About This 25th Anniversary Issue

The first words of Volume 1 No. 1 of a mimeographed newsletter calling itself The Link were: "Solid friendship between the people of the Middle East and the people of the United States is essential to the peace of the world."

That sentence, 25 volumes ago, was written by Rev. L. Humphrey Walz, The Link's first editor, and one of A.M.E.U.'s "founding fathers." (Yes, there was also a "founding mother," Dr. Helen Hilling, a health care consultant who had worked in the Middle East and returned convinced that the situation there, particularly regarding the Palestinians, was not understood by the U.S. public. As it turned out, it was Dr. Hilling who encouraged Humphrey Walz to join A.M.E.U. and to edit The Link.)

In this, our anniversary issue, we look back over the volumes, not in celebration—there's been too many wars and suffering for that—but in recognition of all our feature writers who have striven by way of the printed word (and often with personal courage) to prevent the wars and to assure the suffering.

We have invited ten of these writers to update their original articles; only space limitations deterred us from soliciting contributions from all our feature writers. (A complete listing of all Link issues and writers is found on page 13.) The last words in this anniversary issue we leave to the editor who wrote those first words, Humphrey Walz. On page 12 he looks back at The Link's past, then focuses his sight on its future — a compass setting that will come as no surprise to those who know Humphrey.

A.M.E.U.'s new book and videocassette offerings are listed on pages 14-16.

A personal note in closing: 25 years ago, Jack Sunderland, a businessman whose work took him several times yearly to the Middle East, and who, like Dr. Hilling, saw a need here at home for a better understand of the Middle East, met in 1967 with a small group of like-minded Americans at the home of the owner of a successful public relations firm. The owner scoffed at the idea of a new organization, predicting it would never fly. To date, we estimate we have distributed over 4 million copies of The Link in all 50 states and around the world. About 20% go to academicians, 20% to religious leaders, 15% to business, media and government service people, and approximately 45% to a general audience.

What proved the public relations pundit wrong? For one thing the long-term commitment of our board, whose president, Jack Sunderland, has never missed a board meeting in our 25 year history, and whose vice president and co-founder, Dr. Henry Fischer, former Curator of Egyptology at New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, inaugurated A.M.E.U.'s Book Program out of his home, because the new organization had neither the facilities nor finances to employ a full-time manager. What also proved the pundit wrong was the public support we have received from our National Council Members, whose personal endorsements of our educational efforts have been invaluable. Most critical of all, however, has been the loyal support that has developed over the past two-and-a-half decades among our subscribers. Without that financial base we would not have gotten off the ground. To those supporters I extend, on behalf of the directors and staff of A.M.E.U., our sincerest gratitude, along with our pledge to pursue our original goal of promoting friendship, in the cause of peace, between the people of the Middle East and the people of the United States.

John F. Mahoney
Executive Director
Palestine: The Suppression of an Idea

Muhammad Hallaj

Dr. Hallaj has served as former vice president of Bir Zeit University in Palestine and former editor of Palestine Perspectives. Presently he is director of The Center for Policy Analysis on Palestine, Washington, D.C. Dr. Hallaj is a frequent lecturer and has appeared on numerous radio and TV interview shows, including the MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour. In addition to his 1982 issue, he wrote feature articles for The Link in 1983, 1985 and 1988.

Thinking back on the decade since I first wrote for The Link in early 1982, I am reminded of the saying that “the more things change, the more they stay the same.”

Much has happened in the Middle East and in the world, since early 1982, that has relevance to the Palestinian condition and the Palestinian-Israeli relationship. There was the Israeli invasion of Lebanon; the Soviet empire collapsed; there were two wars in the Gulf; there was the intifada; the PLO declared Palestinian independence and recognized Israel; and now a peace process involving direct Arab-Israeli negotiations is underway.

All of these are “historic events” in their own way, but they do not seem to leave an impression on the situation I have been writing on for The Link during the past ten years. If I had to do it over again, if I had to rewrite what I have written for The Link during the past ten years, I doubt if I would change what I wrote, except a little bit of updating factual information. I would update figures on Palestinians killed, deported and imprisoned; on homes demolished; on leaders assassinated; on closures of schools and universities; on curfews; on land confiscated and colonies planted.

I have written on Israel’s cultural suppression of the Palestinians, on the Israeli thesis that “Jordan is Palestine,” on the falsification of Palestinian history, and on Zionist violence against Palestinian people. My analysis, in all of these articles, focused on the real problem that Zionism and Israel have with the Palestinians: that they deny the legitimacy of Palestinian nationhood and, consequently, they reject Palestinian national rights. In these articles I sought to interpret Israeli attitude, policy, and behavior in terms of this central fact, to say that Israel is not just another authoritarian system of government for the Palestinians, but the negation of their very national existence. No other interpretation explains Israel’s seeming irrationality in dealing with the Palestinian people.

And this is why “the more things change, the more they stay the same” in the Israeli-Palestinian relationship. Israel — as long as it cannot come to terms with the reality of Palestinian nationhood — can only modify the means it uses to oppress and dispossess them; it can only modify the style of waging war on them.

Even Israel’s notion of making peace reflects this fact, and its attitude toward the present peace process shows it. In two important respects, Israel refused to talk peace with the Arabs until it got its way on two issues which shelter it from the necessity of dealing with the Palestinian national question: it refused to talk to the Palestinian national leaders and representatives (but only with “personalities” from the West Bank and Gaza minus Jerusalem), and it insisted on limiting the agenda in a way to exclude Palestinian national rights. It does not want to talk to the PLO about anything, and it does not want to talk to anyone about Jerusalem, settlements, the right of return, or self-
determination. It is now, as it has always been and as I repeatedly stressed in what I have written for The Link over a period of ten years: Israel is determined to evade Palestinian nationhood and any and all of its political expressions and manifestations. And this is why the whole world can change, except Israel's Palestinian policy.

After all these years, one thing is more clear than ever: Israel needs to be forced to make peace with the Palestinians. As the world taught the Arabs that "Israel is here to stay," it needs to teach Israel that the Palestinians also are here to stay, that Palestinian nationhood is neither an Arab ploy to embarrass Israel nor is it a transient annoyance that Israel needs to tolerate for a while. When Israel grasps this fact, or it is made to swallow it, peace will have a chance.

August-September 1984

Shrine Under Siege

Grace Halsell

Grace Halsell went to Jerusalem in the late 1970s to live with Muslim, Jewish and Christian families. Her resultant book, Journey to Jerusalem, and a later one, Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War, were among the first works by an established author and Washington correspondent to document the plight of the Palestinians and the danger to world peace posed by militant Jewish and Christian fundamentalists. In 1980, Ms. Halsell honored A.M.E.U. by joining its Board of Directors.

