BAYLIS THOMAS

THE DARK SIDE
OF ZIONISM

ISRAEL'S QUEST FOR
SECURITY THROUGH
DOMINANCE

The Dark Side of Zionism

The Dark Side of Zionism

*Israel's Quest for Security
through Dominance*

Baylis Thomas

For Mason Cooley

Contents

Preface

This book arises out of the work of the "new historians," those who have utilized unfolding Israeli archives pointing to facts previously unknown or ignored. I refer to Israeli historians such as Avi Shlaim, Simha Flapan, Benny Morris, Ilan Pappé, and the many other scholars who have gained international respect for their expertise about the Arab-Israeli conflict. My work relies on their investigations and underscores important implications of their studies. In addition, the reader will find discussion of topics related to the wider context of this history: colonialism, hegemony, weapons diplomacy, terrorism, nationalism, ancient religion, water wars, and Zionism.

I am led to the conclusion and show that, in order to establish a Jewish state, the Zionists intended from the very first to forcibly expel the indigenous Arabs, the majority population of Palestine. This was pursued largely through Jewish terrorism and by Israeli army under cover of war in 1948. In that war, Israel took by force 78 percent of Palestine, subverting the Palestinian-Arab state called for by the UN Partition Resolution. Israel subsequently sought additional wars with weak neighboring Arab states in order to demonstrate its insuperable military power, acquire territory in Arab states, and expel more Palestinians from their remaining land in the West Bank and Gaza (under Israeli control since 1967). None of this history would have been possible without the diplomatic or military support of Britain, France, and American with their various imperial, petrol, and cold war preoccupations in the Middle East.

The Zionists' intended removal of the Palestinian-Arab population was contemplated even before the twentieth century. Still, it is emotionally understandable that the colonization of Palestine and the expulsion of Palestinian-Arabs have come to be seen by some Jews and others as a *defense* against the Holocaust. And the Palestinian-Arabs, rather than seen as secondary victims of the Holocaust, have, by their resistance to expulsion and loss of homeland, been seen by some of trying to perpetuate a second Holocaust. Transcending fixations on past victimization could lead to a recognition that Israel's continuing use of force to thwart Palestinian-Arab nation aspirations only impairs Israel's peace and security.

Acknowledgments

I am most grateful for the encouragement and thoughtful suggestions offered by Steve Stearns, John Haney, Steve Ostrowski, Joan Hartman, John Davenport, David Cappella, Debbie deSimone, Amy Lyford, Jean Thomas Lyford, Douglas Davidove, Frederic Herter, Ann Baker, and Burton Pike. Norma Hurlburt, my wife, has seen this project through with loving patience and a critical intelligence that I acknowledge with profound thanks.

Gratefully acknowledged is permission to quote from *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World since 1948* by Avi Shlaim. Copyright © 2001, 2000 by Avi Shlaim. Used by permission of W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Introduction

Zionism, as discussed in this book, was a political movement devoted to the creation of a state for Jews in Palestine. It was motivated by an understandable need for security from nineteenth century Russian pogroms, other anti-Semitic persecutions and, finally, the Holocaust. For the Zionists, a sovereign state seemed the way to gain permanent sanctuary for an abused and diffused people. And yet, from its very inception in the nineteenth century, the Zionist project was understood to require the forceful submission or removal of the Palestinian people in order to acquire their territory. After the establishment of the state in 1948, Israel, with the aid of European weapons, pursued expansionist goals in neighboring Arab states. Subsequently, Israel brought under military rule those Palestinians who still remained in Palestine and confiscated much of their land for Jewish settlements. Israel's use of force has resulted in stubborn Palestinian resistance, illustrating the limits to which military solutions can solve human and/or political problems.

To understand the reasons for and scope of the present conflict it is necessary to examine roots dating back more than a century, a half century *before* the Holocaust. It was a time when Jews and Arabs were both seeking national liberation from their respective historic oppressors, the Russian and Ottoman empires, respectively. But when early Zionist settlers began filtering into Palestine in search of liberation, they adopted the usual European-colonialist attitude of contempt and abusive behavior toward the native Palestinian population. The Palestinians, increasingly dispossessed from their land by Jewish immigration, became alarmed by Zionist intentions to

take control over all of Palestine. Already in 1895, Theodor Herzl, the father of political Zionism, understood that a Jewish state in Palestine would require a fight and dispossession of the Palestinian population.

This book describes the history of how Palestinian dispossession and subsequent territorial acquisition of Arab state territory was accomplished. It is briefly sketched below in order to provide a general picture of events that led to the Arab-Israeli crisis today.

Critical decisions were made during World War I (1914–1918). During that war, Britain pledged to support Arab independence throughout all Arab lands (including Palestine) in exchange for Arab help in defeat of Britain's wartime enemy, the Ottoman Empire. And yet, Britain betrayed this pledge and supported a Jewish national home in Palestine (Balfour Declaration of 1917) on belief that the Jews, not the Arabs, could better serve Britain's postwar imperialist designs on the Middle East. Following WWI, Britain gained League of Nations "mandate" authority over Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq while France gained authority over Syria. The Arab peoples rebelled against European control, but were brutally suppressed. In Palestine, for example, resistance to British authority was crushed in 1936 by the British army and Jewish terrorists.

Following World War II, the Jews demanded a state over most of Palestine. They, too, fought against British authority in Palestine and succeeded in driving out the war-weary British. The United Nations recommended the partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Palestinian states. Ben-Gurion subverted this two-state proposal and acquired by force most of Palestine for the Jewish state. He did this through a secret agreement with Transjordan (the lead and only militarily competent Arab state) to divide Palestine between themselves. In 1948, the other weak Arab states fought in vain against both Israel and Transjordan to prevent this collusive takeover. Ben-Gurion subsequently betrayed Transjordan and, with superior forces, took half of Transjordan's expected spoils. In this way, Israel gained the bulk of Palestine (present-day Israel). Largely through terrorism, Israel expelled the vast majority of Palestinians from all Israeli captured lands.

Israel consolidated its hegemony in the Middle East through conventional (later, nuclear) arms acquired from France, Germany, and later, the United States. In pursuit of further territorial expansion, Israel sought to prod the weak Arab states into wars they would lose. Opportunity arose in 1956 when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, an act that offended the European imperial image. Israel, Britain, and France attacked Egypt (Suez War). While this aggression elicited U.S. and UN condemnation, the United States subsequently softened toward Israel when Egypt and Syria accepted weapons for

self-defense from the Soviets, U.S. Cold War enemy. Washington also acquiesced to an Israeli attack on Egypt, Syria, and Jordan in 1967 (Six-Day War) although it knew that Israel was under no military threat. As a result of the 1967 war, Israel colonized the remainer of Palestine (West Bank and Gaza), Syria's Golan Heights and Egypt's Sinai peninsula, all in violation of the Geneva Conventions. Egypt and Syria tried but failed in 1973 to recover these lost territories (Yom Kippur War). In 1982, Israel invaded Lebanon, intent on establishing there a pro-Israeli government. Tens of thousands of civilians were killed and Beirut was devastated. Under pressure from a Lebanese militia, Hezbullah, Israel withdrew eighteen years later.

The history is far more complex (see chapters 2 and 4), and disputes abound: For example, Israeli apologists claim that the Israeli military quest for security in Palestine and against the Arab states was in *self-defense*. This claim owes much to illusions about a *second* Holocaust at the hands of the Arab world—for which blustering Arab speeches bear some blame. Israel, in fact, *wanted* war to dominate ineffectual Arab states and acquire Arab territory. Nahum Goldmann, past president of the World Jewish Congress, criticized Israel precisely because of its unfettered military ambitions: "To brook nothing . . . [to] shape history by creating facts seemed so simple, so compelling, so satisfying that it became Israel's policy in its conflict with the Arab world."

Israeli apologists claim, too, that Israel sincerely sought negotiations and not war, only to be rejected by the Palestinians and Arab states. In fact, Israeli policy was premised on the view that Israel, the dominant military power in the Middle East, had no need to limit itself through negotiations. Nahum Goldmann bemoaned in 1978 that Israel had always evaded negotiations: "In thirty years, Israel has never presented the Arabs with a single peace plan. She has rejected every settlement plan devised by her friends and by her enemies, she has seemingly no other object than to preserve the status quo while adding territory piece by piece."

It is true that in 1979, Israel finally made peace with Egypt, though not with the Palestinians, Syrians, or Lebanese. Regarding the Palestinians, despite popular illusions about the "peace process," each of Israel's negotiations has lacked political or territorial substance, whether at Madrid, Oslo, Wye River, Taba or Annapolis (see chapters 7 through 12).

Without Israeli acceptance of a small Palestinian state on the last 22 percent of Palestine (West Bank and Gaza), the Palestinians will remain an impoverished and desperate people, locked in mutual terrorism with Israel. My view is that Israel, for the sake of its demographic and physical security—and the security of the Palestinians—should unilaterally accept a Palestinian

state on this last parcel of land. It appears, however, that Israel's intransigence reflects a preoccupation if not ancestral duty to focus on the tragedy of the Jews in Europe, a historical injury that seems to have blinded Israel to its current injuriousness toward others and itself. Hope resides in the majority opinion of Palestinians and Israeli citizens, the international community and all Arab states that a separate Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza is the immediate and practical solution leading to peace.

THE COLONIZATION
OF PALESTINE (1880–1948)

Concepts of Colonization

The state of Israel was achieved by means of a Zionist colonization of Palestine, a colonization that continues today on remaining Palestinian land. To provide historical context, it is useful to review the general nature of colonization, as well as the defining European attitudes toward colonization during the late nineteenth century when Zionism began.

A working definition of colonialism might be "the policy of a state or a national group seeking to extend its authority or formal control over another peoples' territory, usually through force and migration of its own settlers." Colonization is usually imposed by a mother state though it can also be imposed by a nationality or people without a state.

Another definition, proposed by David K. Fieldhouse, is: "the movement and permanent settlement of people from one country to another [where] the immigrants intend to establish societies as similar as possible to those they left behind [and who] are not primarily concerned with the indigenous people they find overseas."[1]

Colonialism should be distinguished from imperialism (empire-building). According to Hannah Arendt (*The Origins of Totalitarianism*), colonialism is expansion based on the actual needs and interests of the state, whereas imperialism is animated by expansion *for expansion's sake* in which every conquest is a way station to the next.[2]

Types of Colonization

The Zionist colonization of Palestine, like that of North America by the Europeans, is primarily that of the *settler* type involving displacement of the indigenous (native) population and replacement by the colonist's own settler population. It may be contrasted with the *commercial* type of colonialism in which the indigenous population is *retained* as a source of cheap labor and future market, (e.g., the British colonization of India).[3] Although the Zionist colonization of Palestine was intended to be, and ultimately became, that of the settler type, there were long periods during which the commercial aspect (retention of local Palestinian-Arab labor) remained.[4] As to be expected, settler colonizations, with their dispossession of indigenous populations, are marked by conflict between the colonist and colonized. Maxime Rodinson observes:

> Wanting to create a purely Jewish, or predominantly Jewish, state in Arab Palestine in the twentieth century could not help but lead to a colonial-type situation and to development of a racist state of mind, and in the final analysis, to a military confrontation.[5]

Traditional Rationales for Colonization

Historically, justifications for colonialism have been linked to ethnocentric beliefs about the colonialists superior national character and culture. Consequently, colonization has typically been rationalized as *good* for those colonized. The spread of nineteenth-century-European colonialism throughout Africa, Asia and the Americas was considered by the Europeans to be their gift of high civilization to the natives—a more or less "altruistic" injection of high culture, religion, and national character that could only be an advance for backward peoples. Herzl, the father of political Zionism envisioned a Jewish state in Palestine as "an outpost of civilization against barbarism." Although most Europeans viewed the natives around the world as *genetically* inferior—viewed them as "a kind of undifferentiated brownstuff" (Orwell)—others more generously saw the natives as a backward yet earlier form of the European himself. In either view, colonization was considered to be a gift.[6] Some viewed this injection of civilization to be the ultimate path to world peace.[7]

Popular, too, was the idea, in the case of commercial type colonizations, that a conquered people would profit *economically* from the colonizer's investment in trade and employment (despite confiscation of natural re-

sources). Moreover, the natives, seen as devoid of government, culture, civilization, or political significance, would, it was claimed, profit from *proper* government imposed by Europeans. The Palestinians, for example, were dismissed by most Zionists as politically and culturally unworthy, an insignificant people who could only improve under Jewish rule.

During the early Zionist movement in the late 1800s, a pseudo-scientific "Social Darwinian" justification for colonialism also captured imaginations. Darwin's concept of the "survival of the fittest" (those best adapted to environmental circumstances) was interpreted to mean "survival of the strongest." This popular misconstrual was not only taken to be scientific law but a prescription for what *should* be, (i.e., "might makes *right*"). Theodore Roosevelt, no less, asserted that the extermination of the American Indians and expropriation of their lands "was as ultimately beneficial as it was inevitable . . . [that] such conquests [are] sure to come when a masterful people, still in its raw barbarian prime [the colonists], finds itself face to face with the weaker and wholly alien race [the Indian] which holds a coveted prize in its feeble grasp."[8] Hitler, too, was enamored with Social Darwinism: "The earth is awarded by providence to people who in their hearts have the courage to conquer it, the strength to preserve it, and the industry to put it to the plough. Hence, every healthy, vigorous people sees nothing sinful in territorial acquisition."[9]

Colonization was also cast as *divinely sanctioned*, a providential mission by those religiously elected. Colonial expansion over the North American hemisphere (Manifest Destiny) was supposedly "allotted by Providence for the free development of our [Christian] yearly multiplying millions." The idea of being God's chosen agent to dominate, conquer, displace, or "improve" others has, since biblical times, been a central motive for both modern war and colonization—whether the British conquest of North America, Ireland, and Australia, the Dutch conquest of South Africa, or the Prussian conquest of Poland. The story about the divinely-commanded genocide of Canaanites by the Israelites still infects the thinking of ultranationalist Jews, vigilante settlers, and more than a few fundamentalist Christians today.

Transitions in the Worldview of Colonization

In the mid-nineteenth century, colonization of other peoples was still well accepted. Metternich asserted that colonies could be "freely placed, not in opposition to but in the midst of more or less backward peoples." At the time of the First Zionist World Conference in 1897, colonial expansionism was

still the accepted "way of the world." It was a time when Herzl was comfortable writing about the "expropriation" of Palestine for a future Jewish state and a necessity to "spirit the penniless population" across the border to Arab countries.[10] Maxime Rodinson notes that colonizations by the Zionists and Europeans seemed "perfectly natural, given the atmosphere of the time."

> [Herzl's plan] unquestionably fit into the great movement of European expansion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the great European imperialist groundswell. There is no reason whatsoever to be surprised or even indignant at this. Except for a section of the European socialist parties and a few rare revolutionary and liberal elements, colonization at the time was essentially taken to mean the spreading of progress, civilization and well-being. . . . There is no need for us to moralize by applying to the Zionist leaders or masses of that time criteria that have become common today. But neither do we have the right to deny that their attitude was what it was, nor to disregard its objective consequences.[11]

After World War I, however, thinking began to change. Woodrow Wilson and others at the League of Nations espoused the view that colonial domination was morally and politically unjustified, that it was neither "natural" nor "right" to remove and/or rule over indigenous peoples by force. Although Wilson's view met with significant European imperialist resistance at the time, today it is an accepted political principle at the United Nations. This modern and dim view of colonization has meant that colonization has taken a more *devious* and modern route in the form of "neocolonialism" or "informal colonialism" whereby weaker states, though *technically* independent, are controlled by dominating states pressing for regime change or multinational corporation penetration.[12]

In cases where colonization is *overt*, as in Israel's current occupation of the West Bank, moral cover is needed. The colonist's claim is one of self-defense. That is, when a colonized people offer resistance to colonization (as Palestinians do today), they are portrayed as aggressors and terrorists—as were American Indians and South African Blacks. Accordingly, the colonist's destruction of the infrastructure, culture, or food supply of the colonized is attributed to the aggression of the colonized.[13] The moral trump card of the colonist, his "war against terrorism" implies that he is the victim who "retaliates" against the colonized. Maxime Rodinson questions this portrayal:

> "It is hypocritical to condemn acts of rebellion by the oppressed in the name of some universal morality, while forgetting about the weight of the oppression and the crimes of the oppressor."[14]

It may be anachronistic to moralize about *past* colonizations. But it is not anachronistic to condemn either the *consequences* of past colonizations or *continuing* colonizations as in Palestine today. World thinking about colonization, exploitation, and forced rule has moved toward Wilsonian principles, Geneva and Hague Conventions, and UN Declarations.

Note on the Illegality of Occupier Settlements

The illegality of placing settlements on captured and occupied land derives from the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention known as "The Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War." This Convention prohibits an occupying power from (1) establishing settlements for its own population on occupied lands, (2) deporting inhabitants who are under occupation; (3) imposing collective punishment such as house demolitions; and (4) collecting taxes.

Article 49, paragraph 6 of the Geneva Convention explicitly states: "The occupying power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into territories it occupies." Consequently, Jewish settlements on occupied Palestinian territories are illegal. The United States government reaffirmed in June 1967 (and in 1978) that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to Israel and the occupied territories.[15] (Israel, while it ratified this Convention in 1951 and accepted its applicability to occupied territories, later denied its applicability.) In 1979, UN Resolution 446 stated that the Fourth Geneva Convention *did* apply to Arab territories under Israeli occupation ("including Jerusalem") and that the settlements were both illegal and a "serious obstruction" to peace.[16] The UN Security Council and the General Assembly have repeatedly condemned Israel's settlement activity as a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

Israel counterclaims that the Geneva Conventions apply only to *states and their wars, not to territories* such as the West Bank and Gaza. But the 1977 Protocol I of the Geneva Conventions explicitly states its applicability to conflicts against *non-state* groups involving "colonial domination and alien occupation."[17] Eyal Benvenisti summarizes: (1) the Geneva Conventions apply to *individuals* as well as state governments, i.e., "when it comes to the interests of *individuals* under occupation, the application of the Fourth Geneva Convention is warranted, notwithstanding conflicting claims of sovereignty;" and (2) the Hague Conventions (Article 46) which prohibit an occupying power from confiscating land, property, food, or water, "apply to all cases of declared war or *another armed conflict*."[18]

Avishai Margalit (Hebrew University) points out that the clear purpose of Article 49 of the Geneva Conventions is "to prevent permanent colonization of occupied territories, which is undoubtedly the purpose of the [Jewish] settlements. The rest is sophistry. . . ."[19]

Notes

1. Cited in Uri Ram, "The colonization perspective in Israeli sociology," in *The Israel/Palestine Question*, ed. Ilan Pappé (London: Routledge, 1999), 60.

2. Arendt compares imperialism to capitalism where money is the means to more money for its own sake and in endless acquisition. Franz Schurmann states, "a nation is primarily concerned with national interests. Empires, in addition to pursuing their own interests as nations, also pursue goals deriving from an ideology that goes beyond and is frequently incomprehensible in terms of national interests." Franz Schurmann, *The Logic of World Power: An Inquiry Into the Origins, Currents and Contradictions of World Politics* (New York: Pantheon, 1974) 16–17.

3. David K. Fieldhouse, *The Colonial Empires from the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966) 11–22, 372: George Fredrickson, "Colonialism and Racism: The United States and South Africa in Comparative Perspective," in *The Arrogance of Race* (Middletown, IN: Wesleyan University Press, 1988, 218–21.

4. Although the Zionist colonization of Palestine was nationalistically, ethnically, and intentionally of the settler type, the displacement of Palestinian Arabs was gradual. Thus, this colonization also had a partial commercial aspect. Gershon Safir, "Zionism and Colonialism: A comparative approach" in Ilan Pappé, ed., *The Israeli/Palestine Question*, 84. "The Zionist method of pure settlement" had several phases. The earliest Zionist immigrants in 1882 wished, ideally, to establish a pure settler colonization devoid of Arab labor. But they could not thereby attain a European standard of living and soon employed Arab workers at low wages. Jewish workers were a small minority. By 1905, the Jewish socialist ideal of nonexploitation of others was coupled with the idea of a pure Jewish (settler) colonization, a takeover of Palestine—"there would be no exploitation of Palestinians, nor would there be competition with Palestinians, because there would be no Palestinians" (88). The removal of Palestinian labor was partly accomplished through land nationalization set up in 1901 by the Jewish National Fund. Use of national land was restricted to Jews. The removal of Palestinian labor was further institutionalized in 1920 when Palestinian labor was precluded by the Histadrut (trade union). The settler colonization program rested, thus, on two exclusivist pillars: the Jewish National Fund and the Histadrut. The aim was "removal of land and labor from the market, thus closing them off to Palestinian Arabs" (89).

