that he has been "for 29 years a  
responsible leader of the loyal opposition," and isn't by nature a fanatical  
terrorist. "There is emerging in the American Jewish community a  
feeling that we have to be supportive of Begin," the rabbi says. He argues  
that the prime minister will prove flexible on all major peace issues—  
including withdrawal from West Bank territories.

If a confrontation does come nonetheless, much of the Israeli Lobby's  
efforts will be focused on Congress, where it is often possible to thwart  
the Executive Branch. The most conspicuous might well occur in the  
Senate Foreign Relations Committee. [Emphasis supplied]

In the meantime, representatives of the Israeli Lobby were meeting with  
Carter to explain to the new president the facts of life as the Israeli Lobby

Not surprisingly, at the meeting with Begin, Carter did not mention  
"returning the occupied lands for peace." No reference was made by him  
concerning a "Palestinian homeland." Yet, these were two of the most  
important matters which Carter had announced publicly he would push for

Begin took the advice of his handlers and followed the script. His was a  
stellar performance of sweet reasonableness.

In order to follow the advice of his coaches not to get "pinned down," he  
developed a special language which would, in ordinary parlance, be called  
"double talk"—but which will be referred to here as—"Beginspeak."

Thus, he was able to cheerfully assure everyone that he was willing to  
negotiate anything with the Palestinians but there was much (not specified)  
he would never agree to. (This concession was later qualified by adding the  
condition that he would have to pick the Palestinians that he would be

Whether or not Begin invented the felicitous but meaningless expression  
"the peace process" at this first meeting, or later, is not clear—but it became  
a key part of his vocabulary as long as he held office.

Time magazine of August 1,1977, reporting on the Carter-Begin meet-  
ing, asked rhetorically what happened to Carter's previously announced  
position on the West Bank and Gaza and a Palestinian homeland? Time  
supplied its own answer by stating that, since his meeting with a group ofprominent Jews, Carter had "softened his attitude toward Israel," and de-  
cided to play the role of "pussy cat" and for "some unknown reason," ac-  
cording to Time, did not choose to press "his earlier prescriptions for Israeli  
concessions, including withdrawal from the occupied territories and a  
Palestinian homeland." Time reported that Begin "side-stepped the issue."  
It was clear to the world that, in the face-off, it was Carter who blinked.

For Begin, it had been a tour de force. Carter had publicly backed down  
on raising the key issues.

Begin became an instant hero to Jews in the U.S. and in Israel. It was  
considered a major diplomatic triumph and Begin made the most of it. The  
"Potent Persuaders," whose victory it really was, were content to let Begin  
take the credit.

It was also a great propaganda coup for Begin. He showed the Jews in  
Israel that he could stand up to Washington. After this, no one would doubt  
his boast that "he knew how to handle the Americans." Arrogance became  
his trademark. The Israeli Lobby unwittingly created its own "Frankenstein  
monster."

When the die was cast for Begin, the Israeli Lobby and Israel had passed  
the point of no return. From then on, Begin would do the lecturing and the  
scolding and the American Jews would listen. He was the star and the script  
didn't call for any director.

The irony of this is that it really wasn't all Begin's fault. He had wanted  
to say, as he has said many times since, that "he would never agree to giving  
up a single foot of the West Bank and Gaza." It was the image makers of  
the Israeli Lobby, not Begin, who insisted on projecting Begin as a  
"moderate" and "flexible, even on the West Bank and Gaza."

Begin was not ashamed of having been a terrorist. He bragged about it  
and wrote a book about his experiences. Furthermore, Begin was right, he  
did learn how to handle the Americans. He quickly realized that the U.S.  
government was crippled; that those in the government did not want to  
hear, or deal with, the truth and he shrewdly decided that, if the people in  
the U.S. government wanted double talk—double talk they would get. He  
recognized that the U.S. government was in mortal fear of the Israeli Lobby  
and, as long as he gave them a few crumbs that they could seize upon, such  
as "everything's negotiable," or "we will talk to anyone" (except there is  
nobody to talk to); "I believe in the peace process," or "America is 100%  
behind Israel and relations have never been better,"—they went away  
happy! He wasn't really trying to deceive people—he was just shoving  
pacifiers in their mouths.

Any time that Begin might slip and inadvertently tell the plain truth, the  
press and the U.S. government were quick to interpret it as only a  
bargaining position. Nobody in this country wanted to think, or would let  
himself believe, that Begin (and later Shamir) meant exactly what he said  
back home.

1. There would never be a Palestinian homeland, much less a Palesti-  
   nian state.
2. That Israel did not want "autonomy" for the Palestinians—it wanted  
   to get rid of them by any means necessary.
3. That the Israeli settlements on the West Bank and Gaza would never  
   stop, but would continue to be established as fast as the U.S. supplied  
   the money to build them.

In other words, nothing had changed since the early Zionists said, after  
the Balfour Declaration, "Palestine is going to be as Jewish as England is  
English."

Since nobody in the U.S. government had the courage to be the first to  
say "the emperor has no clothes on," our Middle East policy lapsed into  
schizophrenia—a major factor in creating the dangerous deadlock underly-  
ing the Israeli-Palestinian crisis. For thirteen years, the U.S. has meekly  
participated in this charade. Our presidents and diplomats have developed  
a special vocabulary to be used in reporting on the results of meetings  
between representatives of Israel and the U.S.

Samples of post-meeting announcements by U.S. officials with accom-  
panying translations are:

The meeting was "useful." We agreed on nothing.

The meeting was "frank." We disagreed on everything.

The meeting was "constructive." We're not sure what we agreed on.

Harkabi says that the U.S. has occasionally been known to muster up  
enough courage to describe Israeli defiance as "unhelpful," or an "obstacle  
to peace."

This diplomatic cowardice on the part of the U.S. is not only responsible  
for Israel's perilous predicament but it has cost the U.S. dearly in the  
respect of its friends and allies. Never has the United Nations been more  
united—never has Israel been so alone—as on the day the U.N. voted, 150-  
2, to go to Geneva to hear Yasser Arafat.

The frustrations and disappointments which the U.S. has experienced  
over the past thirteen years in trying to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian  
conflict are the consequences of our failure to recognize two fundamental

* 1. The Likud government of Israel is contemptuous of the U.S. and has  
     no respect, either for the U.S. government or the American people.
  2. The leaders of the Likud government do not want, and never have  
     wanted, peace—they dread it. Their only interest is power and

The evidence which supports these conclusions is extensive and is set

The contempt which the Likud has for the U.S. is obvious and it is richly  
deserved. They know better than anybody that Israel can make or break  
U.S. presidents, senators, congressmen and diplomats. How could the Likud  
leadership be expected to feel otherwise than contemptuous, when every  
representative of the U.S. government wears a collar around his neck and  
they know the leash is held by their friends and colleagues in the Israeli

The most recent examples of the humiliating condescension with which  
the Likud leadership treats the U.S. are found in two articles in the  
Jerusalem Post by Abba Eban having to do with Secretary of State George  
Shultz' visit to Israel in the latter part of 1988 to discuss a peace initiative.  
In the first article entitled, "The Threats Are From Within," Eban

Nothing in our region is too improbable to be true. Israeli leaders, the  
Israeli press, American Jewish supporters of Israel, and some celebrated  
columnists are justly castigating the Palestinian leadership for not being  
sufficiently emphatic in supporting Resolution 242. All of them have  
overlooked the awkward fact that the Israeli government does not  
support it at all. We are recommending strong medicine for others while

Mr. Shamir has never allowed any mention of 242 to pass his lips  
except in tones of rejection. Compared with Mr. Shamir, the Palestine  
National Council is almost a devotee of 242. Resolutions 242 and 338 areat least mentioned in the PNC statement; there is no trace of them  
whatever in the Israeli coalition agreement because the Likud negotiators  
in 1984 resisted the Labour proposal to include 242 as one of the sources  
of Israeli governmental policy.

During Secretary of State Shultz's visit to this area last September, Mr.  
Shamir told him that 242 is not applicable to a negotiation with the  
Jordanians and Palestinians, because the resolution was "exhausted" by  
the withdrawal from Sinai (which also would never have taken place if  
Mr. Shamir had been prime minister in 1977). This prime ministerial  
rejection of 242 led to the collapse of the Shultz initiative and contributed  
to the disengagement of King Hussein from the peace process. While  
some governments have not explicitly endorsed 242, Mr. Shamir is the  
only prime minister in the world who has actually turned it down?  
[Emphasis supplied]

In a follow-up article in the Jerusalem Post, Eban blames Shamir for  
destroying the American peace proposals:

Jordan's role became additionally impossible when Mr. Shamir told  
Secretary Shultz that he stood both for Resolution 242 and for perma-  
nent Israel retention of all of the territory under Israel's control.

It is intellectually respectable to be for one of these but to invoke both  
is sheer frivolity. Moreover, in the Camp David framework agreement,  
the Israel government, then under Likud control, declared that "the  
future status of the West Bank and Gaza and Israel's negotiation of a  
peace treaty with Jordan must be governed by all the principles and  
provisions of 242," one of which is withdrawal of forces.

To be for Camp David and also for total Israeli control of the entire  
West Bank and Gaza is thus just as absurd as to be for 242 and to be in  
favour of West Bank settlements.

To interpret a legal document against its legislative history and against  
the intention of all of its sponsors "mocks intellectual integrity " and is  
a bizarre doctrine. [Emphasis supplied]

Perhaps the only surprise in this is that Eban was surprised. The U.S.  
experience proved long ago that dealing in "absurdity," "frivolity" and  
"mocking intellectual integrity" is what the Likud does best. Shamir is  
merely indulging in a little "Beginspeak" in which he has become very  
fluent.

THE SECOND REALITY

The record of the past thirteen years demonstrates that no one has  
worked harder than Menachem Begin to save Israel from peace. As  
Harkabi states, "Begins primary motivation in starting the disastrous war  
in Lebanon was fear of the momentum of the peace movement, and that he  
might be called upon to honor his signature on the Camp David Accords."  
As previously noted, Harkabi called the Lebanon war the "War to  
Safeguard the Occupation of the West Bank."

Ariel Sharon, hero of the battles of the refugee camps, was the other  
instigator of the Lebanon war, which was based on lies and deceit at the  
highest level. Sharon saw himself, Amos Perlmutter says, "as the King of  
Israel."

While all the nations of the world understand and recognize the hypoc-  
risy of the Likud's "peace process," the Likud continues to make a mockery  
out of U.S. peace efforts and a game out of fooling Washington. There is  
no question that Shamir also knows "how to handle the Americans."

In an article in the Jerusalem Post of March 6, 1989, entitled "The  
Illusion of Shamir's Peace Plan," Israeli journalist Uri Avery writes:

The new Israeli "peace ideas," revealed last month by Prime Minister  
Yitzhak Shamir, bring to mind the stage routine in which the illusion of  
walking and even sprinting is created without the pantomimist advanc-  
ing a single inch. Shamir's intention was to generate feverish diplomatic  
activity, giving the illusion of movement without actually advancing even  
an inch closer to peace.

In the July 17,1989, issue of Time magazine, an article was published  
entitled "Power, Not Peace."

A portion of the article is quoted below:

Extremism was in the ascendancy again last week in the Middle East.  
Capitulating to the hard-line right of his Likud bloc, Israeli Prime  
Minister Yitzhak Shamir fettered his own plan for elections in the  
occupied territories with stiff conditions that seem to doom the peace  
initiative.

Shamir's initiative was never more than a tentative move toward  
starting a dialogue between the Israelis and the Palestinians. It offered  
Arabs in the occupied territories the chance to elect representatives to  
negotiate with Israel a transitional period of self-rule—a possiblebeginning if Palestinians were willing to take it. But under the terms of  
the initiative, the Palestinian representatives could have no overt  
connection with the Palestine Liberation Organization. Not surprisingly,  
no Palestinians rushed to embrace the scheme. Still, coaxed by the U.S.,  
the P.L.O. was giving the plan serious consideration.