The Link called an alarm — but Washington and religious leaders did not seem to care. Despite clear warnings, world leaders look aside as Zionist plans go apace to destroy Jerusalem's most sacred mosque, holy to about a billion Muslims around the world.

Although tax-free dollars are flowing out of the U.S. to a plan that could spark World War III, no strong voice in Washington — or in any U.S. Christian church — is heard against this use of American money to destroy Islam's third most holy shrine.

Since the beginning of the Zionist plan to confiscate all of Palestine, militant Jews have consistently laid siege to the mosque.

"You look at almost any photograph of Jerusalem," said Bobby Brown, a Brooklyn-born militant Zionist "and you see the mosque. The mosque has to go."

I frequently heard that kind of talk when I first went to Jerusalem in 1979, and lived awhile among the Jewish settlers in their illegal colonies in occupied Palestine.

They are heavily armed, and they take properties — increasingly in the Old City, near the mosque — at gunpoint. Rather than acting responsibly, Jewish authorities have encouraged assault on the Islamic shrine, as well as on the Palestinians who, with only stones, have attempted to defend it. In the past 24 years, Jewish militants, often led by rabbis, have made more than 100 assaults on Haram Al-Sharif. In no instance has any Israeli prime minister or the chief Sephardic rabbi or the chief Ashkenazi rabbi criticized these assaults.

Moreover, the U.S. media that stations dozens of writers in Israel, makes little or no attempt to understand and report on the significance to world peace of these assaults. They do little or no investigative reporting, but rather too readily accept "official" Israeli explanations.

An example was the killing of 18 Palestinians by Israeli police in October, 1990, on the grounds of the mosque. Israelis said Palestinians were showering stones on Jewish worshipers, gathered below at the Western (Wailing) Wall — and so the Western media reported what the Israelis told them. It was only later, when video tapes were shown, that it became clear that the Israeli police initiated the conflict, and then shot Palestinians in cold blood.

No reporter for a U.S. daily has researched and published articles on the orchestrated Zionists plot — in evidence now for a quarter of a century — to destroy the mosque. Moreover, most all Western media use Jewish terminology for ancient Palestinian sites. They continue to refer to Haram Al-Sharif as "Temple Mount" — bowing to the Zionist policy to call everything in occupied Palestine by a Jewish name, and thereby to legitimize its annexation or destruction.

Meanwhile Jewish militants print and distribute drawings of Haram Al-Sharif with the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa bulldozed and replaced by a Jewish temple. The Shamir government and the Jewish rabbis do nothing to counter the influence of such Jewish fanatics, and one is left to conclude the officials fully support the militants.

In April 1990, militant Jews laid siege to a church-owned complex — St. John's Hospice — in the Old City. Initially, Shamir and his government denied any involvement. But later they admitted that they had transferred nearly $2 million in Israeli government funds through Panama to enable the Jewish militants to take land from Christian Palestinians.

A few years ago when in Jerusalem, I visited a so-called "religious school" where militant Jews are trained to confiscate Palestinian homes near the mosque. After I climbed the steps to the office of the Jewish yeshiva, located in the heart of the Muslim quarter of the Old City — and in close proximity to the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa mosque — I encountered a Jew who told me his name was Joseph and that he was born in New York. Joseph said God had given all of Jerusalem and Palestine to him and other Jews, and that all the Palestinians would have to leave.
I met many dual U.S.-Israeli citizens who regularly shuttle between New York and Jerusalem in their efforts to take all of the Old City of Jerusalem as their own.

These dual citizens funnel tax-free dollars to a yeshiva, Ateret Cohanim, for use in acquiring more weapons to use in the confiscation of buildings and homes in the Old City. They annually hold fund-raising dinners in New York, usually at the New York Hilton or the Waldorf-Astoria, with such pro-Zionist speakers as Jeane Kirkpatrick, former ambassador to the United Nations. At these dinners, American Jews are urging to write checks for as much as $5,000 to go to militant Zionists in the confiscation of Palestinian property — and for the ultimate destruction of the Holy mosque.

**August-September 1983**

**Prisoners of Israel**

Edward J. Dillon

Rev. Edward Dillon received his degrees in Biblical Studies from the Gregorian University and Biblical Institute in Rome. He has taught at Villanova University in PA., and Regis College in MA. Most of his professional life, however, has been spent working with the homeless and prisoners in Philadelphia, PA., and Rochester, NY. Following Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon, A.M.E.U. sent Father Dillon to report on the thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians held in Israeli prison camps.

Since my 1983 trip to Lebanon, Jordan and the West Bank, I have returned to the Occupied Territories three times (1985, 1987, 1989), largely to keep in touch with Palestinians and Israelis who attempt to advocate for human rights and for peaceful resolutions to the conflict.

I have had time to reflect on various aspects of the struggle. Perhaps the most awesome aspect of the struggle for a just resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian problem is the daunting threat of religious fundamentalism. Muslim fundamentalism is the brand most often mentioned in the press. But it's Jewish and Christian fundamentalism that pose the greater threat. Islamic fundamentalism runs largely counter to the Quran. Jewish and Christian fundamentalism are based squarely on the Jewish and Christian scriptures.

The Hebrew writings present a tribal god who mandates genocide against Israel's enemies. Text after text is squarely on the side of the most intransigent Jewish or Christian Zionist.

This is a problem many devoutly religious people wish would go away. Sooner or later, it will have to be dealt with. Those who consider the Hebrew scriptures sacred will have to confront the fanatic tribalism of the tradition with its territorial divinity. Christians will have to deal with the intolerance latent in the Christian scriptures. Maybe then it will be less awkward to confront any intolerance manifested in the Islamic tradition.

Our religious traditions have become a threat to the possibility of peace in the Middle East and elsewhere. The challenge is to consciously outgrow the narrowness and intolerance of our various traditions. This is no longer a luxury possible to the few. It has to be an urgent agenda for everyone.

We Americans should not be shy about showing the world the blessings of our own system of government with the Bill of Rights making possible a truly pluralist society in which all religions are equally free to be professed, but none having a privileged place. If only all sides to the Israeli-Palestinian struggle could make the American solution a key to any future regional solution. That would be my prayer for them.

**January-March 1984**

**Middle East Lobbies**

Cheryl A. Rubenberg

Dr. Cheryl Rubenberg is Associate Professor of International Relations at Florida International University. In addition to her 1984 Link issue on Middle East lobbies, she wrote our Oct.-Nov. 1986 issue, "The Misguided Alliance," based on her book *Israel and the American National Interest: A Critical Examination*, published by the University of Illinois Press. Since then she has spent a year in Gaza as a volunteer teacher of English.