5. Maxime Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973), 77.

6. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 126.

7. "Peace cannot be had until the civilized nations have expanded in some shape over the barbarous nations." Theodore Roosevelt quoted in William A. Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (New York: Delta, 1962), 72.

8. Theodore Roosevelt, *The Winning of the West, Vol. IV* (New York: Peter Smith, 1889), 200.

9. Adolf Hitler, *Secret Book* (New York: Grove Press, 1961), 15–16. Hitler's war of conquest was modeled with explicit and admiring reference to the efficiency of American's conquest of the "Red Skins." Norman Finkelstein, *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (New York, Verso, 1995), 92, 93n13.

10. Theodor Herzl, *Complete Diaries*, ed. Raphael Patai, 5 vols. (New York: Herzl Press, 1960), vol. 1, 88.

11. Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?*, 42, 46.

12. Arthur Schlesinger suggests that American neocolonialism is more truly an imperialism: "who can doubt that there is an American empire?—an 'informal' empire, not colonial in polity, but still richly equipped with imperial paraphernalia: troops, ships, planes, bases, proconsuls, local collaborators, all spread around the luckless planet." Arthur Schlesinger, *The Cycles of American History* (Boston: Mariner, 1986), 141.

13. Colonists typically destroy native cultures and unity, not only directly, but by provoking ethnic, religious, or factional *rivalries* within native populations. The British exploited internal cleavages within India, Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, and Palestine, as did the French in Syria, Lebanon, and North Africa (Arabs vs. Berbers; Muslims vs. Jews). Rashid Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 23.

14. Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?*, 93.

15. In 1971, George H. W. Bush, then U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, declared that Israel had failed in its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention because of settlement actions "contrary to the letter and spirit of this convention." President Carter declared in 1977 such settlements to be illegal. The U.S. State Department noted that "The United States recognizes Israel as an occupying power in all these [1967 war] territories and therefore considers Israeli administration to be subject to the Hague Regulations of 1907 and the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention . . ." Country *Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1987* (Washington, DC, 1988), 1189.

16. For a review, see Donald Neff, "Settlements in U.S. Policy," *Journal of Palestine Studies,* Vol 13, No. 3 (Spring, 1994).

17. Lisa Hajjar, "International Humanitarian Law and 'Wars on Terror,'" *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 141, Vol. XXXVI, No. 1 (Autumn 2006): 24.

18. Eyal Benvenisti, *International Law of Occupation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), emphasis added, 110. Israel has not signed the Hague Convention, though its High Court has accepted the Hague Regulations as

binding on Israel in its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. Meir Shamgar, ed., *Military Government in the Territories Administered by Israel 1967-1980: The Legal Aspects*, Vol. I (Jerusalem: Alpha Press and Hebrew University, 1982), 371, 404. Cited by Jeffrey Dillman, "Water Rights in the Occupied Territories," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 73, Autumn 1989, 59, 60. Dillman is a lawyer in the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

19. Avishai Margalit, "Settling Scores," *New York Review,* 20 September 2001, 23.

History of the Colonization and Palestinian Dispossession (1880–1948)

The purpose of the Zionist project was to rescue Diaspora Jewry from European, especially Russian, persecution in the late nineteenth century. Theodor Herzl, father of political Zionism, believed that anti-Semitism was ineluctable, that assimilation for the mass of Jews was not possible and, in any event, would dilute Jewish identity. The idea of a sovereign state in Palestine for Jews was to provide them permanent sanctuary.

The immediate issue for the Zionists in the late nineteenth century was the "Arab problem" in Palestine, an indigenous population 92 percent Arab.[1] The early Zionists saw that the establishment of a Jewish state would require the removal of these Palestinian Arabs [hereafter referred to as "Palestinians"]. The idea of removal "goes back to the fathers of modern Zionism . . . one of the main currents in Zionist ideology from the movement's inception" (Benny Morris).[2] Herzl accepted the removal ("transfer") of the Palestinians, though he emphasized the need for diplomatic caution in the face of Ottoman, British, and larger Arab vested interests. In his diaries in 1895, Herzl wrote of the need to "spirit the penniless [Arab] population" across the border to Arab countries while being mindful that "both the process of expropriation [of property and land] and that of the removal of the poor must be carried out discreetly and circumspectly."[3]

Early Conflicted Relations
between the Jewish Colonists and Palestinians

There quickly developed in Palestine the usual kind of colonial relations seen in European colonies in Asia, Africa, and America, namely, contempt for and exploitation of the poorer and less organized native population.[4] According to Morris, the Zionist settlers referred to Palestinians as "mules" and behaved "like lord and masters, some apparently resorting to the whip at the slightest provocation . . . a major source of Arab animosity."[5] The settlers seemed to believe that the only language that the Palestinians understood was force—the settlers "behave towards the [Palestinian] Arabs with hostility and cruelty, trespass unjustly upon their boundaries, beat them shamefully without reason and even brag about it," wrote Achad Ha'am in 1891.[6] He noted in 1893 that "the attitudes of the colonists to their tenants and their families is exactly the same as towards their animals."[7] He warned:

> We are accustomed to believing, outside Israel, that the Arabs are all desert savages, a people like donkeys, and that they neither see nor understand what is happening around them. But that is a great mistake.[8]

Ha'am surmised that aggressive settler attitudes stemmed from anger "toward those who reminded them that there is still another people in the land of Israel that have been living there and does not intend to leave."[9] In any event, relations worsened. The Zionists thought increasingly in terms of taking over Palestine and, to that end, increasingly evicted Palestinian farmers from their homes and traditional farmlands by means of land purchases from absentee owners.[10] This caused political confrontation with Palestinians who themselves, beginning in 1907, aspired to national independence after centuries of oppressive Ottoman rule.[11]

How to Establish a Jewish State in Palestine?

The Zionists settlers believed that force would be required to remove the Palestinians. For example, Ben-Yehuda and Yehiel Michal Pines declared in 1882, "We shall easily take away the country if only we do it through stratagems without drawing upon us their hostility before we become the strong and populous ones."[12] Israel Zangwell insisted in 1904: "We must be prepared to expel from the land by the sword, just as our forefathers did to the tribes that occupied it."[13] Moshe Sharett, a future prime minister, would also acknowledged that "we have come to conquer a country from a people inhab-

iting it"—the land must be "ours alone," and negotiating with the Palestinian Arabs for their removal from their homeland was "deluded."[14]

In addition, the Zionists sought the political help of the European imperialist powers in acquiring Palestine. They sought to convince those powers (in control of the Middle East in 1900) that it was to their geostrategic advantage to legitimize, impose, or protect a Jewish territory in Palestine. The Zionists approached the German Kaiser, the King of Italy, Joseph Chamberlain (British colonial secretary), the Pope, and the Ottoman rulers of Palestine. Herzl argued that a Jewish homeland in Palestine would fit with European imperial aspirations: for the Kaiser it could serve as an outpost for German expansionism in the Middle East; for the British it could provide an outpost to guard the Suez Canal and secure its route to India; for Pope Benedict XV it could be a way to forestall a Russian Orthodox presence in Jerusalem; for the Ottomans it could be a source of Jewish capital. None of these appeals succeeded.

Zionist Alliance with British Imperialism, the Balfour Declaration, 1917

Then a breakthrough occurred in 1917 during World War I when Britain, for its own imperial reasons, offered the Jews a "national home" in Palestine (Balfour Declaration).[15] It was a duplicitous game, for Britain had already, two years earlier, promised to support Arab independence over all Arab-speaking lands (including Palestine). Henry McMahon, British High Commissioner, had pledged this support to Sharif Husayn ibn Ali, king of Hijaz, in 1915 on condition that the Arabs fight their historic Ottoman oppressors (now Britain's wartime enemy). Based on this pledge, the Arabs agreed and, led by Prince Faisal (Sharif Husayn's son) and Britain's T. E. Lawrence ("Lawrence of Arabia"), fought the Ottomans.

Naturally, the Arabs were alarmed by the subsequent Balfour Declaration with its reference to a Jewish national home (a euphemism for "state")—even though the Declaration stated that nothing should be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the Palestinians. D. G. Hogarth, head of Britain's Arab Bureau, falsely reassured Sharif Husayn in 1918 that the term "national home" did *not* mean "state" and that, in fact, the Jews were *supportive* of Arab independence. In response to these assurances, Sharif Husayn "welcomed Jews to all Arab lands."[16] Prince Faisal extended his hand to the Zionists, "mindful of [their] racial kinship and ancient bonds."

Indeed, Faisal signed a formal agreement with Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann on January 4, 1919, pledging that "Zionist Jews" would have a guaranteed status in Palestine, an enclave not a state, providing freedom of religion and self-expression. Schools would be in both Arabic and Hebrew and Jews would have a right to free immigration. Arab tenant farmers were to be safeguarded on their plots and assisted in economic development.[17] Jews, Moslems, and Christians were to share Palestine in all its public institutions.[18]

Faisal's one proviso in this agreement was that the Arabs obtain their independence on all Arab-speaking lands. That is, he cared more about Zionist diplomatic help in removing the *French* from Syria than in excluding Jews from Palestine. And he preferred this "Semitic" understanding with the Zionists rather than over the League of Nations proposal for a "mandate" system (see below) that would formalize European control over Arab lands.

Weizmann reneged on this agreement. He chose to align Zionist fortunes with British imperial power rather than with agreements with the Arabs.[19] It would be, thus, through British imperial power alone that the Zionists would angle for a Jewish state in Palestine. Stranded, Faisal terminated relations with the Zionists and at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference demanded independence over all Arab-speaking lands. He asked that a commission of inquiry go to Palestine to determine the wishes of its people.

The King-Crane Inquiry (1919)

President Wilson complied with Faisal's request, sending the U.S. (King-Crane) Commission to investigate the wishes of the Palestinian people. Wilson's belief contrary to nineteenth century European colonialism and imperialism, was that an indigenous people have a right to self-determination on their own land. The Commission reported:

> If that principle [self-determination] is to rule, and so the wishes of Palestine's population are to be decisive as to what is to be done with Palestine, then it is to be remembered that the non-Jewish population of Palestine—nearly nine-tenths of the whole—are emphatically against the entire Zionist program. To subject a people so minded to unlimited immigration and to steady financial and social pressure to surrender land, would be a gross violation of the principle just quoted, and of the peoples' rights. . . . A Jewish State [cannot] be accomplished without the gravest trespass upon the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine. The fact came out repeatedly in the Commission's conference with Jewish representatives, that the Zionists

look forward to practically complete dispossession of the present non-Jewish inhabitants, by various forms of purchase.[20]

The following month Lord Balfour openly defied the King-Crane Commission:

> In Palestine we do not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants of the country. . . . The four great powers [Western allies] are committed to Zionism, and Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long tradition, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desires and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit the land.[21]

This stance became the template for the future Arab-Israeli conflict. British imperialism faced down Wilsonian liberalism. Israeli historian Avi Shlaim writes: "Zionism was to be permanently allied with European colonialism against all the Arabs."[22] English historian Christopher Sykes writes:" Zionism found itself closely bound to imperialism . . . depending for its foundation and early growth on the success of British imperialism, and in the twentieth century that meant the failure of Arab nationalism.[23] Hannah Arendt writes: "taking advantage of imperialistic interests . . . and alienating the good will of [Arab] neighbors," the Zionists embarked on "folly," a failure to understand "the awakening of colonial peoples and the new solidarity in the Arab world."[24] A few Zionists, more humanist-socialist, such as Judah Magnes and Martin Buber in the 1920s criticized Zionism's turn away from accommodation with the Palestinians and the Palestinians own search for liberation from oppressive Ottoman rule.

The League of Nations "Mandate" System after World War I

Historically, the spoils of war have been garnered through protectorships or direct annexation of conquered territory. The victorious British and French expected just such protectorships after World War I, intent as they were on permanent control over military, economic, and political affairs in the Middle East. President Wilson saw otherwise, favoring the liberation of subject nationalities and end of protectorships. He was forced to compromise. The League of Nations adopted a new legal entity, a compromise known as "mandate authority" by which the European powers were given "temporary" governance over Middle East peoples. Their responsibility was to encourage the development of political institutions until the various Arab territories were "readied for self-goverment." At that point the European powers were expected to withdraw and independent

states automatically established. At the 1920 San Remo Conference, Britain gained mandate authority over present-day Iraq, Jordan, and Palestine; France gained authority over Lebanon and Syria.[25]

The Arabs opposed this mandate system because it authorized European control over Arab lands for an indefinitely long period at the discretion of the European power.[26] For their part, the Palestinians demanded self-determination: an independent Palestinian state with a democratic and parliamentary form of government. This demand was consistent with the principles of the League of Nations (i.e., democratic self-government) but it faced Zionist rejection because the Jews were a minority in Palestine. The Palestinians also objected to British insistence that the League of Nations mandate text—the basis for any future constitution in Palestine—include the *Balfour Declaration*! This implied that at the end of the mandancy, Palestine would become a Jewish state bearing the imprimatur of the League of Nations.[27] No less worrisome for Palestinians was the extent of future Jewish immigration and land acquisition.

The Zionist Project: Acquisition of Land and People

Conflict between the Jews and Palestinians was not assuaged by the presence of British mandate authority and its army in Palestine. The Zionist project was clear: "It was of utmost importance . . . that the Jews should come to outnumber the rest of the population and to acquire ownership of most of the land. . . . Only when these objectives were realized would the Zionists demand self-governing institutions for the country as a whole (Hurewitz)"[28]

The Palestinians were powerless to stem waves of Jewish immigration and, for several reasons, to prevent land purchases. Diaspora money for land poured in ($360 million, 1919–1936).[29] The acreage bought was modest—less than 6 percent of Palestine was purchased by 1948, the time of Israel's birth, but it was the most fertile land and strategically chosen to comprise the nucleus of a Jewish state.[30] Through immigration, the Jewish population rose from about 60,000 to 280,000 between 1917 and 1920, and by 1935, to over 400,000.[31] To accommodate this influx, the Jewish Agency and the Histadrut labor organization boycotted Palestinian labor on Jewish land or in industry.[32]

The "Iron Wall": Jabotinsky's Call for Insuperable Military Power

Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky, a journalist, militant nationalist, and father of right-wing Zionism, insisted on Jewish sovereignty over all of Palestine *and*

Transjordan (a position known as "Revisionism").[33] In 1923 he produced a plan titled "The Iron Wall" which called for the submission of Palestinians through force, though not their removal. He doubted the worth of negotiations because he believed that the Palestinians would never give up their country peaceably. Thus, they must be persuaded by insuperable military power to submit to Jewish rule.

> Every indigenous people will resist alien settlers as long as they see any hope of ridding themselves of the danger of foreign settlement. This is how the Arabs will behave and go on behaving so long as they possess a gleam of hope that they can prevent 'Palestine' from becoming the Land of Israel . . . nothing in the world can cause them to relinquish this hope, precisely because they are not a rabble but a living people. . . . All colonization must continue in defiance of the will of the native population. Therefore, it can continue and develop only under the shield of force which comprises an Iron Wall through which the local population can never break through. To the hackneyed reproach that this point of view is unethical, I answer, "absolutely untrue." This is our ethic. There is no other ethic. . . . The only way to achieve a settlement in the future is total avoidance of all attempts to arrive at a settlement in the present.[34]

Jabotinsky agreed with Weizmann and the socialist/Mapai Zionist, Ben-Gurion, that British colonial power was key. On the other hand, he disagreed with Ben-Gurion's initial belief that Palestine might be won simply by increased Jewish immigration and settlement. Ben-Gurion and the Mapai Zionists came around to Jabotinsky's position that with growing Palestinian unrest, military force was essential.[35] Ironically, it was Jabotinsky who encouraged the very Palestinian rebellion upon which his militant approach was based. For example, at the sixteenth Zionist Congress in 1929, he threw the Palestinian Arabs into a panic by flatly stating that a national home meant a Jewish *state* in which a Jewish majority would be achieved by the "great colonizing masses." Convinced that the Jews were mounting a worldwide conspiracy and massive attack, the Palestinians rioted, resulting in much mutual bloodshed.

The growing violence sparked two British Commissions to investigate its source. In 1929 the Shaw Commission concluded that Palestinian-Arab hostility related to frustration about their national aspirations for statehood and their fear for their economic future under growing dislocation and landlessness. The Commission recommended that Jewish immigration and land purchases be limited. A year later the Hope-Simpson Commission came to the same conclusion, pointing to the Jewish boycott of Arab labor as an additional provocation for violence.

Further Palestinian frustration over statelessness and increasing Jewish immigration occurred in the early 1930s. The Zionists explained this increase as the result of Hitler coming to power in 1933. Yet the immigrants were increasingly coming from Poland, not Germany.[36] Hence, it seemed to the Palestinians that Hitler was being used as a pretext. Jewish immigration seemed to them less a humanitarian cause than a Zionist exploitation of Nazism to establish a Jewish state at Palestinian expense. Regarding this perception, Christopher Sykes observes: "It had this important element of truth: that from the very beginning of the Nazi disaster, the Zionist leadership determined to wrest political advantage from the tragedy."[37] Notable, too, was that the British, while favoring Jewish immigration to Palestine, permitted fewer than 3,000 Jews to enter their larger and richer country in the same 1932–1935 period. Of course, no one anticipated the Holocaust at the time.

Once Jewish immigration to Palestine exceeded that legally permitted by the British mandate authority, the Palestinians broke into an armed rebellion (1936 to 1939) directed largely against the British. In response, the British army and Jewish terrorists fought the Palestinians. The RAF bombed Palestinian villages, killing some 5,000 to 10,000. Many tens of thousands were wounded and leaders were executed, imprisoned or exiled. As a result of this failed rebellion, the future fighting capacity of the Palestinians against the Zionists was permanently disabled.[38]

Another British commission, the Peel Commission, investigated in 1937. It concluded that Palestinian hatred and fear about the establishment of the Jewish national home had been largely responsible for the revolt. It recommended the end of the British mandate and a partitioning of Palestine.

Ben-Gurion Sees the Need for Military Force

Ben-Gurion (chairman of the Jewish Agency) acknowledged that frustrated Palestinian national aspirations lay behind the 1936 rebellion, as well as fears that a Jewish state was being thrust upon them. He knew that the Palestinians had "legitimate fears and grievances."[39] He stated, "were I an Arab . . . I would rise up against immigration" for Arabs are "fighting dispossession . . . the fear is not of losing land, but of losing the homeland of the Arab people, which others [we] want to turn into the homeland of the Jewish people."[40]

> When we say the Arabs are the aggressors and we defend ourselves—that is only half the truth . . . politically, we are the aggressors and they defend themselves.[41]

Ben-Gurion understood, thus, came to agree with Jabotinsky that the Palestinians would inevitably resist a Jewish state—that military force was necessary. Avi Shlaim observes:

> Both concluded that only insuperable Jewish military strength would inevitably make the Arabs despair of the struggle and come to terms with a Jewish state in Palestine. Ben-Gurion did not use the terminology of the Iron Wall, but his analysis and conclusions were virtually identical to Jabotinsky's.[42] When it came to dealing with Arabs, he [Ben-Gurion] had more in common with Ze'ev Jabotinsky and Menachem Begin than he did with the moderates inside his own party.[43]

Ben-Gurion was ready to use military force and a tactical first step opened up with the 1937 Peel Commission recommendation of partition of Palestine. It was an opportunity to gain an internationally recognized Jewish state in at least some part of Palestine, a part which could serve as a stepping stone for military expansion over the whole of Palestine.[44] Ben-Gurion revealed this strategy in 1937 to various party members and others:

> After the formation of a large army in the wake of the establishment of the state, we will abolish partition and expand to the whole of [biblical] Palestine.[45] I do not see partition as the final solution of the Palestine question. Those who reject partition are right in their claim that this country cannot be partitioned because it constitutes one unit, not only from a historical point of view but also from that of nature and economy.[46] [Partition] is not the end but the beginning . . . we shall organize a sophisticated defense force—an elite army. I have no doubt that our army will be one of the best in the world. And then I am sure that we will not be prevented from settling in other parts of the country, either through mutual understanding and agreement with our neighbors, or by other means . . . we will expel the Arabs and take their places . . . with the forces at our disposal.[47] The acceptance of partition does not commit us to renounce [acquisition of] Transjordan; one does not demand from anybody to give up his visions. We shall accept a state in the boundaries fixed today, but the boundaries of Zionist aspirations are the concern of the Jewish people and no external factor will limit them.[48]

The Twentieth Zionist Congress, while declaring the Peel Commission's partition boundaries to be unacceptable, authorized Ben-Gurion to bargain with the Commission for a bigger piece of Palestine. This backfired, allowing the Arabs to mobilize in rejection of partition and the British to retreat altogether from the Peel proposal. The setting of the borders of a Jewish state

by outside powers, even if only a stepping stone, was unacceptable to Ben-Gurion.