Last week those hopes lay in rubble. Rather than risk losing power,  
Shamir chose to scuttle his peace diplomacy. He sidestepped a challenge  
to his leadership by embracing four conditions laid down by hard-line  
Industry and Trade Minister Ariel Sharon and his allies and plainly  
designed to be unacceptable to the Palestinians. Most indigestible was a  
restriction barring the 140,000 Arab residents of East Jerusalem from  
participating in the proposed elections. Shamir also agreed that Israel  
would not return any of the occupied territories to "foreign sovereignty,"  
that the construction of Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza  
would continue and that the proposed elections could not take place until  
the nineteen-month-old intifadeh ended. Ironically, Shamir has espoused  
these same positions many times. But he had hoped to keep them in the  
background while he maneuvered to keep on top of the pressures for  
peace. [Emphasis supplied]

In addition to Abba Eban, other Israelis are finally beginning to recognize  
that the Likud has been deluding them all along about its desire for peace.  
In an article in the Jerusalem Post of October 28, 1989, entitled "Moment  
of Truth," David Landau, a member of the editorial staff of the Post,  
complains that "Shamir is still wrapping his true intent in a tissue of  
disingenuousness. The words 'peace,' 'Camp David' and 'two-phase solu-  
tion' studded his policy statements, but they do not mean what they say."  
Landau writes:

Thus, when Shamir asserted to the Jerusalem Post last week that he is  
confident the Palestinians of Judea, Samaria and Gaza will eventually  
ditch the PLO and talk to Israel on Israel's terms, he didn't mean it. He  
isn't confident. What he means is that as far as he is concerned the  
present situation can continue indefinitely. Intifada? Isolation? Brutaliza-  
tion? Prolonged stalemate and eventual threat of war? If these are the  
price for retaining Judea, Samaria and Gaza, then they are an acceptable  
price.

But he does not say that either. Rather, he speaks of the govern-  
ment's peace initiative"—pretending that he has not just emptied thatterm of any vestige of meaning. He speaks of "Camp David" ignoring  
his own and Foreign Minister Arens's opposition to that agreement. He  
speaks of his "commitment" to the "two-phase solution," concealing his  
determination that the first phase (carefully circumscribed autonomy for  
the Palestinians) remain in force indefinitely (unless the Arabs accept  
the Likud's ideas for a permanent settlement).

He formerly disqualified the PLO because it was terrorist and  
committed to Israel's destruction. Now, having (at least formally)  
renounced those two characteristics, the organization is still disqualified.  
In the premier's words, "Because we oppose a Palestinian state in Eretz  
Yisrael, we cannot negotiate with the PLO."

But since Shamir opposes any withdrawal from the territories, he  
cannot in truth negotiate with anyone—because he has nothing to  
negotiate about. But that truth is unpalatable; Shamir therefore obfus-  
cates it with words and concepts castrated of their original meaning,,[Emphasis supplied]

This, of course, is "Beginspeak" at its finest. It may be news, and also  
disillusioning, to the Jerusalem Post, but it's been going on non-stop for  
thirteen years.

But why should anyone be surprised that demagogues like Shamir and  
Sharon do not want peace? If peace broke out, what would become of  
them? What are the job opportunities for someone with Shamir's experi-  
ence? What can a "hero" like General Sharon look forward to as a finish to  
his illustrious career? As of now, Sharon is riding on top of the world  
promoting his book, the title of which is not "Shalom" but "Warrior." He  
appears on American television talk shows as a celebrity. He is being wined  
and dined everywhere. If peace comes, who would buy his book or even buy  
his lunch?

SHARON AND HIS "FINAL SOLUTION"

Regardless of which Likud leader holds power, Israel's dilemma remains  
unchanged and she will continue as she is, bleeding to death. However, if  
Sharon's ambition to become Prime Minister is achieved, a new and far  
more ominous development is in prospect. The question then arises—how  
would Sharon solve Israel's dilemma and why does Sharon appear so  
confident that he has a solution? The answer may be that he does. His  
solution has nothing to do with "peace," other than avoiding it at all costs.  
From Sharon's standpoint, it has everything going for it and made to order  
for a would-be "King of Israel."

Sharon's power base consists of the following:

1. The Religious Nationalist Extremists who are clamoring for a solu-  
   tion to Israel's dilemma by one great military strike to expel the  
   Palestinians (Amalek) from the West Bank and Gaza using any  
   means necessary, which will pave the way for the coming of the  
   Messiah.
2. The Gush Emunim and other West Bank settlers who, for personal or  
   religious reasons, are determined to get rid of the Palestinians.
3. Those in Israel who, regardless of religious conviction, believe that  
   the Palestinians must be "transferred" (expelled) in order to preserve  
   the Jewishness of the Jewish State.
4. Those Israelis who are not religious zealots and who are not disposed  
   to war for war's sake, but who are exhausted psychologically with  
   Israel's continuing dilemma and feel that some solution is better than  
   no solution. They will follow a leader (even Sharon) if he promises an  
   end to the debilitating internal strife which is destroying Israel.

What is Sharon's solution? As discussed earlier, present Likud policy is  
designed and intended to bring about emigration from the West Bank and  
Gaza by making life in the occupied territories intolerable for its Palestinian  
inhabitants. Some highly-placed individuals in the Israeli military have  
considered accelerating this process by shipping the Arabs to Jordan in  
lorries.

However, this is obviously too slow a process to solve problems which  
must be solved now. Sharon has boasted that he could put down the  
Intifada in 48 hours if he was in charge of the Israeli army. But simply  
putting down the uprising still leaves the Palestinians in possession of  
their lands, and nothing is solved, On the other hand, even Sharon cannot  
simply load 1,500,000 or more Palestinians on trucks and dump them into  
Jordan. That process would also be too slow. Long before it could be  
carried to completion, the United Nations, with the support of the major  
powers, would no doubt intervene. This would be the worst of all possible  
worlds. All of Israel's present problems would be exacerbated and the  
hostility of the world community would be raised to such a pitch that a  
peace might be imposed on Israel. However, these are risks that Sharon  
need not take. There is a safer and proven alternative. It can be  
summarized as follows:

* 1. Israel would continue to stall, delay and confuse any peace efforts by  
     using the same tried and true methods which the Likud has success-  
     fully employed for the past thirteen years.
  2. It will not be long before the peacemakers are thoroughly discouraged  
     and have given up in frustration.
  3. It will be at this point that Arafat's probationary period will be at an  
     end and the extremists in the PLO will say "we told you so" and will  
     take over a newly radicalized PLO.
  4. The Intifada will escalate into real terrorism in the occupied terri-  
     tories verging on guerrilla warfare. Everything will be done by Sharon  
     to provoke the PLO into committing terrorist acts.
  5. The West Bank settlers will demand that the government mobilize  
     the Israeli army to stop these "atrocities."
  6. Sharon will then announce to the world that "I told you so—the PLO  
     has always been nothing but a bunch of terrorists and could never be  
     trusted."
  7. Sharon will declare an "insurrection" in the occupied territories and  
     mobilize the Israeli army to put down the "revolt" and restore order.  
     The battle plan will be the same used in 1948 by the Haganah under  
     Ben-Gurion, the Irgun terrorists under Begin, and the Lehi under  
     Shamir. The elements of this war plan are set forth in detail in  
     Chapter IV, taken from Israeli declassified military archives and the  
     Ben-Gurion diaries.
  8. The Israeli army, together with its West Bank settler "vigilantes," will  
     launch a surprise attack and will sweep across the West Bank and  
     Gaza. Hundreds of Palestinian villages will be destroyed, and homes  
     and lands devastated. A few massacres, like Deir Yassin in 1948, will  
     be carried out to make sure the Palestinians get the message of what  
     will happen to them if they don't leave.

Slowly at first, and then in a tidal wave of humanity, more than 1,500,000  
terrified Palestinian men, women and children will stream in a panic across  
the border into Jordan.

This efficient plan for expelling the Palestinians presents no serious  
problem to the Israeli army. In 1948, a much smaller Israeli army, far less  
well-equipped than the present one, by using these same tactics successfully  
drove 700,000 innocent unarmed Palestinian refugees into exile.

Notwithstanding the bloodthirsty demands of the religious fanatics, that  
Amalek be "wiped out with his women and children," we can safely assumethat Sharon's plan will not call for mass murder and that the killing that  
will be involved will only be that which is necessary to terrify and force the  
Palestinians to flee.

LOGIC, NOT PROPHECY

Does it require some special expertise, secret sources or prophetic pow-  
ers to justify projecting the scenario just described? Not at all. It is simply  
a logical progression from the known facts.

Among the facts that are well-known are these:

Israel's dilemma must be solved soon and Sharon knows it. He is no  
procrastinator. Sharon also knows that simply putting down the Intifada  
solves nothing because the 1,500,000 Palestinians still remain in the West  
Bank and Gaza. If Sharon (or anyone in the Likud with his philosophy)  
comes to power, it will be on the promise of a final solution to the  
"Palestinian problem."

Sharon is on record that the Palestinians belong in Jordan, not on the  
West Bank and Gaza and that Jordan should be their "homeland." He has  
also stated emphatically that the U.S. should not get involved—the Pales-  
tinian problem is for Israel to handle. His supporters among the religious  
extremists are condemning the present Israeli government as too timid in  
solving the Palestinian problem and have demanded that the Palestinians  
(Amalek) be driven out of the sacred occupied lands or God will not allow  
the Israelis to continue living in Israel and will not send the Messiah.

The West Bank settlers are bitterly critical of the Israeli government for  
not sending enough troops into the occupied territories to protect them  
from the stone-throwing Palestinians.

Sharon's supporters are agreed that with Israel's military power, they  
have nothing to fear from anyone and that Israel's Palestinian problem can  
be solved with one bold stroke. All that is needed is a leader with the  
courage to do it.

The only reason for the present delay in expelling the Palestinians is that  
the Sharon faction is not yet in full control of the Israeli government.

But have we been imputing to Sharon, intentions and motivations that  
are too extreme to be taken seriously? The answer is—only if Sharon has  
never meant anything he has ever said or done. Moreover, Sharon is by no  
means alone, among the highest levels of the Israeli military, in his attitude  
toward the Palestinians.

General Eitan, Israel's chief of staff during the Lebanon war, testifiedbefore the Knesset foreign relations and defense committee just before his  
retirement in April 1983. Shipler, in his book Arab and Jew, writes:

He [Eitan] told the legislators that many more Jewish settlements had  
to be built on the West Bank; that if there were 100 settlements between  
Jerusalem and Nablus, Arabs would not be able to throw stones. "When  
we have settled the land, all the Arabs will be able to do about it will be  
to scurry around like drugged roaches in a bottle " declared Israel's  
highest military officer. The remark triggered a storm of outrage among  
many Israeli Jews, but it also prompted expressions of admiration for  
Eitan, who showed up in public opinion polls a month later as the  
country's leading choice for chief of staff. In 1984 he was elected to the  
Knesset.

An outraged Israeli writer said that Eitan's remarks were intended to  
dehumanize the Palestinians so that the military's job becomes easier—  
"cockroaches are not killed—they are exterminated."

A HOLY WAR

The religious extremists have a worshipful attitude toward the militant  
generals in the Israeli army command.  
Harkabi explains that:

For the extremists, Israel's might is a guarantee that no harm will befall  
them. According to Rabbi Z.Y. Kook, the IDF is "holy" and even its  
weapons are "holy" (for all that some of them are manufactured abroad  
by non-Jews and "idolaters"). Generals who openly violate religious  
precepts are venerated like saintly rabbis. A phenomenon which is  
perhaps related is the creeping militarization of religious language, and  
perhaps even of religious thought. Maimonides would be dumbfounded  
to hear a rabbi like Rabbi Hess speak of the "personal interest" of a God  
who "mobilizes" himself.

The faith in Israel's military capacity becomes a functional, psycholog-  
ical, and cognitive need, because without this faith the entire theological  
structure, including the idea that we are living at the beginning of the  
Redemption, would collapse. Little wonder that this faith is in full  
flower, Israel is stronger than all the forces in the Middle East, they  
believe, and not even the Soviets dare raise a finger. In this view,  
setbacks are caused not by intrinsic limitations of Israeli might, but by a  
leadership that is too timorous to exploit the means at its disposal.

Such a faith is a vital part of the world view of the extremists who

have settled in the occupied territories because it seems to offer an

insurance policy against the collapse of their entire enterprise,

Thus an analysis of the evidence almost compels the conclusion reached  
here regarding Sharon's intentions in pursuing his final solution. Indeed,

1. Sharon has no doubt as to what should be done about the Palestinians.
2. His fiery and highly vocal supporters are crying that it must be done.
3. Sharon knows the only way that it can be done.
4. If he is elected Prime Minister, he will have the power to do it.