Like other institutionalized aspects of American society, the U.S.-Israeli alliance remains fundamentally stable in its basic elements. These include U.S. economic, military, and diplomatic support for maintaining Israel's absolute military superiority in the Middle East and its presumed continued role as a surrogate power or strategic asset to American interests; U.S. opposition to Palestinian nationalism and self-determination in addition to, the alleged "evenhandedness" of the Bush Administration aside, an essential indifference to the plight of the Palestinian people; and U.S. interest in a weak and divided Arab world as a means of assuring its enduring freedom of access to the region's oil supplies, markets, and investment opportunities. Thus it should be understood that public disputes over issues such as the $10 billion loan guarantee and Israeli settlements in the occupied territories do not indicate substantial transformations in the primary relationship.

Yet, while it is unquestionable that Israeli and U.S. objectives as outlined above broadly coincide, it is much less clear whether U.S. support for Israel fosters these goals rather than impedes them. For example, as I foresaw in my 1986 Link article,
the extraordinary American efforts to build up Israel militarily so it could serve as a strategic asset to U.S. interests did appear contradictory at best when in the context of the U.S. war against Iraq. Washington had to persuade, cajole, and ultimately bribe Israel not to intervene against Iraq militarily so as not to fracture the pro-American Arab coalition. One wonders then what could possibly be the meaning of Israel as a strategic asset — especially in the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the concomitant loss by Syria (and Iraq) of Soviet military support.

Since 1986, however, it is even more apparent that the strength of the perceptions about Israel and its utility to American interests within a significant sector of the ruling elite, the intelligentsia, and the mass public — a sector that cuts across conservative/liberal/progressive distinctions — is so intensely held and passionately cherished that it cannot be ignored or readily dismissed. Leaving aside the individuals for whom “support” for Israel and its particular mission is a religious faith, it is more important than ever to explain the force, authority, and legitimacy of the ideas about Israel and its relationship to the U.S. among those who do not share an ideological commitment to Zionism.

For example, the certainty for many concerning the “democratic” nature of Israel transcends all the facts about its apartheid-like policies toward its Arab citizens and its fascist policies toward the Palestinian people living under its brutal occupation in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem. Similarly, the conviction that a nuclear-armed Israel is not a legitimate reason for Arab states to seek nuclear weapons to protect themselves informs so many minds as not even to be a subject for discussion. And, further, the insistence by progressive/radical analysts that Israel is a surrogate for America’s imperialistic aim of keeping the Arab world weak and divided, even though what solidarity that does exist in the Arab world — admittedly never extensive nor long-lasting — has come about almost exclusively over shared opposition to Israel and common support for the Palestinian cause.

It is my contention that the persistence and strength of the ideas about Israel among such groups is a testament to the effectiveness of the institutionalization of these ideas whereby a variety of highly subjective propositions, moral maxims, myths, symbols, theories, hypotheses, and clichés are so habitually repeated, externalized, objectified, and finally internalized in the collective American social psyche that what began as opinion, belief, and propaganda took on the authority and legitimacy of “truth” and “knowledge” and was transformed into an objectively existing institution of the social order.

I continue to believe that while explanations for Israel’s success in institutionalizing itself in American political culture are many, two important factors stand out: (1) the coincidence of interests between, on the one hand, powerful segments of the U.S. policy planning elite who viewed Israel as a potentially useful surrogate power, and on the other, Israeli officials who desired the designation in order to receive the benefits and privileges it conferred (e.g., virtually unlimited military and economic aid, technology transfers, etc.). And, (2) Israel’s extraordinarily effective cadre of supporters who combined outstanding organizational skills, huge financial resources, and highly effective and emotional propaganda to facilitate deep penetration of all major institutions of American society — the electoral system, the media, the propaganda system, social science “theory,” popular culture, the C.I.A., and so on — which in turn gave them an enormous influence in opinion shaping and policy formation on Middle East issues.

As Israeli Professor Israel Shahak put it recently, Israel’s power in the U.S. today rests upon its alliance with America’s military-industrial complex and upon the Pentagon’s reliance on the Jewish lobby to get its budget through Congress. (That budget, by the way, currently contains such pro-Israeli items as a grant for developing the “Hetz” [Arrow] missile, U.S. funding of Israeli research ventures, such as fire-control systems, assault helicopters, the deepening of Haifa harbor, and large-scale American purchases of Israeli-made weaponry.)

Given this institutionalization, it is unlikely that U.S. policy towards Israel will change significantly unless large numbers of Americans make such change a priority. And mobilize and struggle to bring it about. Only concerted mass activism can transform an institution. And only an informed, organized, and participant grass-roots American effort working in solidarity with the Palestinian and other Arab peoples can transform American behavior. Such transformation will assuredly never come from the top down — that is the essential meaning of an institution.

May-June 1984

The U.S.S. Liberty

James Ennes

Jim Ennes was the Officer of the Deck during Israel’s 1967 attack on the U.S.S. Liberty which left 34 U.S. servicemen dead and 171 injured. His account of that attack, Assault on the Liberty, has become a standard reference for subsequent books and documentaries. In
1981, he and other survivors formed the U.S. Liberty Veterans Association, whose purpose is to remember and honor their shipmates who were killed. Jim's Link account of the attack proved to be one of our most requested issues ever.

Since I wrote for the Link, at least a dozen leaders in the Lyndon Johnson administration have stepped forward to say publicly that the attack was no accident and that the Israeli cover-up and refusal-to-cooperate prevented the U.S. from investigating properly. Dean Kusk, Clark Clifford and Joseph Califano have all written books in the last two years saying as much, and Califano went on to say that President Johnson said privately that he considered the attack to be deliberate.

Others to express the same views on the record during this period include two former Central Intelligence Agency directors, a former National Security Agency director and his deputy, a former Air Force intelligence chief, a former Navy Undersecretary, and two former chiefs of naval operations. Lyndon Johnson's press secretary tells us that no one in the White House regarded the attack as accidental. National Security Council insiders say the same thing. A former Defense Intelligence Agency insider tells us that the entire U.S. intelligence community cooperated to prepare a "consensus report" which concluded that the attack was no accident. And official oral histories and other documents provide even further confirmation of a deliberate attack.

Only former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara is clearly on record denying that the attack was deliberate, and his denial is widely circulated by the Israeli Embassy to people who inquire. However, when survivors ask Mr. McNamara the basis for his belief, he denies having any recollections of the U.S.S. Liberty attack at all. This, despite the fact that a photograph in my book actually depicts him giving an order to the fleet during the crisis.

We have heard from a number of insiders on the Israeli side, including an Israeli pilot who tells us he was court-martialed for refusing to attack an American ship. His story is supported by that of a former Israeli major who saw the orders being issued, and by a retired career diplomat who actually heard the Israeli pilots reporting during the attack that ours was an American ship. A former Israeli official tells us that two men went to prison for refusing to attack.