Britain, In Need of Arab Oil in World War II, Issues the 1939 White Paper

With the onset of World War II, Britain needed to win favor with Arab states in order to obtain oil—a diplomatic problem arising from Britain's brutal quash of the 1936 to 1939 Palestinian rebellion had alienated the Arab states. Hence, a radical shift in favor of the Arabs and away from the Jews was in order. Accordingly, Britain publicly revealed its long-suppressed 1915 McMahon-Husayn pledge in support of Arab independence, and conceded that it was "not free to dispose of Palestine without regard for the wishes and interests of the [Arab] inhabitants of Palestine." This reversal, in the form of a White Paper, further stipulated that land sales and Jewish immigration were to be limited and that within ten years the "State of Palestine" should be established with a government *shared* by Palestinians and Jews alike. With this radical shift, the Zionist play of the British imperial card had backfired and Britain became the new and chief enemy.

Ben-Gurion and the Jewish Agency went into high gear, demanding the immediate establishment of a Jewish commonwealth over *all* of Palestine with full control over immigration (Biltmore Hotel Conference, 1942). Ben-Gurion declared that the Palestinians were to be evacuated from the Jewish state—an act he acknowledged "impossible to imagine without compulsion, and brutal compulsion."[49] Now the focus was on gaining all of Palestine, which meant the overthrow of the British mandate authority in Palestine. Help arrived from Jewish terrorist groups (Irgun and LEHI, dating from the 1940s) against British authority and its armed forces.

Truman Favors the Zionists; Prelude to the United Nations Partition Resolution

Weakened by World War II, Britain was unable to afford the military, political, and financial costs of battling Jewish terrorism. And President Truman pressed Britain to admit 100,000 more Jews to Palestine while refusing to give Britain the military assistance needed to make this possible. The British resented this pressure from Truman, as well as the financial support of Jewish terrorism by the American public.[50]

At loggerheads, Britain and the United States made a last-ditch attempt at compromise: the 1946 Morrison–Grady Plan calling for the *federalization* of Palestine (i.e., Jewish and Arab *provinces*, like U.S. states) under a time-limited British trusteeship. This plan, offering a *sovereign* state to neither the Zionists nor Palestinians, led to rejection by both. Ben-Gurion did, however, modify his Biltmore demands: the Jews to get *most* of Palestine but also part of *Transjordan* for the Jewish state.[51] Truman was "intensely resentful" about this demand and angry about Jewish terrorism in Palestine—most notably, Menachem Begin's Irgun terrorist bombing of the King David Hotel that killed 91 in 1946. Jewish terrorism that year alone killed 373 people, 300 of them civilians.[52] The Haganah, Palmah commando unit, Irgun and LEHI (Stern Gang) destroyed anything British, including the infrastructure of Palestine needed by Britain to govern.[53]

On Yom Kippur in 1946, Truman, perhaps in an election move, announced support for the partitioning of Palestine into two independent sovereign states.[54] Britain decided to withdraw from Palestine by May 14, 1948, ending the mandate, yet to retain its influence in Egypt and Transjordan. The Soviet Union supported partition, glad to lock the British out of Palestine and make room for Soviet influence in the Middle East through the Arab states. Historian J. C. Hurewitz summed up the period: "The Palestine issue in the fall of 1947 was an Arab-Zionist contest within an Anglo-American controversy about to be drawn into the Soviet-American Cold War."[55]

Attitudes in the West towards Jews and Arabs

In 1947, the West shifted its sympathy toward the Jews, perhaps out of guilt for doing too little to help the Jews during the Holocaust. Racist attitudes were also in play: the Palestinians seen as primitive, something like the American Indians living without science and in embrace of an alien faith. Judaism, on the other hand, was seen as the taproot of Christianity. Jews were now seen as the virtuous underdogs: "the gallant little people with a great and tormented past . . . pioneers taming the wilderness . . . terrorists in the face of authority—images of a new world . . . hopeful, violent, and earnest."[56] What was there in Palestine, it was asked, that was *not* improved by the addition of a Jewish state? And what could the West *not* gain from a "strategic asset," an indebted Jewish state in Palestine from which to control the Suez Canal, Middle East oil, and passage to Asia?

Truman had effectively shifted the application of Wilsonian principles of the right of self-determination from Arab to Jew. Wilson's concept, the

inadmissibility of taking the lands of an indigenous people, was overshadowed by the unspeakable Holocaust.

Jewish-Palestinian Arguments over the United Nations Recommended Partition of Palestine

The Palestinians believed that they were entitled to a state over all of Palestine because, upon British withdrawal, this was stipulated by the League of Nations. But after World War II, the League of Nations was superseded by the United Nations. Consequently, the fate of the Palestine seemed to be in UN hands. The Jewish Agency pressed the UN (Committee on Palestine) for 80 percent of Palestine for a Jewish state.[57]

With some U.S. arm-twisting in November 1947, the UN recommended partition of Palestine: 56 percent for a Jewish state, 44 percent for a Palestinian state.[58] The Palestinians cited the inequity: the Jews, with 31 percent of the population (including 70,000 illegals), were being allotted 56 percent of the land (a per capita allotment of nearly three times as much). Moreover, the Jews owned only 6 percent of Palestine. What, too, would happen to those Palestinians that comprised nearly half the population in the territory allotted to the Jews?

More fundamentally, the Palestinians argued that *no* division of land was right, that an indigenous people on its own land were entitled to self-determination. At the least, a *single* state covering the *whole* of Palestine composed of 31 percent Jews and 69 percent Palestinians seemed to them consistent with such principles. Talk about "fair" shares seemed to them sophistic. They would lose, after four centuries of possession, what was theirs by fact and right—the Jews to gain what was not theirs. Avi Shlaim summarizes the Palestinian case:

> The Arab case was clear and compelling. Palestine belonged to the people living in it, and the overwhelming majority was Arab. In language and culture as well as land ownership, the country had been Arab for centuries. Geographical proximity, historical ties, and religious affinity made Palestine an integral part of the Arab world. It was entitled to immediate independence. Jewish immigration and settlement could not take place without the consent of the country's Arab owners, and this consent was emphatically denied. Neither Britain nor the League of Nations had the right to promise a land that was not theirs so the promise was null and void.[59]

Conversely, the Zionist argument, beyond compensation for the Holocaust, was that the Jews had a right to the land because their God had promised it, and because their ancestors had once lived there—a two-pronged argument that the

Jews were both divinely entitled and the truly indigenous population of Palestine. Argument from historical possession could, of course, equally apply to Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Romans, etc. Hannah Arendt comments on the hopelessness indeterminacy of these competing moral claims:

> The Jews are convinced, and have announced many times, that the world—or history or higher morality—owes them a righting of the wrongs of two thousand years and, more specifically, a compensation for the catastrophe of European Jewry which, in their opinion, was not simply a crime of Nazi Germany but of the whole civilized world. The Arabs, on the other hand, reply that two wrongs do not make a right and that "no code of morals can justify the persecution of one people in an attempt to relieve the persecution of the other." The point of this kind of argumentation is that it is unanswerable. Both claims are nationalistic because they make sense only in the closed framework of one's own people and history, and legalistic because they discount the concrete factors of the situation.[60]

The UN Partition Resolution (181) Rejected by the Arabs, Verbally Accepted by the Jews

It is popularly believed that the Jews accepted and that the Arabs rejected the UN Partition Resolution. The Arabs did reject partition, arguing for an undivided Palestine. Yet Jewish acceptance was a verbal evasion—"more formal than real."[61] Ben-Gurion's acceptance of partition was designed to gain time to strengthen the military in order to *alter* UN designated borders.[62] While the words of the Jewish Agency implied a fair-minded acceptance of partition, *actions* amounted to a rejection of virtually every stipulation of the Partition Resolution—a yes-but-no strategy.

First, Ben-Gurion declared a Jewish state in May 1948, he intentionally omitted mention of UN-specified boundaries for reasons of future territorial expansion. (Even today, the boundaries of Israel remain incomplete.) *Second*, just prior to declaration of statehood, the Jewish illegal army, the Haganah, invaded Jerusalem, an explicit violator of the UN designation of the city as international (neither Jewish nor Arab). *Third*, the UN plan stipulated that the Jews and Palestinians were to enter into a cooperative economic union to increase the viability of the Palestinian state, yet Jewish policy was both one of "economic separation"[63] and destruction of the Palestinian economy. *Fourth*, both states were required by UN stipulation to adopt constitutions that would guarantee equal rights for *all* citizens, yet Israel placed its Palestinian citizens assuring equal rights under martial law and still lacks a constitution. *Fifth*, the UN stipulated that no land owned by citizens was to be expropriated except for public purposes (only

then with full financial compensation), yet most of Israel is land confiscated from Palestinians without compensation and is designated for Jewish use only. *Sixth*, neither the Jewish nor Palestinian state were to be established until October 1948, yet the Jews declared statehood in May in order to hold onto Palestinian territory already captured in war. *Seventh*, the UN stipulated that the Palestinians were not to be expelled from the Jewish state and, if leaving, had a *right to return* to their homes—yet were expelled and denied return.

But the most definitive violation of the UN partition plan relates to the most fundamental stipulation of the UN partition, the establishment of *two* states. Ben-Gurion planned and successfully subverted the establishment of the Palestinian state. He accomplished this sabotage through collusion with King Abdullah of Transjordan. They made a secret agreement to divide Palestine between themselves. "Abdullah secured Jewish agreement for annexing the populated Arab part of Palestine . . . [and] promised that he would never attack the Jews or join with other Arabs in frustrating the establishment of a Jewish state."[64] That is, by agreement, the Jews would have their UN-designated Jewish state without challenge from Transjordan if, in exchange, Transjordan could invade and annex the UN-designated territory of the Palestinian state-to-be without Jewish challenge. Each would have what they wanted without a fight; the UN plan would be aborted, the Palestinian state subverted.

By this nonaggression agreement the Jews removed military challenge from the *only* competent Arab army in the region, Transjordan's Arab Legion. And since Abdullah was the elected military leader of the military forces of *all* the Arab states, he could (and did) blunt Arab efforts to block *both* the Jewish state and Transjordan's planned takeover of Palestinian land.[65] The Arab states, getting wind of this conclusion, objected to Abdullah's long range "Greater Syria" expansionist plan, which included Palestinian territory, since that expansion would have altered the balance of power among Arab states.[66]

Although the Jews had a nonaggression agreement with the military leader of the Arab world, that did *not* mean that fighting in 1948 was entirely unnecessary. It meant, rather, that an *appearance* of war was necessary in order to disguise Abdullah's collusion with the Jews. He wanted the other Arab states to believe that Transjordan would be entering Palestine only to "save the Palestinians from the Jews."[67]

The UN and U.S. Attempts to Avert the Arab-Israeli "International War" of May 1948

Once the state of Israel was declared on May 15, 1948, the world presumed that an "international" war between Israel and the surrounding Arab

states was probable. To avert war, the United States and the UN Security Council both sponsored (prewar) "truce" proposals. The Arab states (other than Transjordan) *favored* these proposals in hopes of avoiding war. The Arab foreign ministers voted on May 11 not to go to war with the Jews.[68] But Abdullah, needing a semblance of war to justify entering Palestine, overruled them as their military leader.

Ben-Gurion also rejected U.S. and UN truce proposals in keeping with the planned collusion.[69] But there were other reasons as well: (1) he intended ultimately to *breach* his agreement with Abdullah and take by force some or all of the Palestinian territory that Transjordan expected to acquire; (2) Israeli hegemony in the Middle East would be established by defeating the already weak Arab states; (3) war would make the prestate invasion of Jerusalem seem justified; and (4) the "ethnic cleansing" of Palestinians from Jewish lands would be possible only under cover of war.[70]

Looking ahead, Ben-Gurion's basic plan was to let Abdullah's Transjordanian forces occupy Palestinian land, then fight them, annex that land to Israel (subverting the Palestinian state) and, in the chaos of war, cleanse Palestinians from all Jewish-held territory. To have truly complied with the UN Partition or accepted the U.S. or UN (prewar) truce proposals would have precluded all of this expansion. That is, acceptance of the UN-designated Jewish state was only a stepping stone to expansion, the removal of Palestinians from that territory, and the subversion of UN-designated Palestinian state.

Truman was not deceived by the meaning of Ben-Gurion's rejection of peace proposals. U.S. diplomat Robert McClintock issued a stern critique:

> The Jewish Agency refusal exposes its aim to set up its separate state by force of arms—the military action after May 15 [1948] will be conducted by the Haganah with the help of the terrorist organizations, the Irgun and LEHI, [and] the UN will face a distorted situation. The Jews will be the real aggressors against the Arabs, but will claim that they are only defending the borders of the state, decided upon . . . by the General Assembly.[71]

Overview of the 1948 War: The Early Civil War between Jews and Palestinians (November 29, 1947 to May 14, 1948)

Local fighting between Jews and Palestinians began soon after the UN Partition Resolution was passed and prior to the declaration of the State of Israel (May 15, 1948). No UN peacekeeping forces were sent and the British army, previously a buffer, was only interested in exiting Palestine. The pre-state

Jewish military force, the Haganah, was, according to J. C. Hurewitz, forged during World War II "into a well organized illegal army of an estimated 60,000 troops, with a striking force, a static defense force, and reservists . . . [with] considerable military supplies acquired during World War II . . . distributed throughout the community."[72] Certainly at the time of the declaration of Israel, active IDF troops on the ground numbered more than 35,000 troops (by mid-July, 65,000). In addition, Jewish terrorist organizations (the Irgun led by Begin and the LEHI led by Shamir) have been estimated at 2,000–5,000 and 300–1,000 men, respectively.

The local Palestinians had limited capacity to fight the Jews. The British had already "completely destroyed the Palestinian leadership and defense capabilities in 1939 when they suppressed the 1936–1939 Palestinian-Arab Revolt."[73] The Palestinian leadership was exiled, imprisoned, or killed—the titular leader of the Palestinians, the Mufti of Jerusalem, despised in the Arab world for his political extremism and unpopular with Palestinians, was exiled. Palestinian family clans were able to mobilize only 3,000–5,000 men out of a population of 1.3 million to fight against partition. In reality, the Palestinians had little motivation to fight and no chance to win against the Haganah or the Irgun and LEHI terrorist militias.[74] In fact, the vast majority of Palestinians were resigned to partition "as a *fait accompli* and [did] not believe it possible to overcome or reject it."[75]

There were, however, some additional forces on the Palestinian side, some 2,000 Muslim Brotherhood volunteers from Egypt were posted in the south of Palestine. And a third faction, the so-called Arab Liberation Army (ALA), was composed of 5,000 to 6,5000 disorganized Syrian and Iraqi mercenaries, sent by the Arab League. The ALA was without leadership until March 1948, one month before its final collapse. Its leader, Fawzi al-Qawukji, was an incompetent Syrian adventurer and bitter personal enemy of the Mufti. He colluded with the Jews and refused to help Palestinian irregulars engaged in blocking the Jewish supply road to Jerusalem.[76] This collusion led to the defeat of the Palestinian irregulars on April 9, 1948.[77] Soon thereafter al-Qawukji and the ALA was attacked and defeated by the Haganah at Mishmar-Haemek. All Palestinian and ALA resistance effectively ended in mid-April, 1948, one month before the declaration of the Jewish state.

In March, just before the final defeat of Palestinian irregular forces, Ben-Gurion put in operation "Plan Dalet," an all-out aggressive campaign in both UN-allotted Jewish and UN-allotted Palestinian areas with the goal of capturing Palestinian villages and removing as many Palestinians as possible.[78] Villages were destroyed, largely through Irgun, LEHI and Haganah terrorism,

creating 250,000 Palestinian refugees.[79] This operation in UN–allotted Palestinian areas was Ben-Gurion's first breach of the Jewish-Transjordanian agreement (as well as the UN Partition Resolution). However, Abdullah did not retaliate—his 7,000 man army was no match for the Haganah. On April 30, 1948, the Haganah invaded the international city of Jerusalem in violation of the UN Partition Resolution and captured the Arab quarter.[80] This marked the end of the Jewish-Palestinian *civil war*.

The Subsequent International War with the Arab States (May 15, 1948 to January 7, 1949)

Israel declared statehood on May 15, 1948, the beginning date of the "war of independence" between Israel and the Arab states. As mentioned above, the weak Arab states sought to avoid war with the Jews but were overruled by Abdullah, their Transjordanian leader. On the eve of the international war, George Marshall, U.S. Secretary of State, assessed the weaknesses of the Arab states:

> Internal weakness in various Arab countries makes it difficult for them to act. Iraq [can only send] a handful of troops; Egypt [has] insufficient equipment for police duty at home; jealousies prevent the Arabs from making the best use of existing forces. . . . Syria, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia are militarily unimportant.[81]

The Haganah (after statehood, the Israeli Defense Force or IDF) and Jewish terrorist groups possessed far more manpower than all the Arab League armies combined, *including* Transjordan.[82] Moreover, the Arab armies were needed at home to handle their own chaotic domestic political troubles: Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and Egypt were all facing either major rebellions, coup d'états or assassinations of leadership, and their populations were rioting in sympathy with Palestinians suffering massacres and expulsion by Jewish terrorists.[83]

And yet there was an *inter-Arab* reason for these states to enter the war. Abdullah's ambitious expansionist plan for Palestine, Syria, and elsewhere threatened the balance of power among Arab states. The Arab states wished to accept U.S./UN truce proposals and even contemplated accepting the Jewish state in order to prevent war, thereby depriving Abdullah of opportunity to enter Palestine.[84] But when Abdullah overruled them, the Arab states had no way to stop his land grab in Palestine except to enter the war and attempt to block him.[85]

Clark Clifford, Truman's special counsel, clearly saw these Arab rivalries that were at play in the 1948 war: "the contest for territory will be, not between Jews and Arabs, but between Arabs and Arabs; not for Jewish territory, but for the part of Palestine assigned [by the UN] to the Arab state."[86] Egypt, for example, once it realized that Transjordan was in Palestine to annex land, not protect the Palestinians from the Jews, devoted half its limited forces to blocking Transjordan.[87]

The Breached Agreement

The international war proved bloodier than expected. Israel had already fought Transjordan over religiously symbolic Jerusalem, an area *not* covered by their nonaggression agreement. But now Israel patently breached their agreement and fought Transjordan for Palestinian territories that Transjordan had expected to annex. According to Simha Flapan, Ben-Gurion "had no intention of remaining loyal to his . . . commitment to Abdullah. He did not expect Abdullah to give up any part of Arab Palestine voluntarily. He hoped to smash the [Transjordan] Arab Legion and force Abdullah to accept territorial concessions."[88] Indeed, Ben-Gurion, with vastly superior military forces, contemplated taking *all* of Palestine.[89] Instead, he took only *half* of the 44 percent UN-allotted Palestinian state because he feared international censure and believed that the mass of angry and homeless Palestinians in the other half would be ungovernable. Israel enlarged its territory from the 56 percent UN allotment to 78 percent (56 + 22) of Palestine and cleansed that territory of 750,000 Palestinians.

Most Israeli casualties occurred while invading Palestinian territory rather than in defense of Jewish territory.[90] This was because neither Transjordan nor Iraq attempted to invade UN-designated Jewish territory. While Syria made minor attempts, Lebanon never even entered Palestine, Egypt was paralyzed in two weeks and Saudi Arabia had no army.[91] The widely held belief that Arab armies threatened Israel is without foundation. Rather, Israel violated the UN Partition Resolution by subverting the Palestinian state-to-be, enlarging Israel through war, and expelling the majority of the Palestinian population.

Expulsion of the Palestinians through Economic Strangulation, Terror, and Massacre

The 1948 war provided opportunity to carry out the logic and intent of political Zionism, establishment of a state for Jews without Palestinians or as

few as possible. From Herzl through Ben-Gurion, consensus existed that forced "transfer" was the solution to the Jews' "Arab problem."[92] Ben-Gurion's position was clear: "better that the smallest possible number of Arabs remain within the area of the state."[93] Their forced removal could be completed only under cover of war and it began as soon as Jewish-Palestinian skirmishes erupted in December of 1947.[94] Ben-Gurion insisted at that time:

> We must respond with a decisive blow: the destruction of the place or the expulsion of the residents along with the seizure of the place.[95] When in action we . . . must fight strongly and cruelly, letting nothing stop us.[96] It is not our task to worry about the return of the Arabs.[97]

Three strategies for the removal of the Palestinians were employed: (1) economic strangulation, (2) terrorism and massacre, and (3) forced expulsion with destruction of Palestinian villages to prevent return.

