

The Middle East Lobbies

By Cheryl Rubenberg

Careful analysis of the impact of lobbies concerned with the Middle East reveals an imbalance of striking proportions. An example from the late spring of 1981 is instructive.

On June 17, 1981, illegally using U.S.-made F-16 fighter bombers escorted by U.S.-made F-15 fighters, Israel attacked and destroyed a nearly completed French-built nuclear reactor near Baghdad, in Iraq. This unprecedented act of aggression was met with near universal condemnation, including a United Nations Security Council Resolution to which the U.S. agreed.¹ A week later, the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee began collecting Congressional signatures on a letter opposing the sale of new weapons to Saudi Arabia, a staunch U.S. ally with whom the Administration was seeking a closer relationship in light of the revolution in Iran, the Iran-Iraqi war, and the perceived threat to the Gulf states as a result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Israel lobby quickly found 54 senators and 224 representatives — a majority of both houses — to sign the letter.²

Beginning on July 10, 1981, Israel, again illegally using American weapons, mounted two weeks of devastating air attacks in southern Lebanon, capped by the July 17 bombardment of a Beirut residential sector, which killed 300 civilians and seriously wounded 800. In all, 450 Lebanese and Palestinians, along with 6 Israelis, were killed.

Dr. Cheryl A. Rubenberg is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Florida International University.

Following the attack on Beirut, the National Association of Arab-Americans tried to win Congressional support for a resolution condemning Mideast violence by all parties and commending the Reagan Administration for its (temporary) freeze on the delivery of fighter planes to Israel. The House version (H Con Res 162) attracted seven sponsors. In the Senate NAAA was unable to find even a single sponsor and the resolution never came before Congress.³

The most impressive success of the Israeli lobby has been its neutralization of the initially negative impact of Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon. Public opinion-makers, and those in government, talk and behave as if that massive war had never occurred,

while "informed" television and newspaper analyses rarely allude to Israel's role in disrupting Lebanon's fragile balance of power.

Thus one is confronted with the reality of an Israel lobby that virtually dominates foreign policy-making and public opinion related to the Middle East, and an Arab lobby that, in the words of former Senator James Abourezk, has never known success: "I don't know that the Arab lobby ever had a victory. I can't think of one."⁴ Commenting on the Israel lobby, Abourezk adds:

... the Israeli lobby ... does the Israeli government's work in the U.S. using the American Jewish community as its grass-roots base. The Israeli lobby has become so professional



About This Issue

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee is the most powerful pro-Israel lobby in America. Its Arab-American counterpart is the National Association of Arab-Americans. In addition to these registered lobbyist groups, there are, at last count, 33 "pro-Israel" Political Action Committees and 2 "pro-Arab" Political Action Committees.

How these and other "pro-Arab" and "pro-Israel" groups operate, how they influence our national elections and foreign policy decisions, and what their objectives are for 1984, are some of the questions examined in this issue.

The table on pages 6 and 7 listing the dollar amounts of the pro-Israel Political Action Committees to Congressional candidates in the 1981-82

election cycle is reprinted with permission of *The Mideast Observer*, which compiled the list from data obtained from the Federal Election Commission.

Our book selection is *The Fate of the Jews: A People Torn Between Israeli Power and Jewish Ethics*, written by Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht and reviewed on page 14 by Grace Halsell.

Our April/May issue of *The Link* will feature an indepth report on the 1967 attack on the U.S.S. Liberty and the ongoing efforts of the ship's crew and investigative journalists to find out why so many American servicemen were killed and wounded by Israeli airplanes.

John F. Mahoney,
Executive Director

and are informed of the substantial contribution that is expected of them for Israel.)⁷

American business in general has been the victim of Middle East politics. A \$2.2 million gift to American Near East Refugee Aid by Gulf Oil after the war of October 1973 resulted in a boycott of Gulf by major U.S. Jewish groups.⁸ Some years ago Business Roundtable submitted to pressure from B'nai B'rith and agreed to limit business in the Arab world because of the Arab boycott of Israel. As such American companies and the U.S. economy suffer an estimated \$1 billion loss per year.⁹

Evan Wilson, a retired foreign service officer, has noted that the oil companies in particular have exerted little or no pressure regarding U.S. policy in the Middle East.¹⁰ Seth Tillman, who spent many years as a professional staff member in the Senate, corroborates Wilson's observation:

Supporters of Israel sometimes cite the major oil companies as participants in the "Arab lobby," but the allegation does not stand up under close scrutiny. Outside the realm of energy costs, uses, and taxation, the oil companies have in fact been chary of taking public positions on Middle East issues, much less of pressing these on Congress.¹¹

With regard to policy outcomes, the Israel lobby stands virtually unchallenged in the Middle East policy-making process. One important exception was the 1981 debate over the sale of five AWAC planes to Saudi Arabia. The Israel lobby lost that round to the Reagan Administration which argued for the national interest buttressed by business and military-industrial interests, and an effective Saudi lobby.

that they virtually dominate the Middle East foreign policy decision-making in both Congress and the Administration. The majority in Congress do not like it, and neither does the Administration, but they cannot do anything about it. They are hamstrung because of the political influence and money of the Israeli lobby.⁵

It is important to note that the American Jews who constitute the lobby are involved because of the strong emotional attachment they feel toward Israel. Arab-Americans, on the other hand, tend to be well assimilated into the American melting pot and do not retain passionate links to the countries of their forefathers, whether from Syria, Lebanon, Egypt or elsewhere. Palestinian-Americans are an important exception — no doubt because they and their countrymen remain homeless and stateless, and because the trauma of mass displacement is so recent.

American business lobbies appear not to exert much direct influence on Middle East policy-making, although business interests are an integral part of all foreign policy. Richard H. Curtiss, a retired foreign service officer with extensive experience in the Middle East, has documented U.S. corporations' negligible financial assistance for pro-Arab political causes, and

has suggested that even companies with substantial interests in the Arab world are concerned about domestic critics labeling them anti-Israel or anti-semitic. "They are well aware," says Curtiss, "that there are vigilant friends of Israel in all walks of American life, including positions on their own boards of directors, who would rapidly alert a host of federal regulatory agencies to any pro-Arab activities that have even the appearance of conspiracy, illegality or irregularity of any sort."⁶ (This contrasts sharply with a common Wall Street practice, to mention but one example, in which Jewish partners of major firms are invited once a year to an informal gathering in a senior partner's home

The Israel Lobby: Organizations and Individuals

Although the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) is the only Jewish organization registered as a lobby, there are more than 35 other organizations concerned with influencing U.S. Middle East policy. Leaders of

most other Jewish organizations sit on AIPAC's Executive Committee, assuring that its reports on Congressional action and its calls for grassroots pressure go far beyond AIPAC's own members. In 1980 AIPAC mem-

bership was approximately 11,000;¹² today it is closer to 44,000, the increase due to intense efforts by AIPAC to stimulate participation.

AIPAC's sole concern has been to nurture the U.S. alliance with Israel and to prevent American alliances with Arab nations from jeopardizing Israel's dominant position in the Middle East. Even American policies that would in no way alter the existing balance of power in that region, but would serve U.S. national interests, are stridently opposed. For instance, in October–November 1983, under pressure from the Israel lobby, Congress eliminated from the 1984 military spending bill funds for an elite Jordanian force intended to assist in the Western defense of the Persian Gulf. Plans for this highly classified Administration-backed program were first leaked over Israeli radio.

In 1980 AIPAC had a budget of \$1.3 million and a staff of 30.¹³ (More recent figures are unavailable.) AIPAC is closely associated with the weekly newsletter, *Near East Report*, sent to AIPAC members and distributed without cost to all Congressmen and other influential individuals throughout government — some 4,000 in all.¹⁴

Many of the major organizations represented on AIPAC's board also belong to the New York-based Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, a coordinating body for debate and action of matters relating to Israel and other concerns of American Jewry. The Conference mainly interprets Israel's views and wishes to the American Government and thrashes out disagreements among members in private. One of the Israel lobby's strongest features is the "united front" it presents to the public, never deviating from the Israeli government line. As a spokesman for the President's Conference explained: "It is our policy to support any democratically-elected government of Israel, and we feel that what is good for Israel is good for the United States."¹⁵

Unlike AIPAC, most of the groups belonging to the President's Conference depend upon tax-deductible donations and cannot legally devote a major portion of their resources to direct lobbying of Congress. They can, however, disseminate information about particular Congressmen and Congressional legislation and alert Jews to undertake pressure campaigns.

Several member organizations of the Presidents' Conference, such as the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, have their own Washington representatives who "informally" press Israel's desires on members of Congress and the Administration. In 1981 the American Jewish Committee urged a mass mailing to members of Congress on Reagan's proposed AWAC sale to Saudi Arabia.¹⁶ The A.J.C. also publishes the monthly opinion journal, *Commentary*.

Also important in building public support for Israel is a network of Zionist groups, originally organized to work for creation of the State of Israel. These include the Zionist Organization of America, the Zionist Labor Alliance, and Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America. These groups promote projects ranging from Hebrew classes to pro-Israel films and trips to Israel for politicians and scholars. One group, the American section of the World Zionist Organization, which must file reports with the U.S. Justice Department because it is based in Jerusalem, recorded itemized expenditures in 1981 of about \$5 million for a six-month period.¹⁷

In addition to these organizations, well-placed Congressional aides, who coordinate their efforts with groups such as AIPAC, have enormous influence on the Congressmen for whom they work.¹⁸ Morris J. Amitay, former executive director of AIPAC and a previous aide to Senator Abraham A.

Ribicoff of Connecticut, explained the contribution of Congressional staff members when he was a Senate aide:

There are now a lot of guys at the working level up here who happen to be Jewish, who are willing to make a little bit extra effort and to look at certain issues in terms of their Jewishness, and this is what has made this thing go very effectively in the last couple of years. These are all guys who are in a position to make the decisions in these areas for these senators.¹⁹

The exact number of Jewish individuals in important staff positions — whether in Congress or in campaigns — is unclear. However, as A. Wesley Barthelmes, a veteran Capitol staff member and administrative assistant to Delaware Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr., said: "It's the old case: whatever X percent it is, it is more energetic and more forceful and more at the cutting edge of things than the goyim [gentiles] Their influence is beyond their number." Moreover, "A lot of the more prominent ones [legislative and administrative assistants and individuals with top campaign roles] who work for the very aggressive, energetic Senators are Jewish..."²⁰ It is also worth noting that every President has had a special White House consultant on "Jewish affairs" and relations with the Jewish community. There are no advisors on relations with the Arab-American community.