Meanwhile, American public support remains strong. At least 22 public memorials have been created or are in production in memory of the men who died. These include four Navy barracks, two flagpoles, several memorial marker stones, two museum displays, the ship's bell on display at Liberty High School in Washington State, the Navy's new Aegis Weapons Training Building in San Diego named in memory of Liberty gunner Alexander Thompson, and a new million dollar public library named for the ship by the people of Grafton, Wisconsin. Almost 100 motion picture producers have inquired, and three documentary films have been completed. The best, by Sligo Productions in Los Angeles, is available on video. A commercial effort by Thames Television in London was seen in the U.S. on The Discovery Channel and on 20\20 with Barbara Walters. Another version was shown recently at prime time on NBC television. In both cases, survivors were persuaded to cooperate by promises to tell our story. Then, after filming was completed, both producers slanted the story to favor the Israeli version, ignoring evidence we provided to show that the Israeli version is untrue.

The governors of nine states, including California, Texas, New York, Washington and New Jersey, have recognized the Liberty by naming June 8, "U.S.S. Liberty Memorial Day."

Several cities did the same, including Omaha, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and the District of Columbia. Milwaukee and the District of Columbia, however, withdrew the honor after spokesmen for Israel complained.

Several members of Congress have written strong letters expressing support. Ted Kennedy, for instance, had his staff study the attack for over a year, then issued a statement declaring that "everything humanly possible must be done" to find the truth in the Liberty attack. That letter, however, represented the pinnacle of Kennedy's willingness to help.

Survivors have waited 25 years for Congress to remove the scales from its eyes. We are still waiting. I know of no one who thinks we should stop trying.

Dec. 1985 & April 1990
The Education of Humphrey
John Law

After Humphrey intruded upon John Law in our 1985 Link, some readers suggested we send the issue to every history teacher in the country: "Humph" was the perfect foil for the former chief Middle East correspondent for U.S. News & World Report. After the two met again five years later, one reader suggested we send the issue to every member of Congress. We did. Now Humph has dropped by again to chat about the Middle East Peace Conference. Humph, it seems, has come a long way since 1985. Or, has he?

Q. Hey, ya wuz right about some things, but ya sure got screwed up on some others...

A. Good morning, Humph. Nice to see you, too! Please tell me how I went wrong.

Q. Well, ya were always so damn pessimistic! I mean, cheez, ya used to tell me that you could see no way the Palestinians and the Israelis...
would ever get together and make peace. But look at what’s been going on this past year! Peace is coming, I’m telling ya, it’s coming!

A. That’s nice to hear, Humph. To what can I attribute your overconfidence?

Q. Yer crazy! It’s plain common sense. I mean, look at the sacrifices the Palestinians have been ready to make, so the peace talks can go forward. They agreed not to have any delegates from East Jerusalem and the, ah, die-ass-poor-a, they accepted being members of a joint delegation widda Jordanians, and, remember, Hanan said...

A. Hanan! Hanan!!

Q. Yeah, you know, Hanan Ashrawi...

A. Yes, of course I know. I’m just amazed that you know...

Q. Waddyamean, I mean everybody knows about her! People always used to think Palestinians were creeps...

A. Just like you...

Q. Whawazzat? I couldn’t hear ya...

A. Er, I said, uh, I like you, Humph.

Q. Oh. Well, Hanan showed people that the Palestinians are well educated, they ain’t got two heads, and most of all, they got a really good case. Their case is so good that the Israelis have just gotta listen, and do somethin’ about it. They gotta give back da land they captured in da 1967 Sick Day War, with no ifs or buts, and they’re gonna do it, you’ll see.

A. What makes you so sure?

Q. Da people in Israel really wanna do it, they finally got da message. Ya think maybe they all bin reading Link? Heh, heh! There was a Gallup poll in Israel the other day that showed that 54 percent of Israelis agreed that they would accept return territory to get peace. That’s a majority, right? Things are changing, right? I told ya, and I’m telling ya again!

A. Humph, that poll included a lot of people, maybe most, who are ready to return "some" of the territory, but not all. But what the Palestinians want to keep is already small — 22 percent of Palestine, remember! — and they will not accept any less. They also want it to be independent, while only a small proportion of Israelis favor this. In any case, Humph, since when does the majority rule in Israel?

Q. Hey, it’s a democracy, right?

A. On paper, but like a lot of other democracies, a majority sets the policy and makes the rules. Didn’t we just agree that a majority of Israelis are ready to give up at least some of the occupied territory? Well, so what? Shamir doesn’t want to give up “one square inch” of it. Nor does his cabinet. Nor do the Jewish settlers. Nor, it appears, do those who run Mossad and Shin Bet, the spy and secret police organizations, which have enormous power.

Q. Yeah, but just wait...

A. These are the people who, every time it begins to sink in among “moderate” Israelis that the current policy will not bring peace, carry out a provocation. It could be new “shoot-to-kill” orders for Israeli soldiers in the West Bank, deportation of Palestinians, house demolitions, curfews, brutal takeovers of Palestinian homes, or the death by torture of a Palestinian prisoner, or any combination of the above. The Palestinian reaction to such humiliations then leads to attacks by individuals against Israelis, and every time this happens, the Israeli “peace camp” loses more supporters.

Q. For Pete’s sake, don’tcha know that Bush and Baker are puttin’ on da pressure?

A. More than any other Administration, Humph. But still not enough. To begin with, the Administration has not even accepted the right of the Palestinians to have their own sovereign state. Also, Baker keeps saying the U.S. will not “impose” a solution. But it’s not a level playing field, since only Israel has soldiers occupying the other’s territory. Unless the U.S. gets much tougher — and I doubt it will — the only solution will be one imposed by Israel. This will guarantee continued, bloody conflict in the region for the indefinite future.

Q. Cheez, you’re still so pessimistic!

A. More than ever, Humph.
ure in stories about Israel’s foreign activities.) And my stories usually turn out to be true.

Howls of protest greeted my story about Israel and South Africa which appeared in The Link in 1986. It was "unfair" to say that Israel was South Africa’s most important military supplier, declared Israel’s defenders. Allegations that the two had tested a nuclear weapon had been "denied," they said. Indeed, there was a veritable cottage industry in those days, cranking out accusations that people who connected Israel and South Africa were part of some Arab-Communist-anti-Semitic conspiracy.

Now, of course, we know from numerous sources — among them U.S. intelligence documents released in 1990 under the Freedom of Information Act — that Israel was helping South Africa develop nuclear weapons. In 1987 the Israeli government itself, in an effort to deflect Congressional demands that it stop dealing with South Africa, admitted that it had military contracts with the white minority government worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

And now we know some more specifics about the military training Israel provided South Africa. Numerous sources have told of Israeli training for the South African police and intelligence forces. Most recently former members of the Zulu organization Inkatha (I wrote that Inkatha’s leader Chief Gatsha Buthelezi visited Israel in 1985) have been talking about how Israel trained the Inkatha hit squads that, funded by the white government, have been used to foment township violence and to kill supporters of the African National Congress.