Conclusion: That is what Sharon will do.

But what about Israel herself? Is the "final solution of the Palestinian  
problem" the final solution for Israels dilemma or the final chapter for

Of course, no one can predict for certain what the fate of Israel would be  
under the circumstances described and we do not presume to do so.  
Although a number of thoughtful minds in Israel have expressed the fear  
of another "Holocaust" or an "Armageddon" or a Moslem "Jihad," we  
refrain from predicting any of these, our purpose being satisfied by point-  
ing out and analyzing the danger of such a catastrophe happening. Proceed-  
ing, therefore, on the assumption that the Palestinian expulsion will  
become a fait accompli without provoking military action against Israel

What would the reaction be from the world community? We can, of  
course, only speculate. But it can be said with some degree of certainty that  
the United Nations cannot remain indifferent.

Let us assume then, the mildest response that can be expected or  
imagined from the world community. It is inconceivable that the U.N.  
sanctions against Israel would not be more severe than those imposed on  
South Africa. In the eyes of the world, nothing that South Africa has done  
would begin to compare with Israels crime if it expelled the Palestinians.

The following would in all likelihood be among the penalties incurred:

* 1. A severance of diplomatic relations with Israel by most nations.
  2. The expulsion of Israel from the U.N. (this has almost happened on  
     a number of past occasions when the provocation was far less).

3. A trade embargo and boycott against Israel in which most all nations

As far as the U.S. is concerned it is impossible to say what it would do.  
But regardless of the U.S. reaction the sweeping economic sanctions of the  
rest of the world would be ruinous for Israel.

The price that Israel might have to pay to lift economic sanctions could  
well be an imposed peace on the basis of the U.N. Partition resolution and  
its 1948 boundaries as well as nuclear disarmament.

It is hard to imagine Israel accepting these conditions, particularly  
nuclear disarmament, when its paranoia regarding the rest of the world  
would then be confirmed by reality. What then would Israels response be?

Can Israel retaliate against economic isolation and eventual strangulation  
by a nuclear strike? If so, against whom? When and how does Israel play  
its nuclear card? Japan responded to economic isolation in 1941 by the  
Pearl Harbor attack (the 1941 version of a nuclear strike) and began a war

In Chapter XI, we cited the great concern expressed from many quarters,  
including the Soviet Union, about the escalating nuclear missile race in the

It is ironic that the U.S. and the Soviet Union have, after 40 years, begun  
to engage seriously in reducing their nuclear weapons stockpiles while, at  
the same time, the Middle East is rushing toward Armageddon with Israel  
building the same type nuclear missile that Washington and Moscow have

An article published in the November 6, 1989, issue of Newsweek  
entitled "Israel's Deal with the Devil?" reports on recent disclosures in the  
Middle East nuclear missile race. The following is an excerpt from the

For years now, it has been a more or less open secret in defense circles  
that Israel is engaged in military collaboration with the apartheid  
government of South Africa. Israel is thought to be South Africa's largest  
arms supplier. Some Israelis say the relationship is necessary for their  
survival. Other people see it as a deal with the Devil—which explains  
last week's fuss over a pair of reports on NBC News.

The network charged that Jerusalem was involved in a "full-blown  
partnership with Pretoria to produce a nuclear-tipped missile for South  
Africa." It said South Africa's Overberg testing range, near the town of  
Arniston, was built to Israeli specifications. Citing "a CIA document," itsaid "the first missile flight of the Jerusalem-Pretoria alliance was on July  
5th," when a rocket flew 900 miles toward Antarctica. In exchange for  
the technology, NBC said, Israel gets the use of test facilities there and  
"a continuous supply of enriched uranium for its nuclear warheads."

"It's all lies," said Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir. But both  
countries are known to have nuclear-weapons capabilities. And a U.S.  
official with intimate knowledge of the subject told Newsweek that: the  
Israel-South Africa missile partnership couldn't be closer." The official  
said: "We know everything—names, dates, everything."

The missile project involves technology from Israel's Jericho-2B mis-  
sile, an intermediate-range weapon of the type that Washington and  
Moscow have agreed to eliminate. Israel used a Jericho as the first two  
stages of a rocket called Shavit (Comet), which launched a satellite into  
orbit last year. American experts estimate that the Jericho-2B could hurl  
a one-ton warhead more than 1,700 miles.

The timing is further complicated by friction between Washington  
and Jerusalem. The two allies are at loggerheads on a number of issues,  
notably Shamir's reluctance to implement his own proposal for elections  
on the occupied West Bank. Having pushed and cajoled the Arabs into  
agreement, the administration now discovers, in the words of one senior  
U.S. official, that Shamir "can't say yes to his own plan." The implied  
threat to Israel's military aid from the U.S., which amounts to a vital $1.8  
billion a year, may have been designed to put new pressure on Israel.

Despite Prime Minister Shamir's statement that the report above quoted  
"was all lies," the Pentagon on November 15,1989, confirmed it as true.

If, and when, another war comes to the Middle East, there are few things  
that can be predicted. One thing, however, we can be assured of—Israel will  
never accept defeat. When the Israelis say that "never again" will they be  
the only victim, they mean it. The end will come not as with the zealots of  
Masada, but as with Samson pulling down the pillars of the temple.

When the Arab oil fields are in ruins; when enough cities have been  
vaporized; when the casualties are in the millions, the Jews of Israel will not  
be among the survivors—they will fight hopelessly to the death.

CHAPTER XIV

A Plan for Peace

F

OR THOSE WHO HAVE tried to find the "road to peace" in the  
Middle East, it has been a treacherous journey, inevitably ending in  
bitter disappointment.

THE PERILOUS ROAD

As a result of these failures in the many good faith efforts to bring peace  
to the Middle East, the idea has gained credence that the Israeli-Palestinian  
deadlock defies solution much like North Ireland. As a result, a certain  
attitude of hopelessness has begun to pervade any discussion of the Middle  
East crisis.

To adopt this attitude, however, is to fall victim to the Likud's strategy,  
which is to convince the world that there is no solution except Israel's status  
quo. Under the guise of seeking peace, the Likud has spent most of its time  
and effort during the past thirteen years planting land mines and booby  
traps along the road to peace. They have cleverly led peace seekers up blind  
alleys and into Israeli Lobby ambushes. Most of the problems encountered  
in the search for peace have not been real, they have been contrived. The  
biggest obstacle to peace has simply been relentless Likud sabotage.

To divert attention from itself, as the main roadblock to peace, and to  
further discourage genuine peace efforts, the Likud has fostered the view  
that the issues involved in the Palestinian situation are enormously  
"complex," the strategy being that if they can discourage and frustrate peaceefforts to the point where everyone "gives up," they have won their  
primary objective.

At this writing, this strategy is becoming dangerously close to success. It  
would be well, of course, if the Israeli-Palestinian crisis could be locked away  
and forgotten about. Unfortunately, long before the conflict reaches the  
North Ireland stage, it is more likely to have exploded in fire balls and  
mushroom clouds, perhaps taking a sizable part of the Middle East with it.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION

After Secretary of State Baker's initial strong and courageous grasp of the  
situation, and his forceful comments on the "Greater Israel" theme, many  
people took heart. Recently, however, it has been rumored that the  
administration is already wearying of the challenge.

In an article published in the Jerusalem Post of September 23,1989, the  
Bush administration's Middle East policy is discussed.

It is pointed out in the article, entitled "Why Bush Is in No Hurry to  
Take the Plunge," that President Bush and Secretary Baker are politicians  
and, therefore, "appreciate the special place that Israel has carved out for  
itself in the American political scene ."

The following are further excerpts from the article:

For the most part, Bush, Baker and their colleagues regard it as a very  
risky, even no-win situation.

Thus, those people in Israel and the Arab world who are hoping for  
an active and high-level American mediatory role are in for a sorry  
disappointment.

Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Jordan's Crown Prince Hassan  
both emerged from meetings with Bush, Baker and other U.S. officials in  
recent weeks reportedly upset by the administration's reluctance to get  
too deeply involved in the peace process.

Barring some major development, Egyptian President Hosni Mubar-  
ak and Finance Minister Shimon Peres—among other Middle Eastern  
leaders due to visit Washington—will similarly be disappointed by the  
administration's passivity.

Beyond the widespread sense in Washington that the Middle East is  
hopeless, there are also other more pressing problems right now on the  
American agenda, including the war against drugs, the economy, and the  
superpower relationship.

Most observers here agree that there are only two ways that the U.S.

is going to get deeply involved in the Middle East. The first will be if  
there is some sort of urgent crisis—involving either hostages or actual  
hostilities. Short of that kind of emergency, the president and the  
secretary of state will want to wait on the sidelines.

Administration officials, despite this gloomy assessment, will continue  
to go through the diplomatic motions. They will continue to explore  
Israel's plan for Palestinian elections in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.  
They will focus on Egypt's 10-point proposal to implement those elec-  
tions. There will be numerous meetings with Arab and Israeli leaders.

But right now, this administration has no real stomach for undertak-  
ing the tough kind of decisions, the dogged hard work, and the political  
risks necessary to achieve progress. [Emphasis supplied]

In essence, the Jerusalem Post is telling us that President Bush and  
Secretary Baker have already been intimidated by the Israeli Lobby which  
they now understand has carved out a "special place" in the American  
political scene.

As a result, the Post is almost gleeful in reporting "the widespread sense  
in Washington is that, the Middle East situation is hopeless." The president  
and secretary of state want to "wait on the sidelines"; they do not want to  
get "too deeply involved in the peace process."

The fact that the Israeli Lobby has already discouraged Secretary Baker  
(within a few months of his maiden speech on the Middle East) is more  
than a cause for alarm, it is a warning of disaster. If the Jerusalem Post  
article is even close to the truth, it is a Likud triumph, a major victory for  
the Israeli Lobby and a great loss for the Israeli people.

As we have seen, the chief goals of the Israeli Lobby and its client, the  
Likud, are:

1. To stifle and block any efforts by American Jews to exert any influence  
   on Likud policies.
2. To keep the U.S. from doing anything in the Middle East that the  
   Likud doesn't approve of.

For the U.S. to be "passive" or "stand by" or "not want to get involved"  
(as just quoted from the Jerusalem Post), is a Likud prayer answered.

In Chapter XII, we have made an effort to identify and deal with the  
issues which lie at the root of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is apparent  
that the issues are quite clear. The problem is that the positions of the  
parties with respect to the issues are irreconcilable.

Just how "complex" is the issue of the future of the West Bank and Gaza?  
A single bone tossed at two hungry pit bulls does not create a "complex"  
issue. The solution may be painful to the dogs but the issue is clear and non-  
negotiable. Even Shamir, in a lucid moment, states it plainly—"What's to  
negotiate?—They think the land is theirs, we think its ours."

There is nothing at issue in the Middle East that remotely compares in  
complexity with the problems that must be solved in, for example, nego-  
tiating a "Reduction of Conventional Forces in Europe," or in the "Strategic  
Arms Talks."

These involve matters so technical and esoteric that only a relatively few  
people in the world can understand them in all of their ramifications. The  
problems are so involved and convoluted that, with the best of intentions,  
they take years to negotiate.

The "complexity" argument is simply another Likud smokescreen. The  
Likud's success lies in the fact that rational minds have difficulty dealing  
with irrational concepts. This is what dumbfounded and exasperated Abba  
Eban in Shamir's explanation of the Likud's position on U.N. Resolution  
242 (quoted earlier). The whole purpose of "Beginspeak" has been to  
confuse and befuddle people into thinking that something logical or sen-  
sible is actually being said.

When Begin and Shamir have announced their willingness to negotiate  
with the Palestinians (but not about the future of the West Bank and Gaza),  
it is equivalent to Gorbachev announcing at the beginning of strategic arms  
talks that he was ready to negotiate everything but intercontinental ballistic  
missiles.

THE OPPORTUNITY

Although the current situation in the Middle East is near flashpoint and  
the threat to world peace has never been greater, paradoxically the oppor-  
tunity for genuine peace has never been more promising.

The events of the past 18 months have opened up possibilities which  
have heretofore been non-existent. In a sense, it can be compared to a  
planetary alignment in the solar system. If acted upon quickly, it can achieve  
remarkable results as we have seen in the Voyager II space probe. But, as  
in the solar system, such alignments are rare and transitory.