Goals of the Lobby

The Israel lobby's foremost goal is ensuring that Congress votes maximum amounts of U.S. aid at the most favorable terms to Israel. The record shows impressive success on this goal as well as others. Israel is expected to receive more than \$2.61 billion in economic and military assistance in the fiscal year which began on October 1, 1983. Indeed, on November 30, 1982, under pressure from the Israel lobby, the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to allocate Israel significantly more money than the Adminis-

tration had asked for. (Israel is the largest recipient of U.S. aid in both military and economic categories. It receives more than 20 percent of all assistance the U.S. gives to nations abroad.) The Administration had asked for \$1.7 billion in military credits, of which \$500 million would not have had to be repaid, and \$800 million in economic grants (i.e., non-repayable gifts). The committee voted to increase the credits that did not have to be repaid to \$850 million and added \$125 million to the \$800 mil-

lion in economic assistance.²¹ The vote confirmed former Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin's declaration that the U.S. election results had "strengthened his hand" on the Middle East.²²

Following successful efforts in 1982 to secure the largest annual appropriation ever approved for Israel, the lobby gave full priority to obtaining Congressional authorization for Israel's use of a portion of U.S. military credits to finance the construction of a new fighter plane, the Lavi. Normally a foreign country is expected to use military credits to finance purchases of American military equipment and not to develop its own defense industry which will compete with American companies. Northrop Corporation, whose F-20 fighter has not been financed by the government, strongly opposed the Israeli project, as did Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, who said it was inappropriate for military credits to be used in this manner.²³

Nevertheless, on November 10, 1983, Congress approved legislation that allows Israel to use \$550 million in military credits to finance construction of the Lavi. The bill was introduced by Representatives Clarence Long and Jack Kemp, ranking majority and minority members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

In addition to the governmental aid, which currently amounts to \$5,150 yearly for every Israeli family of five, Israel receives approximately \$500 million from tax-exempt Jewish charities in the U.S., \$500 million from the sale of Israeli government bonds, and several million dollars of special tariff concessions on Israeli imports to the U.S. The lobby has been active in assuring the continued tax-exempt status of the private funds that go to Israel and works for ever-increasing benefits in other areas.

A U.S. Government report prepared by the General Accounting Office (GAO) entitled *U.S. Assistance to the State of Israel* was released to the public on June 24, 1983, after heavy censorship by the U.S. State Department in response to direct pressure by the Israeli Embassy in Washington. Subsequently the original classified version was leaked in which the secret sections demonstrate conclusively that Israel's strategy is to get the U.S. Congress to finance half of Israel's defense budget, underwrite most of Israel's export

earnings, and cover the growth decline in Israel's foreign exchange reserves.²⁴ If the American Government accepts the Israeli demands identified in the report, U.S. financial aid to Israel is likely to rise by more than \$2.7 billion over the next decade just to enable Israel to meet its *existing* debts to the U.S.²⁵

The trend in Congress and the Administration appears to be not only to meet Israel's demands, but to offer

aid in the form of non-repayable grants rather than loans. In early November the Reagan Administration approved a plan to convert all military aid to Israel to outright grants in the 1985 budget. The total of these grants is expected to rise by 50 percent in the new budget to \$1.275 billion,²⁶ although Israel is asking for \$1.7 billion in grant military aid. In addition, the U.S. will grant \$910 million in economic assistance.²⁷

Whose Interests Does the Lobby Serve?

American Jewish and American Zionist groups argue that support for Israel is in the national interest of the United States, while at the same time accusing supporters of Arab causes of being "foreign agents." Thomas A. Dine, director of AIPAC, in a speech written for a National Association of Jewish Legislators meeting, said that Arab influence in the U.S. is directed and financed from "outside." "They," Dine wrote, "are a foreign lobby their support is not rooted in American soil."²⁸ Israel, however, is a foreign nation and those who actively work for its interests, while not required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, could as well be considered agents of a foreign government.²⁹

Senator Charles Mathias, Jr., Republican of Maryland, made the point very explicitly in an article in the Summer 1981 *Foreign Affairs*. Mathias recalled Washington's Farewell Address in which he warned against "excessive attachment" to particular foreign nations "facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists..."³⁰ He also noted the Founding Fathers' warning against the politics of factions, especially in the conduct of foreign relations. Mathias referred to syndicated columnist Meg Greenfield's analysis of "pluralism gone mad" and wrote of the dubious political tradition of political appeals to separatism and parochialism, to the frequent neglect of the common aims and interests of all Americans.³¹ Mathias emphasized in his critique that: "The [greater] problem is the loss of cohesion in our for-

eign policy and the derogation from the national interest when, as Washington and Madison feared, factions among us lead the nation toward excessive foreign attachments or animosities."³²

Significantly, Mathias pointed out that the Arabs are unequal competitors with an "aid-dependent" Israel because of lack of an Arab-American community in size, unity or motivation to the Jewish community.³³ Mathias also pointed out one of the Israel lobby's more effective tactics — emotional blackmail — when he described AIPAC's distribution to every member of Congress of complimentary copies of the novel *Holocaust* during the debate over the AWAC's sale.³⁴

Indeed, Americans in or out of government who advocate a more balanced Middle East policy, or who for example have supported arms sales to Arab states, are accused of submitting to Arab "blackmail." Stephen Isaacs, a former *Washington Post* correspondent who is very sympathetic to the Jewish community and its interests, writes:

The Jewish activists in Washington have also not hesitated to use America's traditional distaste for being blackmailed as they have striven to make clear to all those who hold power in Washington that if the Arab nations succeed in changing America's Middle East policies through withholding oil, nothing can stop them from proceeding on to another, different blackmail attempt.³⁵

Hyman Bookbinder of the American Jewish Committee conceded that the tactic is used: "It's easy to slogan-

ize by saying oil profits are being put ahead of American's honor in the world. We're not above doing that from time to time."³⁶

Another widely used and very effective tool is the charge of anti-semitism laid against those who oppose the lobby's position. When Senator Mathias voted in favor of the sale of U.S. arms to Saudi Arabia, a policy he considered essential to U.S. interests in the Middle East, a Jewish newspaper in New York commented:

Mr. Mathias values the importance of oil over the well-being of Jews and the State of Israel. The Jewish people cannot be fooled by such a person, no matter what he said, because his act proved who he was.³⁷

Former California Congressman Paul "Pete" McCloskey also relates having the charge of anti-semitism leveled at him:

When I ran for reelection in 1980, I was asked a question about peace in the Middle East, and I said if we were going to have peace in the Middle East we members of Congress were going to have to stand up to our Jewish constituents and respectfully disagree with them on Israel. Well, the next day the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith accused me of fomenting anti-semitism, saying that my remarks were patently anti-semitic.³⁸

Senator Mathias has further noted that the "secret weapon" of ethnic interest groups is neither money nor technique, but the ability to galvanize for specific political objectives the strong emotional bonds of large numbers of Americans to their cultural or ancestral homes. Mathias quotes a Congressional aide with strong sympathies for Israel as saying, "We don't do it for money the way some paid lobbyists do. We do it out of a very, very passionate commitment."³⁹

The importance of "techniques" relative to the "passionate commitment" of Israel's American supporters, however, cannot be minimized. AIPAC, for example, possesses a computerized listing of supporters of Israel in every state and Congressional district. A member of Congress who is undecided or likely to vote against a matter of concern to Israel can routinely expect to receive letters and telegrams, not merely from a scattering of leading citizens in his own constituency, but possibly from past and potential cam-

paign contributors from across the country.⁴⁰ AIPAC also has "power of attorney" from many supporters listed in its computerized files. When a pending matter is urgent, a Congressman may see telegrams from his constituents, billed to their home telephone numbers, even before some of the constituents themselves know the telegrams or mailgrams have been sent out over their names.⁴¹

Former Illinois [Republican] Congressman Paul Findley relates an example of the sophistication of the lobby's techniques:

There was an occasion on which I hadn't even drafted an amendment. I hadn't even spoken to anybody else about it except whispering to somebody else on the committee with me that I thought I'd offer an amendment to cut maybe \$50 million out of the aid bill to Israel which is just a tiny portion of what was pending. Within a half an hour I was visited by two other members of the committee who were in the room during that period. Clearly they'd had calls from their home districts of concern about what this Findley was up to — what amendment he was going to offer. It shows the efficiency of the network. Obviously the word was passed very swiftly and got out to the districts, then calls came back. That was very impressive. Chances are there was an AIPAC representative in the room. They normally are present during all deliberations of the committee. They cover the Hill. They have four or five people full time that deal with Congress. They don't have to cover every committee hearing, just the ones where they need to be present.⁴²

One other technique used increasingly by the Israel lobby is the effort to discredit and intimidate individuals and organizations which do not adhere to the Israeli line. A recent 154-page AIPAC publication entitled *The Campaign to Discredit Israel* lists 21 organizations and 38 individuals in minute detail. The B'nai B'rith published a 118-page book entitled *Pro-Arab Propaganda in America: Vehicles and Voices*, which similarly describes 48 organizations and 34 individuals.

The primary accusation leveled against the organizations and individuals is that they are "pro-Palestinian" or "pro-PLO." The Israel lobby has succeeded in associating the words

"Palestinian" and "PLO" with terrorism and evil in the minds of Americans. Now, with techniques reminiscent of the McCarthy era, the lobby smears its opposition with the phrase "pro-PLO."

The Jewish Defense League, for example, attempted to smear Presidential candidate Rev. Jesse Jackson. The smear effort began on November 11, 1983, with an ad in the *New York Times* featuring a photograph of Jackson embracing Yasir Arafat. Above the photograph, in boldface type, the advertisement posed two questions: "Do you believe that any Jew should support this man? Should any decent American?" The ad went on to brand Jackson a threat to Jews, Israel and America, and to ask for contributions to help quash his campaign for the Presidency. It further declared that "We will expose Jesse Jackson for the danger he really is: Ruin, Jesse, Ruin."

In defense of the ad, Fern Rosenblatt, national director of the JDL and associate director of "Jews Against Jackson," stated: "Jesse Jackson has to be stopped. To recognize the PLO and to negotiate with them ... is outrageous. To be so openly anti-semitic is not grounds for being President of the U.S."⁴³ Actually the Jewish Defense League effort against Jackson had been in operation for some time: at nearly every campaign stop Jackson's speeches were being interrupted by militant JDL people.