Writing about the Iran-contra affair could be a life-time occupation. In 1987 I wrote about the then unfolding scandal involving secret arms sales to Iran by Israel. By a group in the Reagan White House who used the profits to illegally aid the contras trying to bring down the government of Nicaragua. That was riveting stuff in those days, although the Israelis were pushed off center stage by the eye-rolling Ollie North. We watched Congressional hearings unravel some of the inept maneuverings of Ollie and his Israeli partners between 1984 and 1986. I wrote in The Link that the Israelis appear to have teamed up with the Reagan presidential campaign to cut a deal with the Iranians to hold the hostages in the Tehran embassy until after the election.

Now, as Congress moves toward investigating the October Surprise, as that secret deal has become known, we are discovering that the 1987 Iran-contra hearings were part of something strongly resembling a cover-up. Congress, the putative overseer of the Executive branch, was not up to revealing the full scope of illegal administration- Israeli activities. Ollie and company made a sufficiently egregious dog and pony show, letting the Congress avoid showing the U.S. public that the secret dealings began in the early 1980s, with Reagan administration complicity in massive Israeli arms sales to Iran.

The covert U.S.-Israeli relationship went well beyond secret dealings with Iran. In 1989 I wrote that the Medellin cocaine cartel in Columbia was a third partner in the Harari network, a U.S.-Israeli operation to aid the contras. I wrote how the Panama based Harari Network had used the same aircraft, airstrips and pilots they used to bring arms to Central America to ferry to the U.S. And I talked of other Israeli intelligence operatives and "cutouts" operating outside the law but, evidently, well within the graces of the Reagan administration. It was an improbable story and very few editors wanted to hear about it, John Mahoney at The Link excepted.

He was prescient. Within a year we had learned of the Israelis arming and training the hit squads of the Medellin cartel. We heard from Colombian authorities that the Israelis involved (the same men had also trained the contras) had taught the "narcos-paramilitaries" how to carry out assassinations, make car bombs and bombs to bring down commercial aircraft. There were reports that Mike Harari, the head of the Harari Network, was involved with these activities. But we never did learn exactly what he did. When the Bush administration invaded Panama in late 1989 it was careful to let Harari — who had served for years as General Noriega's key advisor and business partner — get safely back to Israel.

August-September 1986
The Vatican, U.S. Catholics and The Middle East

George E. Irani

George Irani is the author of The Papacy and the Middle East: The Role of the Holy See in the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1962-1984. His Link article, which was based on his book, has been reprinted twice by AMELI, Dr. Irani currently teaches at Franklin College, Franklin, Indiana.

The visit of John Cardinal O'Connor to the Middle East (January 1992) has again centered the attention on the role of the Vatican and the Catholic Church in the Holy Land. Since 1987 the region has lived through several developments which are still having an impact even today. The Palestinian intifadah (uprising) began in December 1987 as an expression of the Palestinian people's will to assert their own self-determination and nationhood. The Vatican and specifically Pope John Paul II issued several statements calling for a halt in violence and retaliation in the occupied Palestinian territories. As a sign of his deep solidarity with the Palestinian people the Pope, for
the first time in history, appointed a Palestinian — His Beatitude Michel Sabbah — as the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. The Pope also welcomed for a third time PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat in the Vatican.

From the perspective of Vatican-Israeli relations there were some interesting movements. Relations with Judaism as a faith were warmly consolidated. During each of his trips overseas, Pope John Paul II made sure to meet with representatives of the local Jewish communities. A document is now being prepared by the Vatican to explain and clear once and for all the Church's responsibilities and shortcomings during the Holocaust (Shoa). This is a welcome movement for both Catholics and Jews. The rubble of centuries of misunderstandings and persecutions is beginning to be cleared. Prospects are hopeful for a deeper relationship between the two communities of faith. There is, nonetheless, a disturbing factor: the absence of official diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the Jewish state. The Vatican's attitude is still dictated by a fundamental imperative, i.e., stop the emigration of Christian Arabs from the Holy Land and the Middle East in general. This is a sour point in the bilateral relationship. Another difficulty resides in the still undefined status of Jerusalem. Once again the Vatican would like to see Jerusalem under a limited sovereignty. The Holy See is ready to accept Israeli sovereignty provided the Jewish state pledges to the international community that it will respect the political, human, and religious rights of all the communities living in Jerusalem. Recently Cardinal O'Connor stated that the Vatican had no problem with Israel's sovereignty over the Holy city but that the matter was a question of guarantees. The same point was issued by the Apostolic Delegate in Jerusalem, Monsignor Montezemolo. You cannot separate sovereignty from guarantee. Who will offer the guarantees? Who will guarantee that these guarantees will be respected permanently and will not become hostage to the whims of the party governing Jerusalem? When this issue will be solved to the satisfaction of the Vatican, the Palestinians and Israel, then diplomatic relations between Israel and the Vatican will be possible. But as long as there is no foreseeable solution to the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians, the Holy See will not be willing or likely to establish formal diplomatic relations with the State of Israel.

Lebanon also was kept on the Pope's agenda. The Land of Cedars was mentioned more than 160 times by the Pontiff. It seems that John Paul II has a special predilection for Lebanon. And he is right. If you look at the tragedy of Lebanon and what is happening today to Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union, Lebanon looks a lot like a children's game. For this Pope and the Vatican, Lebanon must remain an example of coexistence between different religious and ethnic groups. John Paul II has really suffered because of the inter-Christian fighting (1989-1990) between the Lebanese Forces of Dr. Ja'Ja' and General Michel Awn. What did they achieve with the use of violence and destruction? Lebanon today is under Syrian tutelage because of this intersecular Christian war.

Finally, there is the Gulf War. One year later one cannot but agree with the Pope's stand. Violence begets violence and innocent civilians pay the price. The Pope was accused of being a pacifist and anti-American. Far from that, the Pontiff's stand was based on sound Christian principles. What did the Gulf War achieve? Yes, it got Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait but he is still in power. He is still a threat. In addition, thousands of children are dying from starvation today in Iraq. Disease and poverty is rampant. Is this the way the world community plans to solve conflicts between nations? John Paul II wondered why is there a double standard in international affairs. If Lebanon was fair game for the Israeli Army in 1982 why didn't the U.S. condemn the invasion? The same applies to Turkey's invasion and occupation of the island of Cyprus and the Israeli occupation or annexation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. International law must be applied uniformly across the borders. What's good for Iraq ought to be applied to others too in a nonviolent manner.
over by Israel of the West Bank.

The Soviets are mostly from big cities and prefer the bright lights. Housing Minister Ariel Sharon, however, is building in the West Bank, not in Haifa or Tel Aviv. The arrival of the Soviets is a new pretext for solidifying Israel's hold on the West Bank. The money Israel would borrow with U.S. guarantees is not aimed at the "humanitarian" goal of settling immigrants. It is aimed at taking over the West Bank and perpetuating war in the region.