Included among the comparatively recent developments are the fol-

* 1. The Bush administration has expressed a willingness to take a fresh  
     look at the Israeli-Palestinian deadlock.
  2. The United Nations is increasingly more willing to assert itself and to  
     assume a more positive role in attempting to resolve the Middle East
  3. The acceptance by the PLO of Israels right to exist and its agreement  
     to suspend terrorist activities so long as bona fide peace efforts are in
  4. The willingness of representatives of the U.S. to talk directly to
  5. The determination of the Palestinians to continue the Intifada until  
     Israel removes its occupation troops.
  6. Numerous indications on the part of the American Jewish community  
     that, while continuing its strong loyalties to Israel, it is becoming  
     increasingly skeptical and disillusioned with the policies of the Likud

Taken together these new circumstances have opened an unprecedented  
opportunity for a real peace movement which, if undertaken without delay  
and pursued vigorously and wisely, has a high prospect of success.

The great danger is that this historic opportunity will slip from our grasp  
and be lost forever either because the parties do not see it for what it is, or  
do not have the courage and will to pursue it. In the Israeli-Palestinian crisis  
there are time imperatives which are beyond the power of anyone to

There is another obstacle inherent in the nature of the issues which also  
makes many good faith attempts at achieving peace doomed from the

The sincere efforts of many well-meaning people to break the Middle  
East deadlock by trying to persuade Shamir to "talk to the PLO " even if it  
were to succeed, unfortunately does not bring peace any closer. Indeed, it is  
counter productive because it not only wastes precious time in what would  
certainly be interminable negotiations, but what is more important, it

Elections, with or without representatives of the PLO, are meaningless.  
At best, after endless haggling, all that could possibly be accomplished

would be to determine who would represent the Palestinians in negotia-  
tions with Israel on an issue which cannot be negotiated.

THE FUTILITY OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND  
THE PALESTINIANS

There is a belief, unsupported by history, but commonly accepted in even  
the highest diplomatic circles, that the secret for reaching a settlement  
between nations on dangerous unresolved issues is to convene a peace  
conference and coax or drag the parties to the "bargaining table" whereby  
some alchemy, and with enough time, the parties will negotiate a proper  
settlement of their differences. Negotiations are somehow considered to  
have magical properties so that, instead of being a process they tend to  
become an end in themselves. They become rituals rather than mechanisms  
for reaching solutions.

What must be understood and accepted, if any progress toward peace is  
to be made, is that the future status of the West Bank and Gaza is a non-  
negotiable issue.

There is much to be learned from the bitter experience of the Paris Peace  
Talks in which the U.S. tried to end the Vietnam War by "negotiating" a  
"peace with honor" and failed disastrously.

In 1968, the Vietnam War had been in progress for approximately three  
years during which President Johnson had vainly tried to arrange a truce  
with North Vietnam as a prelude to peace negotiations. Despite his  
desperate efforts to get the North Vietnamese to the bargaining table, he  
failed. On March 31, 1968, Johnson publicly announced his intention not  
to seek re-election.

The North Vietnamese then agreed to negotiate provided there would  
be no cessation or reduction in the fighting, which proceeded full scale. The  
U.S. sent a negotiating team headed by Averell Harriman to Paris to meet  
with the Vietnamese representative, Xuan Thuy. The peace conference  
opened in Paris on May 10, 1968, on a note of euphoria (in the U.S.  
delegation).

The U.S. position was clear and unchangeable. It wanted South Vietnam  
to be free to choose its own government. The North Vietnamese position  
was equally clear and unchangeable; it wanted all of Vietnam under Com-  
munist rule.

The positions of the parties were, of course, irreconcilable and not sub-  
ject to compromise. This did not, however, deter or discourage the negotia-  
tors. They diligently tried every day to negotiate the non-negotiable.

The negotiations continued all through the remainder of 1968, with each  
side simply repeating their respective positions without any progress  
except that the fighting continued to get worse.

When the Nixon administration took office in January, 1969, a new  
negotiating team, led by Henry Kissinger, took over the negotiations. The  
North Vietnamese delegation was then headed by Le Due Tho.

The frustrating and fruitless negotiations dragged on for four more  
years, through the Nixon administration and almost into the Ford admin-  
istration. Kissinger tried every conceivable tactic to extract concessions or  
compromises from the North Vietnamese. He alternately threatened and

After each session, which consisted of repeating what they had said in  
the previous session, the negotiators would appear before the press and  
solemnly announce that the talks had been "helpful," or some other  
innocuous and meaningless bit of diplomatic jargon.

After many fine Parisian dinners and champagne toasts, the negotiators,  
out of exhaustion or boredom, finally signed a truce agreement which  
pretended to guarantee South Vietnam's independence. Finally, it was

As we know, after the U.S. forces were withdrawn and the South  
Vietnamese took over, the North Vietnamese armies simply rolled over  
South Vietnam just as they had always planned to do. Saigon's name was  
changed to Ho Chi Minh City, a name that doubtless had been picked out

Tragically, more American soldiers were killed after the peace talks than  
had died before. The cost to the nation in blood, pain, death and resources  
of the failure of our diplomats to recognize the impossibility that the  
negotiations could succeed, is immeasurable. A non-negotiable issue can be  
won or lost but simply cannot be compromised.

After the battles of Lexington and Concord, American independence was  
"non-negotiable" even though the British tried hard to open negotiations  
with Washington, which included an offer of autonomy for the colonies if  
Washington would only disband his unconventional forces, who persisted  
in firing at the British from behind stone walls.

George W. Ball, former Undersecretary of State in the Johnson and  
Carter administrations and Ambassador to the United Nations, shares this  
view as to the futility of direct negotiations between the parties in the

In a brilliant article appearing in Foreign Affairs, April 1977, issueentitled "How to Save Israel in Spite of Herself," he argued for the U.S. to  
step in and set the terms of settlement:

Nonetheless it is the conventional wisdom to reject any suggestions that  
the United States set the proposed terms of a settlement. Instead we  
must let the parties find their way by palaver to some common meeting  
ground somewhere near the center of a no-mans land studded with land  
mines of hatred, religion, vested interests, rigid dogmas of military  
necessity. For those who believe such a feat of diplomatic navigation is

Many who oppose the injection of an American plan of settlement  
appear to regard negotiation as a mystical process that automatically  
grinds out solutions. Yet experience has shown again and again that  
effective negotiation requires at least four preconditions, none of which  
now exists with respect to the Arab-Israeli struggle. First, there must be  
a desire on each side to find a solution. Second, both sides must be  
convinced that negotiation is not a zero-sum game—that, in other  
words, the offer of a concession is not merely an advantage to the other  
side but a benefit to both. Third, the leaders of the negotiating nations  
must be sufficiently secure in their personal political positions to risk  
making the concessions needed for a settlement. Finally, the parties must  
start from positions sufficiently close if they are, by their own efforts, to

One of the most difficult problems to be overcome in peace negotiations  
is the weakness of the negotiators in relation to their constituencies. The  
extent to which either side has the power to make unpopular concessions  
is extremely limited. This is where George Ball thinks that an American

Finally, America's indispensable role is to provide the means of relieving  
the political leaders on both sides of the need to make politically  
unpalatable decisions, by furnishing them the escape route of yielding  
reluctantly under the relentless pressure of outside forces. This means  
that our President must take the political heat from powerful and  
articulate pro-Israeli domestic groups. It means that as a nation we must  
be prepared to accept abuse and blame from both sides, permitting localpoliticians to save their own skins by attacking American arrogance and

After Ball's article was published in Foreign Affairs, Philip M. Klutznick,  
his friend and prominent member of the Jewish community, wrote a letter  
to the editor of Foreign Affairs commenting on Ball's article. Ball's reply

I have such high regard for Philip Klutznick as a man of integrity and  
perception that I am extremely reluctant to disagree with him.

It would obviously be preferable for the Arabs and Israelis to negotiate  
a final settlement between themselves. But I cannot believe that such a  
procedure would succeed. In my article I pointed out that the requisite  
conditions to an effective negotiation in the classical mode simply do not  
exist between the Arabs and Israelis and, if that was true before the May  
elections, the victory of the Likud Party has powerfully reinforced my  
dubiety. Can anyone seriously believe that a government headed by a  
leader who categorically asserts that he will never yield an inch of West  
Bank territory will be persuaded to make the requisite concessions if the  
United States merely plays a sideline role, "helping to provide a frame-  
work for negotiating and submitting concrete proposals from time to

In some international disputes there is wide latitude for negotiation  
since a settlement is often possible with any of several combinations of  
mutually balancing concessions. But in the Arab-Israeli dispute each  
side has explicitly formulated its minimal requirements and passion-  
ately asserts that it will not settle unless those requirements are met.  
Thus the Israelis insist—and with good reason—on a real peace and  
will not be content with some vague declaration of non-belligerency.  
The frontline Arab states, on their part, are never going to agree to a  
full peace unless Israel commits herself to withdraw from substantially  
all territories she seized in 1967 and accepts the creation of a Palesti-  
nian homeland. Unlike many other situations, there is little room for  
bargaining within the context of a comprehensive settlement and, as  
Mr. Klutznick himself points out, "... piecemeal steps seem to have

No amount of pushing and prodding is likely to force either side to  
grant the minimal requirement demanded by the other. That can occur,  
it seems to me, only if the United States says in effect: "These are theterms of a settlement based on the principles propounded by the U.N.  
Security Council which should satisfy each side's minimal requirements.  
They include powerful enforcement and security measures such as  
buffer zones with neutral forces, demilitarized areas, and superpower  
guarantees."

If the Arabs reject the U.S. proposals and refuse a full peace, even on  
the promise of an Israeli withdrawal, we should recognize that another  
war is inevitable. But if the Arab states do agree to a full peace—as I  
believe they are likely to do—and the Israelis refuse to accept withdrawal  
essentially to pre-1967 boundaries, then the United States must face a  
hard national decision: Can we in good conscience continue to provide  
huge subsidies to enable Israeli obduracy to perpetuate a stalemate that  
will sooner or later lead to catastrophe for all? Do we really want our  
Middle East policies to be made in Jerusalem or should we try to stave  
off disaster by taking a positive position of our own? [Emphasis  
supplied]

George Ball's thoughtful and wise approach to Middle East peace was  
doomed for two principal reasons:

1. It called for a peaceful solution to be imposed on the parties by the  
   United States. The concept of an "imposed" solution is anathema to  
   the Israeli Lobby because they interpret it to mean that Israel will  
   inevitably be the "sacrificial lamb."
2. At the time that Ball wrote the Foreign Affairs article, the Likud party  
   led by Menachem Begin had just come to power and peace was the  
   last thing they were interested in.

Much has changed in the Middle East since 1977, when Ball's Foreign  
Affairs article was written. For the most part, the changes have been for the  
worse.

On the positive side, however, was the settlement of the Sinai issue with  
Anwar Sadat at Camp David in 1979. Another positive development has  
been the PLO's statements regarding terrorism and the recognition of  
Israel. However, this is only a temporary reprieve pending Arafat's success  
or failure in his efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the West  
Bank and Gaza issue. The understanding reached between Arafat and the  
radical wing of the PLO is that Arafat must soon produce tangible results  
in his "moderate" approach or all bets are off.

A third, and perhaps the most important, potentially positive factor isthat Jewish and Israeli intellectuals have, by and large, abandoned the Likud  
and its West Bank policies. This, however, must be translated into positive  
steps by the intellectuals to exert their influence. Unless the peace activists  
organize to provide leadership for the Jewish community in America and  
the electorate in Israel, their impact unfortunately will be minimal.

On the negative side is the fact that the Likud, which first came to power  
in 1977, is now fully entrenched. Furthermore, the Likud continues to gain  
a greater share of the electorate with each succeeding election. This is due,  
in large part, to a lack of alternatives for the Israeli voters. The leaders of  
the Likud, as is the case with all demagogues, have simple and emotionally  
powerful answers to Israels problems. In contrast, the Labor party appears  
weak and indecisive.

There is good reason to believe that the Likud's hold on the government  
could be reduced dramatically if a peace party with a dynamic leadership  
would challenge the Likud with a plan for peace and security that the Israeli  
people could believe in.