One week after the ad's appearance the JDL reported receiving 1,500 letters, \$5,000 in contributions and the formation of 10 additional "Jews Against Jackson" chapters across the country. Many prominent Jewish leaders, however, denounced the ad as "ill-conceived" and the JDL as a "fringe-group."⁴⁴ Subsequently, Mark Siegel, director of a Jewish political action committee, the National Bipartisan Political Action Committee, and Thomas Dine, executive director of AIPAC, requested a meeting with Jackson in order to gain a "better understanding of his Middle East policy."⁴⁵

In recent years techniques employed by the Israeli lobby have become more direct and intense. Former Senator James Abourezk describes the tactics used by the Israeli lobby in Congress as "political terrorism and intimidation.... If a member of Congress refuses to go along with a request, the Israeli lobby threatens him with political

defeat.”⁴⁶ Congressmen and their assistants are afraid that the lobby will turn off contributions and voters if they do not “toe the line.”⁴⁷ In 1982 Congressman Findley, although facing a newly reapportioned district, apparently lost his seat as a result of the Israel lobby’s efforts. Findley was targeted because he advocated cuts in the amount of aid that is given to Israel and called for a more balanced policy in the Middle East. Money from all over the U.S. was poured into the campaign of his opponent, Richard Durbin, a Catholic lawyer. Durbin received \$103,325 from 31 Jewish political action committees (PAC’s).⁴⁸ (See contribution list below.) According to Findley, Durbin received more in contributions from individual Jewish donors nationwide than he received from Jewish PAC’s.⁴⁹ In retrospect, Findley concludes:

Without the Jewish money, my opponent could not have mounted the attack that tore me to pieces... Without the money to buy that very

expensive time [television] and prepare those very expensive ads [newspaper], the attack could not possibly have been so great. An incumbent has enormous resources and can usually overcome a lot of odds. And I almost did. The margin was so close that any of a number of factors could have tipped the scale. But the main factor was that my opponent had a lot of money with which to attack me and that money came mainly from Jewish sources. And had that not been available I would have won. I don’t have any doubt.⁵⁰

The *Wall Street Journal* commented on Findley’s campaign:

Some people went to great effort to defeat Mr. Findley. Robert Asher of Highland Park, Illinois, was the treasurer of Citizens Concerned for the National Interest ... which raised money from the Jewish community in the fashionable North Shore suburbs of Chicago and contributed

\$5,000 [the maximum amount a PAC can contribute to a single candidate] to Mr. Durbin. Mr. Asher also headed the National Committee to Elect Dick Durbin, which solicited individual donations from Jewish leaders across the country with a letter saying: “This year we have the best chance we will ever have to remove this dangerous enemy of Israel from Congress...” Barbara Anne Weinberg, a Beverly Hills housewife, helped form the Citizens Organized Political Action Committee, a Los Angeles-based PAC, ... that gave \$5,000 to Mr. Durbin. According to election-commission records, Mrs. Weinberg and her husband, Lawrence Weinberg, gave \$20,000 to the PAC in 1981–1982 and gave an additional \$2,000 to Mr. Durbin.⁵¹

Durbin, as well as Findley, has said that he believes contributions from the Jewish community may have made the difference in their closely fought

Congress and the PAC’s

The dollar amounts denote the sums of the contributions of the pro-Israeli PAC’s to candidates in the 1981–82 election cycle. In parentheses are the number of PAC’s contributing.

S = Senator; ** = no 1982 race; * = elected in 1982; X = not elected; D = Democrat; R = Republican.

Reprinted from *Mideast Observer*, Nov 1, 1983

Alabama

S ** Heflin (D) \$5,000 (1)
1 * Edwards (R) \$1,500 (1)
2 X Camp (D) \$7,500 (2)
6 * Erdreich (D) \$6,250 (6)
X Smith (R) \$2,000 (1)
7 X Kartus (D) \$800 (1)

Arizona

S * DeConcini (D) \$32,000 (12)
1 X West (R) \$750 (2)
3 X Bosch (D) \$6,000 (2)
5 X Kolbe (R) \$5,000 (1)

Arkansas

1 * Alexander (D) \$250 (1)

California

S * Wilson (R) \$7,500 (3)
S X Brown (D) \$9,000 (5)
1 * Bosco (D) \$250 (1)
3 * Matsui (D) \$200 (1)
4 * Fazio (D) \$500 (2)
5 * Burton (D) \$10,250 (8)
6 * Boxer (D) \$1,000 (2)
9 * Stark (D) \$5,750 (3)
11 * Lantos (D) \$15,500 (13)
12 * Zschau (R) \$250 (1)
13 * Mineta (D) \$250 (1)
14 X Reed (D) \$5,500 (3)
15 * Coelho (D) \$5,000 (1)

21 * Fiedler (R) \$250 (1)
24 * Waxman (D) \$250 (1)
26 * Berman (D) \$5,750 (3)
27 * Levine (D) \$200 (1)
28 * Dixon (D) \$300 (1)
30 * Martinez (D) \$5,500 (3)
31 * Dymally (D) \$300 (1)
33 * Dreier (R) \$250 (1)
34 X Lloyd (D) \$250 (1)
35 * Lewis (R) \$250 (1)
38 * Patterson (D) \$5,500 (2)
41 * Lowery (R) \$250 (1)

Colorado

1 * Schroeder (D) \$5,250 (2)
2 * Wirth (D) \$5,900 (3)
3 * Kogovsek (D) \$5,000 (1)
5 * Kramer (R) \$250 (1)
6 X Hogan (D) \$250 (1)

Connecticut

S ** Dodd (D) \$1,628 (1)
S * Weicker (R) \$42,075 (17)
S X Moffett (D) \$6,500 (3)
2 * Gejdenson (D) \$30,175 (20)
3 X DeNardis (R) \$200 (1)
4 * McKinney (R) \$2,500 (1)
5 * Ratchford (D) \$5,700 (3)
6 * Johnson (R) \$5,000 (1)

Delaware

S ** Biden (D) \$1,500 (1)
S * Roth (R) \$11,500 (6)
S X Levinson (D) \$18,500 (10)
1 X Evans (R) \$500 (1)

Florida

S ** Hawkins (R) \$4,000 (1)
S * Chiles (D) \$1,100 (2)
1 * Hutto (D) \$2,000 (1)
2 * Fuqua (D) \$2,000 (1)
4 * Chappell (D) \$2,000 (1)
5 * McCollum (R) \$2,400 (3)
X Batchelor (D) \$2,000 (1)
6 * MacKay (D) \$1,500 (2)
7 * Gibbons (D) \$2,000 (1)
9 * Bilirakis (R) \$2,750 (2)
X Sheldon (D) \$11,500 (6)
X Kiser (R) \$2,250 (2)
10 * Ireland (D) \$1,000 (1)
11 * Nelson (D) \$1,500 (2)
12 * Lewis (R) \$5,500 (2)
X Culverhouse (D) \$1,250 (3)
X Koehler (D) \$250 (1)
13 * Mack (R) \$1,000 (1)
14 * Mica (D) \$3,250 (3)

15 * Shaw (R) \$7,750 (4)
16 * Smith (D) \$2,750 (3)
X Becker (D) \$250 (1)
X Berkowitz (R) \$1,700 (3)
17 * Lehman (D) \$250 (1)
18 * Pepper (D) \$1,000 (1)
19 * Fascell (D) \$40,750 (22)

Georgia

4 * Levitas (D) \$750 (1)
5 * Fowler (D) \$1,250 (1)
7 X Sellers (R) \$250 (1)

Hawaii

S * Matsunaga (D) \$11,000 (5)

Idaho

1 X LaRocco (D) \$2,000 (1)
2 X Stallings (D) \$250 (1)

Illinois

S ** Dixon (D) \$1,750 (3)
4 X Derwinski (R) \$4,750 (4)

6 * Hyde (R) \$6,000 (2)
7 * Collins (D) \$400 (2)
8 * Rostenkowski (D) \$1,000 (1)
9 * Yates (D) \$13,450 (11)
10 * Porter (R) \$6,100 (4)
13 * Erlenborn (R) \$500 (1)
16 * Martin (R) \$1,000 (1)
17 * Evans (D) \$200 (1)
18 * Michel (R) \$8,500 (6)
19 X Gwinn (D) \$500 (2)
20 * Durbin (D) \$103,325 (31)
22 * Simon (D) \$2,100 (3)

Indiana

S * Lugar (R) \$5,000 (1)
S X Fithian (D) \$6,250 (6)
2 * Sharp (D) \$5,500 (2)
9 * Hamilton (D) \$300 (1)

Iowa

3 X Cutler (D) \$58,600 (24)
5 * Harkin (D) \$1,500 (2)

Kansas

2 X Kay (R) \$5,000 (1)
3 * Winn (R) \$250 (1)
4 * Glickman (D) \$200 (1)

Kentucky

4 X Mann (D) \$200 (1)

Louisiana

8 * Long (D) \$500 (1)

Maine

S * Mitchell (D) \$77,400 (27)
1 X Kerry (D) \$250 (1)
2 * Snowe (R) \$500 (1)

Maryland

S * Sarbanes (D) \$48,500 (16)
2 * Long (D) \$29,250 (18)
5 * Hoyer (D) \$250 (1)
8 * Barnes (D) \$6,800 (4)

Massachusetts

S * Kennedy (D) \$10,420 (5)
1 * Conte (R) \$200 (1)
4 * Frank (D) \$10,000 (8)
5 * Shannon (D) \$250 (1)
6 * Mavroules (D) \$5,250 (2)
9 * Moakley (D) \$250 (1)

contest, during which each spent more than \$700,000.⁵²

Again from the *Wall Street Journal*:
 “There is no question that the Findley–Durbine race was intimidating,” says Democratic Representative Mervyn Dymally of California, who often grumbles during subcommittee sessions that aid to Israel is too high, especially after Israel’s military adventures in Lebanon. Whenever Representative Dymally grumbles, he says, he receives a prompt visitation from the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee or one of the Jewish PAC’s, usually accompanied by someone from his district. During one recent session, he explained that while he sometimes complains, in the end he always votes for more aid to Israel. “‘Not once,’ I told them, ‘have I ever strayed from the cause. And they said, ‘Well you abstained once.’ That’s how good they are.’”⁵³
 In the words of Findley:
 Perception is very important but it

is backed up by the reality that they [the Israel lobby] come through on issues that come before Congress where they have an almost unbroken record of success.... My colleagues knew that I went through a real struggle in 1980 and even if I had won last November [1982] my colleagues were aware of the national scope of my challenge and this awareness has a chilling effect. Even if I’d won they would have said “I don’t want to go through that. At least I won’t take any chances.”⁵⁴

When asked if Congress was ideologically committed to the Zionist–Israeli line or acted more out of fear of the kind of sticks the lobby can wield, Findley replied flatly: “It’s out of fear.” Further, “They have been able to convince members of Congress that Jewish support is vitally important and that they [the Congressmen] would be in trouble if they didn’t have it. I think that’s the key. By making examples of the few, they can influence the many.”⁵⁵

Although those active in the Jewish PAC’s are flush with success, not all in the Jewish community are involved in the lobbying efforts.