(1) *Economic strangulation*: Immediately following passage of the UN Partition Resolution calling for Jewish economic *cooperation* with the Palestinians, Ben-Gurion focused on destruction of the Palestinian economy: "Haifa and Jaffa are at our mercy. We can 'starve them out.' Motorized transport [commerce] . . . is to a large extent at our mercy."[98] Yadin, Sasson, Danin, Allon, and other military and political leaders agreed to this approach. Within two months of the UN Partition Resolution, Ben-Gurion was saying that Arab commerce "has for the most part been destroyed," accomplished largely through siege of Arab towns through destruction of rural areas around them.[99] Sasson reported that the Palestinians in Haifa, Jaffa, and Jerusalem were facing "hunger, poverty, unemployment, fear, terror,"[100] and Husayn al-Khalidi (Arab Higher Committee) informed the Mufti of the crisis: "There are no people, no discipline, no arms, no ammunition . . . no tinned food and no foodstuffs. The black market is flourishing. The economy is destroyed. . . . This is the real situation, there is no flour, no food. . . . Jerusalem is emptying out."[101] By mid-January 1948, Haifa, Jaffa, Tiberias, Safed, Acre, Beit-Shan, Lydda, Ramallah, Majdal, and Beersheba had collapsed. "Deprived of transportation, food, and raw materials, the urban communities underwent a process of disintegration, chaos, and hunger, which forced them to surrender."[102]

(2) *Terror and Massacre*: Panic and flight was induced by massacres committed by Jewish terrorists, the Haganah and, later, the IDF. For example, in April 1948, Begin's Irgun IZL and Shamir's LEHI massacred "with great cruelty" (and Haganah consent) up to 254 Palestinian men, women, and children from the peaceable village of Deir Yassin.[103] The world was shocked.

This, "more than any other single event, was responsible for breaking the spirit of the civilian population and setting into motion the mass exodus of Arabs from Palestine."[104] Publicly, Ben-Gurion expressed shock, yet days later ratified an agreement of cooperation between Irgun and Haganah.[105]

Attacks by the Haganah in late April 1948 led to a mass exodus from Haifa, Jaffa, Tiberias, and Safad.[106] Benny Morris concludes: "there can be no exaggerating the detrimental effect on Arab morale of the [Irgun] IZL and LEHI bombing campaigns in the big towns."[107] Massacres and expulsions also occurred at Dawaymeh, Tantura, Khisas, Sa'sa, Nasr al-Din, Ein Zeitun, Tirat Haifa, al-Bi'na, Dayr al-Assas, Nahf, Safsaf, Jish, Saliha, Hula, Eilabun, Arab al Muwassi, and Majd al Krum. Many of these massacres occurred toward the *end* of 1948 after the international war was over. There were at least twenty brutal massacres (more than fifty civilians killed in each) and one hundred smaller massacres, according to a former director of the Israel army archives who stated: "in almost every Arab village occupied by us during the War of Independence, acts were committed which are defined as war crimes, such as murders, massacres, and rapes."[108] Ilan Pappé provides full description of IDF operations, looting, and rape and fixes the number of confirmed massacres at over 31.[109] Morris notes that "almost all the massacres followed a similar course: a unit (of the IDF) entered a village, rounded up the menfolk in the village square, selected four or ten or fifty of the army-age males . . . lined them up against a wall and shot them."[110] By June 1, two weeks after the Jews declared statehood, some 370,000 Palestinians refugees had fled from Jewish-held territory.[111] The principal cause: "Jewish military attack, or fears of further attack."[112]

(3) *Military expulsion*: The majority of expulsions as well as massacres of Palestinians occurred *after* Palestinian resistance had ended in April 1948. Even before the international war, over one hundred Arab villages had been attacked and emptied without a single Jewish village lost.[113] On July 12–13, as many as 500,000 Palestinian civilians were driven out of Lydda and Ramleh by Moshe Dayan and Yitzhak Rabin (with Ben-Gurion's approval) and marched toward Ramallah, a city that suffered an identical fate the next day. Ben-Gurion was careful about revealing these expulsions for fear of international censure.[114] Eventually, the IDF systematically destroyed 531 Arab villages and eleven towns by a plan designed years before the 1947 Partition Resolution.[115] Palestinians, forcedly expelled, were kept from return at gunpoint. The Israeli cabinet resolved on June 16 to bar all refugee return (in violation of UN 194 stipulations) and army actions were taken to bulldoze or

mine Arab villages and burn fields in order to prevent that return. Looting of Palestinian property by Jewish civilians and soldiers was widespread.[116] During the July–November 1948 period, another 300,000 Palestinians fled to surrounding Arab nations because of "military attacks or expulsions."[117] Simha Flapan concludes:

> That Ben-Gurion's ultimate aim was to evacuate as much of the Arab population as possible from the Jewish state can hardly be doubted, if only from the variety of means he employed to achieve this purpose: an economic war aimed at destroying Arab transport, commerce, and supply of foods and raw materials to the urban population; psychological warfare, ranging from 'friendly warnings' to outright intimidation and exploitation of panic caused by dissident underground terrorism; and finally, and most decisively, the destruction of whole villages and the eviction of their inhabitants by the army.[118]

There were, however, limits to how far the cleansing of Palestine could go. As mentioned above, Ben-Gurion considered taking all of Palestine.[119] But about 80–85 percent of all Palestinians who had lived in the new an enlarged Israel (78 percent of Palestine) were made refugees and packed either into the Gaza Strip and West Bank or escaped to Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon—a total approaching three quarters of a million. For Israel to advance further and rule over a tinderbox of Gazan and West Bank Palestinians would have been unsafe and unacceptable to Britain and the United States.

Summary

The subversion of the UN partition plan calling for two independent states was accomplished through a collusive nonaggression agreement between the Jews and Abdullah, head of Transjordan, the lead Arab state. The other, weak Arab states hoped to avoid war yet sought to stop this subversion. War erupted in earnest when Israel breached the nonaggression agreement and took territory that Transjordan had expected to annex.

The largely forced dispossession of 750,000 Palestinian-Arabs by economic strangulation, siege, massacre, terror, and military expulsion was consistent with the political philosophy and practical intent of Zionism from its early beginnings, and was a matter of "virtual consensus" among the Zionist leadership for a decade before it was finally accomplished.[120] Neither the expulsion of the Palestinian population nor the acquisition of territory through war was an accidental by-product of war in self-defense. War was a necessary part of the Israel's plan that entailed avoidance of peace proposals, collusion

with Transjordan, and terrorism against a civilian population. Israeli historian Ilan Pappé notes:

> It is not that the Zionist movement, in creating its nation-state, waged a war that "tragically but inevitably" led to the expulsion of "parts of the indigenous population." Rather, it is the other way round: the objective was the ethnic cleansing of the country . . . and the war was . . . the means to carry it out.[121]

Notes

1. In 1906, in all of Palestine, there were 700,000 inhabitants, 5,500 of whom were Jewish (550 of these were Zionist pioneers). Nur Masalha, *Expulsion of the Palestinians: The Concept of "Transfer" in Zionist Political Thought 1882–1948* (Washington, DC: Institute of Palestine Studies, 1992), 39n4.

2. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 139.

3. Theodor Herzl, *Complete Diaries*, ed. Raphael Patai, 5 vols. (New York: Herzl Press, 1960), vol. 1, 88.

4. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 39. Settlers variously described the Palestinians as "primitive, dishonest, lazy, savage." Avshalom Feinberg saw "no more cowardly, hypocritical and false race than this race," although Ben-Gurion described them in 1906 as "good-hearted" and "easily befriended." Yosef Virkin saw the Palestinian as "almost always a submissive servant who may be exploited." Quotes from *Righteous Victims*, 43, 44.

5. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 47. Though much was made of the idea of the "new Jew" as a pioneering man-of-the-soil, economic reality forced Jewish settlers to utilize cheaper Palestinian labor except at a few sites. The Jewish labor movement failed early on. Morris, 52. The reference to Palestinian laborers as "mules" is a biblical reference to Canaanites slaves.

6. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 48, quoting Ya'akov Ro'i, "The Relations Between Rehovot and Its Arab Neighbors (1890–1914)," in *HaTziyonut*, ed. Daniel Karpi (Tel Aviv University Press, 1980), 165.

7. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 48, quoting Anita Shapira, (Heb.) *Land and Power* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1992), 90–91.

8. Ilan Halevi, *A History of the Jews* (London: Zed Books, 1987), 169.

9. Ahad Ha'Am, "The Truth from the Land of Israel" in *Complete Works* {Hebrew}, (Jerusalem, 1961), 27–29. Cited by Masalha, *Expulsion of the Palestinians*, 7.

10. Jewish co-optation of Arab elites (*effendi* class) or absentees land owners was achieved through careful distribution of favors, privileges, and special dispensations—"a longstanding tradition," Ian Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980), 203. It was not difficult to displace a rural people under oppressive Ottoman rule, heavily taxed, indebted at usurious rates and farming their land without

clear title (the only way to avoid military conscription into the Ottoman army). A. L. Tibawi, *A Modern History of Syria* (London: Macmillan, 1969), 176.

11. Yitzhaq Epstein, "The Hidden Question," *Hashiloah*, 1907, 193–206. *Cited in Masalha, Expulsion of the Palestinians*, 8.

12. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 49.

13. Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 137.

14. Text in *Ha'aretz*, Friday Supplement, December 1, 1995. Cited by Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 91.

15. Beyond protection of the Suez Canal and route to India, Britain wanted the Jews to persuade the U.S. to enter World War I on the British side and worried that Germany might be first to offer the Jews a state in Palestine. Moreover, Britain needed a foothold in the Middle East after Churchill, Lord of the Admiralty in World War I, decided to convert the British Navy from coal to *oil* burning.

16. Christopher Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1965), 30.

17. Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*. Vol. I (New York: Knopf, 1986), 121.

18. Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel* Vol. I, 166. The Arabs at the Syrian National Congress of 1919 accepted this proposal. The Zionists then rejected it as "ridiculous and dangerous." 167. Winston Churchill believed that the Jews "take it for granted that the local population will be cleared out to suit their convenience." Martin Gilbert, *Winston S. Churchill*, Vol. 4, 1916–1922 (London: William Heinemann, 1975), 484.

19. Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel*, Vol. I, 121–22. Had the Jews made common cause with the Arabs, it would have entailed removal of the French from Syria and thus conflicted with British obligations to France (Sykes-Picot agreement, 1916). Faisal condemned both the Sykes-Picot agreement and the Balfour Declaration as British betrayals of the earlier (1915) McMahon-Husayn pledge to the Arabs.

20. U.S. Department of State, *Papers Relative to the Foreign Relations of the United States* [1919]. Vol. XII (Washington, DC, 1947), 792–93.

21. Sykes, *Crossroads*, 5.

22. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 12.

23. Sykes, *Crossroads*, 5.

24. Hannah Arendt, 1944, 1950, cited by Corey Robin, "Dragon-Slayers," *London Review of Books*, 4 January 2007.

25. France invaded Syria in 1920, destroyed Damascus, unseated King Faisal and suppressed rebellions in 1925–1926 and 1945. Britain suppressed independence movements in Iraq until 1958.

26. Some Arab leaders were willing to acquiesce to a United States, though not British, mandate authority.

27. *Theoretically*, by the wording of the Balfour Declaration, the mandate authority would facilitate Jewish immigration only "under suitable conditions" and limit it so as to "ensure that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced." All parties knew better.

28. J. C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976), 21. Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky stated clearly that, "the creation of a Jewish majority . . . was the fundamental aim of Zionism [since] the term 'Jewish state' . . . means a Jewish majority, [and Palestine] will become a Jewish country at the moment when it has a Jewish majority." Cited by Finkelstein, *Image and Reality of the Israeli-Palestine Conflict* (London: Verso, 1995), 8.

29. Hurewitz, *Struggle for Palestine*, 30.

30. Kenneth Stein, *The Land Question in Palestine, 1917–1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 3–4. Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of the Palestinians* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007), 18.

31. Hurewitz, *Struggle for Palestine*, 27.

32. By 1930, some 30 percent of the rural Palestinian population was unemployed, sparking more unrest. Royal Commission's Hope-Simpson Report, cited in Sykes, *Crossroads*, 115.

33. Palestine, at the time, included present-day Jordan, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. Walter Laqueur, *A History of Zionism* (New York: Schocken, 1976), 85. Simha Flapan, *The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities* (New York: Pantheon, 1987), 17. Transjordan (present-day Jordan) was separated from Palestine by the British in 1921 and the Jabotinsky "revisionists" (including Menachem Begin) insisted on reunification to restore to the Jews both sides of the Jordan.

34. Vladimir Jabotinsky, *Writings: On the Road to Statehood* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1959), 251–60. Cited by Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 13–14.

35. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 16.

36. Of the 145,000 Jews immigrating to Palestine in the years 1932–1935, 43 percent came from Poland and 12 percent from Germany, about the same number as before Hitler's rise.

37. Sykes, *Crossroads*, 136–37. As matters worsened for Jews in Germany in 1938, thirty-one nations met at Evian (France) to examine their willingness to accept refugees (mostly Jewish). It proved a sorry affair. Neither the United States nor Britain acted honorably, each limiting immigration to only 100,000 over the next three years—though, to be fair, the number of potential refugees in need of rescue at the time seemed limited to the possible victims of Germany's Nuremberg Laws (about 600,000). No one guessed that the Holocaust would exterminate up to 6 million Jews and an equal number of others. Nor did the Zionist leaders act honorably. "Even in the terrible days ahead they did not want Jewish settlements outside Palestine to be successful. . . . This was the last thing that the Zionists leaders wished for." Sykes, *Crossroads*, 188, 189. The Zionists also worked to *resist* an increase in U.S. immigration quotas for Jews, lest Jews elect to emigrate to the United States, not Palestine. Letter of Rabbi Stephen Wise, leader of the American Jewish Congress. Cited in

Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators* (London: Croom Helm, 1983), 146–47. After the war, some Zionists also opposed Truman's efforts to resettle more Jews in the United States (and other countries) because that would have weakened the case for a Jewish state. Alan Taylor, *Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy, 1897–1947* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1970), 89ff. "The prevailing opinion [of the Israeli public] has been that the Yishuv . . . failed to do what could have been done to rescue Jews in Nazi-occupied countries." Dina Porat, *The Blue and Yellow Stars of David: The Zionist leadership in Palestine and the Holocaust, 1939–1947* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), Intro.

38. The British army employed eighteen battalions and two squadrons of RAF planes to bomb Palestinian villages. Palestinian nationalism and revolt were under the leadership of Hajj Amin al-Husayni, grand mufti of Jerusalem, who was deported to Iraq by the British in 1937. Approximately 10 percent of the Palestinian adult male population was killed, wounded, imprisoned or exiled. Rashid Khalidi, "Shared Responsibilities," *London Review of Books*, August 16, 2007, 31.

39. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 136.

40. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, quoting Shabtai Teveth, *Ben-Gurion and the Palestinian Arabs, Peace to War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 165, 166–68.

41. Ben-Gurion quote cited in Simha Flapan, *Zionism and the Palestinians* (London: Croom Helm, 1979), 141.

42. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 19.

43. Avi Shlaim, *Collusion Across the Jordan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 610.

44. Simha Flapan, *Birth*, 21, 22. Keith Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian history* (London: Routledge, 1996), 126. Israel Shahak, *J. of Palestine Studies*, Spring 1981.

45. Zeev Tzur, *From the Partition Dispute to the Allon Plan* (Tel Aviv, 1982), 12. Cited in Simha Flapan, Birth, 20.

46. Tzur, *From the Partition*, 20. Cited in Flapan, *Birth*, 22.

47. David Ben-Gurion, *Letters to Paula and the Children* (Hebrew, Tel Aviv, 1968) 210–13, cited in Flapan, *Birth*, 22. Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Political Biography* (Hebrew, Tel Aviv, 1977) Vol. 2, 702–3, cited by Jerome Slater, *London Review of Books*, June 8, 2006, 4.

48. Speech of 1937, cited in *New Outlook* (Tel Aviv), April 1977, from Ben-Gurion's *Memoirs*, vol. 4, 151.

49. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, Letter, *London Review of Books*, May 11, 2006, 4. Ben-Gurion declared in 1948: "I am for compulsory transfer; I don't see anything immoral in it." Ben-Gurion, minutes of the Jewish Agency Executive, June 12, 1948. *Central Zionist Archives* (Jerusalem). Cited by Flapan, *Birth*, 103. Ben-Gurion added for tactical reasons: "we have to state the principle of compulsory transfer without insisting on its immediate implementation."

50. "Pro-terrorist advertisements in the American press provoked bitter reaction in Britain." J. C. Hurewitz, *The Struggle for Palestine*, 278, 300. Jewish-owned department

stores boycotted the *New York Times* when it briefly refused to run Irgun fund-raising ads by the *American League for a Free Palestine*. Alfred Lilienthal, "Book on Times' Editor," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* (June 1989), 22.

Note: The Irgun, initially led by Jabotinsky, then Menachem Begin, employed terrorism against the British army after 1944, as did the LEHI, led by Abraham Stern and then Yitzhak Shamir, Israel Scheib, and Narhan Yellin-Mor. Tessler, *History*, 207. After World War II the Zionists also went on a successful propaganda attack against the British, wrongly claiming that Britain sank or turned back Jewish refugee ships to axis-occupied countries during the war. According to Christopher Sykes, no cases are known in which refugee ships were sent back to Axis-occupied countries after April 1939 despite many claims otherwise. Sykes, *Crossroads*, 221.

51. Michael J. Cohen, *Palestine and the Great Powers, 1945–1948* (Princeton; Princeton University Press, 1982), 139. Ben-Gurion's plan was that Transjordan would annex densely populated Arab areas in Palestine, the remainder of Transjordan to be annexed by the Jews. Note: Britain had installed Abdullah (second son of Sharif Husayn) as monarch of Transjordan, and after 1928, Britain retained control of Transjordan's foreign relations and training of its army.

52. Mark Tessler, *History*, 256.

53. Destroyed were British military installations, planes, radar stations, railroads, utilities, and police stations. Acre Prison was dynamited to release convicted terrorists. In 1944 the LEHI, under Yitzhak Shamir's guidance assassinated a British minister, mistakenly thought to be anti-Zionist.

54. According to historian Michael Cohen, the decisive factor in Truman's decision was "the Democratic Party's need to mobilize the Jewish vote in the impending congressional elections." Rabbi Silver, head of the American Zionist Organization saw it as simply "a smart preelection move." Steven L. Spiegel, *The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1985), 19.

55. Hurewitz, *Struggle for Palestine*, 301.

56. Albert Hourani, quoted in Sachar, *A History of Israel* Vol. I, 295.

57. Ilan Pappé, "The Geneva Bubble," *London Review of Books*, 8 January 2004, 17.

58. The United States pressured the Philippines, Liberia, Haiti, Cost Rica, Greece, China, and France. William Roger Louis, *The British Empire in the Middle East, 1945–1951: Arab Nationalism, the United States, and Postwar Imperialism* (New York, Oxford University Press 1986), 483n13, 485–86, 491. Michael Cohen, *Palestine and the Great Powers, 1945–1948*, 295–98.

59. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 4.

60. Hannah Arendt, *The Jew as Pariah: Jewish Identity and Politics in the Modern Age*, ed. Ron Feldman (New York: Grove Press, 1978), 200–201.

61. Flapan, *Birth*, 44.

62. Ben-Gurion: "As for setting the borders—its an open-ended matter. In the Bible as well as in history there are all kinds of definitions of the country's borders, so there's no real limit. No border is absolute." Six months before the UN vote on

partition, Ben-Gurion explained that his acceptance of the principle of partition was an attempt to gain time to strengthen the Jewish military, the vehicle for *altering* borders. He pledged to Mapai's Central Committee that the UN-partition borders were not to be considered permanent. Shlomo Ben-Ami, *Scars of War, Wounds of Peace: The Israeli-Arab Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 34.

63. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Annual Reports* (Washington, DC: State Department 1971) 1947, vol. 5, 1241.

64. Avi Shlaim, *The Politics of Partition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 100. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 116. Abdullah kept his promise. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 239.

65. Warren Austin, U.S. ambassador to the UN, indicated that the intervention of any Arab states except Transjordan would be of "negligible importance." *Foreign Relations of the United States*, annual reports (State Department, Washington, 1971) 1948, May 8, 1948, 936–41.