Another very negative development has been the Likud's settlement  
policies in the occupied territories. In 1977, there were few Israeli settle-  
ments in the West Bank and Gaza. Since then, the Likud has launched an  
aggressive settlement program to get as many new settlers as possible to  
implement Begins "facts on the ground" policy. Many of these new  
settlements are in close proximity to Palestinian villages which have been  
there for centuries. A large number of the settlers are religious zealots who  
consider the Palestinians as the intruders. The result has been a bitter  
confrontation in which the settlers carry guns and the Palestinians throw  
rocks. This is the emotional crucible out of which the Intifada was forged.

The West Bank settlers, which now number in excess of 70,000, are  
ideologically the core of the Likud's constituency.

CUTTING THE GORDIAN KNOT

As a nation, we are often so obsessed with our failures that we neglect  
to recognize or take credit for our successes. One of the most outstanding  
of these has been the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

At the end of World War II, there were only two significant military  
powers in the world, the U.S. and the Soviet Union. When Winston  
Churchill, in his historic speech in Fulton, Missouri, announced to the world  
that the hopes for a peaceful post-war Europe had been betrayed and that  
an "iron curtain" had descended from "Stettin, in the Baltic, to Trieste, in  
the Adriactic," the ruined and ravaged nations of Western Europe werehuddled around the U.S. like chicks to a mother hen. The Russian bear, still  
panting after swallowing Eastern Europe, looked to the West and saw a

NATO was born as a brave mutual defense pact, comprising most of the  
nations of Western Europe, as protection against an insatiable Soviet Union

The unique aspect of the NATO alliance was that the U.S. did not simply  
make a paper commitment to come to the defense of any NATO member  
under attack, but pledged as security for that commitment to deploy  
military forces of the U.S., both land and air, on the frontiers of the NATO  
countries. This is sometimes called the "trip wire." In essence, it acts as a  
trigger which, when violated, automatically puts into effect a pre-planned  
and self-executing military response of which all parties, friend and foe, are

The deployment of battle-ready units of the U.S. Army and Air Force on  
European soil as a deterrent to aggression has been the most successful

The presence of approximately 300,000 American troops in the NATO  
countries, of course, did not guarantee that the Soviet Union could not  
successfully overrun Western Europe. But it made unmistakably clear to the  
Soviets that, if they attempted to do so, the full military and industrial  
might of the United States would be engaged from day one. The real  
strength of NATO has, of course, not been the American military presence  
as such—but the unambiguous nature of the U.S. commitment.

If the United States had merely signed the NATO pact and then gone  
home, there is no doubt that the history of Western Europe and the world,  
for the past thirty or forty years, would have been radically different.

Once the Soviet Union reached nuclear parity with the U.S. in the year  
1949, and had American troops not been an integral part of the defense of  
NATO, Russia could easily have overrun Western Europe by using only its  
massive conventional forces after which it could have sat back and dared the  
U.S. to start a nuclear war over a fait accompli. This seems fanciful today

The American military presence, symbolic of the U.S. commitment, was  
the only reason that Europe had the courage to withstand the military and  
psychological pressures of the Cold War.

It is doubtful that either Hitler or the Kaiser would ever have started the  
World Wars had they known for certain that America would become

The wisdom of the NATO alliance has borne fruit beyond what anyone  
could have dreamed. West Germany, the remnant of a nation destroyed, has  
in a few decades become the number one economic power in Europe with  
a standard of living equal to or exceeding that of its American conquerors.  
As this is written, the supreme accomplishment of NATO in addition to  
keeping the peace for 40 years, has been the incredible events occurring in  
the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. Germany's economic  
renaissance, the shining example which has caused the disaffection in the  
Soviet bloc, is due not only to the quality of its people but the fact that the  
energies and vitality of the West Germans were not expended in debilitat-  
ing fear of the Soviets but were channeled in a positive direction—the

An even more spectacular example of the success of the U.S. policy of  
mutual defense treaties is the case of Japan.

Militarily naked, only minutes away from Soviet bases, Japan has had the  
assurance of a total commitment of the U.S. to her defense backed up by  
U.S. armed forces, air, ground and naval, deployed in Japan. Having no  
worries about her security, Japan has not only beaten her samurai "swords  
into plowshares," but also into Toyotas, Sonys, etc., and an endless list of  
electronic wonders. The speed with which Japan has achieved this transfor-  
mation has been breathtaking. Not too many years ago a "Mitsubishi" was  
not an automobile built by a joint venture with Chrysler but the most  
fearsome fighter plane in the Pacific, the Japanese "Zero."

From a nation in ashes in 1945, Japan has built perhaps the most  
successful commercial and industrial society in the world. This is not  
primarily because she spends a relatively small portion of her GNP on  
defense—but because the talents of her people are unfettered and not  
disrupted by fears and anxieties about her security. Her creative energies  
are not stifled under a blanket of fear—but are given free rein to pursue the  
paths of progress and prosperity. Japan's youth are in laboratories, class-  
rooms and universities, immersed in their new computerized and electronic  
world, not skulking around the back alleys of West Bank villages.

THE REMARKABLE CASE OF SOUTH KOREA

Following World War II, the Korean peninsula, by agreement with the  
Soviet Union, was divided at the 38th Parallel into North Korea and South  
Korea. By 1950, Russia and Communist China were rapidly converting

North Korea into a communist satellite while the U.S. was hopeful that a  
republic would emerge, western style, in South Korea.

The U.S. was still in the process of sorting out just where, and to what  
extent, our military commitments should be made in the fluid situation  
which followed the global dislocations of World War II. It so happens that  
a highly-placed official in the Truman administration was explaining to the  
press, with the aid of a map, the extent of the U.S. defense perimeter in  
East Asia. For some reason, deliberate or accidental, the defense perimeter  
did not include South Korea. This was interpreted in Moscow and Peking  
to mean that the U.S. was indifferent to South Korean security. Not long  
after, the North Koreans launched a surprise attack in force on South  
Korea.

The U.S., realizing too late that a Communist South Korea would place  
the Russians and Chinese on the doorstep of Japan, hurriedly convened a  
meeting of the Security Council of the U.N. to meet the emergency. The  
Russian delegation walked out—thus foolishly missing their chance to veto  
the Security Council resolution to defend South Korea and repel the  
invasion from the North.

Thus began the Korean War, almost forgotten by many people but  
which resulted in American casualties nearly equal to those suffered in  
Vietnam. The U.S. misled the North Koreans and the Chinese with its  
ambiguous position and the North Koreans, in turn, misjudged the U.S.  
Neither the U.S. nor North Korea wanted a war. Before it was over, the  
U.S. had experienced spectacular victories over the North Koreans and  
crushing defeats at the hands of the Red Chinese. The bloody war, that  
nobody had wanted or intended and in which both sides were trapped,  
ended in a stalemate and the creation of a demilitarized zone (DMZ) on the  
38th Parallel.

Under a mutual defense treaty with South Korea dated October 1,1953,  
the U.S. deployed approximately 40,000 troops to guard the DMZ against  
any new threat from North Korea. This U.S. force is still in place and  
continues as it has for 35 years in a war-ready state.

At the end of the Korean War, South Korea, which together with North  
Korea, had been an undeveloped backward peasant society and a pre-war  
colony of Japan, began to build a new nation. The threatening attitude of  
North Korea toward South Korea never ceased and has lasted to the  
present day, although somewhat mellowed.

The South Korean army trained and equipped by the U.S., and the  
physical presence of 30,000 to 40,000 battle-ready American troops on the

DMZ, have stood guard while the energetic and ambitious South Korean  
people created a modern miracle. The result was a transformation of a  
primitive medieval society into a modern, aggressive and dynamic nation,  
an economic powerhouse, able to compete in the world markets on even  
terms with the most advanced industrial countries.

It is another example of the unique peacekeeping effectiveness of a  
deterrent that is clear to all potential aggressors. When there are no  
surprises—when predatory powers know in advance the consequences of  
initiating a war—the will to war usually subsides and ultimately vanishes.

ISRAEL'S SECURITY—A SOLUTION

In Chapter XII, it was stipulated that Israel's security is an absolute  
precondition to any acceptable peace proposal. The discussion of this all  
important topic was deferred to this chapter where it more properly  
belongs.

The matter of Israel's security is, of course, not a new question but one  
that has been raised and considered many times before and solutions for  
which have frequently been proposed.

In order for the reader to gain a quick insight into how Israel itself views  
the problem of its security and why it has rejected various other proposals,  
we have outlined a short and hypothetical dialogue which incorporates  
security proposals which have actually been made to Israel at various times,  
together with the usual responses made by spokesmen for the Israeli  
government.

SECURITY PROPOSAL I

"Don't worry, Israel's security will be guaranteed by the United Nations."  
ISRAEL'S RESPONSE

"We can't trust the U.N. After all, it was Egypt's Nasser, ordering the U.N.  
peacekeeping force out of the Sinai, that precipitated the 1967 War."  
SECURITY PROPOSAL 2.

"Israel's security will be guaranteed by the United States and the Soviet  
Union."  
ISRAEL'S RESPONSE

"You don't really expect us to put our lives in the hands of the Russians,  
do you?"  
SECURITY PROPOSAL 3

"Very well, then, the United States will guarantee Israel's borders and its  
security."

ISRAEL'S RESPONSE

"We appreciate your kind gesture but you must realize that we would not  
even have time to dial Washington before we were overrun by an Arab  
army—they would be only ten miles away. Not only that, but Congress  
would have to convene to declare war, and besides that, any real military  
help is still 4,000 miles away. We can depend only on ourselves

This raises a perplexing question. Why is the U.S. committed, under  
solemn treaties, to expend unlimited military resources and, if necessary, to  
sacrifice the lives of an unforeseeable number of American soldiers to  
defend our NATO ally, West Germany (historically not our best friend), or  
Spain, or Greece, to which we have no special ties, and not to Israel which  
does not even have a defense treaty with the U.S. and is not a formal ally  
of the U.S.? Why is Israel forced to depend on herself alone?

Do we not owe Israel, to which we have many ties, as much security as  
we give, for example, to Turkey? Are the Japanese and Koreans more  
deserving of our defense commitments than Israel?

While peace and unbounded prosperity are enjoyed by Japanese, Ger-  
mans, Koreans, and many other countries, under the American defense  
umbrella, Israel is paralyzed, obsessed and consumed with fears of the  
future. Her economy survives only with the aid of a life support system  
provided by the U.S. Treasury and the charity of World Jewry. Israel is a  
nation in siege. The best of her talented people are being drained off to the  
U.S. and other countries. She is wracked by internal dissension, involved in  
a hopeless attempt to beat and shoot the Palestinians into submission.  
Eastern Jewry is avoiding Israel like the plague. Israel is led by a clique of  
rabble-rousing demagogues, whole sole purpose is not the welfare of Israel,  
but is to stay in office by constantly whipping up the emotions of the Israeli  
people into a high state of paranoia. We ask again—why is Israel forced to  
rely only on itself alone?

When the Israelis say that they cannot depend upon "promises" or  
"guarantees" for their security, they are right. When they say that they  
could "some day" be overrun by Arab enemies before the U.S. (being 4,000  
miles away) could respond—they are right. In fact, this is exactly the same  
argument used by the NATO countries to convince the U.S. to deploy and  
maintain its military forces on the NATO frontiers.

There is nothing new about Israel's security problem or the solution  
to it.

If the U.S. entered into a mutual defense treaty with Israel, as we havedone with South Korea, under the terms of which the U.S. would deploy  
ground, air and naval forces to safeguard Israel's borders, then Israel's  
security is no more in doubt than that of Japan, West Germany, South  
Korea, or other countries which the U.S. is committed to defend and has  
backed up that commitment with our armed forces already in place.

If those countries have not been afraid of the Soviet Union or China or  
North Korea because of the U.S. military presence on their soil, can Israel  
say she is afraid of a Palestinian state or any Arab nation or nations?

Is the solution to Israel's security concerns, which we have just proposed,  
a difficult one to put into effect? Are there diplomatic or international  
problems which would interfere with the ability of the U.S. to proceed  
immediately to implement this proposed solution to Israel's security needs?

The answer is, of course, no! The U.S. can enter into a mutual defense  
treaty with any nation at any time without the consent of anybody, allied or  
otherwise.

The proposed treaty, in its essentials, is identical with the mutual defense  
treaty entered into with South Korea in 1953. A copy of this treaty can be  
found in the Appendix. The consent (ratification) of the U.S. Senate,  
however, is required for all treaties. Senate approval should not be difficult.  
Israel has many friends in the U.S. Senate so ratification should be quick  
and easy.