The Legal Adviser of the U.S. Department of State has never repudiated a well reasoned 1978 formal opinion from that office that the Israeli settlements are illegal under international law. In 1981, President Ronald Reagan, in a one-gobbled sentence off-the-cuff statement, said he thought that wasn't so, but the Legal Adviser never backed up Reagan's statement with a formal legal opinion.

Nonetheless, the Bush administration has continued U.S. annual military and economic aid to Israel, and has even increased it over the Reagan levels, knowing full well that Israel spends increasing amounts on settlements, and that funding the Israeli Defense Force means funding the soldiers who suppress the Palestinian uprising.

Secretary of State James Baker admitted last year that even if Israel does not use the U.S. money on the settlements, our aid frees up other funds for that purpose. By saying this, Baker blew the cover off the excuse prior administrations gave for our generous aid in the face of Israel's blatantly illegal use of funds to build settlements.

Since the settlements are illegal, U.S. aid and loan guarantees are illegal as well. The United States is helping Israel violate the law by providing the funds. When that kind of activity occurs in another context, Bush calls the perpetrators "drug kingpins" and calls for them to be strung up.

I wish I could report, in this presidential election year, that the opposition has a better plan, that it would stop this madness. To the contrary, the opposition is even worse. With the notable exception of Jerry Brown, the leading Democrat hopefuls criticized Bush for the modest efforts he made to convince Israel to stop building settlements in return for the loan guarantees. Bush at least delayed action on Israel's request last summer for a guarantee for $10 billion in loans. The Democrats would have co-signed for Israel post haste, no questions asked.

U.S. funding of Israeli settlements has been condemned by the United Nations. Judging by U.N. votes, the only countries that don't view the funding as illegal are Israel and the United States. It is high time we recognized that funding a crime is just as bad as the crime itself.

At that time, it was thought that U.S. aid to the Jewish state had peaked and would start declining, particularly in light of socioeconomic problems in the U.S. and skyrocketing budget deficits.

Nevertheless, U.S. aid to Israel continued to rise and Israel's dependence on foreign aid continued to deepen. And while official aid remained at the $3 billion level annually, the increase in aid was delivered to Israel indirectly and through twisted and sometimes highly questionable channels. Senator Robert Dole said recently, "We do provide Israel nearly $4 billion — not the $3 billion usually cited — in aid every year."

For example, U.S. aid to Israel in 1990 was listed at $3 billion, but according to AIPAC, Israel received in the same year $666.1 million in extra aid. In 1991 Congress appropriated in addition to the regular $3 billion, $650 million in emergency aid, $700 million in surplus military equipment and $400 million in housing loan guarantees for a total of $5.26 billion. And with the same enthusiasm, Congress rejected a request to increase U.S. aid to the two million Palestinians living in the Occupied Territories from $16 million to $25 million a year.

But despite the massive financial aid given to Israel over the years, the Israeli economy has remained weak, suffering from highly complicated structural problems. As a result, in view of Israel's growing need for foreign assistance, American Jewish organizations were forced to invent new schemes to manipulate the American political system and public opinion and raise billions of dollars each year to sustain Israel's sick economy and highly militarized society. In fact, Israel's budget is as large or larger than the nation's GNP, making it the only state in the world, possibly in history, to function under such conditions for years.

And because Israel has failed to

---

**May-June 1989**

**U.S. Aid to Israel**

Mohamed Rabie

Mohamed Rabie's article was based on his 1988 book *The Politics of Foreign Aid: U.S. Foreign Assistance and Aid to Israel*, published by Praeger. Dr. Rabie has taught at Kuwait University, Kuwait, and at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. and writes frequently on politics and economics in the Middle East. He is currently president of the Center for Research and Publishing in Washington, D.C.

Since its inception in 1948, Israel has depended on the generosity of the U.S. and world Jewry to survive. American aid to Israel has fluctuated over the years and so did Israel's economic performance, reflecting a high degree of dependence on foreign aid. However, since the early 1970's official aid has increased year after year reaching $3 billion in 1985.
restructure its economy, particularly its highly inefficient welfare system, Israel's credit rating declined tremendously. At the current Standard and Poor rating of "triple B minus", Israel could borrow almost no money from the international money market. In 1988, Israel asked and received a U.S. guarantee to borrow $5 billion to refinance an outstanding debt to the U.S. As a result, Israel was able to save an estimated $150 million annually in interest payments and the American taxpayer assumed the responsibility for Israel's debt in case of default.

On September 6, 1991, Israel requested a $10 billion loan guarantee from the U.S. The request was described by Israel and its American supporters in Congress and in the media as a humanitarian gesture to provide housing and employment for the new Soviet Jewish immigrants. After the request was officially made, AIPAC announced that it was launching an intensive campaign to secure quick Congressional authorization and government approval. However, upon the insistence of President Bush, the AIPAC campaign failed and Congress was forced to delay consideration of the Israeli request. But regardless of Israeli humanitarian claims and the outcome of Congressional considerations, the request should be viewed in light of certain facts.

1. Israel refused to stop the settlement activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Since Israel's occupation of those territories in 1967, more than 250,000 Jewish colonial settlers were settled there. Israel has so far confiscated about 70 percent of the land in the West Bank and more than 50 percent of the land in the Gaza Strip. This means that the loan to be obtained with U.S. backing would be used in reality to confiscate more of the Arab land, uproot its Palestinian legitimate owners and replace them with Jews to be imported from the Commonwealth states of Eastern Europe, with grave political consequences on the so-called peace process and U.S. moral standing in the world.

2. Socioeconomic conditions in the U.S. and skyrocketing budget deficits demand that charity should start at home. Before providing Israel with the financial assistance to house and employ its Jewish newcomers and enable them to suppress and dispossess the Palestinians of their land and livelihood, both the U.S. Congress and government should provide first the housing needed to house America's homeless which exceeds Israel's new immigrants by several times and create employment opportunities for the unemployed Americans whose numbers are about three times the entire Jewish population of Palestine/Israel.

3. The circumstances that surrounded the request and the attitude displayed by AIPAC and several other Jewish organizations in the U.S. make the entire process more of a demand by a powerful Jewish state rather than a humble request by a needy and deserving nation. And by using the financial and political power and media influence of the American Jewish community, Israeli action will further undermine the credibility of the American political process, exposing it as a tool to be used and abused by special interest groups and foreign powers.

4. Israel's economic performance and credit rating seem to indicate that Israel will not be able to service its debt. As a result, it would be reasonable to assume that the U.S. would be asked anew to rescue the Jewish state from default and possible bankruptcy. While economic growth in Israel since 1988 has been less than 1 percent annually, the inflation rate has remained around 20 percent per year. Unemployment meanwhile, has increased from 6.4 percent in 1988 to more than 10 percent in 1991, and a huge trade deficit persisted at the $3-4 billion level annually.