66. Abdullah's "Greater Syria" plan was for the creation of a large Arab state composed of Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Transjordan, and perhaps Saudi Arabia. This plan would have created a radical shift in balance of power between independent Arab states, a deep worry to Syria and Egypt. Abdullah and his brother Faisal were the sons of Sharif Husayn who intended, with British help in 1915, to establish an independent state over the entire Arab-speaking world. Abdullah saw himself as the carrier of this historical mission. He believed that the Syrians would enthusiastically receive him as king (as they had his brother Faisal in 1920). Flapan, *Birth* 181. Note: Syria, formerly a Hashemite kingdom like Transjordan and Iraq, was briefly ruled by Abdullah's brother, Faisal until expelled by the French in 1921. As reward for not coming to his brother's defense, Britain awarded Abdullah rule over poor, backward Transjordan which was, for Abdullah, merely a way station to the throne in Damascus. Flapan, *Birth*, 126–27. Abdullah, *My Memoirs Completed* (London: Longman, 1978), 30.

67. Abdullah hoped to arrange and proposed mock battles so that the other Arab countries would not detect his collusion with the Jews. Israel, however, declined the proposal. Avi Shlaim notes, "It should not have been beyond the realm of possibility to preserve the spirit of the agreement by adopting new tactics—by staging mock battles, for example to enable Abdullah to pose as a great Arab nationalist while at the same time averting a real military clash. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 214.

68. On May 4, Azzam Pasha, secretary general of the Arab League, asked Abdullah to join in this acceptance of truce. Abdullah refused since that would have precluded the secret invasion agreement with the Jews. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Annual Report, 894–95* [May 4, 1948] (Washington, DC, 1971), cited in Flapan, Birth, 174.

69. Flapan, *Birth*, 174. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 192.

70. Ben-Gurion "knew that transfer would be possible only in the midst of war, not in 'normal times.'" Ben-Ami, *Scars of War*, 26. Already in 1937 Ben-Gurion understood this: "The Arabs will have to go, but one needs an opportune moment for

making it happen, such as war." Charles Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Boston and New York: Beford/St. Martin's, 2004), 167–68. Also cited by Ilan Pappé, "State of Denial: Israel, 1948–2008," *The Link* Vol. 41, Issue 2, April–May 2008, 6.

Ethnic cleansing is "any action by one ethnic group meant to drive out another ethnic group with the purpose of transforming a mixed ethnic region into a pure one." See U.S. State Department and UN websites. Ethnic cleansing is by international law a crime against humanity.

71. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Annual Report, 894–95* [May 4, 1948] (Washington, DC, 1971), cited in Flapan, *Birth*, 174.

72. Hurewitz, *Struggle*, 239. "The haganah contained most of the enlistees from the Jewish Brigade and other branches of the British armed forces, now being gradually demobilized. Moreover, the equivalent of one year's compulsory military training for high school seniors was inaugurated in November 1945."

73. Ilan Pappé, "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 141, XXXVI, Vol. 1 (Autumn 2006), 14.

74. Ben-Gurion: "The decisive majority of them [Palestinians], do not want to fight us, and all of them together are unable to stand up to us, even at the present state of our organization and equipment." *Political and Diplomatic Documents of the Central Zionist Archives and the Israeli State Archives*, doc. 274, 460. Cited in Flapan, *Birth*, 73.

75. Report of Arab affairs expert Ezra Danin in *Political and Diplomatic Documents of the Central Zionist Archives and Israel State Archives, December 1947–May 1948* (Jerusalem, 1979). Doc. 90, 128. Cited in Flapan, *Birth*, 73.

76. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 158. The Palestinian siege of Jerusalem was possible only because Ben-Gurion had posted most of the Haganah on the *periphery* of Jewish territory in order to show the world that a Jewish state was viable and defensible.

77. Qawukji was chosen by the Arab League to lead the ALA just because he *opposed* the Mufti and the disaster-prone local Palestinians. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 155. The Arab League opposed the Mufti because he unrealistically sought an independent state over *all* of Palestine. Qawukji, like Abdullah, wanted Palestine to be annexed to Transjordan.

78. Ben-Gurion decided to press on to military victory before the United States could organize a UN vote on trusteeship. He was convinced, already in March 1948, that he could demonstrate not mere military self-sufficiency but *definitive* victory and thus declare statehood as soon as possible. Plan Dalet was drawn up in the early 1940s in anticipation of post-World War II conflict with the Palestinians. Ilan Pappé, "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 141, Vol. XXXVL, No. 1 (Autumn 2006), 11.

79. Flapan, *Birth*, 42.

80. By UN resolution, Jerusalem was designated as an international city, neither Jewish nor Arab. Thus, the Haganah advance on the city was a violation of the UN plan and a provocation to Abdullah, guardian of sacred Muslim shrines. Abdullah proposed to avoid war by dividing the city (East = Arab, West = Jewish) and sug-

gested a mock battle in order not to appear to be in cahoots. Britain proposed a truce in Jerusalem on May 7 which Transjordan accepted. The Jews continued making military headway in Jerusalem, captured the Arab quarter (Katamon) and eventually accepted a limited truce. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 180, 239, 245.

81. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Annual Report, 1947*, 983 (Washington, DC: U.S. State Department, 1971). Cited in Flapan, *Birth*, 191. Also, Dean Rusk's statement: "Jewish military superiority which now obtains in Palestine" in "Draft Memorandum by the Director of the Office of United Nations Affairs (Rusk) to the Under Secretary of State (Lovett) [Jewish aggression]," Secret, Washington, DC, May 4, 1948.

82. The total number of Arab forces in mid-May was less than 25,000, compared to the 35,000 IDF. By the final stages of war, the IDF superiority was two to one. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 35. Flapan, *Birth*, 196. The Arabs knew that massive numbers of weapons were secreted into Palestine by the Jews while the British were preparing to depart. And stores of modern weapons, including tanks, aircraft, artillery, and small arms purchased abroad, awaited transfer to Palestine on British exit. By the time of statehood, Israel had acquired 30,000 rifles, 5,000 machine guns, 200 heavy machine guns, 30 fighter aircraft, several B-12 Flying Fortresses, 50 65 mm cannon, 35 anti-aircraft guns, and 12 heavy mortars, all with large stores of ammunition. Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *O Jerusalem* (New York: Pocket Books, 1972), 410.

83. Hurewitz, *Struggle*, 318–19.

84. "The Arabs would now welcome almost any face-saving device if it would prevent open war. Might even accept de facto partition . . . [rather than] march of Abdullah's troops to Jewish-Arab frontier." U.S. ambassador in Cairo. *United States National Archives, 867N 01/5-1378, cable 513 from Cairo, May 13, 1948*. Flapan, *Birth*, 181.

85. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 189.

86. Clifford Papers, *Truman Library (May 9, 1948), box 13*. "It may be argued that the Arab League's decision to intervene was rooted not in a common interest to save Palestine for the Palestinians or to defeat Zionist ambitions, but in inter-Arab fears and rivalries." Avi Shlaim, *The Politics of Partition*, 160. Other jealousies existed between Saudi Arabia and the Syrians, on the one hand, and the Hashemite governments of Transjordan and Iraq on the other.

87. Flapan. *Birth*, 151.

88. Flapan, *Birth*, 137.

89. By mid-July, 1948, Israel had about *twice* the military force of all Arab states *combined* and was able with mop-up operations to take as much of remaining Palestine as desired or tolerable to the international community. Fred Khouri, *The Arab-Israeli Dilemma* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1985, 71, 72, 546n5.

90. Israeli soldiers killed within the borders of the UN-allotted Jewish state was 1,581; killed outside those borders was 2,759. Flapan, *Birth*, 198–99.

91. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 239.

92. Moshe Sharett, the Jewish leader most liberal and accommodative to Arab interests, declared in 1944: "Transfer could be the crowning achievement, the final

stage in the development of policy . . ." *Central Zionist Archives S1000/42B*, protocol of meeting of Jewish Agency Executive, May 7, 1944. Cited by Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 254. Chaim Weizmann took the same position regarding "transfer."

93. Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Political Biography* (Hebrew, Tel Aviv), 1977) Vol. 2, 702–3. Cited by Flapan, *Birth*, 84.

94. See note 70.

95. Ben-Gurion, *War Diaries* (Hebrew, Tel Aviv) 1982) 3 Vols., ed. Gershon Rivlin and Elhannan Oren. December 19, 1947, 58. Cited in Simha Flapan, *Birth* , 90.

96. Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion*, Vol. 2, 680. Cited in Simha Flapan, *Birth*, 90.

97. Ben-Gurion, War Diaries, May 1, 1948, 382. Flapan, *Birth*, 84.

98. Ben-Gurion letter to Sharett, December 14, 1947. Political and Diplomatic Documents of Central Zionist Archives/Israel State Archives, doc. 45, p. 60. Cited by Flapan, *Birth*, 91.

99. Ben-Gurion, *War Diaries*, January 15, 1948, 156. Cited by Flapan, *Birth*, 92.

100. *Political and Diplomatic Documents of Central Zionist Archives/Israel State Archives*, December 1947–May 1948 (Jerusalem 1979) doc. 100, 145. Cited by Flapan, *Birth*, 92.

101. Ben-Gurion, *War Diaries*, January 15, 1948, 156.

102. Ben-Gurion, *War Diaries*, January 15, 1948, 156. The following month, February 1948, Palestinian irregulars adopted the same siege tactic at Jerusalem for two months until defeat.

103. Ilan Pappé, however, reports the number as closer to *half* of 254. *The Ethnic Cleansing of the Palestinians*, 91.

104. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 164. The massacre involved rape, theft, torture, and killing. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 208.

105. Ben-Gurion vigorously denied Haganah involvement in what he called a "brutal and barbaric deed." However, Morris states that the attack was "undertaken with the reluctant, qualified consent of the Haganah commander in Jerusalem." Morris, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem 1947–1949* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 113–14. The Irgun claimed that the Haganah had approved the attack. Flapan, *Birth*, 94.

106. "Almost every instance—the exodus from Haifa (April 21–May 1), from Jaffa (late April–early May), from Tiberias (April 17–18), from Safad (May 10)—was the direct and immediate result of an attack on and conquest of Arab neighborhoods and towns. . . . In no case did a population abandon its homes before an [Haganah] attack; in almost all cases it did so on the very day of the attack and in the days immediately following." Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 255. In early May, before the declaration of Israeli statehood, the Arab states cautioned the Palestinians to stay put, or, if already left, pressured them to return to their homes (256).

107. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 254.

108. Finkelstein, *Image and Reality*, 110. Morris, *Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem 1947–1949*, 592. Later massacres involving women and children occurred at

Qibya, Baher al-Bakr, Irbid, Sidon, ar-Rashadiyeh, and al-Fakahani. David Shipler, *Arab and Jew: wounded spirits in a promised land* (New York: Penguin Books, 1987), 206. Men in villages of 1,500 were often executed on the spot (some 20–30), according to Ilan Pappé, "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," 13–14.

109. Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of the Palestinians* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007), 258.

110. Benny Morris quoted by Rabbi Michael Lerner, *Healing: Israel/Palestine* (San Francisco: Tikkun Books, 2003), 64, 65.

111. Flapan, *Birth*, 89.

112. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 255. Some 10 percent of urban or wealthier Palestinians left voluntarily upon collapse of the community and inevitability of Jewish conquest of Palestine.

113. Flapan, *Birth*, 193.

114. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 253, 257. Ben-Gurion: " Were I asked what should be our program, it would not occur to me to tell them transfer . . . because speaking about the matter might harm [us] . . . in world opinion." (254). Written orders may not have been given, only promotions. According to Morris, Ben-Gurion "always refrained from issuing clear or written expulsion orders; he preferred that his generals 'understand' what he wanted done. He wished to avoid going down in history as the 'great expeller' and he did not want the Israeli government to be implicated in a morally questionable policy." Morris, *Birth*, 292–93. Ilan Pappé, however, states that written orders *were* given: "handed down to brigade commanders not as vague guidelines, but as clear-cut operative orders for action. "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," 17.

115. Ilan Pappé, "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," 11.

116. Looting by Jewish civilians and the army was massive. For example, the army removed 15 tons of Palestinian property each day from Jaffa; in Jish, the army stole 605 pounds of jewelry and shot the robbed who asked for receipts. Tom Segev, *1949: The First Israelis* (New York: The Free Press, 1986), 72, 73. Ben-Gurion wrote on June 16, 1948, "There is a moral defect in our ranks that I never suspected existed: I refer to mass looting in which all sections of this [Israeli] population participated. This is not only a moral defect but a grave military defect." *War Diaries*, 524 (Cited by Flapan, *Birth*, 100). Expulsion and massacre seemed not to elicit Ben-Gurion's moral qualms.

117. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 257.

118. Flapan, *Birth*, 90.

119. Ben-Gurion: "I assume that most of the Arabs of Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Hebron would flee, like the Arabs of Lydda, Jaffa, Tiberias and Safad, and we will control the whole breadth of the country up to the Jordan." Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion* Vol. 2, 823. Cited in Flapan, Birth, 50.

120. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 253–54.

121. Ilan Pappé, "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," 17, 18.

DOMINATION OF ARAB STATES (1949–1974)

Hegemony in the Middle East

Though the word *hegemony* may refer to leadership, in the political arena the word refers, as here, to the intimidating influence of one state on others. The primary basis for that influence is military supremacy, that position of a state in which "no other state has the military wherewithal to put up a serious fight against it."[1] The term 'hegemony' came into popular usage during the cold war with reference to the military-backed capacity of the West or the Soviet "camps" to dominate, control or at least gain the political alignment of other states.

When the influence of one state over others is not primarily accomplished through *military* intimidation, the term "neocolonialism" better applies, as in situations of economic control through multinational corporations;[2] political pressure for "regime change;" or "protectional" relations such as defense treaties or military assistance.

Hegemony over the Middle East

Many nations aspire to hegemony, but in the Middle East it is the United States and its Israeli strategic partner that possess intimidating and over-arching power. Both nations have sought a *preponderance* of power rather than a *balance* of power among other nations. Both have a proclivity for rein-terpreting international law, dispensing with negotiation, and threatening to use force to attain what they consider their "national security." Both explain their current wars as fights in self-defense against terrorisms, seeming to ignore the effect of their own provocations or intimidating behavior on the

security of others. Seeing themselves as outposts of democracy in a sea of Islamo-fascist evil, they appear to be blinded by a sense of mission and a belief in the righteousness of their own power. Israel and the United States find, paradoxically, virtue in their exercise of intimidating power as though nothing more than a simple preservation of their national security.

The United States has, since 1967, been the guardian, apologist, strategic partner, and model for Israel's use of force against its Arab neighbors. Moreover, Israel has enjoyed virtual *carte blanche* regarding its military behavior, and gained immunity from UN condemnations through the backing of the United States which has, itself, since the Monroe Doctrine, been a militant global power.[3] Both the United States and Israel are intolerant of all rival states (recently Iran) that might try to attain parity in military power, even if for their own protection. Israel's huge military force and sole possession of nuclear weapons in the Middle East exemplifies the essence of what is meant by the term *hegemony*.

Dominance Strategy versus International Cooperation

Hobbes, the seventeenth century political philosopher, argued that every man is by nature a selfish animal at constant war with his fellows. Thus, to deal with ongoing fears of a violent death at the hand of others in a "state of nature," men chose to submit to a governing sovereign ruler, a surrender of autonomy for the sake of security—in modern times, a surrender to law.

In a parallel way, states, like individuals, live in fear of each other. They, too, may rationally surrender certain sovereign "rights" or interests to a higher authority. By accepting international law, for example, states attain greater security. While the historical record suggests that this trade-off has had only partial success in achieving security, supranational institutions such as the United Nations, the World Court, the Hague and Geneva Conventions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Non-Proliferation Treaty have nonetheless had a palpable positive effect. The limits on these effects reflects the fact that states have *unequal* military, political or economic power. A truly powerful state can pursue its own interests with relative impunity—avoiding what it considers impairments that accommodation to international law or institutions might entail. Thus, dominance is often presumed by states to be to their advantage.

The "Realist" Schools of International Domination

The realists (from Machiavelli to Hans Morgenthau) hold that the main factor influencing governments in their international relations is pursuit of *mil-*

itary dominance over others—whether for purposes of survival, territorial integrity, domestic political order, or imperialism.[4] In contrast, idealists insist that the internationally-accepted concept of national sovereignty means that all states are *equal*—that is, equally and inviolately sovereign. The realists dismiss this notion of equality as mere legal fiction.

Within the realist school there are two camps: the "offensive" and the "defensive" realists. The offensive realists hold that great powers (even liberal states) are never satisfied with their power, and are always working to increase ever more their power in belief that security, political order, and survival depend on a state's capacity to coerce others. Their underlying premise is that states inhabit a fundamentally *anarchic* world in which the national interests of states conflict with each other. Moreover, the offensive realists presume that no "Hobbesian" *global* authority could be strong enough to curb powerful individual states. Thus, in a world lacking sufficient central authority, to surrender military or political power would be self-impairing. This offensive realist position is that of the hegemonic state, committed to the proposition that national security turns on unfettered autonomy and paramount military power.[5] There are, of course, some problems implicit in this position, and not only for the weaker and intimidated states—since powerful states also compete with each other and wars become likely.[6] Indeed, mere suspicion of hostile intent or military parity in a competing hegemon can end in conflict—the so-called "tragedy of the great powers."[7]

The other camp of realists, the "defensive" realists, concede that the *goal* of every state may be possession of coercive power. Yet they believe that a *coalition of states* can and will arise in opposition to dominating powers. Presumably, this coalition would be an effective counterforce. Defensive realists even believe that dominating states will *anticipate* this counterforce—whether in the form of explicit military coalition or other international pressures—and *choose* to conform to coalition pressures. It can be seen that for the offensive realist, military power is something to be *unleashed*; for the defensive realist it is something to be *counterbalanced*—the difference between *raison d'état* and *raison du systèm*.

Mark of the Hegemonic Offensive Realist State: (1) a huge military, (2) evasion of international laws and Conventions, and (3) pursuit of preemptive wars

(1) Intimidation of other states requires massive military expenditures in excess of all practical needs for self-defense. The military expenditure of the United States, for example, equals half of the world's *total*.[8] Israel spends 20

to 40 percent of its national budget on military/security expenditures and is the largest global recipient of U.S. foreign aid, grants, weaponry, and technological transfers.[9] Since 1982, the United States has *guaranteed* Israel's military supremacy in the Middle East by pledging to maintain its "qualitative edge" in weapons over that of all others in the Middle East—a pledge repeated by Clinton in 1993 and by George W. Bush in 2007.[10]

(2) Offensive realist states are also marked by their disregard for international restrictions, laws, and Conventions that would limit their behavior. Israel has demonstrated this kind of exceptionalism by its violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Hague and Geneva Conventions, and UN resolutions regarding the protection of civilians under military occupation. Protections, which Israel ignores, include prohibitions on deportation, settlement building on occupied lands, imprisonment without charge, torture, assassination, collective punishment, and confiscation of land and water.[11] The United States has also shown similar disregard for international curbs on its autonomy.[12]

(3) Offensive realists rationalize their wars as "preemptive," that is, conducted in anticipation of an imminent attack—as distinct from "preventative" when an attack is considered inevitable but not imminent. Preventative wars are intentionally considered to be illicit, but even preemptive wars must be authorized by the United Nations. That is, *only* the international community can determine the legitimacy of any war.[13] Article 51 of the UN Charter restricts unauthorized defensive responses to only those instances where a state undergoes *immediate armed attack*, not an "anticipated imminent attack." And even in those cases of immediate armed attack, the response must be reported to the UN Security Council and force continued only with UN concurrence. This UN prohibition on preemptive wars represented a significant advance in the history of international affairs.[14]

Yet Israel and the United States have disregarded this advance. Israel alleges, without merit, that its wars on Arab states in 1956, 1967 and 1982 were preemptive, that is in anticipation of Arab attack (see chapter 4).[15] The U.S. war on Iraq in 2003 was similarly alleged to be in defense against an "imminent military threat" which, proving illusory, was downgraded to a crusade for "freedom and democracy" and regime change. Nevertheless, George W. Bush insisted in 2002 that the United States would "not hesitate" to act preemptively and alone, (i.e., that international agreement was *not* necessary for U.S. military strikes). Bush further asserted that the United States would through military force "dissuade" all others who attempted military *parity* with the United States—the baldest possible statement of U.S. global hegemony.[16]

Israel and the United States have gained their status as hegemonic powers through their offensive realist policies, namely, the possession and use of massive military force, indifference to international laws, and pursuit of "preemptive" war. Both behave as though they alone possess a right to absolute security. While they see themselves as victims of hateful terrorist attacks, Europeans, for example, see both Israel and the United States as major dangers to world peace.[17]

The Importance of the Middle East

The United States and Israel dominate the Middle East for different reasons. Israel has acted as though its security consists in its domination of the Arab states, military control of the Palestinians, and retention of Syria's Golan Heights. And yet Israel has dismissed the pledge of the whole Arab world in 2002 and 2007 for final peace (a pledge even to guarantee Israel's security) if Israeli would return to its 1967 borders and accept a small Palestinian state and return the Golan Heights. This dismissal suggests that Israel seeks not security as much as retention of Palestinian land and water from the Golan Heights. Israel seems disinterested in peaceful coexistence and balance with the Arab world, preferring to hold the Middle East in its hegemonic grip.