There may be some Americans who would not support a proposal to  
station U.S. troops in Israel, presumably because they might be exposed to  
terrorist attacks. If so, it may be the result of a failure to understand the  
plan as proposed.

The proposal to station U.S. military units within Israel's borders, is  
made only in the context of a comprehensive peace plan in which the  
Palestinians would have their own independent state. Thus, the reason for  
PLO terrorism and the Intifada in the West Bank would no longer exist.

The American people have consistently supported the policy of Mutual  
Defense Treaties that involved American peacekeeping forces all over the  
world.

Can it be seriously argued that it is better to wait until an uncontrolled  
conflagration breaks out in the Middle East and for the U.S. to then  
desperately try to save Israel with a rescue effort from thousands of miles  
away, rather than to establish a just peace and rely on a credible deterrent  
to preserve it?

In a future war there will be no victor. The great lesson of the past forty  
years is that peace and security are attainable not by "winning" wars, but by

preventing them.

The most authoritative and comprehensive statement of Israel's position  
on its security needs is set forth in an article published in the Jerusalem Post  
of February 18, 1989, by the internationally prominent publisher, Robert  
M&xwell.

Maxwell was a member of the Steering Committee for Prime Minister  
Shamir's solidarity conference held early in 1989, to demonstrate the  
solidarity of the Jews within and outside Israel regarding Israel's defense  
policies. In his article Maxwell persuasively sets forth Israel's position with  
respect to its security concerns. The article is quoted below in part:

I have the honor to be a member of the steering committee for Prime  
Minister Shamir's conference of leading Jews, whose purpose is to show  
the solidarity of the Jews who live and work outside Israel with the  
people of Israel and the initiative its government is taking for peace and  
security in the Middle East.

The lessons of this century, of the Holocaust, of the history of the  
Jewish people, are that peace and security cannot be assured by promises,  
by United Nations resolutions, or by professions of good intent, whether  
they emanate from Washington, London, Moscow or wherever Yasser  
Arafat's caravan has rested.

Israel requires deeds, not words. It does not need paper assurances. It  
needs guarantees made of steel. Since the civilized world cannot produce  
such guarantees, Israel must look after its own defense. In the final event,  
the only people the Jews can trust for their survival are the Jews them-  
selves.

Those who are intolerant of the Jewish obsession about security must  
understand that it is impossible for Israel's leaders to compromise with  
this imperative. Compromise which threatens the existence of the Jew-  
ish state is not compromise but betrayal.

In the early years of Hitler, there were Jewish leaders who thought  
that the democracies would protect them. They were wrong. It has taken  
nearly 2,000 years to rebuild the State of Israel. It is the bounden duty of  
the Jewish people within and without the borders of Israel to ensure that  
never again will it be destroyed, to make certain that it will be main-  
tained at almost any cost, because the final cost is the very existence of  
the Jewish people.

That is the price we are not prepared to pay. We have been let down  
too often to trust blindly again. We cannot rely upon others for oursalvation, however solemn the pledges, however sincere the intent. The  
road to the Holocaust was paved with good intentions on the part of

Israel wants peace and needs peace, but peace with security. Unlike  
other nations, it cannot afford to lose even one single war, because that  
would mean instant annihilation. And four wars have been imposed on

It cannot trust its whole existence to promises which may not be kept,  
which may not be intended to be kept and, even if they were so intended,

While Israel is ready to negotiate a settlement with its neighbors  
directly and without preconditions, it cannot accept an armed, terrorist-  
dominated Palestinian state adjoining it—a state, moreover, of unremit-  
ting hostility, only waiting for its revenge, not for the events of the past  
year or two, but for the establishment of Israel itself.

It is impossible to divorce the events of today from what has gone  
before. The six million dead are part of today's living history.

I am not advocating intransigence. What I am saying is that we cannot  
betray those who died by risking the lives of those who survived and  
descended from them. That is the overwhelming reality of Israel today.  
History only repeats itself when those in command of our nations forget

Israel needs peace just as its Arab neighbors need peace. Deep down,  
both peoples are impatient to return to the ageless aspirations of their  
forefathers, to be respected for the high ethical ideals, the intellectual  
excellence, the ability to invent and to create that which they have  
demonstrated so often and so brilliantly in the past.

I believe that these aspirations are indeed within their grasp. But real  
peace, with real security, is the unalterable condition of this process,  
imposed on us by the blood-stained lessons of history, and the catas-  
trophic experience of our own generation. [Emphasis supplied]

We are impressed and greatly encouraged by the remarkable similarity  
between the views expressed by Maxwell in his article in the Jerusalem  
Post, and those presented in this chapter. Indeed, his article eloquently  
summarizes one of the principal theses of this book:

"It is the bounden duty of the Jewish people within and without the  
borders of Israel to ensure that never again will it be destroyed, to makecertain that it will be maintained at almost any cost, because the final cost  
is the very existence of the Jewish people."

We have repeatedly emphasized and cited the opinion of many promi-  
nent Israelis on the importance of the involvement of Jews outside Israel

Maxwell says that "those who are intolerant of the Jewish obsession about  
security must understand that it is impossible for Israel to compromise this  
imperative." This is the position that has been consistently taken in this book  
in discussing Israel's security. We have stated clearly that Israel's security is  
a sine qua non, an indispensable prerequisite to any peace proposal.

We have gone even further than Maxwell in urging Jews outside Israel  
to become involved with Israel's fate. We not only understand the Jewish  
"obsession with security," but in company with many concerned Israelis,  
have stressed the point that the Diaspora is not "concerned" enough with  
it; that there is too much passivity in the Diaspora which, as Abba Eban

Maxwell calls attention to the fact that the lessons of this century, of the  
Holocaust, of the history of the Jewish people, are that peace and security  
cannot be assured by promises, by United Nations resolutions, or by  
professions of good intent, whether they emanate from Washington, Lon-

Israel, he says, "requires deeds not words. It needs guarantees of steel."

We are in total agreement with this position. The Jews in Israel are  
entitled to the same "guarantees of steel" that the Jews in America have;  
that the South Koreans, Japanese and Germans have—the armed forces of

Maxwell rightly points out that Israel cannot trust its whole existence to  
promises which may not be kept, which may not be intended to be kept or

This is the crux of the matter—promises are simply not enough!  
Obviously, Japan would never have staked its nationhood on U.S. promises  
alone; neither would the people of West Germany or South Korea; nor  
should Israel be expected to do so. Maxwell confirms what we have as-  
sumed Israel's position to be—Israel wants peace—but peace with security.

In an article appearing in the Jerusalem Post dated June 3, 1989,  
entitled "Rabin Praises Military Alliance," Defense Minister Yitzhak  
Rabin announced that the U.S. and Israel have conducted at least twenty-  
seven combined military exercises in recent years. The article goes on to

Rabin, who met earlier with Defense Secretary Richard Cheney and  
other high Pentagon military and civilian officials, recalled a conversa-  
tion he had had earlier this year in Tel Aviv with the commander of the  
Mediterranean Sixth Fleet and the U.S. ambassador to Israel.

"They came to my office and said they have reached the point where  
it's not enough to train in Israel U.S. Marine Corps units up to the level  
of company," Rabin said. "What they would like to do is to do it on  
battalion-level size with the use of U.S. artillery and attack helicopters."

The defense minister said he was glad to report that "a month ago, the  
first U.S. Marine battalion completed its exercise" in Israel, including the  
use of live ammunition, artillery, and attack helicopters. "And I know  
that the demand is to have more and more of this kind of training in

What is the point of this? If U.S. forces were in Israel merely to conduct  
maneuvers or training exercises, it accomplishes nothing for Israel's  
security any more than a temporary presence of U.S. military forces in  
Korea, Japan or Germany would provide security for those countries.

If the intent of the U.S. military is only to familiarize U.S. forces with the  
local terrain and other factors in order to be in a position to assist Israel in  
an emergency, it makes little sense, because there is no reason to suppose  
that the U.S. forces would be there in an emergency. If the U.S. has simply  
promised to be there in a military crisis, it could be one that the U.S. might  
not be able to keep in time. Moreover, as the Israelis say, any real help

Unless U.S. forces in Israel are stationed and deployed in Israel and their  
presence is intended as a guarantee of Israel's security as part of an overall  
peace plan, the training exercises are a wasteful and unnecessary provoca-  
tion to the other nations in the Middle East, and endanger U.S. military

A mutual defense treaty with Israel is the first step in a plan for peace

The plan presented here is based upon these conclusions:

1. That peace by negotiation between Israel and the Palestinians is  
impossible, not only because of the irreconcilable nature of the issues,  
but because time is running out in the Middle East crisis.

2. That, after many years of discussions, conferences and failed  
negotiations, the respective positions of most of the principal parties  
in interest are sufficiently well known and understood, that a peace by  
consensus is now feasible.

This hoped-for "consensus," however, is fragile and fleeting. Therefore,  
if the plan proposed here is to achieve success, it must be pursued  
expeditiously.

The following, for our purposes, are considered to be the "principal  
parties in interest" in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. They are listed, not  
necessarily in the order of importance.

1. The United States.
2. Israel.
3. The Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.
4. The Palestinian refugees.
5. The United Nations.
6. The Soviet Union.
7. The American Jewish Community.
8. The allies of the United States.
9. The "friendly" Arab countries.  
   10. The "hard-line" Arab nations.

It is contemplated that the proposed plan would be sponsored by the  
United States and organized and implemented under its leadership.

The following is an outline of the basic elements and provisions of the  
plan as proposed:

I. The United States would immediately enter into a Mutual Defense  
Treaty with Israel, essentially the same as that presently in force  
between the U.S. and the Republic of South Korea, dated October 1,  
1953.

While the provisions of this Mutual Defense Treaty with South  
Korea are more than adequate to defend Israel from attack or  
aggression, it is, nevertheless, recommended that certain additional  
provisions be included in the text of the treaty to provide Israel with  
further assurances:

(a) As part of the U.S. commitment under the Mutual Defense  
Treaty, the U.S. agrees to deploy and station military forces—air,  
ground and naval—at such strategic points along the borders of  
Israel or elsewhere as shall be mutually determined.

* 1. The U.S. forces deployed pursuant to the Treaty shall be fully  
     equipped, battle-ready units and contingents of the U.S. Armed  
     Forces sufficient to defend Israel from attack or invasion from any
  2. The number and composition of the U.S. forces shall be agreed
     1. Simultaneously with the effective date of the U.S.-Israel Mutual  
        Defense Treaty, Israel will withdraw all of its occupation forces from  
        the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and re-establish its frontier  
        boundaries as they existed immediately prior to the 1967 war,  
        pursuant to United Nations Resolutions 242 and 338.
     2. The United States and Israel will recognize an independent Palesti-  
        nian State as provided for in the Partition Resolution of the General  
        Assembly of the United Nations enacted on November 29, 1947,  
        effective May 14, 1948, to which Resolution the United States is a
     3. The borders of the said Palestinian state shall encompass the so-called  
        West Bank and Gaza, and shall be congruent with the borders of Israel  
        as they existed immediately prior to the 1967 war.

All Israeli settlers presently owning land in the occupied territories  
shall have the choice of remaining and becoming citizens of the  
Palestinian State or disposing of their property as hereinafter pro-

* + 1. That a Non-Aggression Pact be entered into between the State of
    2. That a demilitarized zone (DMZ) between Israel and the Palestinian  
       State be established, the location and extent of which shall be
    3. That a commission of the United Nations be established for the

(a) To determine the just compensation due to the Palestinian  
refugees for lands and property taken by Israel in the 1948 War  
of Independence and now incorporated into the State of Israel. It  
is understood and agreed that all such compensation paid by the  
Government of Israel in satisfaction of the claims of the said  
refugees shall not be considered "indemnification" or "restitu-  
tion," but in the nature of payment for properties acquired under  
the sovereign right of Eminent Domain.

(b) To determine the just compensation due to Israeli settlers in the  
occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza for lands and  
property held by them which they may desire to dispose of.

VIII. That the city of Jerusalem remain in status quo until such time as  
Israel and the United Nations agree that it is propitious to convene a  
conference to determine the permanent status of Jerusalem.