5. Giving Israel $3 billion a year may not sound like very much in view of the size of the American GNP. But U.S. aid to Israel represents about 25% of American aid given to all nations of the world. And since GNP per capita in Israel is about $9,500, as compared to less than $700 in almost all other aid-recipient countries, the magnitude of aid given to Israel could not be justified on either moral or economic grounds.

In addition, because of the U.S. budget deficit, the money given to Israel had to be borrowed, and the borrowed money had to be serviced. As a result, the more than $56 billion given to Israel in official aid between 1948 and 1992 have required paying an estimated $65 billion more in interest, making the total about $121 billion. Other indirect grants and subsidies given to Israel over the same period may have increased direct cost of supporting the Jewish state to a total of $200 billion.

Meanwhile, America's poor, homeless and unemployed have continued to wait hopefully and helplessly for their government's assistance, a government that seems more responsive to Israeli whims than to American needs, and more supportive of Israeli violations of Palestinian human rights and international law than of American volunteer organizations promoting American democracy and moral values at home and abroad.

---

A Glance Back, A Look Forward

L. Humphrey Walz, D.D.,
First Editor of The Link

Rev. Humphrey Walz is a "retired" Presbyterian minister, now living in Janesville, Wisconsin. Among his "re-
tirement" activities he writes a regular column on religion and the Middle East for The Washington Report, is active in numerous human rights organizations, peace groups and ecumenical endeavors, and, since 1968, has served with distinction as a member of A.M.E.U.'s Board of Directors.

When introduced as a "founding father" of A.M.E.U., I can't help feeling pleased. Nonetheless, it is important to note that it was primarily business and professional people who, without "benefit of clergy," launched this enterprise. They were brought together by a shared sense of responsibility for reducing ignorance of and insensitivity toward the peoples of the Middle East. American failure to act promptly and informedly in that arena, they sensed, could permit — or even precipitate — results disastrous for all parties, including ourselves.

When the aftermath of the 1967 Arab-Israeli "Six Day War" so tragically revealed the foresightlessness of their insights, they looked around for possible colleagues from other fields to help expand their orbit. Concurrently, the role of organized religion was becoming more obvious. The longtested, unpoliticized, little publicized involvement of many American denominations with life in the region where their faith had been cradled was, however dimly, dawning on the public consciousness.

Hence it was only natural that among those newly elected to A.M.E.U.'s enlarged board were Msgr. (now Bishop) John G. Nolan, Executive Secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association and President of the Pontifical Mission for Palestine, Beirut-born Rev. Dr. Harry G. Dorman, National Council of Churches Executive Director for the Middle East and Europe, and President Emeritus Henry Pitney Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary. It was in this setting that my friend and neighbor, N.Y.U. Professor Helen Hilling, persuaded both the Nominating Committee and me that we belonged together.

Our need to keep informed of others with similar concerns prompted the idea of a newsletter to link us and our then 2,000 real and potential supporters in common consciousness. I was charged with launching the trial balloon and, in September 1968, the first Link's eight pages of photoreduced, typewritten items and photocopied articles from foreign and domestic periodicals emerged from the N.Y.C. Presbytery office's offset press to be stapled by volunteers.

Recipients submitted some 4,000 more names of possible subscribers and donors. By January 1969, we were able to afford our first commercially printed issue.

As time passed, we saw the need for including what has come to be The Link's chief contribution: analytic essays by keen, first-hand observers to interpret sensitively and accurately various basic realities not generally fully understood. For the first such feature, we had British M.P. Christopher Mayhew, fresh from an investigatory tour of Egypt, Israel and Jordan, report on "Arab-Israeli Facts and Prospects" in our May/June 1970 issue.

Later, we felt a growing need for a scholarly, conservative, Christian answer to the imaginative, out-of-context politicizing of selected Bible passages to endorse militant Israeli expansionism. To this end we sought the cooperation of the Rev. Bradley Watkins, home after a teaching career in Egypt. His 12-page "Holy Books and Holy Land: Clear Thinking Needed," subtitled "Confusion Thwarts Bible's Offer of Way to Peace" was to make the November-December 1970 Link our first issue to elicit widespread demand from the Middle East.

As other periodicals, notably The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, came into being, our reportorial services became less necessary. Our earlier experiences have given us special appreciation for the dedication, discipline, courage and sacrifice behind such publications. Moreover, their growth has increasingly freed up our time to concentrate on our Public Affairs Series, our Book Program, and on developing more of the in-depth, easily disseminated Link essays which our subscribers have so well received.

And, as we face the future, we see even more clearly the importance of linkage with others likewise-minded in the struggle against stereotypes, and in the deepening of American appreciation for the history, culture, problems, achievements and humanity of all the peoples of the Middle East. In the course of being so engaged, we are grateful to the high ecclesiastic who cited A.M.E.U. as being "a voice for the voiceless."

It is especially to deserve such a label in the realm of human rights that I hope more of our future cooperative efforts can expand. As long as people continue to be subjected to house arrest, curfews and imprisonment in crowded cells or desert shackles without public hearings, as long as their homes can be demolished, their land confiscated, their higher education restricted, their families broken up, their jobs eliminated, their freedom of expression limited or censored and their other rights violated along ethnic or creodal lines without access to news media or due process, so long will it remain important for those free to speak out to do so — together where possible — no matter how uncomfortable it may sometimes be.

The morale of the victims needs such voices. The character and positive influence of our country require them.
The Link, 25-Year Index: 1968-1992
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New Books and Audio-Visuals

□ WHOSE PROMISED LAND
Cohen, Chapman, Lion Press, 1992, 256 pp., paper
One of the most popular books AMEU has ever carried is now available in an updated edition. Competing datums of Zionists and Palestinians are presented in their own words. Then the religious question is faced: Are the ancient promises of the Bible relevant today?
List: $10.95; AMEU: $6.95

□ THE GENIUS OF ARAB CIVILIZATION
"Magnificent" is the word often said of this richly illustrated introduction to Arab civilization. Now, this latest edition offers a new section on pre-Islamic Arabs, new and original essays by leading scholars, new color illustrations, plus a new introduction by the editor, along with a completely revised and updated "Guide to Further Reading".
List: $50.00; AMEU: $35.00

□ ANGLE OF VISION
Charles Kimball, Friendship Press, 1992, 120 pp., paper
While the "angle" of this work is the history of the Christian communities in the Holy Land, the "sweep" is ecumenical. Kimball's intent here, as in his 1990 "Link" article, is to promote knowledgeable advocacy for peace in a region that is one of the most militarized on earth.
List: $7.95; AMEU: $7.50