A recent American Jewish Committee-commissioned study reveals contrasting attitudes towards Israel of American Jews. The study, conducted by Steven Cohen, Senior Fellow at the Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University, was based on questionnaires completed by 640 American Jews and 272 Jewish “leaders.” The results included the following (YES%–NO%):

- “Israel should offer the Arabs territorial compromises in ... the West Bank and Gaza in return for credible guarantees of peace.” (Public 42–29%, leaders 74–16%)
- “Israel should suspend the expansion of settlements in ... the West Bank ... to encourage peace negotiations.” (Public 51–28%, leaders 55–28%)
- “Israel should talk with the PLO if the PLO recognizes Israel and renounces terrorism.” (Public 70–17%,

Michigan	New Hampshire	3 * Hall (D) \$250 (1)	9 * Ford (D) \$500 (1)
S ** Levin (D) \$250 (1)	1 * D’Amours (D) \$250 (1)	7 * Dewine (R) \$250 (1)	Texas
S * Riegle (D) \$29,000 (14)	New Jersey	11 * Eckhart (D) \$8,750 (7)	S * Bentsen (D) \$7,500 (4)
3 * Wolpe (D) \$9,650 (7)	S ** Bradley (D) \$2,000 (2)	12 X Shamansky (D) \$23,200 (15)	5 * Bryant (D) \$550 (2)
5 X Monsma (D) \$800 (2)	S * Lautenberg (D) \$10,500 (5)	17 * Williams (R) \$1,600 (2)	12 * Wright (D) \$5,000 (1)
6 * Carr (D) \$5,000 (1)	3 * Howard (D) \$5,000 (1)	21 * Stokes (D) \$300 (1)	16 * Coleman (D) \$5,000 (1)
9 * Vander Jagt (R) \$300 (1)	X Muhler (R) \$5,000 (1)	Oklahoma	18 * Leland (D) \$500 (1)
15 * Ford (D) \$250 (1)	7 X Levin (D) \$500 (1)	4 * McCurdy (D) \$5,000 (1)	21 X Loeffler (R) \$5,000 (1)
17 * Levin (D) \$1,250 (2)	9 X Hollenbeck (R) \$5,200 (2)	Oregon	23 X Wentworth (R) \$7,500 (4)
X Rosen (R) \$1,000 (1)	New Mexico	S ** Packwood (R) \$500 (2)	24 * Frost (D) \$18,300 (13)
X Brodhead (D) \$250 (1)	S * Bingaman (D) \$36,575 (19)	1 * AuCoin (D) \$11,250 (7)	25 * Andrews (D) \$5,000 (1)
18 X Blanchard (D) \$250 (1)	1 X Hartke (D) \$500 (1)	2 X Willis (D) \$7,000 (3)	26 * Vandergriff (D) \$5,000 (1)
Minnesota	3 * Richardson (D) \$5,500 (2)	3 * Wyden (D) \$1,850 (3)	Utah
S * Durenberger (R) \$56,000 (20)	New York	Pennsylvania	S X Wilson (D) \$53,200 (23)
3 * Frenzel (R) \$500 (2)	S * Moynihan (D) \$11,000 (6)	S * Heinz (R) \$15,500 (9)	2 X Farley (D) \$250 (1)
6 X Erdahl (R) \$1,500 (1)	2 * Downey (D) \$5,000 (1)	1 * Foglietta (D) \$5,250 (2)	Vermont
7 X Wenstrom (DFL) \$5,500 (2)	4 * Lent (R) \$250 (1)	2 * Gray (D) \$7,950 (6)	S X Guest (D) \$40,800 (16)
Mississippi	5 * McGrath (R) \$250 (1)	3 * Borski (D) \$5,000 (1)	1 X Kaplan (D) \$250 (1)
S * Stennis (D) \$100 (1)	6 * Addabbo (D) \$250 (1)	X Dougherty (R) \$500 (2)	Virginia
S X Barbour (R) \$8,250 (5)	7 * Rosenthal (D) \$300 (1)	X Glancey (D) \$250 (1)	S * Tribble (R) \$5,000 (1)
2 * Franklin (R) \$100 (1)	8 * Scheuer (D) \$200 (1)	4 * Kolter (D) \$5,250 (1)	S X Davis (D) \$44,600 (22)
X Clark (D) \$750 (3)	10 * Schumer (D) \$250 (1)	6 * Yatron (D) \$250 (1)	4 * Sisisky (D) \$9,450 (8)
4 * Dowdy (D) \$5,200 (2)	13 * Solarz (D) \$1,500 (2)	7 * Edgar (D) \$6,250 (3)	8 X Harris (D) \$1,250 (2)
Missouri	15 * Green (R) \$250 (1)	8 * Kostmayer (D) \$900 (1)	10 X Lechner (D) \$2,375 (3)
S * Danforth (R) \$19,950 (8)	17 * Weiss (D) \$250 (1)	12 * Murtha (D) \$750 (2)	Washington
S X Woods (D) \$4,500 (2)	20 * Ottinger (D) \$6,250 (3)	13 * Coughlin (R) \$200 (1)	S ** Gorton (R) \$500 (1)
1 * Clay (D) \$5,000 (1)	21 * Fish (R) \$250 (1)	15 * Ritter (R) \$500 (1)	S * Jackson (D) \$11,750 (6)
2 * Young (D) \$1,000 (1)	22 * Gilman (R) \$6,500 (3)	18 * Walgren (D) \$500 (1)	3 * Bonker (D) \$350 (1)
4 * Skelton (D) \$20,000 (12)	X Bingham (D) \$1,000 (1)	21 X Andrezeski (D) \$7,250 (7)	5 * Foley (D) \$5,500 (2)
5 * Wheat (D) \$8,750 (6)	27 * Wortley (R) \$750 (2)	Rhode Island	6 * Dicks (D) \$400 (1)
Montana	28 * McHugh (D) \$11,200 (7)	S X Michaelson (D) \$31,250 (11)	8 X Bland (D) \$1,000 (2)
S ** Baucus (D) \$1,200 (2)	31 * Kemp (R) \$8,700 (6)	2 * Schneider (R) \$5,250 (2)	West Virginia
S * Melcher (D) \$5,000 (1)	33 * Nowak (D) \$250 (1)	X Byrne (D) \$1,000 (1)	S * Byrd (D) \$55,500 (19)
1 * Williams (D) \$2,500 (4)	North Carolina	South Carolina	1 * Mollohan (D) \$750 (2)
Nebraska	2 X Michaux (D) \$2,750 (4)	5 * Spratt (D) \$250 (1)	Wisconsin
S X Keck (R) \$500 (1)	3 X McDaniel (R) \$500 (1)	6 * Tallon (D) \$850 (1)	1 * Aspin (D) \$250 (1)
1 * Bereuter (R) \$250 (1)	5 * Neal (D) \$5,500 (2)	South Dakota	3 X Offner (D) \$500 (1)
2 X Fellman (D) \$14,500 (9)	8 * Hefner (D) \$250 (1)	S ** Pressler (R) \$500 (1)	4 X Adelman (D) \$15,350 (14)
Nevada	North Dakota	1 * Daschle (D) \$6,500 (2)	5 X Aronson (D) \$1,750 (3)
S * Hecht (R) \$46,500 (17)	S * Burdick (D) \$44,775 (21)	Tennessee	8 X Clusen (D) \$750 (2)
S X Santini (D) \$2,850 (1)	1 * Dorgan (D) \$3,250 (3)	S * Sasser (D) \$58,250 (23)	Wyoming
S X Cannon (D) \$1,000 (1)	Ohio	4 X Baker (R) \$5,100 (2)	S * Wallop (R) \$5,000 (1)
S X Fore (R) \$1,000 (1)	S * Metzenbaum (D) \$35,175 (15)	7 * Sundquist (R) \$2,000 (1)	S X McDaniel (D) \$28,200 (19)
1 * Reid (D) \$250 (1)	1 * Luken (D) \$250 (1)		

leaders 73–17%)

– “Palestinians have a right to a homeland on the West Bank and Gaza so long as it does not threaten Israel.” (Public 48–26%, leaders 51–28%)⁵⁶

It is also interesting to note that 5 of the 38 “Arab-propagandists” listed in the forementioned AIPAC publication, *Campaign to Discredit Israel*, and 6 of the 34 listed by B’nai B’rith’s *Pro-Arab Propaganda in America*, are Jewish. This clearly suggests that not all American Jews support the policies

of Israel or the domestic lobby’s efforts on behalf of Israel. Indeed, over the past year and a half, political advertisements in major newspapers such as *The New York Times* supporting the human rights of Palestinians on the West Bank, opposing the war in Lebanon, and so on, contain a large number of Jewish individuals’ names. While support for Israel is virtually universal among American Jews,⁵⁷ a significantly increasing number disagree with many of Israel’s policies.

from 18 Jewish groups which helped him win in the suburbs of Baltimore.⁶⁴

During the 1982 Congressional elections Jews used more than 33 separate political action committees to give favored candidates \$1.87 million, more than in any other prior election.⁶⁵ These PAC’s:

– Pumped \$103,325 into the coffers of Richard Durbin in his successful bid to unseat Paul Findley.

– Spent \$355,550 to help elect or defeat members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Appropriations Committee’s Foreign Operations Subcommittee, panels that subsequently added more than \$125 million to the Reagan Administration’s request for aid to Israel.

– Contributed \$77,400 to help elect a Democratic senator from Maine, George Mitchell, and contributed \$232,600 to six members of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

– Were joined by a new mega-PAC, National PAC, which raised more than \$1 million in its first year of operation and which has a policy of giving \$5,000 apiece to friends of Israel in Congress. National PAC, along with other newly organized Jewish PAC’s, plans to expand its activity in the 1984 elections.⁶⁶

According to an analysis of records of the Federal Election Commission, the combined contribution of these groups – many of which gave to the same candidates – now rivals the sums dispatched by Washington’s largest lobbies.⁶⁷ *The Wall Street Journal* reported that several ranking Congressmen – most of whom would not comment on the record for the story – say they believe the political effect of Jewish PAC money is greater than that of other major lobbies because it is skillfully focused on one foreign-policy issue.⁶⁸

Yoel Marcus, former correspondent for the influential Israeli newspaper *Ha’aretz*, recently pointed out that, as a result of Jewish PAC activity in the 1981–82 Congressional season, “the pro-Israel faction in the House Foreign Affairs Committee obtained a majority of 21–16.” “In fact from 1983,” Marcus stated, “it is assured that the House will not pass any sharply anti-Israeli measures. The aim in the next elections [1984] will be to create a similar situation in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.”⁶⁹

The effects and often the identities of the Jewish PAC’s – many of them newcomers to the political scene – are

Jewish PAC’s: A New ‘Tool’

Several people involved in Jewish political action committees have said that what happened to former Representative Findley may be a preview of what is in store for Senator Charles Percy, Republican of Illinois and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is up for reelection in 1984. Many Jews are displeased with Percy for criticizing Israeli actions in Lebanon and advocating a more evenhanded U.S. policy in the Middle East.⁵⁸ An article in a January 1983 issue of *Jewish Week* stated:

His name, for many influential Jews, has become almost synonymous with being pro-Arab or anti-Israel. It does not seem to make much difference about how these Jews feel about the policies of the Israeli government. To them Percy is simply bad news. They want him to go, and therefore he will be fighting for his political life.⁵⁹

The article also claimed that Percy was suddenly demonstrating greater “understanding” of Israel’s problems because he was concerned about reelection. It further suggested that Percy may have been influenced by the defeat of Findley.⁶⁰

In May 1983 a letter was sent to Jewish voters in Illinois from the “Friends of Seith Committee,” which supports Alex Seith, a Democrat who narrowly lost to Percy in the 1978 elections. The letter castigated Percy for “increasingly questionable judgment on foreign policy” and praised Seith as “one of the strongest supporters of Israel and Jewish interests in the U.S.” “With Alex in the Senate,” the letter stated, “our interests – yours, mine and Israel’s – will be served intelligently and consistently.”