It shall be understood and agreed that consent by any party to the  
continuance of the status quo shall not be construed as acquiescence to  
the status quo permanently nor as prejudicial to any right, or claim of

The recommendation with respect to the status of Jerusalem is in no  
sense sweeping the matter under the rug—the rug is afire. The first  
imperative is to smother the flames. Sufficient time, perhaps decades, must  
be allowed to pass in order for the fears, hatreds and religious passions

With the coming of peace, the incitement to fear and hatred will  
gradually diminish and disappear. Harmony and the recognition of mutual  
interests can replace hostility. We have witnessed the Berlin Wall coming  
down almost overnight. The movement toward freedom, independence  
and self-determination is suddenly epidemic in the world. No one can say  
what may evolve in Jerusalem. It is even possible that some day Christians,  
Jews, and Moslems may discover that they share the same God.

The greatest enemy of peace in the Middle East is delay. One important  
aspect of the proposed plan is the fact that, in its critical elements, it can be  
activated and executed quickly to defuse the time bombs ticking away in the  
Middle East and already approaching the point of explosion. Among the

Yasser Arafat is in a race against time. In April, 1989, Arafat was elected  
"President of Palestine" by the Central Council of the PLO. This was  
pursuant to a deal with the extreme elements of the PLO, headed by  
George Habash and other rejectionist and Moslem fundamentalist leaders.

Arafat convinced the radicals to allow him and the moderates one more  
chance to make peace with the Israelis through diplomacy, with the  
understanding that if he failed in his efforts, he would yield to a take-over

of the PLO by the radicals, who have been urging terrorism and guerrilla

How long this probationary period will last is anyone's guess. Habash  
has been quoted as saying "six months." No doubt it depends on the degree  
of progress being made, if any. Once convinced that Arafat is being stalled  
or that real progress toward peace is unlikely or impossible, Arafat's efforts

The Palestinians can hardly be charged with impatience. The General  
Assembly of the United Nations, including the United States, voted for an  
independent Palestinian state more than forty years ago.

If history tells us anything it is that the Intifada can never be suppressed.  
"Restoring order," which is the euphemism used to describe the Likud's  
policy of beating, torturing and shooting the Palestinians, is a hopeless  
effort. Israel's military leadership (except Ariel Sharon) have all declared  
that a military solution to the Intifada is impossible.

"Restoring order," of course, was what the German army of occupation  
was trying to do as it hunted down, tortured and killed the members of the

"Restoring order" is what the French were trying to do in Algeria and  
Vietnam; it's what the British were trying to do in Palestine when they  
captured and shot Jewish terrorists; it's what the Russians were trying to do  
in Afghanistan; it's what King George III was trying to do when he sent his  
Redcoats to Boston to restore order after a "disorderly" Tea Party in Boston

THE THREAT FROM RELIGIOUS FANATICS

Most major events that have shaped the world's history have been  
unanticipated and ones over which governments have had little control. At  
this writing, the Warsaw Pact is suddenly in a state of disintegration.

In 1914, during one of the most stable periods of European history, one  
homemade bomb, thrown by a Serbian political fanatic at Sarajevo,  
exploded into World War I, ultimately costing the lives of twenty-five  
million people and changing the world for all time.

A little more than ten years ago, a plot by Jewish religious fanatics to  
blow up the Moslem sacred shrine—Dome of the Rock—almost succeeded.  
If it had, Harkabi says, it could easily have provoked a "Jihad" against Israel  
by perhaps forty Moslem nations from Mauritania to Indonesia. This iswhat the Jewish fanatics hoped would happen so that it would stop the  
"Sinai land for peace deal" between Egypt and Israel.

The plotters were captured but there are still hundreds of thousands of  
Orthodox zealots who still consider the Dome of the Rock (which sits  
conspicuously in the middle of Jerusalem) as an "abomination" that must be  
wiped out.

The Jerusalem Post of October 18, 1989, reported on the following  
incident entitled "Group Lays Cornerstone of Third Temple":

Led by a cohen in priestly robes, and equipped with special vessels for  
the Temple ritual, two rams' horns, a clarinet and an accordion, members  
of the Faithful of the Temple Mount marched last week from the  
Western Wall to the Pool of Siloam to consecrate what they have  
designed as the cornerstone of the Third Temple.

An outraged Mayor Teddy Kollek described the FTM as "dwarfs  
walking in the footsteps of Shabtai Zvi"—a reference to the false  
messiah of the 17th century. Kollek said he hoped the group would not  
bring catastrophe to the Jewish people as other false messiahs had done,  
and added that although few Jews considered the acts of the FTM  
important, many Arabs regarded them in a different light. [Emphasis  
supplied]

One rabbi is quoted as calling them "dangerous lunatics." The following  
is taken from an editorial in the same edition of the Post entitled  
"Engineers of Armageddon":

Acting in the exercise of its claim of sovereign right to all Jerusalem, the  
government left the administration of the Temple Mount to the Moslem  
authorities.

The government's policy has not, however, been uniformly endorsed  
by the citizenry. To the messianic wing of Israeli ultra-nationalism, the  
status quo on the Temple Mount has been an insufferable offense calling  
for quick remedy. The quickest remedy yet has been offered by the group  
that sought to blow up the Dome of the Rock a decade ago. The ensuing  
Armageddon was expected by its engineers to have the particularly  
beneficial result to killing the then mooted land-for-peace deal between  
Israel and Egypt over Sinai.

What that now-extinct underground group tried to secure, by violent  
clandestine means, the Temple Mount Faithful, an offshoot of the

Greater Israel Movement, has been hoping to achieve through public

Yesterday, the second day of Hoi Hamoed Succot, their leader,  
Gershon Salomon, laid what he described as the cornerstone of the Third  
Temple, at a site about a mile away from the Western Wall. That was not  
quite the ground he had originally had in mind.

But a fact had, as it were, been established which, by merely helping  
fan the Arab riot at the Old City's Herod's Gate, showed its effectiveness.

So much for the Temple Mount Faithful. The group is smallish and  
can easily be dismissed as inconsequential. But it is not. If, to ordinary  
Jews, the group's political mangling of religion is merely an abomina-  
tion, to ordinary Moslems its actions are a serious provocation. Unless it  
puts these unfunny oddballs in their places, the government will have to  
bear responsibility for their words and deeds\* [Emphasis supplied]

If the Moslems consider it a "serious provocation," and if, by chance, it  
starts a chain reaction among the fanatics on both sides which escalates into  
"Armageddon"—how does the Israeli government "bear the responsibility"  
as suggested in the editorial? Did anyone care who bore the responsibility  
for the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand? The obligation is not to fix  
the responsibility for Armageddon, if it comes, but to stop it from coming.  
Yet every day, hundreds of Jews and Moslem fanatics and hundreds of  
thousands of fearful, hate-filled people are thrown together in this seething  
cauldron and see no way out. On any morning we may awake to see a  
headline that removes the Middle East crisis from anyone's control.

The question remains as to how the proposed peace plan would be  
received by the "principal parties in interest."

There is, naturally, no way of predicting with absolute certainty how  
anyone or any nation would react to the plan as proposed.

However, it is perfectly possible, in fact highly probable, that the  
response of most of the principal parties in interest can be ascertained in  
advance, based upon positions previously taken and public statements made

It is, of course, possible that previous publicly stated attitudes and  
expressions of views by a party in interest may not be an accurate re-  
flection of a party's true position on the issues which are addressed in the  
plan. In such cases, the proposed plan would at least serve a valuable

purpose in exposing heretofore concealed attitudes and disguised in-

The following are what, it is assumed, would be the positions of the  
respective parties in interest with regard to the proposed plan.

The U.S., as previously indicated, would necessarily have to approve of  
the plan and act as sponsor and coordinator in its implementation.

The plan should receive strong support from the U.S. for the following

1. The U.S., under President Truman, was the principal sponsor and  
   advocate for the Partition Resolution passed by the United Nations in  
   1947, which calls for the establishment of two independent sovereign  
   states in Palestine, one Jewish and the other Palestinian.
2. The U.S. has consistently supported United Nations Resolutions 242  
   and 338, which call for Israel to return the occupied lands on the West  
   Bank and Gaza to the Palestinians and also calls for a just settlement
3. It would immediately remove the concern that Israel might be  
   attacked, defeated and destroyed if war should break out in the Middle
4. It would reduce the enmities and hostile attitudes in the Middle East  
   growing out of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which often forces the  
   U.S. to choose between friendly Arab states, our European allies, and

A large majority of the Israeli people should welcome the plan. Public  
opinion polls have shown that all segments of Israeli society (with the  
exception of the religious extremists and nationalists) have strongly  
expressed a desire for peace with security. Retaining the occupied lands  
except for defensive purposes is not important to most Israelis. Since under  
the proposed plan "defensive borders" are irrelevant, this concern is elim-  
inated. Robert Maxwell confirms that the principal concern of Israelis is  
security. David Shipler, in his Pulitzer Prize winning book quoted earlier,

The biblical arguments for holding the West Bank excite very few out-  
side the ranks of the militant movement of settlers; most Israeli reluc-

tance to relinquish the occupied territory rests on worries about security,

A large majority of the Israeli people have always been willing to trade  
land for peace. Their concern has been that they might find themselves

The proposed plan offers Israel assured peace and security.

Furthermore, the plan should afford great relief to the Israeli people who  
would no longer need to be preoccupied with such futile debate as to

Under a mutual defense treaty with the U.S., such useless speculation is  
no more relevant than a debate in West Germany after the NATO pact as

The same is true of the mutual defense pact with South Korea. The  
South Koreans did not have to convince themselves that North Korea or  
China could be trusted—they trusted the United States. It was assumed that  
the North Koreans and the Chinese could not be trusted—which, of course,  
is the reason for the mutual defense treaty.

While we believe as stated earlier that, if Arafat can succeed in having a  
Palestinian state recognized, both Arafat and the PLO can be trusted to act  
in their own best interests. But under the proposed plan the question is  
moot—it doesn't make any difference whether Arafat can be trusted or not.

The plan would, no doubt, be approved by an overwhelming majority of  
the United Nations for the following reasons:

L It would be a final implementation of the Partition Resolution passed  
in 1947 calling for the creation of a Jewish and a Palestinian state in

* 1. It would carry out the provisions of Resolutions 242 and 338 which  
     have been a constant source of controversy over the past 22 years.
  2. It would comply with the Resolutions 242 and 338 on the need for a  
     just solution to the Palestinian refugee problem.
  3. It would remove from the annual U.N. agenda the Israeli-Palestinian  
     conflict which has been the source of more contention, acrimony and  
     divisiveness than any other issue in the history of the U.N.
  4. It would abolish the ever-present threat of a nuclear war in the  
     Middle East, an important duty of the U.N. in fulfilling its primary  
     responsibility for keeping the peace of the world.
     1. THE PALESTINIANS OF THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

The plan would, at last, satisfy the Palestinian nationalist movement for  
self-determination and give the Palestinian people the homeland and state  
promised to them by the U.N. Partition Resolution in 1947.

* + 1. THE "FRIENDLY" ARAB COUNTRIES

Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the Arab Emirates, Kuwait and Jordan should  
provide strong support for the plan since it would remove their greatest  
fear, a new war in the Middle East, which might not only destroy all of the  
progress they have achieved in the past twenty-five years but reduce their  
nations to ruins.

* + 1. OUR EUROPEAN AND ASIAN ALLIES

The plan should receive near unanimous approval. It eliminates one of  
the few, and perhaps only, major issues which separates the U.S. from its  
allies. It would restore respect for the U.S. where it has been lost and  
enhance the U.S. role of leadership that our allies can only applaud.

It would also eliminate one of the greatest fears of our allies, the  
interruption or loss of critical oil supplies from the Middle East which  
would inevitably result from a Middle East war.

* + 1. THE PALESTINIAN LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

By electing Yasser Arafat "President of the State of Palestine" and  
according him an opportunity by diplomatic means to have the State of  
Palestine accepted, the radical element in the PLO have already decided to  
follow Arafat if he succeeds in making peace and the recognition of a  
Palestinian state.

The adoption of the plan would be a clear success and should receive the  
wholehearted support of all elements of the PLO.

* + 1. THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

The response should be highly favorable to the plan. The great sacrifices  
made by American Jews to keep Israel alive in the face of the ever-present  
fears and anxieties that Israel may not survive another war, or a war after  
that, will have been justified.