□ BEHIND THE INTIFADA: Labor and Women's Movements in the Occupied Territories
Josef R. Hilterman, Princeton Univ. Press, 1992, 283 pp., cloth
This is the first comprehensive study on how local organizations in the West Bank and Gaza provide basic services unavailable under military rule. Author is editor of MERIP's Middle East Report.
List: $29.95; AMEU: $19.95

□ ISLAM AND ARABS IN EARLY AMERICAN THOUGHT: The Roots of Orientalism in America
Provocative, yet instructive examination of the idealism and intolerance that led American missionaries, world travellers and national leaders, from colonial times on, to establish "an American Israel" in the Holy Land.
List: $39.95; AMEU: $28.50

□ THE ASCENDANCE OF ISRAEL'S RADICAL RIGHT
David Sprinzak, Oxford Univ. Press, 1992, 392 pp., cloth
Author, who teaches political science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, traces the roots of Jewish radicalism from Rabbi Abraham Kook in the 1920's, who declared Zionism the onset of Biblical redemption; to Rabbi Zvi Yeheuda Hacohen Kook, who saw Israel's 1967 Six Day War victory as a sign of God's redemptive plan; to today's Gush Emunim settlers on the West Bank, who warn that ceding one inch of land would violate God's will. Sprinzak himself warned that Israel's radical right has far greater influence than its numbers would suggest.
List: $34.95; AMEU: $19.95

□ THE ARABIC ALPHABET POSTER
Amisest Edition, 1990, 21" x 34"
Each letter is beautifully illustrated on this very "frameable" poster. (AMEU's Book manager liked it so much, she now has one on her office wall.)
List: $15.00; AMEU: $15.00
(includes mailing tube & postage)

□ AFTER THE STORM: Power and Peace in the Middle East
Friendship Press, 1992, 1/2" VHS, 28 min.
Prepared for the National Council of Churches 1992 Study Theme on the Middle East, this video engagingly presents the region's history, geography, culture, languages, religions, economics and politics. Study guide is also included.
List: $19.95; AMEU: $18.95

□ FROM THE BEGINNING: Resources and Study Guide to the Middle East
Betty Janie Bailey, Friendship Press, 1992, 60 pp., paper
This is a 6-session guide on peoples, traditions, cultures, churches and issues in the Middle East. Accompanying study plans include folk tales, recipes, greetings, worship material, and resource listings.
List: $6.95; AMEU: $6.50

□ BESIEGED: A Doctor's Story of Life and Death in Beirut
Dr. Chris Giannou, Olive Branch Press, 1990, 254 pp., paper
Set against the bloodletting in Beirut from Oct. 1985 to Jan. 1988, this is the extraordinary story of how a Canadian doctor and his colleague maintained a hospital under the rubble.
List: $12.95; AMEU: $10.95
BOOKS BY LINK AUTHORS

Check Box and Complete Order Form on page 16. Prices Include Postage. For International Orders, Add $ .50 Per Book.

- **JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM**
  Grace Halsell, MacMillian, 1982, 193 pp., paper
  Poignant account of author's first year in the Holy Land. Good gift to give to someone approaching the conflict for the first time. See her update on pages 3-4 of current Link.
  List: $7.95; AMEU: $2.50 ($1.50 each for quantities of 5 or more)

  George E. Irani, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1986, 218 pp., paper
  First major study of the role of the Catholic Church on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Includes previously unexplored archival resources in Rome, Jerusalem and Beirut. Author, who wrote for the Link in 1986, updates his position on the Catholic Church in pages 9-10 of this present Link.
  List: $10.95; AMEU: $8.50

- **ISRAEL AND THE AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST: A Critical Examination**
  Cheryl Rubenberg, Univ. of Illinois Press, 1986, 416 pp., paper
  Author concludes that the U.S.-Israeli partnership has severely damaged U.S. national interests in the Middle East. Professor Rubenberg, who wrote a feature article for The Link on this subject, updates her thinking on this subject on pages 4-5 of this Link issue.
  List: $13.95; AMEU: $11.95

- **A VISION FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE MIDDLE EAST**
  Mohammad Rahbani, Ctr. for EI. Dev., 1990, 337 pp., paper
  Author addresses the basic aspirations of Israelis and Palestinians within the framework of political and economic cooperation among all nations of the Middle East. For update of author's Link article, see pages 10-11 of current Link issue.
  Special AMEU price: $3.50

- **ASSAULT ON THE LIBERTY**
  James Grims, Random House, 1979, 299 pp., cloth
  The author was an officer on the bridge during the prolonged and brutal attack on the USS LIBERTY by Israeli planes and torpedo boats in 1967 that killed 34 American crewmen and wounded 171 others. See his update on pages 5-6 of this Link issue.
  List: $14.95; AMEU: $11.50

- **PALESTINE AND ISRAEL: A Challenge to Justice**
  Author argues that the Zionist movement violated many conventions and agreements of international law in the establishment of Israel and that Palestinians hold good legal title for a state of their own. See his update on pages 9-10 of this Link issue.
  List: $18.95; AMEU: $16.50

- **PROPHETIC AND POLITICS: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War**
  Grace Halsell, Lawrence Hill, 1986, 210 pp., cloth
  Explores link between U.S. fundamentalists and Israeli ultranationalists. See author's update on pages 3-4 of current Link issue.
  List: $14.95; AMEU: $5.50

- **A PROFILE OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE, 3rd rev. ed. 1990**
  Mohammad Hallaj, Edward Said, et. al., Chicago and New York, 1990, 38 pp., paper
  Excellent essays on the history and demographics/socioeconomic circumstances of the Palestinian people. See Hallaj's update on pages 2-3 of current Link.
  List: $6.00; AMEU: $4.00
VIDEO-CASSETTES

☐ USS LIBERTY SURVIVORS: Our Story
Sigo Productions
The 60-minute documentary presents interviews with the USS LIBERTY survivors taken during their 20th anniversary reunion. Also included is film footage from the US Navy archives and private sources. Considered the best of all Liberty documentaries by Jim Ernes. See page 6 of current Link. List: $35.00; AMEU: $35.95

☐ STOLEN FREEDOM: Occupied Palestine
30 Minute Video, Kezadeh Production, 1991
Narrated by Casey Kasem with extensive commentary by Hanan Mikkil-Atrash. This is particularly good both for the younger audience that can relate to Casey Kasem and for a general audience that will recognize the impressive Palestinian Peace Conference spokesperson. The focus is on the sheltered dreams of young Palestinians under a brutal occupation. List: $23.95; AMEU: $23.00

☐ THE INTIFADA: A Jewish Eye Witness
50 Minute Video, Syracuse Alternative Media Network, 1991
Written & narrated by Elana Levy, who visited Israel-Palestine twice in 1989. “What I saw,” she reports, “forced me to speak out—as a Jew, as an American, as a woman, and as a human being.” This is a very moving, personal witness to Israel’s iron-fist occupation. List: $35.00; AMEU: $35.00
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