Seith, unlike Percy, the letter concluded, “is a true friend of the American Jewish community, Israel and America.”⁶¹

The Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative Clement Zablocki, Democrat of Wisconsin, felt “some heat” last year from the Jewish PAC’s. The 1982 campaign was Zablocki’s first seriously contested race in 30 years. Zablocki beat back a challenge by a state senator, Lynn Adelman, who is Jewish, and who received \$15,350 from 14 Jewish PAC’s. A letter soliciting funds for Adelman among the Jewish community in Milwaukee read: “Adelman’s election not only means a friend of Israel in Congress, but also that the House Foreign Relations Committee will have a friend of Israel as its new chairman.”⁶² To be sure, had Zablocki survived his heart attack on November 30, 1983, and sought reelection as planned, he would likely have been targeted even more intensely by the Jewish PAC’s.

The other “Friend of Israel” mentioned in the above letter is Representative Dante Fascell of Florida, the second-ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, in line to succeed Zablocki for the chairmanship. Representative Fascell received \$40,750 from 22 Jewish PAC’s in 1982 and says the money helped him survive a stiff challenge from a former television newsmen in his district, which includes part of Miami.⁶³

Another key person for Israel is Democratic Representative Clarence Long of Maryland, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. (It was Long who sponsored the bill allowing Israel to use military credits to finance the Lavi.) In 1982 Long received \$29,250

frequently obscured by titles such as the Committee for 18, Arizona Politically Interested Citizens and the Joint Action Committee for Political Affairs. Mark Siegel, former Carter aide, former political director of the Democratic National Committee, and now director of the Jewish PAC, National Bipartisan Political Action Committee, says the committee names were chosen because of a concern in the Jewish community that "there are those in the political process who would use the percentage of Jewish money (in a given race) as a negative."⁷⁰

Siegel's PAC was formed in 1978 by 30 Jewish backers of Henry Jackson's Presidential campaigns. Siegel says, however, that the prime objective of the Jewish PAC's is the Senate because it is the "real battleground" of foreign-policy issues. Other PAC leaders are reported to agree.⁷¹ The Senate will likely be the focus of the Jewish PAC's in 1984, particularly in Percy's campaign.

According to Federal Election Commission records, 33 Jewish PAC's active in the 1981-82 Congressional campaigns contributed a total of \$1,873,623. Of that, \$966,695, or 59 percent, went to Senate races. And 74 percent of the money was directed to incumbents like Senator Mitchell, who drew money from 27 of the groups — all based outside Maine. A disgruntled aide to former Representative David Emery, who lost to Mitchell, commented: "You are talking about a pretty tight network. The word is out pretty much on who (they're) for and who (they're) against, and you can't change it."⁷²

At least two new Jewish PAC's have been formed in an attempt to gain greater influence over the outcome of the 1984 Congressional elections. One consists of prominent Jewish businessmen from both political parties in Virginia, a state where the Jewish community has traditionally been less politically organized than elsewhere. Many of Virginia's Jewish leaders say they are disappointed and unhappy with the positions of the Virginia Congressional delegation, particularly Republican Senator John W. Warner's vote in favor of the AWAC's sale to Saudi Arabia.

A second new Jewish PAC, formed in Washington in early November 1983, goes by the name of Capital PAC or CAPPAC and is "dedicated to strengthening American support for the State of Israel."

The potent influence of such PAC's is beginning to worry Americans. In January 1984 the citizens' lobbying group Common Cause launched a TV advertising campaign in support of legislation to curb what it called "the dangerous and scandalous role played by affluent special interest groups in Congressional elections."⁷³ Observes former Congressman William Brodhead: "They're trying to buy votes. There's

no other purpose of it ... Democracy can't survive in this country if people are going to be buying and selling votes in the lobbies of the United States."⁷⁴ Representative James Leach, Republican of Iowa, has co-sponsored a bill to reduce the influence of PAC's because, in his words, "Washington has just become a special interest enclave, a city of special interests very different from the rest of society."⁷⁵

Role of Israel Lobby in Presidential Campaigns

The role of the Israel lobby, especially in financial matters, is highly significant in Presidential campaigns. Jewish money, not necessarily from PAC's, is enormously important, particularly in the Democratic Party. The *Christian Science Monitor* recently reported that 50 percent of all Democratic Party funds comes from the Jewish community.⁷⁶ According to Stephen Isaacs, Democratic Presidential candidates are ultimately dependent on Jewish money for success.⁷⁷ One non-Jewish Democratic campaign strategist told Isaacs: "You can't hope to go anywhere in national politics, if you're a Democrat, without Jewish money."⁷⁸

Pete McCloskey makes a similar observation:

In the case of the Democrats, their Presidential candidates have to seek Jewish money. Jewish money is a big part of the funding of any Democratic candidate. If you look at Ted Kennedy's expressed views on Israel or Scoop Jackson's or Walter Mondale's, you realize their campaign money comes from the Jewish community. Because John Glenn is an American first, Israel second person, you will begin to see Jewish money quietly trying to come in and discredit John Glenn, because he could be another Jimmy Carter and stand up to the Israelis. John Glenn is a man who could stand up to Israel, and yet in this primary, if he hasn't already been approached, my guess is that he will be approached, quietly, by a few Jewish leaders saying, "What is your commitment to Israel?"⁷⁹

The 1984 Democratic Presidential contest illustrates the extent to which the interests of the Israel lobby domi-

nate the considerations of candidates. On May 20, 1983, the lobby's *Near East Report* inaugurated a section devoted to "Campaign '84" in which each candidate was asked to submit a position paper on the Middle East. John Glenn and Walter Mondale were early responders, each castigating the Reagan Administration for being insufficiently pro-Israel and pledging that Israel would be the cornerstone of their Middle East policy.

Indeed, both Glenn and Mondale have long supported Israel and its interests: Mondale has voted with the Israel lobby on every issue and Glenn has voted with it on every issue except one, the 1978 F-15 aircraft sale to Saudi Arabia. Mondale, however, is considered by the lobby to be more acceptably pro-Israel than Glenn, because of the 1978 vote, and because Glenn criticized Israel's bombing of the Iraqi reactor and suggested in 1981 that the U.S. negotiate with the PLO.⁸⁰

As their respective campaigns gained momentum in the fall of 1983, Mondale apparently attempted to capitalize on the doubts in the Jewish community about Glenn in order to further his own Presidential bid. On September 14, 1983, the *Wall Street Journal* reported that backers of Mondale and others had spread the word in the Jewish community that John Glenn was not a supporter of Israel. According to the *Journal*: "This charge has hurt the Glenn campaign's finances, and the candidate reacts defensively when the issue is raised."⁸¹

Glenn's "defense" was reported by the *New York Times* that very day. In an address before the Foreign Policy Association in New York the previous evening, Glenn devoted the greater

portion of his first major foreign-policy statement to Israel. Indeed, a candidate's position on Israel is so important that while the *Times* noted that Glenn had touched on a number of foreign-policy issues, in the "Excerpts" it printed, only his comments about the Middle East appeared. In an abrupt departure from his earlier position Glenn stated: "The PLO has proven itself to be little more than a gang of thugs. And until they abandon the use of terror and renounce forever their oath to destroy Israel, the United States should never recognize or negotiate with them."⁸² The remainder of his comments were equally as strong in support of the Israel lobby's positions, including a criticism of previous administrations for "appeasing" the Arabs.

Subsequently Mondale continued his efforts in the Jewish community. In an address before the Conference of President's of Major American Jewish Organizations, Mondale reaffirmed his fidelity to Israel and told the leaders, among other things, "Some in the [Carter] Administration called them [West Bank settlements] illegal, but you never heard Walter Mondale say that. I don't believe it now and I didn't believe it then."⁸³

The Israeli lobby, it should be noted, is the only lobby that measurably affects the electoral process. Due to the peculiarities in the electoral college system, a few thousand votes can determine the outcome of a Presidential election in a given state, thus awarding all that state's electoral votes to one candidate. The electoral system consequently biases election results in favor of heavily populated states, such as New York, California and Florida. Here the winner-take-all system gives those states disproportionate weight. While Jews constitute less than three percent of the population at large (approximately six million), they are concentrated in the populous states. This combined with their extremely high turnout at the polls affords Jews political influence greatly disproportionate to their actual numbers.

The American Jewish Committee reports that in New York, for example, Jews are 12 percent of the population but 16 percent of the registered voters and 19 percent of those most likely to vote in any election. In the 1982 New York primaries 35 percent of Democratic voters were Jews.⁸⁴

The substantial financial support

given to Presidential and Congressional candidates also explains much of the power of the Israel lobby. "Jews take enormous pride in their prominence in financing campaigns..., according to Stephen Isaacs, and "give like no other group in society."⁸⁵ The level of Jewish giving results from a number of factors, not the least of which are the very effective fund-raising techniques employed by Jewish leaders.

However it is raised, Jewish financial contributions play a major role in the success of the Israel lobby. The perception of the ability of the Jewish vote to "swing" the outcome of Presidential elections in states with large

numbers of electors, combined with their vast financial contributions to Presidential candidates, assures the organized Jewish community that candidates, particularly Democrats, will bow to their interests. Republican candidates then feel pressured to be even more pro-Israel in order to compete for the "Jewish vote." The more immediate influence of the Israel lobby over senators and representatives, the effectiveness of Jewish Congressional aides, and the role of the Congress in foreign policy-making, virtually assures that the campaign promises of Presidents will be translated into policy.

The Israel Lobby and U.S. Middle East Policy

Two recent articles in the *New York Times* dramatize both the power of the Israel lobby and the negative implications of that power for the U.S. national interest. Bernard Gwertzman analyzed the declining hopes for peace in the Middle East, increasing U.S. concern with Israel's policies vis-a-vis Lebanon, and growing frustration of moderate, pro-American, Arab governments with American policy in the region, and concluded:

After years of misunderstandings, Washington will want from the new Israeli government some agreement on ground rules for handling crises in Lebanon and elsewhere. The U.S. would also like to persuade the Israelis that, given the Syrian resurgence, it is important for Israel not to use its political influence in the American Congress to continue to block the sale of military equipment to Jordan and to other moderate Arabs.⁸⁶

The following day, Zbigniew Brzezinski, former national security advisor, wrote of the "shambles" of America's Middle East policy, and argued that the U.S. has been reduced to acting merely as "a proxy of Israeli foreign policy." Brzezinski concluded:

The U.S. is on the brink of becoming plunged into military activity against the Palestinians and Syrians. The result of such involvement is likely to enhance the standing of Syria

in the Arab world as the authentic voice of Arab nationalism. Even moderate Arab governments unsympathetic to Syria would find themselves under popular pressure in the face of Syria's willingness to stand up to an America perceived by the Arabs as a military proxy of Israel....

It is only a matter of time before the U.S. is deserted by its European allies.... The U.S. will gradually become bogged down, the region is likely to be cast into greater turmoil and the Soviet Union, without too much exertion, will find itself increasingly influential.⁸⁷

Nevertheless, the necessity of being as "pro-Israel" as possible during an election year impelled the Reagan Administration to forge a highly risky new military alliance with Israel.

Just one year after Israel's massive war in Lebanon and its absolute, unequivocal rejection of the Reagan Plan for a Mideast peace settlement, the Administration undertook a formal program of "strategic cooperation" with Israel which will make the U.S.-Israeli relationship the centerpiece of American policy in the region and includes joint military planning and increased American aid to Israel.