The assurance that Israel will survive and be given an opportunity to  
fulfill its destiny, should be a source of great satisfaction to the American  
Jewish Community and the Jewish people worldwide.

The American Jewish Community for the first time is experiencingserious divisions and open dissension on the question of supporting the  
Likud's policies in the occupied territories.

A news item published in the November 25,1989, issue of the Jerusalem  
Post reports that "U.S. community leaders are now ready to oppose Israeli

Political differences in Israel have spilled over into the American Jewish  
community, resulting in a much greater readiness on the part of Amer-  
ican Jewry to oppose Israeli policies publicly.

This was evident in the mood among the 3,000 local and national  
Jewish leaders attending the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish  
Federations here last week. Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir received a  
polite but restrained reception when he addressed the conference.

The Jewish leaders here were clearly divided over Shamir's refusal to  
exchange land for peace, and they did not accord him prolonged out-

They certainly gave him the appropriate standing ovations and inter-  
rupted his speech a dozen times with applause. But there was widespread  
disappointment in what was regarded as a very hard-line speech.

Shamir spoke shortly after he received a letter from 41 prominent  
American Jewish leaders asking him not to misread the polite applause  
of the audience as evidence that American Jewry supports his determi-  
nation to hold on to the territories and to resist efforts by the Bush  
administration to bring about Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

Among those signing the letter were Hyman Bookbinder of the  
American Jewish Committee; Edward Sanders of the American Israel  
Public Affairs Committee; Ted Mann, a former chairman of the Confer-  
ence of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations; Morton  
Mandel, former president of the Council of Jewish Federations; and  
Peggy Tishman, immediate past president of the UJA Federation of

But Seymour Reich, the current chairman of the Presidents' Confer-  
ence, strongly disagreed with those signing the letter.

"I've been traveling around the U.S.," he told the Jerusalem Post, "and  
the American Jewish community is solidly behind the prime minister.  
We want to give him a chance to wage peace his way. There's no break

Reich dismissed the letter as the work of "a few individuals who are  
out of sync with the Jewish mainstream."

Another letter received by Shamir during his visit was from 213 leading  
Reform and Conservative rabbis calling on him to "accept the principle of  
exchanging land for peace." Several hundred Jews also signed an open letter  
to the premier written by Michael Lerner, editor of Tikkun magazine,  
urging talks with the PLO, and recognition of Palestinian self-  
determination.

Since these divisions in the American Jewish Community are based  
primarily on differing views as to the best way to protect Israel's security,  
the proposed plan should be welcomed by both factions, since it assures  
Israel's security. With this source of contention removed, the plan would act  
to re-unite American Jews in the service of Israel.

I. THE SOVIET UNION

In the present international climate, where the Soviet Union is strug-  
gling with serious internal problems and the Warsaw Pact nations are in a  
state of turmoil, the last thing the Soviets should be interested in is  
undertaking destabilizing activities in the Middle East, or fomenting any  
problems in the area. In the process of expanding its diplomacy toward  
developing better relations with all nations of the world, particularly the  
U.S., the proposed plan should receive at least mild approval.

As earlier noted, the Soviet Union has complained of Israel's long-range  
nuclear missile capability. It is, therefore, possible that the proposed plan  
might well be received enthusiastically.

J. THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEES

It is impossible, from a practical standpoint, to restore to the Palestinian  
refugees the homes and lands from which they fled in 1948 and have now  
been incorporated into Israel proper.

While the emotional and physical suffering of the refugees cannot be  
compensated for, the United Nations Resolutions 242 and 338 imply that  
justice is required only in the form of monetary compensation. Most  
realistic refugees recognize that this is their only hope and have indicated  
a willingness to accept just compensation in lieu of the right to return to  
their homes and lands in Israel.

K. THE "HARD-LINE" ARAB COUNTRIES

Although Syria, Iraq and Libya can be considered parties in interest, what  
their responses would be is conjectural and is not significant in determining  
whether or not the proposed plan should be adopted. However, it wouldnot be surprising if Syria and Iraq were strong supporters, since it would  
remove the threat of the religious radicals in Israel to expand its borders to  
include the conquest of Syria and Iraq as part of Greater Israel.

L. THE DISSENTERS

There is, of course, one group in Israel which would be opposed to the  
plan, or any other peace plan. These are the Gush Emunim and other  
religious nationalist extremists, including the West Bank settlers.

Their opposition would be highly vocal and, as we have discussed in  
detail, is based on the argument, real or pretended, that the West Bank and  
Gaza are sacred lands of Eretz Israel which, according to the Torah, cannot  
be returned.

The Israeli settlers in the occupied territories number about 70,000  
people. The plan, as proposed, would give them the choice of continuing to  
live in their present homes in the occupied territories under Palestinian  
sovereignty, or selling their property and moving elsewhere.

While the welfare and survival of Israel and the peace of the world far  
outweigh the beliefs and comforts of this small minority, the degree of  
deprivation or sacrifice required of the West Bank settlers under the  
proposed plan should be analyzed objectively rather than emotionally. In  
this analysis the following factors should be considered:

1. As to the settlers, they occupy subsidized homes, most of them less  
   than ten years old; there are no family or generational traditions  
   connected with these habitations. There is, in a word, no uprooting  
   involved.
2. Most of these settlements are not what Americans would think of as  
   pioneer homesteads where a man is wresting a livelihood for himself  
   and his family out of the soil in a battle with nature. Many of them  
   are bedroom communities for office workers in Tel Aviv and Jerusa-  
   lem. They are not to be confused with the Kibbutzim movement who  
   were the original founders of Israel. These were communal organiza-  
   tions who worked together tilling the land and providing for their  
   needs from the work of their hands. They were not religious zealots  
   but were, for the most part, secular socialists.

David Shipler, in his book, Arab & few: Wounded Spirits In a Promised  
Land, that we have referred to earlier, has provided some illuminating  
comments regarding the nature of the West Bank settlers:

There were several waves of settlers. The bulk of the religious, ideolog-ically driven Israelis took up their stations on the West Bank in the five  
years or so beginning with Begins election in 1977, although small  
vanguards of them squatted illegally here and there from 1968 onward.  
That fundamentalist movement was bracketed, before and after, by  
mostly secular Jews who settled the West Bank for nonreligious reasons,  
both in the early years after 1967 and beginning in the early 1980s. The  
third wave, 1980s wave of settlers, went most in search of economical  
housing, made possible by government subsidies unavailable in major  
cities.

They did not need a comprehensive system of faith to move them to  
the satellite towns that were serving as bedroom communities for  
Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

The middle group was the important one in shaping the ideological  
framework of the movement. Led by the Gush Emunim activists, those  
settlers, most of them with higher education, forged an amalgam of  
religious and nationalist impulses that took them to barren, stony hill-  
tops where they practically camped in small house trailers for several  
years until the government built them permanent apartments. They  
were driven by a search for biblical heritage, military security, and  
personal fulfillment, with the mixture of these components varying in  
each individual. Some stressed the secular, pioneering objectives, and  
many found a modest religious revival in the new communities.

Strangely, despite these settlers' avowed reverence for the land, I  
never encountered any who seemed to have any feeling for it. None  
had the farmer's devotion to working the land they claimed to love;  
they used it as a place of residence, a symbol of their faith and their  
history, an abstraction, but they almost never turned a spade or plowed  
a furrow. I never saw a pious settler in the hills of Judea and Samaria  
hold a clump of raw earth in his hand and watch it and smell it as he  
crushed it and sifted it between his fingers. As the Jewish townships  
spread from the rocky hilltops into the more arable valleys, advancing  
bulldozers cut swaths and scars through the Arabs' vineyards and small  
fields of winter wheat, which were then left fallow by the newly arrived  
Jews. One settlement I know kept a herd of sheep, another grew  
flowers in a hothouse. Some settlements built small factories on their  
land, but by and large their residents commuted to work in Jerusalem  
or Tel Aviv.

After the guerrilla war in Algeria, when the French finally decided togrant Algeria independence, they brought back more than a million of their  
colonists and settlers from Algeria whose ancestors had been there for up  
to 130 years.

Seventy thousand West Bank settlers, therefore, should not cause any  
great resettlement problem. Also it should not be forgotten that, for forty  
years, 700,00 innocent Palestinians have been uprooted from homes occu-  
pied for generations and still do not live in homes, but in camps.

As to the obligation of the religious extremists not to give back a "single  
foot" of the sacred lands of the West Bank and Gaza, their consciences may  
be alleviated somewhat by the pronouncements of a convocation of learned  
rabbis dealing with this question.

According to a report in the Jerusalem Post of August 12, 1989, there is  
a dispute among the rabbis as to whether, according to the Torah, it would  
be permissible to give up any of the occupied land. A majority said no!  
However, according to the Post:

Citizens' Rights movement MK Dedi Zucker met with the chief rabbis  
and extracted from them assurances that if the government nonetheless  
decided on a territorial withdrawal, they would see themselves "bound"  
by the decision and take no action against it.

Many leading scholars, according to the Jerusalem Post, October 28,  
1989, including Ovadia Yosef (Shas) and Eliezer Schach (Degel Hatorah),  
"have ruled Halachically that peace, not land, is the loftiest value.'

Reprise and Epilogue

I

N CONCLUDING, we turn briefly to the beginning chapter of our  
thesis and quote again from Barbara Tuchman s The March of Folly,  
which she explains "is the pursuit by governments of policies contrary to  
their own best interests."

She cites, as a classic example, the fate of the Jewish Kingdoms of Israel  
and Judah and the price paid by the Jewish people for the folly of King  
Rehoboam:

The Kingdom of Judah, containing Jerusalem, lived on as the land of the  
Jewish people. It suffered conquest, too, and exile by the waters of  
Babylon, then revival, civil strife, foreign sovereignty, rebellion, another  
conquest, another farther exile and dispersion, oppression, ghetto and  
massacre—but not disappearance. The alternative course that Reho-  
boam might have taken, advised by the elders and so lightly rejected,  
exacted a long revenge that has left its mark for 2,800years. [Emphasis  
supplied]

The continuing folly and failures of many of the leaders of the ancient  
Hebrew kingdoms and the historical consequences to the Jewish people are  
recounted in detail in Chapter I of this book.

We saw that the Romans first became the masters of the Jews, not by  
conquest, but because they were invited to rule the Kingdom of Judah and  
to settle the internecine quarrels and dissension among the Jews.  
Abram Sachar comments on the phenomenon:

Freedom was again crushed out because the Jews had not learned how to  
use it. The selfishness of the ruling houses and the strife of political and  
religious factions exhausted the strength of the State. A curse seemed tolie on the Jews which prevented them from reaching the highest levels  
of moral power except when they were hammered and beaten by

Today, Israel again faces a crisis of leadership and is called upon to make  
choices which may determine the fate of Israel forever.

In his recent book entitled The Chosen and the Choice, Israel at the  
Crossroads, author Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber[[10]](#footnote-10) relates his conversations  
with a number of Israelis, including Shimon Peres, and expresses his views  
concerning the golden opportunity which the future holds for an Israel at

I come across urgent calls from Jews in anguish for a revision of old  
doctrines. The head of a religious high school in Jerusalem writes: "On  
this our 40th anniversary I cannot help seeing our nation as beset with  
pain and anguish. We feel lost. I wonder what Isaiah would say today if  
he were among us, leaning against the walls of Jerusalem.

"There is nothing new under the sun, have we not always destroyed  
our achievements with our own hands? Can we not recall before our eyes  
a whole two-thousand-year history of recurrent self-destruction? I dream  
that some day I shall be able to tell my pupils about the rediscovery of  
the good life in our God-given land. We must do something more than  
just perpetuate our defense by military means. We have to heal the  
wounds in ourselves and our enemies, we have to re-invent peace. Yes,  
a more far-seeing form of Zionism." [Emphasis supplied]

Among his other observations Servan-Schreiber states that "Something  
new must be created in the spiritual field by the Jewish people, if they want  
an Israel that is faithful to its destiny and able to fulfill its potential." I

Now may be the last chance for Israel to fulfill its promise—not the  
promise of the Land—but the promise of its People.

I have long believed that what Israel desperately needs is a "Prophet,"  
however, my opinion has now changed. Israel has its prophets—Abba  
Eban, Yehoshafat Harkabi, Simha Flapan, Amos Perlmutter, to name a few.  
Sadly, however, as with the Prophets of old, no one is listening.
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