The importance of the Middle East to the United States, in addition to past geographic "containment" of the former Soviet Union, has historically been about oil. Assuring the flow of oil through the Persian Gulf "has been bedrock American foreign policy for more than half a century."[18] Eisenhower sent troops to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait in 1958 to protect oil resources. Carter asserted that "any attempt [by others] to gain control of the Persian Gulf . . . will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force."[19] George W. Bush was no less caught up in what Kevin Phillips calls U.S. "petro-imperialism."[20] Israel figures in this, as key U.S. partner, since Israel possesses advanced weaponry *in situ*, military bases that contain U.S weapons, and a commitment to fight alongside the United States against "confrontational" states.[21] Israel's nuclear weapons indirectly serve U.S. interests as instruments of discipline in the Middle East.

While the presence of the United States in the Middle East has been promoted as a "crusade for freedom and democracy," Washington has shown its friendship toward autocratic Arab governments.[22] That the U.S. intends to maintain fifty permanent military bases in Iraq suggests less about freedom than strategic and economic need.[23] David Hirst observes:

> Bush didn't embark on this interventionist, quasi-colonial phase of America's
> relations with the Middle East, only, or even mainly to confer democracy on

it. He did so for other reasons that had far more to do with the traditional drive for strategic and economic domination—as well as with an Israel whose influence on U.S. policy has reached unprecedented levels.[24]

A Symbiosis

Israel and the United States have historically needed each other. Israel clearly has needed U.S. military and financial aid, diplomatic protection, and security agreements. The United States has needed Israel as a military base, as a political justification for U.S. penetration of the Middle East and its resources, and as an ally against their once shared opposition to the Soviet-Arab block. This mutuality of need has heightened the conflation of U.S. and Israeli interests.

Already in the early 1950s, President Truman was shaping U.S. foreign policy to Israeli interests.[25] By the 1960s, President Johnson had acquiesced to Israel's production of nuclear weapons and, for cold war reasons (Soviet arming of Arab states), acquiesced to Israel's 1967 open attacks on Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. After 1973, President Nixon, under congressional pressure, massively rearmed Israel. It was, however, during the Reagan era that the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) "became practically a full partner in forming U.S. policy toward the Middle East."[26] Reagan ignored his Secretary of Defense Weinberger's fear of being held "hostage to Israeli policy," and signed a 1981 Memorandum of Understanding on Strategic Cooperation with Sharon. This Cooperation included: (a) Israeli-U.S. purchase of each other's arms; (b) Israel's right to produce or to modify U.S. military equipment for sale; (c) storage of U.S. arms in Israel for speedy deployment in the Middle East; and (e) use of the IDF for U.S. missions against "confrontational" states.[27] In both of the Bush administrations, the influence of American neoconservatives further heightened what Rashid Khalidi describes as a "complete identity of Israeli and American interests."[28] This extends to U.S. indifference to Palestinian suffering under Israeli military occupation. For example, the U.S. attitude about Jewish settlement-building has been one of appeasement: a progressive slide from "illegal" (under Carter), to "obstacle to peace" (under Reagan), to "complicating factor" (under Clinton), to "concern" under (George W. Bush).[29]

A Concept of Moral Legitimacy versus Hegemony?

Israel and the United States illustrate the notable success of the offensive realist-hegemonic strategy. They have so far experienced little opposition from coalitions of other nations, contrary to predictions of defensive realists,

remain regional and global hegemons, respectively. John Bolton explained: "There is no United Nations. There is an international community that can act occasionally, when led by the only real superpower left in the world, the United States, when it suits our interests and when we can persuade others to go along."[30] Americans have, as Robert Kagan notes, "ignored the United Nations, their [own] allies, and international law when these institutions and rules became obstacles to their objectives."[31]

In contrast to this display of hegemony lies the concept of "moral legitimacy." This legitimacy may be said to be achieved when a state voluntarily cooperates with others, not solely by complying with internationally-accepted laws and Conventions, but by incorporating the humanitarian needs of other states or peoples into its actions. Contrasted with hegemonic intimidation, legitimacy entails an exercise of "soft" power on behalf of someone or something besides the state's own interests or ultimate gains. The implication is *not* that such a state would lack military power, but rather that it cooperates with other governments to address the concerns of the world community, concerns such as health, disaster relief, climate change, illegal drugs, human rights, genocides, and world poverty. "What other source of legitimacy can there be?" asks Robert Kagan.[32] The concept of moral legitimacy may sound like liberal cant, and may even seem to conflict with a state's duty to care for its *own* citizens.[33] Yet cooperation, assistance, and accommodation to others' needs makes enlightened sense in an era of increasing global interdependence, especially when international cooperation rather than military power is required to deal with terrorism. Israel and the United States, while believing in the righteousness of their power and their political ideologies, have, by their abuse of power and indifference to others, lost international legitimacy.

Notes

1. John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, (New York: W. W. Norton, 2002), 40. When an intimidating influence or dominance over weaker states does not include formal claims of governance, the term 'hegemony' is usual. David B. Abernethy, *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415–1980* (New Haven: Yale University, 2000), 382.

2. The role of multinational corporations in neocolonialism partly replicates that of the history of the charter company (e.g., East India Company) in earlier imperialisms. The charter company was a private company authorized by the imperial country to monopolistically exploit a colony for joint profit. Chalmers Johnson, *Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), 30.

3. Examples would include military invasions or regime change operations in Cuba, Hawaii, Philippines, Mexico, Nicaragua, Haiti, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Iran, Vietnam, Chile, Grenada, Panama, Haiti, Somalia, Angola, Cambodia, Afghanistan, and Iraq.

4. Adam Roberts, "Predictions of offensive realism," *Times Literary Supplement (TLS)*, 26 July 2002, 24.

5. Frances FitzGerald, "George Bush & the World," *New York Review of Books*, 26 September 2002, 81.

6. "A great power . . . is likely to behave more aggressively because it has the capacity as well as the incentive to do so." Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 37. Mearsheimer is the leading American exponent of the "offensive realist" school.

7. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 2–3, 18–21, 53–54.

8. Joseph Nye, "Toward a Liberal Realist Foreign Policy," *Harvard Magazine* (March–April 2008): 37. In 2001, the United States spent 22 times more on the military than the total spent by all potential enemies (Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya Syria, Sudan, North Korea).

9. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims* (New York: Vintage, 2001), 686. 2007 Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operation. "The Americans have made virtually all their most advanced weaponry and technology—meaning the best fighter aircraft, missiles, radar, armor, and artillery—available to Israel." Aaron Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach: Arms Sales as Diplomacy* (New York: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1985), 175. Between 1949 and 1995, Israel received $65 billion in aid (13 percent of all U.S. aid globally), not including large transfers of surplus military equipment, subsidies for Israel's foreign aid program, early lump-sum payments of aid and debt refinancing. After 1985, aid was in gifts, not loans. Neff, *Fallen Pillars: U.S. Policy towards Palestine and Israel since 1945* (Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1995), 185. On U.S. diplomatic support, see Neff, *Fallen Pillars*, 120. A good summary of the earlier history of U.S.-Israeli weapons cooperation is found in Bishara Bahbah, "The U.S. Role in Israel's Arms Industry," *The Link*, Vol. 20, Issue 5 (December 1987).

10. Neff, *Fallen Pillars*, 180. Dan Glaister, *Guardian Weekly*, 3 August 2007, 8.

11. The Fourth Geneva Convention prohibits an occupier state from settling its own citizens on captured land and prohibits deportation of those under capture (Article 49). There are 400,000 Jewish settlers on captured land, and 1,600 Palestinians were deported between 1988 and 1990 alone. Hague Conventions prohibit confiscation of land, property, food, and water (Article 46) and collective punishment (Article 50). More than 50 percent of West Bank land and 80 percent of its water has been confiscated. Contrary to international law, 8,200 Palestinians have been imprisoned, most without charge. When tried, they are routinely convicted through false evidence provided by Shin Bet. Ian Black and Benny Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991), 413. International law also prohibits extrajudicial "targeted killings" (assassinations)—see

Seymour Hersh, *New Yorker*, December 23, 30, 2002. Yet Israeli undercover death squads circulate in the occupied territories, according to Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 591-92. Torture by Israelis has been "virtually institutionalized" according to Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (*Torture and Ill-treatment: Israel's Interrogation of Palestinians from the Occupied Territories* (New York: *Human Rights Watch*/Middle East, 1994). Also, see "Torture during Interrogations," *B'Tselem*, November 1994 and U.S. State Department report on the specifics of Israeli torture practices (*Human Rights*, 30 January 1997). Israel's High Court of Justice ruled that torture was illegal in 1999. Shin Bet torture diminished but did not end. See interview with Shin Bet interrogators in *Ma'ariv* in July 2004, cited in *B'Tselem*, July 20, 2005.

12. U.S. disregard, in addition to that of the Kyoto Accords, the 1993 antiballistic missile treaty, and the International Criminal Court, includes disregard of international prohibitions on torture. The U.S. Attorney General has recently declared the Geneva Conventions "obsolete," dismissed habeas corpus and accepted torture, arguing that the U.S. commander-in-chief is above the law and that the treatment of prisoners is a state secret. "President's Prison," editor, *New York Times*, 25 March 2007. Prisoners labeled as "unlawful combatants" are treated as *stateless* terrorists "outside" the requirement of judicial due process. Aryeh Neier, "The Military Tribunals on Trial," *New York Review of Books*, February 14, 2003. U.S.-sponsored torture is outsourced ("rendered") to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Poland, and Romania. The UN firmly counters U.S. torture policy in a report on the "absolute nature of the prohibition of torture . . . no exceptional circumstances whatsoever . . . may be invoked as a justification for torture." John Cushman, "U.N. Condemns Harsh Methods In Campaign Against Terror," *New York Times*, 28 October 2004, A13.

13. The UN Security Council must first determine whether there exists a threat to peace and, if so, impose sanctions or take necessary military actions itself.

14. Michael Byers, "Jumping the Gun," 3. Prior to the nineteenth century, military aggression was largely unregulated. Natural law distinctions about just and unjust wars were lacking and conquest conferred good title to territory. In the late nineteenth century, however, some principles governing wars were generally accepted: preemptive self-defense permitted when the need was "instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment of deliberation." This was further refined by the UN. Michael Byers, "War Crimes," *London Review of Books*, 17 August 2006.

15. Israel's false claims were not only that preemptive war was necessary, but that Israel had been physically attacked first. Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, Vol. 1, (New York, Knopf, 1986), 497. Donald Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem* (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988), 210.

16. "We must deter and defend against the threat before it is unleashed. . . . We will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively. . . . The United States must and will maintain the capacity to defeat any attempt by an enemy—whether a state or non-state actor—to impose its

will on the United States, our allies, or our friends. . . . Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military buildup in hopes of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States." David Sanger, "Bush to Outline Doctrine of Striking Foes First," *New York Times*, September 20, 2002, 1. Also, Judith Miller, "Keeping U.S. No. 1: Is It Wise? Is It New?" *New York Times*, 26 October 2002, B9. Preemption has been a U.S. historical pattern. There have been 300 occasions of U.S. forces deployed abroad between 1798 and 2001. Congressional Research Service, cited by David Armitage, "Past and perilous," *TLS*, 23 March 2007, 9.

17. Gallop poll survey in fifteen European countries. *New York Times*, November 16, 2003. Fifty-three percent consider the United States to be a threat to world peace—more than Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, Saudi Arabia, China, India, Russia, Somalia, or the European Union. Israel is considered a threat to peace by 59 percent.

18. Ted Koppel, *New York Times*, 14 February 2006.

19. William Tabb, "Resource Wars," *Monthly Review*, Vol. 58, No. 8, January 2007, 36.

20. Kevin Phillips, *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century* (New York: Viking, 2006). The new Iraqi oil law, written by the United States, Britain, and the giant oil corporations, apparently specifies that 80 percent or more of Iraq's oil reserves will be under the control of global oil corporations. "Notes from the Editors," *Monthly Review* Vol. 58, No. 7, (December 2006). The United States wants to be the *sole defender* of the vital oil interests of Europe and Japan, both of whom thereby owe fealty to the United States, according to William Tabb. "Resource Wars," *Monthly Review*, Vol. 58, No. 8 (January 2007): 36.

21. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 392. Other contributors to U.S. control of the Middle East are Turkey (possessing American nuclear missiles) and Iraq (containing 14 American military bases). Turkey is the third largest recipient of U.S. military aid after Israel and Egypt.

22. Where Arab countries are democratic (e.g., Lebanon) they are anti-Western and anti-Israel—"almost everywhere there are free elections, the American-backed side tends to lose." Hassan Fattah, "U.S. Promotes Free Elections Only to See Allies Lose," *New York Times*, 10 August 2007, A4.

23. Iraqi leaders state that the United States insists on keeping more than 50 military bases in Iraq. *New York Times*, editorial, 14 June, 2008, A16.

24. David Hirst, "Dangerous democracy," *Guardian Weekly*, 29 April–5 May, 2005, 6.

25. Truman's Secretary of State warned that "Israel has had more influence with the U.S. than has the U.S. with Israel." "The Acting Secretary of State to the Secretary of State, at Paris," Top Secret, Priority, NIACT, June 12, 1949—10 p.m., *Foreign Relations of the United States* 1949, 1127. Truman was sensitive to Jewish influences as well as the sympathetic public reaction to the Holocaust.

26. Neff, *Fallen Pillars*, 120.

27. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 392. The 1981 Memorandum was interrupted because of the Golan Heights annexation but reinstated two years later.

28. Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire*, 53. Perle, Kristol, and 34 other neocon power players wrote on April 3, 2002: "Israel's fight against terrorism is our fight. Israel's victory is an important part of our victory." In 1996, Perle, Feith, and Wumser wrote a policy paper ("A New Strategy for Defending the Realm") for prime minister Netanyahu urging Israel to make a "clean break" from the peace process, that is, discard UN 242 (land for peace) and demand of Arabs an unconditional acceptance of Israel's territorial rights to the occupied territories. In September 2002, Perle briefed Pentagon officials on his strategy: Israel to take all of Palestine, the Palestinians to be deported to Jordan, and the Jordanian monarchy to take over Iraq. Kathleen and Bill Christison, "The Bush Administration's Dual Loyalties," in *The Politics of Anti-Semitism*, Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair, eds. (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2003), 135–39.

29. "During the Clinton tenure . . . the very reality of occupation at the root of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict essentially dropped out of Washington's political discourse." Phyllis Bennis, *Before and After: U.S. Foreign Policy and the September 11th Crisis* (New York: Olive Branch Press, 2003), 69.

30. John Bolton, candidate for U.S. Ambassador to the UN. *Guardian Weekly*, 12–18 August 2005, 7.

31. Kagan, *Return of History*, 50. The United States ignored the need of UN authorization in Reagan's covert wars in Nicaragua, Cambodia, Angola, and Afghanistan. Nor were authorizations obtained for U.S. invasions of Grenada, Panama, Haiti, Kosovo, or bombing of Iraq by Clinton.

32. Robert Kagan, "A tougher war for the U.S. is one of legitimacy," *New York Times*, 24 January 2004, B7.

33. Condoleezza Rice, *Foreign Affairs* (January 2000). Condoleezza Rice criticized the Clinton administration for addressing "humanitarian interests" and the interests of the "international community" rather than focusing on U.S. "national interests." She affirmed that the Bush administration, by contrast, would take a fresh look at all treaties, obligations, and alliances in order to reevaluate them in light of America's national interest—that is, from the perspective of "the only real superpower left in the world, the United States."

Rice's concern about excessive U.S. "humanitarianism" seems unwarranted given the traditional passivity of the United States towards genocides, e.g., Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sudan. Secretary of State Baker (G. H. W. Bush administration) believed that the United States did not "have a dog in this fight," a fight in Bosnia resulting in 200,000 Bosnian deaths and 2 million refugees. Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Harper Collins [Perennial], 2003), 267. The Clinton administration committed its own sin of omission in Rwandan—800,000 killed in three months. Nor did it intervene in the 1994–1997 Tutsi Rwandan Army's genocidal revenge on fleeing Hutus (200,000 killed or missing)—an

Army installed with Washington approval. Howard French, *A Continent For The Taking*, (New York, Knopf, 2004), cited in the *New York Times BR*, 25 April 2004.

American intervention in genocides has been "virtually non-existent" despite UN-approved precedent for "preclusive" intervention (when a state compromises is sovereignty by threatening its own people by genocide, ethnic cleansing or slavery). American "idealist rhetoric [has] provided a proper mask for the brutal policies that underpinned the tremendous growth of American power. . . . Despite claims that American policy is infused with moralism, Somalia is the only instance during the past hundred years in which US soldiers were killed in action on a humanitarian mission—[and] in that case, the loss of a mere eighteen soldiers so traumatized American policymakers that they refused to intervene in Rwanda in the spring of 1994 [although] stopping that genocide would have been relatively easy." John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy*, 47, 250.

꙳꙳ꙮ꙳꙳

History of the Arab-Israeli Wars (1949–1974)

The UN Lausanne Peace Conference, April 1949:
Israel Rejects Peace Treaties

Following the 1948 war, the United Nations sponsored the Lausanne Peace Conference in an effort to bring lasting peace to Israel and the Arab states. It failed. The Arab states and Israel had widely different expectations. The Arab states by now had accepted the original 1947 UN Partition plan but not Israel's seizure of half of the UN-allotted Palestinian state-to be. It will be recalled, from chapter 2, that the Arab states had considered accepting the UN plan in hopes of avoiding war in 1948, but were overruled by a Transjordan/Israeli secret plan to subvert the UN plan.

At Lausanne, the Arab states accepted the original UN-designated boundaries of Israel and the UN designation of Jerusalem as an international city. They also agreed, in accordance with UN Resolution 194, that Palestinian refugees should be permitted to return to their homes in Israel or be compensated with money or land.[1] Simha Flapan observes: "By signing the Lausanne protocol, the Arabs had in fact accepted the legitimacy of the Partition Resolution . . . abandoned the idea of Palestine as a unitary state, accepted the reality of Israel, and agreed to solve the dispute by political means."[2]

Israel insisted, however, that it would not relinquish any of its territorial war gains—that beyond its UN allotment (56 percent of Palestine), Israel would retain a further 22 percent of Palestine (half the Palestinian's UN

allotment). Israel also rejected the UN internationalization of Jerusalem and the UN Resolution 194 recommended settlement of the 750,000 Palestinian refugee problem.[3]

When Ben-Gurion declared Israeli statehood in 1948, he intentionally omitted any mention of the limits or boundaries of the state lest future territorial expansion be precluded.[4] For this same reason, Israel refused to make peace treaties with Arab states that would define borders. The U.S. ambassador to Syria angrily blamed Israel for this maneuver.[5] Syria, to protect itself, had pressed for a peace treaty with specified boundaries, but Ben-Gurion and Abba Eban would accept only *armistice agreements* (provisional agreements to hold fire in position). This meant that border tensions between Israel and the Arab countries would fester for another three decades.

Gershon Aver (former Israeli Foreign Minister) observed:

> When the [Lausanne] Commission failed we immediately wanted to pin the blame on the Arabs and it was convenient to say that we had gone there with sincere intentions of striving for peace and, only because of Arab states adopted the position of extremists, it was impossible to attain it. This is not an explanation but a propaganda gambit, and a successful one.[6]

The Lausanne Peace Conference left standing an enlarged Israel with undefined borders and with no assigned responsibility for the ethnic cleansing of 80–85 percent of Palestinian inhabitants from its captured territories. Moreover, Israel remained with sufficient military power to defeat any and all the surrounding Arab states and was ready for a second round of war in pursuit of further territorial expansion.