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir and Defense Minister Moshe Arens came to the United States to cement the relationship and on

November 29, 1983, President Reagan announced the following:

- formation of a Joint Political-Military Group and joint military exercises
- an agreement on the pre-positioning or stockpiling in Israel of American military equipment
- increased military and economic aid for fiscal 1985 and an increase in the amount that will be given as a grant
- negotiations to establish a free trade arrangement between Israel and the U.S.

- a special exemption for Israel from foreign military sales laws
- permission for Israel to resume buying the extremely anti-personnel U.S.-made cluster bombs, and permission to buy cluster bomb fuses, thereby enabling Israel to produce its own cluster bombs and avoid U.S.-imposed restrictions on their use (which Israel had ignored in the past).⁸⁸

There was no evidence that Israel made any concessions to the U.S. in the agreement, indeed it continues to reject President Reagan's Middle East initiative. Moreover, the Israelis reiterated their opposition to American arms sales to Jordan and Saudi Arabia.⁸⁹ The normally pro-Israel *Miami Herald* (for one) wrote in its lead editorial:

Israel has everything to gain from the enhanced "strategic cooperation" agreements negotiated this week in Washington,

What does the United States get? Heightened risk of direct military involvement in the bloodfest of Middle East sectarian strife — that's what. What's more, if worst comes to worst, the change in the role of U.S. military forces in the Mideast increases the risk of direct U.S.-Soviet military confrontation there. That serves no one's interest anywhere.⁹⁰

The *Wall Street Journal* noted: "Of course a shift back toward Israel ... is good politics as President Reagan and other Republicans approach an election year and begin to worry about the Jewish vote. Israeli officials know political forces may be a factor in the U.S. attitude. 'Can any American President divorce himself from this reality,' asks one [Israeli official], answering 'he can't.'" ⁹¹ The *Miami Herald* likewise noted: "There is little doubt, however, that there is more to the U.S.' desire to improve rela-

tions than immediate problems in the Middle East. The Administration also has an eye on next year's Presidential election and would not relish

widespread unhappiness in the politically powerful American Jewish community."⁹²

The Arab Lobby

Although the Israel lobby dominates the policy-making process and the electoral process, there is a significant and growing Arab lobby. Of interest, however, is why it has been so difficult to mobilize Arab-Americans to participate in the Middle East policy debate. The answer is complex, but lies in the fact that the majority of the two to three million Arab-Americans are well assimilated second- and third-generation individuals whose fundamental identity is "American," rather than Lebanese, Syrian, etc. As one knowledgeable observer commented, the greater portion of Arab-Americans tend to be unabashedly nationalistic and highly patriotic. Moreover, because Arab-Americans come from many different countries, religions and sects, all the divisive conflicts that exist in the Middle East keep them from becoming a cohesive domestic political force. Also, many Arab-Americans are small-scale, independent entrepreneurs who are fearful of political involvement. "A lot of their customers are Jewish and if they know you are speaking out on the Middle East, they'll walk," said a former NAAA lobbyist.⁹³ Moreover, Arab-Americans are not single-issue voters and represent a cross-section of the general population, "although as a community, they tend to have a generally conservative social and political character which stems from a strong emphasis on the family as the central unit of society."⁹⁴

Two major Arab-American organizations comprise the Arab lobby: the National Association of Arab-Americans (NAAA) and the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC).

The NAAA, founded in 1972, has been a registered lobby since 1978. Its president, Robert Joseph, recently placed NAAA membership at 80,000, although another prominent Arab-American says it is considerably less. NAAA priorities include closer political, military and economic ties be-

tween the U.S. and Arab nations, a loosening of the U.S.-Israeli tie and the creation of a homeland for the Palestinians. NAAA has always recognized Israel's right to exist.⁹⁵

NAAA's basic policy may be gleaned from the series of resolutions it passed at its Eleventh Annual Convention in May 1983. The resolutions included: condemning the Israeli invasion and occupation of Lebanon; urging the U.S. to provide financial support and military expertise to Lebanon; urging the U.S. to undertake a reappraisal of its foreign assistance programs to Israel in light of the fact that Israel's policies have not contributed to peace in the Middle East; urging the U.S. to recognize the legitimate right to self-determination of the Palestinians; urging the U.S. to begin a dialogue with the PLO as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinians; condemning the human and civil rights violations of Israel in the occupied territories; urging the U.S. to use its good offices to end the conflict between Iraq and Iran; condemning the Department of the Interior for its decision to declare Kuwait ineligible to purchase federal lands for oil and mineral leases in the U.S.; and urging an investigation of the alleged espionage violation of Stephen D. Bryen, now a Defense Department employee, in offering to provide the Israeli government with sensitive Pentagon documents on air bases in Saudi Arabia.⁹⁶

NAAA engages in a number of activities, including publication of an annual convention journal, a yearly *Middle East Business Survey* (MEBUS), a monthly analysis paper, *Counterpoint*, a biweekly newsletter of political commentary, *Focus*, a quarterly newsletter, *Voice*, and various reprints and occasional papers. NAAA also conducts international trade seminars, arranges cultural exhibits, and monitors the media for biased reporting and negative stereotyping, in addition to its efforts at lobbying Congressmen.⁹⁷

In November 1983 NAAA undertook an ambitious media campaign opposing the levels of aid to Israel and the amendment offered by Clarence Long that allows Israel to spend U.S. grant dollars to develop the Lavi. According to NAAA the campaign had two primary goals: "to stimulate public debate on the wisdom of aid to Israel and to spotlight the role played by Long in increasing aid to Israel."⁹⁸ The ads questioned whether it is fair to provide \$2.6 billion in aid to Israel when unemployment affects many Americans and the country is suffering from the results of Israel's invasion of Lebanon.

The campaign proved highly controversial: all 15 radio stations in Baltimore refused to run the NAAA commercials, although four in Washington did. The Washington stations were subjected to intense pressure from Jewish groups, most prominently the Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting (CAMERA). One station, WTOP-AM ran the ad for two weeks, then refused to run an updated version. Subsequently WTOP gave CAMERA free airtime to respond to NAAA's message.

NAAA president Robert Joseph expressed satisfaction with the campaign (which also included the use of roadside billboards):

American leaders must know that there is a significant portion of the American public that does not support the funding of Israel's military aggression, the occupation of Arab land, the denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians, and Israel's destructive policies in Lebanon. By taking our case directly to the American public, we are making sure that the American public knows how its tax dollars are being spent.⁹⁹

The second organization, the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, formed in 1980, is fundamentally concerned with the human and civil rights of Arab-Americans and Arabs living in the Middle East. The breadth of that interest naturally draws ADC into the Middle East policy debate. According to executive director, James Zogby, ADC has a membership of 18,000 with more than 44 chapters across the country. ADC appears to be a highly effective Arab-American organization with the potential to develop into a countervailing force capable of challenging the

dominance of the Israel lobby.

ADC is engaged in a wide variety of projects including: monitoring the media for negative stereotyping; campaigning against what it considers "hate groups" such as the Jewish Defense League and other "anti-Arab propagandists like the television preachers associated with the Evangelical Right and the Moral Majority"; providing internships for young Arab-Americans to work in Washington; producing films such as "Report from Beirut," which depicts the devastation of the war in Lebanon in 1982; organizing a "Save Lebanon" campaign which included helping Lebanese and Palestinian students in the U.S. who were separated from their families because of the war in Lebanon and bringing injured Lebanese and Palestinian children to this country for medical care; organizing an advertising campaign to counter pro-Israel propaganda; sponsoring Congressional seminars to inform members of Congress of the organizations' concerns; organizing nationwide "action-alerts"; meeting with Congressional representatives and Administration officials; testifying before Congress; engaging in political organizing in communities; and building coalitions with other American groups who share similar and related concerns.¹⁰⁰ In addition ADC produces a number of publications including: *ADC Reports*, *ADC Issues*, *ADC Background Papers*, and a variety of research papers. It has a fully staffed research institute.

In mid-September ADC announced the formation of an umbrella organization of Arab-American groups. The Council of Presidents of National Arab-American Organizations, as it is being called, "will coordinate activities between its member organizations and will take positions on various issues which affect its membership." The "founding groups" were listed as: ADC; the American Druze Society; the American Federation of Ramallah, Palestine; the Association of Arab-American University Graduates; the Palestine Congress of North America; the Committee for a Democratic Palestine; Palestine Aid Society; Palestine Arab Fund; the al-Bireh Society and the United Holy Land Fund.

There are at this writing two pro-Arab PAC's registered with the Federal Elections Commission. One, the Middle East Political Action Committee or M-PAC, lists James Zogby as head.¹⁰¹ Zogby, however, states that "So far

there has been no money in and no money out. We just registered in case we decided to use it later."¹⁰² Federal Election Commission records confirm the assertion.¹⁰³

The second PAC is the Americans for Lebanon Political Action Committee or AL-PAC, registered to Joseph Barakat, Sr., of Oxford, Pa. (It is thought that this is an offshoot of the American Lebanese League,¹⁰⁴ a pro-Phalangist group with close ties to Zionist and pro-Israel groups. Mr. Barakat could not be reached for comment.) In the 1982 elections AL-PAC contributed a total of \$5,500 to six candidates, including \$1,000 each to the campaigns of Senators Mitchell, Democrat of Maine, and Wilson, Republican of California, and to Representatives Hamilton, Democrat of Indiana, Hiler, Republican of Indiana, and Kazen, Democrat of Texas, plus \$500 to the unsuccessful effort of Richard Anter, an Ohio Republican.¹⁰⁵

ADC will likely participate in the 1984 electoral process through advertising and information campaigns directed toward its constituency, the media and the electorate. There is an increasing number of groups and individuals throughout the U.S., non-Arab as well as Arab, with a significantly different view than the Israel lobby of the proper U.S. role in the Middle East and of what policies best serve the U.S. national interest in the Middle East. ADC could play a pivotal role in mobilizing these diverse constituencies.

NOTES

1. Seth P. Tillman, *The United States in the Middle East: Interests and Obstacles*, Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1982, pp. 38-41.

2. "Arab, Israel Backers Lobby for Aid, Influence," *The Middle East*, fifth edition, Washington, D.C., Congressional Quarterly, 1981, p. 63.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

4. A interview with James Abourezk, "Building-up Grass-roots Support," *The Middle East*, July 1983, p. 20.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

6. Richard H. Curtiss, *A Changing Image: American Perceptions of the Arab-Israeli Dispute*, Washington, D.C., American Educational Trust, 1982, p. 132.

7. A partner of Bear Stearns & Co. who added that the firm collectively gave more than 2 million dollars to the United Jewish Appeal in 1983.

8. Curtiss, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 132.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

11. Tillman, *op. cit.*, p. 69. Also see: Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, p. 69.

12. Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, p. 64.

13. *Ibid.*
14. "Israel Lobby: A Potent, Effective Force on U.S. Policy," *The Middle East: U.S. Policy, Israel, Oil and the Arabs*, fourth edition, Washington, D.C., Congressional Quarterly, 1979, p. 89.
15. Quote told to Richard Curtiss, reported in Curtiss, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
16. Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, pp. 64-65.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
18. Tillman, *op. cit.*, p. 65.
19. Stephen D. Isaacs, *Jews and American Politics*, Garden City, New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1974, pp. 255-256.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
21. *New York Times*, December 2, 1982. Also see: Thomas R. Stauffer, *U.S. Aid to Israel: The Vital Link*, Middle East Problem Paper no. 24, Washington, D.C., Middle East Institute, 1983, passim; *U.S. Assistance to the State of Israel* (uncensored draft report), prepared by the Staff of the U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., 1983, reprinted and distributed by American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC), Washington, D.C., 1983, passim; *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, November 29, 1982; and *The Link*, published by Americans for Middle East Understanding, New York, December 1982. All of these sources put U.S. aid to Israel at far higher figures than those "officially" given by the U.S. Government.
22. *Miami Herald*, November 11, 1982.
23. *New York Times*, November 11, 1983.
24. *U.S. Assistance to the State of Israel* (uncensored version), *op. cit.*
25. Claudia Wright, "The Real Cost of U.S. Aid to Israel," *Middle East International*, July 22, 1983, p. 13.
26. *Middle East International*, November 11, 1983, p. 14, and *New York Times*, November 30, 1983.
27. *New York Times*, November 30, 1983.
28. Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, p. 68.
29. During the Fulbright Hearings of 1963, based upon documents subpoenaed from the files of some of these "American" organizations, enough evidence was found to justify their inclusion in a category described in the title of the published Hearings as, "Non-Diplomatic Representatives of Foreign Principals."
30. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., "Ethnic Groups and Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1981, p. 976.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 980.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 981.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 979.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 994.
35. Isaacs, *op. cit.*, p. 260.
36. Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, p. 68.
37. Mathias, *op. cit.*, p. 995.
38. Grace Halsell, "Interview with Pete McCloskey," *Arab News*, June 15, 1983.
39. Mathias, *op. cit.*, p. 996.
40. Curtiss, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
41. *Ibid.*
42. Interview with former Congressman Paul Findley, Washington, D.C., September 22, 1983.
43. *Miami Herald*, November 20, 1983.
44. *Ibid.*
45. *Ibid.*
46. *The Middle East*, July 1983, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
47. Curtiss, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
48. *The Mideast Observer*, vol. 6, no. 19, November 1, 1983, p. 3, and John J. Fialka, "Jewish Groups Increase Campaign Donations," *Wall Street Journal*, August 3, 1983. The figures given by Fialka and *The Mideast Observer* differ slightly in the dollar amount donated to some candidates.
49. Findley Interview.
50. *Ibid.*
51. Fialka (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Ibid.*
54. Findley Interview.
55. *Ibid.*
56. *St. Petersburg Times* (Florida), September 24, 1983.
57. There are some Jews, albeit a small minority in organized fashion, who dispute the principle that Jews have a "right" to an ethnically-exclusive state in Palestine. While believing that Jews should be free to "return to Zion" if they so chose, they do not support the belief that that freedom translates into a legitimate political-nationality claim of Jews against other ethnic or religious groups. American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism is one such group.
58. Fialka (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
59. Excerpts from the *Jewish Week*, reprinted in *Focus*, Washington, D.C., National Association of Arab-Americans, February 1, 1983, p. 3.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *Focus*, Washington, D.C., National Association of Arab-Americans, May 1, 1983.
62. *Mideast Observer*, *op. cit.*, and Fialka (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
63. *Ibid.*
64. *Ibid.*
65. *Mideast Observer*, *op. cit.*
66. *Mideast Observer*, *op. cit.*, and Fialka, (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
67. Fialka (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
68. *Ibid.*
69. Sarah Graham Brown, "Will Community Doubts Shake Lobby?," *The Middle East*, September 1983, p. 27.
70. Fialka (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Mideast Observer*, *op. cit.* and Fialka (*WSJ*), *op. cit.*
73. *The Miami Herald*, January 18, 1984.
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Ibid.*
76. *Christian Science Monitor*, November 30, 1983.
77. Isaacs, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-139.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
79. Isaacs, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-126.
80. See: Howell Raines, "John Glenn: The Hero as Candidate," *New York Times*, November 13, 1983, p. 54. See also: *Near East Report*, April 29, 1983, p. 71.
81. Albert R. Hunt, "In His Presidential Bid Glenn Is Helped by All-American Image," *Wall Street Journal*, September 14, 1983.
82. *New York Times*, September 14, 1983.
83. "Mondale Backs U.S. Navy Shelling of Guerrillas," *Washington Post*, September 21, 1983.
84. *The 1982 Elections*, New York, The Information and Research Service of the American Jewish Committee, p. 6.
85. Isaacs, *op. cit.*, pp. 116 and 119.
86. Bernard Gwertzman, "Black Clouds in the Middle East," *New York Times*, October 8, 1983. (Emphasis added.)
87. Zbigniew Brzezinski, "America's Mideast Policy in Shambles," *New York Times*, October 9, 1983.
88. *New York Times*, November 30, 1983.
89. *Ibid.*
90. *Miami Herald*, November 30, 1983.
91. *Wall Street Journal*, November 14, 1983.
92. *Miami Herald*, November 27, 1983.
93. Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, p. 66.
94. Joanne McKenna, "The Coming of Age," *Arab Perspectives*, vol. 1, no. 9, December 1980, p. 14.
95. Congressional Quarterly (fifth edition), *op. cit.*, p. 65.
96. *Resolutions*, Eleventh Annual Convention, National Association of Arab-Americans, May 1983, Washington, D.C., mimeograph.
97. *Ibid.* Also see: Ray Vicker, "U.S. Arabs ... Organize to Aid Image, Exert Political Pressure," *Wall Street Journal*, July 29, 1982.
98. "The NAAA Media Campaign," *Voice*, Washington, D.C., NAAA, vol. 10, nos. 11-12.
99. *Ibid.*
100. Interview with James Zogby, Washington, D.C., September 23, 1983. See also: *ADC Reports*, no. 14, September-October 1982, and *ADC Reports*, no. 15, November-December 1982.
101. Interview with Allan Kellum, editor *Mideast Observer*, Washington, D.C., September 23, 1983.
102. Zogby Interview.
103. *Mideast Observer*, *op. cit.*
104. Kellum Interview.
105. *Mideast Observer*, *op. cit.*

Notice

We recommend to our readers the highly esteemed magazine, *New Outlook*, published under the auspices of the Israel Peace Research Society. Established 26 years ago, *New Outlook* is unique in its goal of promoting Israeli-Arab cooperation, dialogue and the recognition of the legitimate rights of both parties.

As a magazine it is considered the main unofficial organ of the Israeli Peace camp and a forum for the most significant writers from all over the world who are concerned about peace

in the Middle East.

New Outlook enjoys a worldwide distribution among Jews, Muslims and Christians, and offers important information not readily available in the conventional press. As a publication with no official political organization behind it, it is totally independent in pursuing its goals.

To subscribe write: *New Outlook*, 107 Hahashmonaim St., Tel Aviv, Israel 67011. Annual subscription rate for the United States is \$30.00.

Book Views

The Fate of the Jews: A People Torn Between Israeli Power and Jewish Ethics

By Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht
Times Books, 324 pp., 1983, \$18.65.

By Grace Halsell

The majority of Jews have turned from Jewish ethics to worship a false god of Zionism, writes Feuerlicht, born in Brooklyn of Orthodox Jewish parents. And in so doing they relegated "much of the money and all of the power of the American Jews" to a small oligarchy of Jewish men.

Feuerlicht, in this superbly researched and written book, gives an example of how power is inbred: in 8 major national Jewish organizations, 28 individuals held a total of 108 directorships and 4 families held 31. One family held 11 directorships and another 8 and another 7. One Jewish man held 7 positions, his wife, 8. This oligarchy of millionaires and professional Jews has moved the Jewish community to the political right "because they felt most comfortable there." And using the power of position and leadership they "smothered dissent" and called it "unanimity."

No one, it seems to me, can read this book with an open mind and fail to see that Zionism equates with racism. With impeccable documentation, she delineates how Zionists using "a form of colonialism" imposed a non-resident people — Jews from Europe and elsewhere — upon a indigenous Arab population. Her examples of Israeli torture of Palestinians are among the most graphic and, to my mind, accurate, of any I have come across.

She shows her readers how the so-called "white" Ashkenazic Jews discriminate not only against Arab Muslims and Arab Christians, but also against Arab Jews. Indeed, she writes, Zionism for its own purposes created the conflict between the Jews from Arab countries and the Arab Muslims and Christians. Immediately after gaining control of power in the new Zionist state, Ashkenazic Jews began

to discriminate against the generally darker-skinned Sephardic or Arab Jews, and the Ashkenazic Jews discriminate in particular against the black Falasha Jews of Ethiopia. In demonstrations against their treatment, the Ethiopian Jews ask: Why are we rejected? Is it because we are black? Feuerlicht writes that Israel officials have countless excuses for not assisting Falashas, but "they all add up to one word: prejudice."

In our daily press, there are examples to substantiate this charge. Recently the *Jerusalem Post* reported a charge made by Eli Artzi, the director-general of the Absorption Ministry, that Israeli mayors of Eilat, Tiberias and Upper Nazareth had refused to allow the connection of water to apartments prepared for Falasha immigrants because, the mayors said, "we don't want them in our towns."

Even though Jews by and large have forsaken Jewish ethics for nationalism and a so-called national liberation movement, most Jews do not wish to be "liberated" by moving to a Jewish state, Feuerlicht writes. Seventy-five percent of the world's Jewish population do not live in Israel. Most of them by choice. The Jewish population of Israel is actually shrinking, more than half a million Israelis having emigrated.

Feuerlicht says she hopes that it is not too late for Jews to stop pretending about the Jewish past and building grandiose plans for a Jewish future. Over again, she points out that the first great contribution of Judaism was moral law, that the glory of the Jews was not in its kings but in their prophets. Tourists, she reminds us, flock to the ancient fortress of Masada, site of a mass suicide by Jews to avoid capture, and Israeli servicemen are brought there to vow that Masada will never fall again. But God ordered Jews not to die but to live, and she quotes, "I have set before thee life and death ... therefore choose life." Yet, she adds, Israelis by putting their faith in armies and weapons and by honoring kings rather than prophets are choosing not life — but death.

It is interesting to note that this book warning that the Jews are sowing the seeds of their own destruction has been issued by the *Times*, a publishing arm of the Jewish-owned *New York Times*. Although the book has been printed, it has not been publicized nor widely distributed. As the author writes in her concluding chapter: "A book critical of Israel is not burned, for fear someone may be attracted by the smoke; sometimes it is not even criticized, for fear the argument may spread. Instead, it is ignored, so it will be quickly and quietly buried."

If Jews can be faulted for allowing Zionists to make decisions for them, Arabs, Arab-Americans and Americans in general may also be faulted for not doing what the *Times* will not do — widely distribute and publicize this excellent study. Because Zionist domination may determine not only the fate of the Jews, but the fate of America and the Middle East as well, we all need to listen — and act — from the warnings sounded by the author.