Israel Proposes to Invade Egypt in 1951; Then Attempts Sabotage (Lavon Affair, 1954)

Ben-Gurion planned in the 1950s to capture the last 22 percent of Palestine not taken in 1948. He wanted as well the Egyptian Sinai.[7] His protégé, Moshe Dayan, agreed that "boundaries will be changed by war."[8] Avi Shlaim notes that Dayan considered the 1948 war "not yet over . . . several further large-scale operations were required to . . . round off Israel's borders and to assert her military dominance in such a crushing manner that the Arabs [the states] would give up all hope of a second round. Dayan wanted to threaten the Arabs and constantly to escalate the level of violence so as to demonstrate her [Israel's] superiority and to create the conditions for territorial expansion."[9]

    To this end, in 1951, Ben-Gurion approached Britain with a sweeping ex-
pansionist scheme in which Israel would invade the Egyptian Sinai with
British assistance.[10] Once Israel was in possession of the Sinai, Britain would
be free to establish military bases there. In addition, Britain, according to this
plan, would take control of Jordan (formerly Transjordan) and permit Israel to
possess the West Bank (which Jordan, with Palestinian acceptance, had an-
nexed in 1950). In sum, Israel would gain all of Palestine plus the Egyptian
Sinai, while Britain would rule Jordan. This plan fell within the European
colonialist model of Middle East domination. Yet Britain, in dire need of U.S.
loans, turned down the scheme out of fear of American disapproval.
    One year later, in 1952, Gemal Abdel Nasser ousted Egyptian King Farouk
(Britain's pawn monarch) in a bloodless coup. Ben-Gurion worried that
Britain might withdraw from Egypt altogether, leaving Nasser as an unen-
cumbered champion of Arab nationalist free to rally the Arab world against
European (and Israeli) colonialism. In response, Israel devised a plan to sew
chaos in Egypt, thinking that this would give Britain justification for staying
in Egypt. The chaos would also discredit Egypt in American eyes. In 1954,
Israel sent terrorist/saboteurs disguised as fanatical Egyptian nationalists to
Egypt to bomb movie theaters, post offices, and American and Egyptian gov-
ernment facilities.[11] This plot, known as the "Lavon Affair," failed when the
terrorists were captured and convicted and two of them were executed. Israel
responded by blowing up Egypt's military headquarters in Gaza, killing thirty-
nine soldiers and thirty-two Palestinians (February, 1955). This act heralded
a new and revolutionary era in Israeli-Egyptian relations.

Efforts to Draw the Arab Countries into More War

The United States watched with alarm, not only Israel's threats to invade
Egypt but its provocative military advances into Egyptian and Syrian DMZs
in violation of armistice agreements.[12] Dayan was master of the game of "de-
fensive retaliation" as a means to provoke war: "At least 80 percent of the
clashes were started [when] we would send a tractor to plow some [off-limits]
DMZ area and knew in advance that the Syrians would start to shoot. If they
didn't shoot, we would tell the tractor to advance further until in the end the
Syrians would get annoyed and shoot. And then we would use artillery and
later the air force also, and that's how it was."[13] Israeli historian Benny Mor-
ris observes that Israeli "retaliatory" strikes were designed to:

> help prod this or that Arab state into a premature war with Israel. Dayan
> wanted war, and, periodically, he hoped that a given retaliatory strike would

embarrass or provoke the Arab state attacked into itself retaliating, giving Is-
rael cause to escalate the shooting until war resulted—a war in which Israel
could realize such major strategic objectives as the conquest of the West Bank
or Sinai, or the destruction of the Egyptian army. Such certainly was the main
motive behind the IDF strikes against Egypt . . . and Syria . . . in 1955.[14]

These efforts to lure Arab states into wars they would lose began after 1948,
and some of these are described in this endnote.[15] These efforts *failed* because
the Arab states were thoroughly intimidated by Israel's military power, and,
in any case, were resigned to Israel's existence. Arab leaders made speeches
at home to satisfy domestic outrage over Israel's brutal dispossession of the
Palestinians, but they had no desire for war. In fact, no Arab state ever at-
tacked Israel after 1948.[16]

Israeli Claims Palestinian "Infiltration" as a Pretext for War

To justify military actions against Arab states, Israel accused them of en-
couraging Palestinian "terrorist infiltration," that is, the return of Palestinian
terrorists from refugee camps in Arab states. Avi Shlaim:

> The official line was that Palestinian infiltration into Israel was aided and
> abetted by Arab governments; that it was a form of undeclared guerilla warfare
> designed to weaken and destroy the infant state; that Israel was thus the inno-
> cent victim of Arab provocation and aggression; and that its military reprisals
> were a legitimate form of self-defense.[17]

The *reality* was that three-quarters of a million Palestinian refugees were
huddled in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, many
without food or shelter. The "great bulk" of Palestinian efforts to cross ("in-
filtrate") ill-defined borders into Israeli-captured territory were economically
or socially motivated, for example, to look for relatives, return to their
homes, recover possessions, tend fields, harvest food, and occasionally in the
process, exact revenge or steal property.[18] The inevitable desire and need of
Palestinians to return to their homes (their *right* under UN Resolution 194)
was cynically depicted by Israel as motivated by terrorism, the claimed
reason for shooting Palestinians on sight by Israeli border guards and civil-
ians. Some 2,700 to 5,000 Palestinian were killed, the vast majority of them
unarmed.[19]

Israel's fear was that returning Palestinians would "enlarge Israel's [Arab]
minority and nullify one of the 1948 war's chief gains—a relatively homoge-
neous Jewish state."[20] The claim that Palestinians were terrorists who were

encouraged by the Arab states, or even permitted to infiltrate, is "grossly inaccurate and unfair," according to Shlaim.[21] "Terrorist infiltration" was not only a charge to justify attack on Arab states, but to keep Palestinians from returning home.

Nasser Fears and Israel Plans Invasion

Israeli provocations towards the Arab states elicited U.S. and UN "shock." U.S. diplomats reported on Israel's "flagrant violation of armistice agreements." They believed that Israel was "spoiling for [a] fight" and "watched with amazement . . . Israel's apparent efforts to keep the border areas in turmoil and increase the appearance of threats to its own security."[22] That these efforts failed to provoke wars revealed (1) the fundamental military *impotence* of Egypt and Syria, (2) Israel's intent on military domination, and (3) the inability or unwillingness of the United States or the UN to curb Israel.

Nasser feared an Israeli attack because Egypt lacked the capacity to defend itself. So when the Americans refused to supply arms, Nasser signed an arms deal with the Czechs (with Soviet permission) in September 1955. Israel, though generously armed by the French, claimed that its very existence was threatened (contrary to American view).[23] President Eisenhower called Israel's bluff and offered to *defend* Israel if it were attacked by Egypt, *provided* that Israel curb its clear intentions to extend its borders through attack on Arab states. Israel rejected this offer, IDF Chief Moshe Dayan explaining that a U.S.-Israeli security pact "would put handcuffs on our military freedom of action, [preventing] 'reprisal' attacks into Syria, Jordan and Egypt."[24] That is, Dayan needed war, not a defense pact with the United States, in order to intimidate Arab nations and expand into their territory. As in 1948, Israel needed war to extend its boundaries beyond internationally-accepted limits.

Once Nasser received some Czech arms, Ben-Gurion ordered Dayan to provoke immediate war before Egypt could gain competence in use of those arms.[25] To this end, the IDF attacked and killed 100 Egyptian troops at Kuntilla and the Sabha in the Egyptian Sinai.[26] Egypt still refused to go to war.

Ben-Gurion Plans the Recolonization of the Whole Middle East and the Destruction of Egypt

Ben-Gurion announced to Britain and France at the secret Sevres Conference on October 23, 1956, a plan to *recolonize* the Middle East through joint pursuit of war—the *whole* Middle East to be controlled by Israel, Britain, and France.[27] His plan called for the following: Iraq and Jordan (to be merged) to

come under British rule; Lebanon and Syria to come under French rule; the Egyptian Sinai, southern Lebanon and *all* of Palestine to come under Israeli rule—the Palestinians having been deported to Jordan. (For other summaries see Avi Shlaim and Moshe Dayan.)[28] The plan, according to Shlaim, illustrated Ben-Gurion's "craving for an alliance with the imperialist powers against the forces of Arab nationalism. It exposed an appetite for territorial expansion at the expense of the Arabs in every possible direction . . . a cavalier attitude toward the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of the neighboring Arab states."[29]

At this same conference, plans were being laid for a more urgent task: the removal of Nasser and immediate defeat of Egypt. The alleged ground was, three months earlier (July 1956), Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal, a source of revenue for Egypt's Aswan Dam project. The British and French were livid, their imperial image sullied. Nasser had already alienated the French by supporting Arab independence in Algeria. Nationalization of the Canal and block of Israeli shipping provided Ben-Gurion with a long-wished opportunity to join imperial Europe in a war he had been trying to provoke since 1949.[30] (Egypt had a legal right to nationalize the Canal but not to refuse passage of Israeli shipping, a violation of a 1951 UN resolution.[31]) At the same time, Israel had no reason to claim that Egypt either intended to attack or had the military wherewithal to do so.[32]

The Suez War, October 29, 1956

Two weeks before this war, Israel, as a diversionary tactic, attacked a Jordanian village (Qalqila) with planes, tanks, and artillery, killing 48. However, the intended war—Israel, Britain, and France against Egypt—began when Israel falsely claimed to have been attacked by Egypt. The IDF swept through the Sinai all the way to the Suez Canal. By prearrangement, Britain and France, posing as peacekeepers, demanded that Egypt withdraw from its own territory! Knowing Egypt would refuse, Britain and France invaded Egypt on pretext of "separating the combatants and saving the Canal." A huge armada of British and French planes and ships joined in Israel's war. Ninety-five percent of the Egyptian air force was destroyed while still on the ground. Thousands of Egyptians (soldiers and civilians) were killed. Israel, Britain, and France lost 200.

The war went perfectly except that the UN condemned it as outright aggression and Eisenhower branded it as "unconscionable."[33] Worse, the war caused the Soviets to threaten missile and or nuclear war against Israel, Britain, and France.[34] The world seemed to teeter on the brink of an atomic

cataclysm—"nuclear war was urgently in many minds" (*New York Times*).[35]
An enraged Eisenhower managed to force Israel to retreat from the Sinai—
sweetened with generous World Bank and U.S. loans. Despite the interna-
tional outrage generated, Israel's image rose to new heights as a player with
the European world powers. Moshe Sharett, later prime minister, reluctantly
admitted to himself after the war: "moral evaluations apart, Israel's political
importance in the world has grown enormously."[36]

Alliance with the Europeans was the key. Ben-Gurion concluded: "From
the point of view of our existence and security, the friendship of one Euro-
pean country is more valuable than the views of all the [Arab] people of
Asia."[37] It was a mutually profitable alliance: Israel supported French colo-
nialist interests in Algeria while France, Britain, and Germany poured arms
(and nuclear facilities) into Israel.[38] This alliance was the very fulfillment of
Ze'ev Jabotinsky's vision from the 1920s: that Zionism and European impe-
rial power rule the Middle East.[39]

The United States Shares Israeli Hostility
toward Arab Nationalism

The United States rejected Arab nationalism once Arab states accepted arms
from U.S. cold war rival, the Soviet Union. True, Eisenhower was displeased
with Israel—its Suez War, its diversion of Syria's water, its armistice viola-
tions, its raids on Syrian, Jordanian, and Egyptian territory, and its refusal to
compensate Palestinian refugees for confiscated land and property. Yet Eisen-
hower shared with Israel and the Europeans an aversion to Nasser. And
Nasser had no tolerance for British colonialism in Egypt and European colo-
nialism elsewhere in the Middle East. By accepting Soviet arms (after the
U.S. failed to supply them), Nasser seemed to the United States to have
joined the communist enemy "camp." Eisenhower deeply feared the spread of
Soviet influence in the Middle East and the potential for loss of U.S. access
to Arab oil.[40] Israel's concern was different: Soviet military help could boost
Arab confidence—enough to challenge Israeli behavior, especially regarding
the festering Palestinian refugee problem.

Palestinian Refugees and the Rise of Fatah and the PLO

The festering Palestinian problem was of concern to John Kennedy, elected
president after Eisenhower in 1961. He was less critical toward Arab nation-
alism than Eisenhower, believing that Arab movements, despite accepting
Soviet arms, could be legitimate independent movements on a neutral path

between East and West. Kennedy was willing to talk to both the Arabs and Israelis about the fate of Palestinians languishing in refugee camps for over a decade. He sent Joseph Johnson of the Carnegie Foundation to study the problem. Johnson proposed that the Palestinians be given a choice between gradual repatriation to Israel or financial compensation. Neither Israel nor the Arab states accepted this proposal. Israel feared that the refugees would choose repatriation (destroying Israel's Jewish character). The Arab states, uncomfortable with agitating Palestinians in already unstable regimes, wanted them gone. They feared that the Palestinians would accept compensation and remain in the host Arab states. Neither the Israelis nor the Arab states wanted the refugees.

Yasir Arafat took a different approach. He believed that by *heightening* tensions between Israel and the Arab states, the international community would finally take notice and rise up in the support of the Palestinian cause all but ignored since the Suez War. Why not copy Israel's own provocative methods and stir up fights? In 1965 Arafat organized a group called Fatah to begin guerilla operations in Israel. While "the damage that the Fatah could inflict remained comparatively minor and its threat as a military force was nonexistent, Fatah was a menacing challenge to Israel as a symbol of Palestinian and Arab resistance."[41] It made the Israeli public anxious, sometimes caused real damage, increased Israeli-Arab state tensions, but, more to the intended point, drew attention to the fact that three-quarters of a million impoverished Palestinians were trapped in refugee camps. In 1967, Fatah absorbed the moribund Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO).

Israeli Provocations in Jordan and Syria
Lead to the 1967 "Six Day" War

It will be recalled that Eisenhower had forced Israel to give back the Egyptian Sinai after the Suez War. Israel's appetite for territory was still directed toward the Egyptian Sinai, toward the remainder of Palestine under Jordanian and Egyptian control, and toward Syria's water-rich Golan Heights. Expansion was possible only with war and, according to Israeli military historian Martin van Creveld, Israel was ready: "at the peak of its preparedness . . . confident in its power . . . spoiling for a fight and willing to go to considerable lengths to provoke it."[42] Pretext was found in actions against Jordan and Syria.

For example, in Jordan in 1966, a Fatah land mine killed three Israeli soldiers. Jordan had no responsibility, yet IDF Chief Yitzhak Rabin launched a

devastating "retaliation" against the Jordanian town of Samu. A large Israeli armored brigade including tanks, air coverage, and nearly 4,000 soldiers, routed five thousand villagers, methodically destroyed 125 homes, a school, a clinic, and damaged many other structures.[43] Jordanian soldiers rushed to the scene. A Jordanian plane was shot down and there were scores of fatalities, many civilian. The Arab world was outraged. Riots spread throughout the Palestinian refugee population in Jordan.

In Syria, provocations related to conflict over water. Israel began in 1964 to pump water out of the Sea of Galilee—limiting Syria's supplies without sovereign right. Syria sought to stop this by damming inflows to the Sea of Galilee from within Syria. Israel bombed these Syrian dam projects and mutual artillery shelling made the border a tinderbox. In April 1967, Israel sent fighter planes against Syrian gunner positions and several Syrian villages. Six defending Syrian planes were downed and Israeli planes buzzed Damascus, a show of military supremacy and contempt. Levi Eshkol (Prime Minister since Ben-Gurion's retirement in 1963) and Yitzhak Rabin, Chief of Staff, publicly threatened war against Syria. Avi Shlaim notes:

> Israel's strategy of escalation on the Syrian front was probably the single most important factor in dragging the Middle East to war in June 1967, despite the conventional wisdom on the subject that singles out Syrian aggression as the principal cause of the war . . . many of the firefights were deliberately provoked by Israel. . . . Support for this revisionist view came [from] Moshe Dayan.[44]

The Israeli intention to invade either Syria or Jordan was well advertised.[45] After Samu, Jordan feared that it was the target. After Israel's air attack, Syria feared that it was the target. Rabin warned Syria that Israel would bring down its regime, and Soviet intelligence informed Egypt that Syria was, indeed, the target. The issue of blocked Israeli navigation through Egypt's Strait of Tiran also set off sparks, as it had in 1956.[46] Egypt repeatedly cautioned Syria against any act that could be used by Israel to drag Syria and thus Egypt (Syria's mutual defense ally) into a war against superior Israeli forces. All the Arab countries were fearful of war. Egypt and Jordan worried, too, that Fatah might provoke something.[47]

War Talk

Talk flew from all sides. Nasser made belligerent speeches to prop up his flagging reputation in the Arab world (having been accused of cowardice by failing to defend Jordan at Samu or Syria under Israeli air attack)—and

Dayan acknowledged that "the nature and scale of our reprisal actions against Syria and Jordan had left Nasser with no choice but to defend his image and prestige in his own country and throughout the Arab world."[48] Nasser did not want war, he needed to win back his political prestige in the Arab world.[49]

Israel took advantage of belligerent Nasser speeches by publicly broadcasting them. The Israeli public believed it was in profound danger and was warned of a "second Holocaust" by a press nourished by psychological warfare waged by Israel's military.[50] Israeli leaders quietly knew otherwise.[51] General Mattityahu Peled, an architect of the 1967 war, later admitted that it was "a bluff, a pretense that Israel was in an anguished struggle for its existence and can be exterminated at any time."[52] Although Egypt had received weapons from the Soviet Union, General Ezer Weizmann, planner of the war, agreed that "there was no threat of destruction."[53] Israeli leaders nevertheless sought to convince Lyndon Johnson that Israel was in mortal danger, that preemptive war was *necessary*, in order that Johnson not later force Israel to relinquish anticipated war gains, as had Eisenhower in 1956. Johnson knew better: that even *if* Egypt or Syria were to attack Israel, Israel would "whip the hell out of them" in less than a week.[54] Walter Rostow, Johnson's National Security Advisor, referred to Israel's anticipated war as a "turkey shoot."[55] The 1967 war was not necessary as an act of self-defense but as an exhibit of hegemony. It had been an extension of the 1956 Suez war which, in turn, had been an extension of the 1948 war—the war that Ben-Gurion and his generals regretted ending too soon.[56]

The "Six Day" War, June 1967

On June 5, the Israeli foreign minister, Abba Eban, falsely informed the U.S. ambassador that Israel had been attacked.[57] In fact, Israel launched a surprise attack on Egypt, destroying 309 of 340 Egyptian planes sitting on the ground. The war against Egypt was essentially over in three hours. Egyptian troops in the Sinai, lacking air protection, were incinerated by napalm dropped from Israeli planes.[58] Dayan forbade announcement of Israel's victory, thus ensuring that Egypt's allies, Syria and Jordan, would be drawn into war in defense of Egypt and become objects for Israeli attack. It took a few days for Israel to capture the Gaza Strip, the Jordanian-administered West Bank, and all of Jerusalem. Jordan attempted to defend the West Bank but its 24 plane air force was destroyed in a single day. The U.S. State Department and Jordan pleaded for a cease-fire on the second day of the war, but Israel continued to napalm unprotected Jordanian forces and West Bank Palestinians.[59]

Then the United Nations adopted cease-fire Resolution 233. Eban intoned at the United Nations that "Israel, by its independent effort and sacrifice, has passed from serious danger to successful and glorious resistance . . . and is now willing to demonstrate its instinct for peace." Yet Israel continued its military advance. On day three, East Jerusalem and the whole of the West Bank were controlled by the IDF. At that point, Israel accepted the UN cease-fire. The CIA appraised Israel's war goals:

> Immediate and primary GOI [Government of Israel] war aim is destruction of the center of power of the radical Socialist movement, i.e., the Nasser regime. . . . If the aims of the radical Arabs can be destroyed, the GOI assumes [that] Turkey, Iran and Israel will represent an overwhelming balance of military power in the area. . . . Israel will attempt to destroy the Syrian regime and to eliminate both Syria and Jordan as modern states.[60]

Yet Israel faced a dilemma. It had not yet destroyed Syria as a modern state, yet had accepted the UN cease-fire. On day four of the war, breaching the cease-fire, Israel launched an intensive air and artillery bombardment on Syrian positions. This breach was diplomatically risky, for Washington disapproved of the extension of the war into Syria in that Syria had made no major war moves.[61] Washington worried, too, that an Israeli advance into Syria could provoke Soviet intervention in defense of Syria.

A more immediate problem for Israel related to the USS Liberty, a U.S. intelligence-gathering ship off the coast of Gaza monitoring Israel's military actions. With knowledge of Israeli preparations for a forthcoming massive invasion of Syria, the United States could make ultimatums. The Israeli cabinet nevertheless demanded an invasion of the coveted Syrian Golan Heights.[62] Israel proceeded to bomb and torpedo the USS Liberty, nearly sinking it—an effort, beyond doubt, to blind the United States to the forthcoming invasion of Syria.[63] President Johnson thought that the Soviets had attacked the USS Liberty and ordered U.S. warplanes to "use force including destruction" against whoever was responsible for attacking the ship. Israel had to admit its "mistake," claiming a "communication accident."[64] Johnson, ardently pro-Israel, ordered a complete news blackout by the U.S. government and navy. He considered it politically unwise to dash America's jubilation over Israel's 1967 war to "end Arab aggression." The American government never told the public about Israel's attack on the USS Liberty.