Grace Halsell is a Washington-based journalist and author of Journey To Jerusalem.

In Tribute



Malcolm H. Kerr

No two men better personified an understanding of the Middle East so needed in these times than Dr. Joseph J. Malone and Dr. Malcolm H. Kerr.

Joe Malone was chairman of the history department at the American University of Beirut from 1959 to 1971. His death on December 4, 1983, came as a loss to all who knew and admired him.

Malcolm Kerr's brutal murder on the campus of the American University of Beirut in January of this year was a profound tragedy for his family, for the University where he served as President with such distinction, and for his many friends in America and the Middle East.

A.M.E.U. is honored to have had both these men on its National Council.

Books To Order

New Selection

□ Roberta Strauss Feuerlicht, *The Fate of the Jews: A People Torn Between Israeli Power and Jewish Ethics*, Times Books, 1983, 324 pp., \$18.65. Probing the legacy of Jewish history, the author concludes that the resiliency of Judaism is derived from its internalized moral code and the teachings of the ancient prophets — teachings that, she believes, are ignored by Israel's militarism, its ruling elite and its supporters abroad. Our price, \$11.00. See review on page 14.

□ Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, *Palestinian Rights: Affirmation and Denial*, Medina Press, 225 pp., \$7.95. In this book of essays, seventeen distinguished international scholars examine, analyze, and detail Palestinian national rights, including their right to national identity, sovereignty in Palestine, return, and representation. The international assessment and response to these rights and their violation by Israel are carefully probed and documented. Our price, \$3.95.

□ Dewey Beegle, *Prophecy and Prediction*, Pryor Pettengill, 274 pp., \$5.95 (paperback). Refutes the biblical claim of Zionists to the Promised Land by discussing what the Bible teaches about prophecy, especially concerning the predictions of events which already have occurred and those which are to come. Our price, \$4.50.

□ Lenni Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Croom Helm Ltd., London and Lawrence Hill and Co., Westport, CT., 1983, 277 pp., \$8.95 (paperback). Using a wide range of sources, predominantly Jewish, Brenner concludes that from the beginning the goal of Zionism was the occupation and control of Palestine, and not the rescue of millions of Jewish victims of Nazi, Fascist and other European tyrannies. Our price, \$7.95.

□ Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*, Bantam Books, New York, 1982, 622 pp., \$22.50. Drawing from the 5,000-page diary he kept as President, Carter evaluates his accomplishments and disappointments. A sizeable portion is

devoted to Camp David with minute-by-minute accounts of the negotiations and private meetings with Middle Eastern officials. Our price, \$9.50.

□ Colin Chapman, *Whose Promised Land?*, Lion Publishing, Herts, England, 1983, 253 pp., \$3.95. Outlines the conflicting claims to the Holy Land from the time of the Bible on. Discusses the relevancy of biblical promises to the modern age. Our price, \$2.75.

□ Richard Curtiss, *A Changing Image: American Perceptions of the Arab-Israeli Dispute*, American Educational Trust, Washington, D.C., 1982, 216 pp., \$9.95. Traces the evolution of American public opinion on the Arab-Israeli conflict; concludes that it is becoming more balanced, and that this trend will continue. Our price, \$7.25.

□ Saad El Shazly, *The Crossing of the Suez*, American Mideast Research, 333 pp., \$14.00. Egypt's former military commander-in-chief tells how the Egyptian Army executed its brilliant 1973 crossing of the Suez and how Egypt's political leaders turned that success into disaster. Our price, \$10.95.

□ James Ennes, Jr., *Assault on the Liberty*, Random House, 301 pp., \$13.95. The author served as lieutenant among the officers of the U.S.S. Liberty on her fatal voyage. He was on watch at the bridge during the day of the Israeli attack. Our price, \$10.95.

□ General Accounting Office, *U.S. Assistance to the State of Israel: The Uncensored Draft Report*, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, Washington, D.C., 1983, 78 pp. This report examines the full range of aid to Israel and the U.S. policies governing this relationship. Specifically it examines how the relationship is translated into policy objectives, the major determinants of aid levels to Israel, the effect of U.S. aid on Israel's economy and the U.S. commitment to develop Israel's arms industry — current and proposed. Our price, \$4.50.

□ David Gilmour, *Dispossessed: The Ordeal of the Palestinians 1917-1980*, Sidgwick and Jackson, 242 pp. Well-documented history of Palestinians, based in part on revealing quotations from Zionist sources. Author examines the status of Palestinians in exile, the complex inter-relationships of the PLO, and the Palestinians vis-a-vis the

international community, particularly with the Soviet Union and the Third World. Our price, \$3.95.

□ Grace Halsell, *Journey to Jerusalem*, Macmillan, 1982, 256 pp., \$7.95. A distinguished journalist visits the Holy Land and meets people as diverse as Mayor Bassam Shaka of Nablus and Bobby Brown of the Bronx, NY, now a Gush Emunim settler near Bethlehem. Our price, \$2.95.

□ David Hirst, *The Gun and the Olive Branch*, Futura Publications Ltd., London, 1983 reprint, 367 pp. Aptly subtitled "The Roots of Violence in the Middle East." In tracing those roots, the author dispels a number of myths about Arabs and Zionists. Well researched and very readable. Our price, \$2.75.

□ Stephen D. Isaacs, *Jews and American Politics*, Doubleday & Co., 302 pp. An investigation into the role Jews play in American politics. It explodes many myths on this subject and shows how Jews have exercised the power they have. Our price, \$3.85.

□ Michael Jansen, *The Battle of Beirut*, South End Press, Boston, 1982, \$6.50 (paperback). This book analyzes the war from its start in June 1982, to the massacre at Sabra and Shatila in September. It explodes the contention of a "limited operation" and "minimal civilian casualties," and exposes the longer term ambitions of Israel. U.S. policy is also examined, especially the degree of collusion between Alexander Haig and the Israeli leaders. Our price, \$5.95.

□ Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel*, Monthly Review Press, 314 pp., \$5.95. Expanded version of Jiryis' original authoritative account of the deprivation of Arabs living in Israel. Our price, \$4.25.

□ Alfred Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection II*, North American, New Brunswick, NJ, 904 pp., \$9.95 (paperback). Covers the Arab-Israeli conflict from the time of Herzl to the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Research involved is monumental. Contains much information of which most Americans are unaware. Our price, \$8.25.

□ Basheer Nijim, ed., *American Church Politics and the Middle East*, Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Belmont, MA, 1982, 156 pp., \$6.95. Examines the biblical, theological and socio-religious factors in the formulation of U.S.-Middle East policy. Our price, \$5.25.

□ Livia Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*, Association of Arab-American University Graduates, 1980, 68 pp., \$4.50 (paperback). Examines the 1953-57 diary of Moshe Sharett, founding member of Israel's Labor Party, his country's first foreign minister and its second prime minister. Our price, \$3.50.

Cheryl Rubenberg, *The Palestine Liberation Organization: Its Institutional Infrastructure*, Institute of Arab Studies, Inc., Belmont, MA, 1983, 66 pp., \$3.50 (paperback). This monograph studies the civilian network of social institutions and services established and operated by the PLO to provide health care, education, employment, vocational training and social services to the Palestinian people. Our price, \$3.25.

Regina Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism*, Zed Press, London, 1983, 144 pp., \$9.95. Two centuries before Herzl the Protestant revolution generated the belief that a Jewish return to Zion would expedite the Second

Coming of Christ. That belief continues among certain fundamentalists, and the author attributes the axiomatic support of Israel in the West today to this theological foundation as much as to Jewish lobbying and diplomacy. Our price, \$5.50.

Marion Woolfson, *Prophets In Babylon: Jews In The Arab World*, Faber & Faber, London, 1980, 292 pp., £14 (\$38.00). Traces the story of the Jews through Babylon, Yemen, Spain, the Maghreb, and in the Ottoman era, Iraq, Syria, Egypt and Palestine. Author points out that while the Jews were sometimes misused or persecuted, more often they enjoyed a privileged status,

respected by Muslim and Christian alike as "people of the book." In the concluding chapters Woolfson traces the growth of Zionism and its sometimes subversive consequences on Jews both inside and outside Israel. Our price, \$17.50.

Contribution to A.M.E.U., tax deductible

Free Pamphlet Collection

A check or money order for \$_____ is enclosed, payable to A.M.E.U.

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____ 17-1-84

A.M.E.U. Board of Directors:

Hugh D. Auchincloss
Atwater, Bradley & Partners, Inc.

John V. Chapple
former C.A.R.E. Director, Gaza Strip Project

John H. Davis
former Commissioner General of U.N.R.W.A.,
International Consultant

John Dorman
former Director of American Research Center,
Cairo

Henry G. Fischer (Vice President)
Curator in Egyptology,
Metropolitan Museum of Art

Grace Halsell
Writer

Robert M. Henry
Aramco, retired

O. Kelly Ingram
Professor, Duke University

Robert M. Kerrigan
Attorney

Robert E. Marsh
Independent Consultant

John G. Nolan (Secretary)
National Secretary,
Catholic Near East Welfare Association

Joseph L. Ryan, S.J.
Holy Cross College

Talcott W. Seelye
former U.S. Ambassador to Syria

Jack B. Sunderland (President)
President of Coroil, Inc.

John M. Sutton
President, Near East Foundation

Elizabeth Thomas
Egyptologist

L. Humphrey Walz
Associate Executive, H.R.
Presbyterian Synod of the Northeast

Mark R. Wellman (Treasurer)
Financial Consultant

A.M.E.U. National Council:

Hon. James E. Akins, Thomas C. Barger,
Dr. Alford Carleton, Dr. H. Kenn Carmichael,
William R. Chandler, David S. Dodge,
Dr. Cornelius B. Houk, Dr. Harry N. Howard,
Dr. Francis H. Horn, Judge Philip C. Jessup,
Prof. George Lenczowski, Dr. W.T. Mallison,
Joyce L. Manson, Sister Blanche Marie McEniry,
Hon. Sheldon T. Mills, William E. Mulligan,
Floyd W. Ohliger, C. Herbert Oliver,
George L. Parkhurst, Donald L. Powers,
Dr. George S. Rentz, John J. Slocum,
Dr. Joseph Thompson, Dr. John C. Trever,
Donald W. Wagner, Jr., Hon. Evan M. Wilson,
Dr. Edwin M. Wright.

A.M.E.U. Staff:

John F. Mahoney, *Executive Director*
Barbara Suarez, *Administrative Assistant*
David Yates, *Distribution Manager*
L. Cooley, *Editor*; F. Cooley, *Designer*

A.M.E.U. grants permission to reproduce material from *The Link*, in part or whole, with full credit given to A.M.E.U., which requests one copy of the work upon publication.

All correspondence should be addressed to:
Room 771, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115.
(212) 870-2336.



Americans for Middle East Understanding, Inc.
Room 771, 475 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10115

A \$20.00 voluntary annual subscription is requested to cover cost of postage and handling for *The Link* and A.M.E.U.'s Public Affairs Series.