On day five, Israel proceeded to invade Syria and capture the Golan Heights. The UN demanded another cease-fire. Israel again agreed, yet continued its attack with heavy artillery bombardment and massive air support.

UN observers reported that the Damascus suburbs had been bombed. The Russians were incensed. They severed ties with Israel, and, threatening military action, sent twenty warships and eight submarines to the Mediterranean. Johnson and Kosygin were on the hotline as the U.S. Sixth Fleet steamed toward the Soviet fleet. As in the Suez war, the United States and the Soviet Union were heading toward a "grave catastrophe." Israel quickly completed its territorial goals, ended hostilities, and a U.S.-Soviet collision was averted.

The Effect of the 1967 War

Abba Eban and Prime Minister Eshkol assured Johnson that the war had been "defensive" and that Israel had no "colonial" aspirations. But the war had, in fact, demonstrated Israel's appetite for territorial expansion and its undisputable supremacy in military power. The war tripled Israel's geographic size at the cost of 766 IDF fatalities whereas the Arab countries under attack lost about 20,000 men.[65] Israel annexed Jerusalem over world protest, and refused to withdraw from the Egyptian Sinai, the West Bank, Gaza, or the Golan Heights (as called for by UN Resolution 242). Abba Eban described the euphoria of a new Zionist mentality gripping the Israel public:

> We interpreted the war not just as a victory, but as a kind of providential messianic event that changed history permanently and gave Israel the power to dictate the future. . . . [The new Zionism] says that we will not give any territory back; if the Arabs don't like it here they can get the hell out, and if they stay we will not give them all their human rights, and being Jewish is more important than being democratic.[66]

The Ethnic Cleansing of Captured Territory

Another effect of the 1967 war was further ethnic cleansing of the Palestinian and Syrian populations, followed by Jewish colonization of Jerusalem, Gaza, West Bank, Golan Heights, and Egyptian Sinai. For example, after the fighting had ended, Israel bulldozed thousands of homes in the West Bank and prodded the Palestinians to flee to Jordan, Lebanon, and Egypt.[67] Loudspeakers warned Bethlehem residents that they had two hours before their homes would be shelled and Israeli buses and trucks removed Palestinians to the muddy shores of the Jordan River.[68] About 100,000 refugees crowded into Amman, sleeping in public buildings and doorways, foraging through garbage pails and living under trees. Gazan refugees were transferred to camps

in the Jordan Valley (West Bank).[69] Virtually all inhabitants of the Golan Heights were made refugees. By UN estimate, the war created 325,000 new refugees: 178,000 from the West Bank, 102,000 from the Golan Heights, and 38,000 from the Sinai. Historian and journalist Donald Neff observes:

> With only a few notable exceptions, stories coming out of Israel and printed in major U.S. dailies during this period were almost invariably focused on the glory of Israel's achievements and the humanity of its occupation policies. They were mute about the plight of a people suddenly rendered captive or homeless in their own land, silent now that victims of the past had suddenly become oppressors of the present. This blindness to a whole people's suffering and the unrestrained glorification of Israel was widely shared and partly explained by the lingering Holocaust guilt of the West. The Christian West experienced an undercurrent of feeling that finally its guilt over the Nazi atrocities was at last exculpated.[70]

Provocations Leading to the 1973 Yom Kippur War

Following the 1967 victory, Israel not only continued its military occupation of the Egyptian Sinai but advanced further to the east bank of the Suez Canal. There, Israeli troops were posted about 200 yards across from Egyptian troops on the opposite bank of the Canal. Continuous mutual shelling inflicted high costs on both sides. Nixon, in search of peace, proposed in 1969 that Israel give up all its 1967 war gains in exchange for binding peace treaties with both Egypt and Jordan. The new Israeli Prime Minister, Golda Meir—who succeeded Levi Eshkol in 1969— flatly refused. Indeed, Israel bombed even deeper into Egyptian territory, near Cairo, causing 1.5 million Egyptians to flee their homes. That was in 1970, the year Nasser died of a heart attack.

Anwar Sadat, Egypt's new president, faced riots in the streets of Cairo over Israel's bombing of cities and humiliating occupation of the Sinai. Sadat offered Israel, in February 1971, a formal peace treaty and use of the Suez Canal provided that Israel withdraw its forces partly away from the Suez Canal. Golda Meir again refused. Nixon, facing reelection, rewarded Meir's intransigence with massive amounts of arms. He also weakened Egypt through a bribe to Brezhnev (loan guarantees and U.S. technology) to withhold Soviet arms from Egypt. Sadat and Syria's president, Hafez Assad, faced not only Meir's resolute refusals, but U.S.-Soviet acquiescence to Israel's continuing occupation of their territories.

The foreign occupation of Egyptian and Syrian sovereign territories (as well as *continuing* air attacks on Syria)[71] was intolerable to Sadat and Assad.

Resolved to restore Arab dignity, they would calm domestic rioters by demonstrating that they could stand up to Israel. Assad's goal was to restore the Golan Heights to Syria through military victory, but Sadat's goal was more modestly political and symbolic. He knew that recapture of the Sinai was impossible, given the superiority of Israeli air power. Nonetheless, Sadat hoped to show a complacent IDF that Egypt was not impotent, and to persuade the Israeli leadership that occupation of another's land was no route to peace.[72]

The Yom Kippur War, October 6, 1973

Egyptian troops did manage to cross the Suez Canal and surprise Israeli forces. This advance had a stunning effect for a number of days, at least until Israel got fully mobilized. Israel demanded an immediate resupply of U.S. weapons. Nixon saw little need and was ambivalent about supporting Israel's continued hold on 1967 war gains that violated UN Resolution 242 that called for their return. But because the fighting in the Golan Heights and the Sinai was fierce, suggesting that Israel might resort to nuclear weapons, Nixon acquiesced to "one of the largest airlifts ever undertaken."[73]

The Soviets pressed for a cease-fire. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger stalled them in order to give Israel time to improve its military position.[74] Brezhnev bluntly scolded Nixon and ordered a Soviet fleet to the Mediterranean. Nixon responded by putting U.S. military and nuclear units on worldwide alert and sent aircraft carriers and bombers to the Mediterranean—the third nuclear crisis arising from Israel-Arab wars. The Soviets and Americans both contemplated military intervention in Egypt. However, the United States, under threat of an Arab OPEC oil embargo, prevailed on Israel to pull back from the Canal. UN peacekeeping forces eventually buffered both the Suez Canal and the Golan Heights.

No military victor emerged from this war, though the outcome was favorable for Israel. Syria and Egypt failed to regain their former territories and U.S. weapons and money flowed into Israel.[75] Despite the early scare of this war, Israel preserved its hegemonic grip in the Middle East. The total war damage was large: some 30,000 killed or wounded, 3,100 tanks, and 440 airplanes destroyed.[76]

What the Yom Kippur war meant for the forgotten Palestinians was that they were on their own. Hope of outside help faded with the political and military paralysis of Egypt and Syria.

The PLO Seeks a Political Solution

In 1974 the Fatah/PLO reduced its guerilla operations and Arafat made efforts to find a long-term political solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Previously, in 1969, the PLO had proposed a singular, *secular* state over the *whole* of Palestine. Now Arafat made a radically different proposal: a small Palestinian state consisting of the Gaza Strip and West Bank (22 percent of Palestine). Such a state, less than a quarter of Palestinian expectations in 1947—and half of what the UN had allotted for a Palestinian state—represented a major compromise, a practical attempt to satisfy the needs of Israelis and Palestinians alike. The proposal won considerable international attention as well as support. Arafat was permitted to address the United Nations in November 1974. In 1975, the General Assembly granted observer status to the PLO and acknowledged a Palestinian "right to national independence and sovereignty." The UN favored Israeli withdrawal from all territories occupied in 1967, and called on UN member states to refrain from economic or military aid to Israel until that was achieved.[77] Israel refused to return any Arab territory or partition of Palestine between Israel and a small Palestinian state.[78]

Summary

Following its establishment, Israel looked to territorial expansion beyond Palestine to the achievement of hegemony over the surrounding Arab states. Ben-Gurion proposed a long-range plan, in conjunction with Britain and France, for the recolonization of the whole Middle East. The more immediate project was destruction of Nasser and Arab nationalism, undertaken with European help and cover. Israel had been trying but failed to prod the Arab states into war, then openly attacked Egypt (Suez War) in 1956. In reaction, the Soviets threatened nuclear war and Israel was forced by the United States to relinquish its war gains, the Egyptian Sinai.

Israel again attacked Egypt and the other surrounding Arab states in 1967 on a claim, disputed by the United States, that its survival was threatened. Egypt, Jordan, and Syria were crushed in this "Six Day" war. Again, a threatened nuclear cataclysm between the Cold War superpowers was averted. Israel captured the Egyptian Sinai, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Jerusalem, and Syria's water-rich Golan Heights, removed civilian populations by force, and began settler colonization in violation of international laws and Conventions.

In 1973, Israel had a temporary scare when Egypt and Syria attempted to recover the Egyptian Sinai and Syria's Golan Heights, which Israel had occupied in the 1967 war. During this "Yom Kippur" war, the United States poured weapons into Israel, ensuring that Israel, now a nuclear power, had unchallenged hegemony in the Middle East.

It is conventionally believed that Israel's history of militance and territorial expansion should be understood as preemptive war in self-defense—that after 1948 the Arab states sought war, that Israel sought negotiation, that Israel was attacked, that territorial expansion was incidental to defense. The history is otherwise.

Notes

1. The Palestinians, as distinct from the Arab nations, proposed, alternatively, that Israel be allowed to keep the captured Palestinian lands (expanded borders) as long as refugees were allowed to return to their homes, whether under Palestinian or Israeli jurisdiction. Simha Flapan, *The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities* (New York: Pantheon, 1987), 222.

2. Flapan, *Birth*, 224.

3. Flapan, *Birth*, 224, 229. Avi Shlaim, *Collusion Across the Jordan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 465. Without success, Truman threatened Israel over its blanket refusal to repatriate Palestinians and rejection of basic UN principles of peace. Flapan, *Birth of Israel*, 214, 224. Elias Sasson (Israeli Foreign Ministry) summarized Israel's real goals: "a) Arab forfeiture of all the Israeli-held territories; b) Arab consent to absorb all refugees in their countries; c) Arab consent to adjustment of frontiers to Israel's sole advantage; d) Arab forfeiture of their property and assets in Israel, in exchange for compensation which only the Jews will evaluate and which we will pay, if at all, after peace is achieved; e) de facto, de jure recognition of Israel in its new borders; f) Arab consent to immediate diplomatic and economic ties." Sasson to Shabatai Rosenne, June 16, 1949, *Israeli State Archives 130.02/2447/2*. Flapan, *Birth*, 215.

4. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 33.

5. "It should be evident that Israel's continued insistence upon her pound of flesh and more is driving Arab states slowly (and perhaps surely) to gird their loins . . . for long range struggle." Keeley to State Dept. May 19, 1949 NA RG 84. Cited in Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict* (New York: Vintage, 2001), 710n15.

6. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 464. Personal interview by Avi Shlaim. Shlaim believes that Avner's statement is too categorical.

7. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 611. Ben-Gurion's socialist party, Menachem Begin, former terrorist, and Yigal Allon, Officer in Command, all clamored publicly for conquest of all of Palestine.

8. Benny Morris, *Israel's Border Wars, 1949–1956* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 11, 12.

9. Shlaim, *Collusion*, 571.

10. Avi Shlaim, *Collusion*, 611.

11. For complete account see Jonathan Shimshoni, *Israel and Conventional Deterrence: Border Warfare between 1953 and 1970* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988) 79–83. Ben-Gurion nearly convinced his cabinet to authorize full invasion of the Gaza Strip.

12. Shimshoni, *Israel*, 83.

13. Interview with Dayan, 1976, by reporter Rami Tal and reported by Serge Schmemann, "General's Words Shed a New Light on the Golan," *New York Times*, 11 May 1997, 3.

14. Morris, *Israel's Border Wars*, 178–79.

15. Israeli provocations:

Syria: In 1951, Israel falsely claimed ownership of territory in a DMZ and evicted 2,000 Syrian farmers. When the United Nations countermanded this action, Israel blew up the farmers' villages. Nevertheless, Syria nevertheless avoided actions that could precipitate war. In 1953, Dayan illegally diverted water from the Jordan River to Israel from the DMZ despite Syria's riparian rights. Fighting ensued but the UN Security Council pressured Israel to desist. In 1955, five Israeli soldiers spying in Syria were captured. In response, Israel invaded Syria, destroyed a Syrian convoy, took hostages, and killed thirty-six Syrian soldiers and civilians when exchange negotiations failed. That same year Israel raided Syrian military posts at Butayha and Kursi in Syria, killing fifty Syrians and taking thirty prisoners. The larger purpose of these Israeli acts, beyond provoking Syria, was to provoke war with *Egypt*, Syria's ally and defender. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 149. "The aim was to activate this [mutual defense] pact and provoke the Egyptians into retaliating against Israel—thus precipitating an Israeli-Egyptian war." Morris, *Israel's Border Wars*, 281.

Jordan: In 1953, an unknown terrorist killed an Israeli mother and two children with a grenade. Jordan condemned the act and offered assistance in capturing the perpetrator. Nevertheless, Ariel Sharon's 101 commando unit dynamited forty-five homes in Qibya (Jordan), killing sixty-nine civilians, half of them women and children trapped in their homes. Ben-Gurion denied Israeli involvement, the UN Security Council condemned Israel and the United States withheld grant money. While Israel killed Jordanian soldiers and "infiltrators" at many times the rate of its own losses, Jordan resisted war. Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*. Vol. I (New York: Knopf, 1986), 444.

Gaza Strip: Israeli attacks on Egyptian military headquarters in Gaza began in early 1951 when 71 were killed. This was followed by massacres at Khan Yunis (Gaza), 275 Palestinians killed, another 111 at Rafah days later. Donald Neff, *Warriors at Suez* (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988), 420. (Neff was a reporter for the *UPI*, the *LA Times* and *Time*.) In 1953, two of Sharon's 101 Commando squads entered the el-Bureij Palestinian refugee camp near Gaza (administered by Egypt), killing 20 Palestinians and

injuring 60. The refugees rioted, demanded Egyptian guns and attempted to organize themselves for tit-for-tat attacks across the border. Shimshoni, *Israel,* 49. These Palestinian Fedayeen ("self-sacrificers") were refugees trapped for five years in "unalleviated misery." Sachar, *A History,* Vol. I, 442–43.

16. The ineffective Iraqi scud missile attack in 1991 could be considered an exception.

17. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 84.

18. Morris, *Israel's Border Wars*, 49, 412. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 82.

19. Morris, *Israel's Border Wars*, 126, 137, 166–72, 415. Palestinian infiltrators *did* kill 200 Israelis between 1949 and 1956. Unknown is how many, for the same period, were in revenge for the Israeli killing of 2,700 to 5,000 Palestinians, and for multiple IDF atrocities during and after 1948. Benny Morris, "Response to Finkelstein and Masalha," *Journal of Palestine Studies* (Autumn 1991): 112. Some Palestinians were killed by land mines on ill-defined borders.

20. Morris, *Israel's Border Wars,* 143. Historical note: The right of return or to leave is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1948 in Article 13(2): "Everybody has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." On the basis of Article 13(2), Israel harshly criticized the Soviet Union for its refusal to allow Jews to leave the country, yet remained silent regarding the equal right of every Palestinian to "return to his country." At the same time of passage of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (December 10, 1948), the UN Resolution 194 affirmed the Palestinian right of return.

21. Shlaim points out that (1) Lebanon "effectively sealed the border with Israel;" (2) the Syrians "exercised strict control over their border with Israel and infiltration was rare;" (3) Egypt "kept a quarter of a million Palestinian refugees incarcerated in a tiny strip of territory in Gaza . . . pursuing a consistent policy of curbing infiltration;" and (4) Jordan did everything it could "to prevent infiltration and prevent access to Israel" All quotes from Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 84, 85.

22. Edward Tivnan, *The Lobby: Jewish Political Power and American Foreign Policy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 42–43.

23. Shimshoni, *Israel*, 97.

24. Moshe Sharett, *Toman Ishi* [Personal Diary] in Hebrew, Yaqov Sharett, ed. (Tel Aviv: Ma'a, 1979). Selections translated in Livia Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism* (Belmont, MA: AAUG Press, 1986) 38.

25. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001* (New York: Vintage, 2001), 286. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 174.

26. "Ben-Gurion and Dayan decided, in reaction to news of the Czech arms deal, to provoke war with Egypt using retaliatory strikes that would push Egypt into counterattacking and give Israel grounds for war. This aim was to underlie the three retaliatory strikes of October–December 1955, Kuntilla, al Sabha and Operation Kinneret [Sea of Galilee]." Morris, *Israel's Border Wars*, 358.

27. Historical reminder: The League of Nations aimed to *de-*colonize the Middle East after World War I—Syria and Lebanon, in fact, becoming independent in 1941,

Iraq in 1932, Egypt in 1936, and Jordan in 1946. Still, Britain, and to a lesser extent France, continued to dominate these Arab nations militarily, albeit with a progressively weakening grip after World War II. Ben-Gurion's idea of recolonizing the Middle East appealed to Britain and France.

28. Shlaim: "Jordan, he [Ben-Gurion] observed, was not viable as an independent state and should therefore be divided. Iraq would get the East Bank [Jordan] in return for a promise to settle the Palestinian refugees there and to make peace with Israel, while the West Bank would be attached to Israel as a semiautonomous region. Lebanon suffered from having a large Muslim population . . . the problem could be solved by Israel's expansion up to the Litani River, thereby helping to turn Lebanon into a Christian state. The Suez Canal area should be given international status, while the Straits of Tiran should come under Israeli control to ensure freedom of navigation. A prior condition for realizing this plan was the elimination of Nasser and his replacement with a pro-Western leader who would also be prepared to make peace with Israel. . . . Britain would restore its hegemony in Iraq and Jordan and secure its access to the oil of the Middle East. France would consolidate its influence in the Middle East through Lebanon and Israel, while its problems in Algeria would come to an end with the fall of Nasser." Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 172. Also, Flapan, *Birth*, 49.

Dayan: "Jordan [formerly Transjordan] has no right to exist and should be divided. East of the Jordan River, it will become part of Iraq and Arab [Palestinian] refugees will be settled there. The West Bank will be annexed to Israel, as an autonomous region. Lebanon will get rid of its Moslem regions to assure stability based on the Christian [minority] part. Britain will hold sway over Iraq, including the East Bank [Jordan] and the southern Arabian Peninsula. France—over Lebanon, perhaps Syria, with close ties to Israel. The Suez Canal will be internationalized, and the Red Sea straits will be under Israeli control." Moshe Dayan, *Milestones* (Tel-Aviv: Idanim, 1976, Hebrew) 255. Cited by Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, *The Israeli Connection: Who Israel Arms and Why* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1987), 5.

29. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 178.

30. Egypt also blocked Israel from the Straits of Tiran that it considered Egyptian territorial water—a legal issue never resolved in international court. Egypt considered the Straits of Tiran to be its territorial waters and blocked Israeli passage on May 22. U.S. veteran diplomat Charles Yost considered the legal issue an open question. Nasser offered to take the issue to the World Court, Israel declined. Neff, *Warriors*, 188, and documentation in Norman Finkelstein, *Image and Reality of the Israeli-Palestine Conflict* (London: Verso, 1995), 215n17.

31. Background note: In November 1955, the United States (and Britain) offered to finance the Aswan Dam and, implicitly, to provide weapons to Egypt—in hope of luring Egypt away from Czech/Soviet influence. In July 1956, the United States reneged on the Aswan Project under pressure from the Jewish lobby and cotton-growing southern states fearful of Egyptian competition. Nasser immediately nationalized the Canal in search of revenue. Egypt denied Israel passage on grounds that they were still at war (lacking a peace treaty).

32. "Israel did not face any serious danger from Egypt at that time." Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 176.

33. Eisenhower contemplated using U.S. forces to protect *Egypt* from Israel, in conformity with the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 that called for American, British, and French intervention to defend *any* nation attacked in violation of the Arab-Israeli armistice.

34. A scorching Soviet note accused Israel of "playing with the fate of the whole world, with the fate of its own people. It is sowing hatred of the State of Israel among the peoples of the world." The Soviets threatened to crush British and French "war-mongers" by using "every kind of modern destructive weapon." Sachar, *History,* Vol. I, 505.

35. Cited by Neff, *Warriors at Suez*, 406. Eisenhower remarked that "we may have to hit 'em [the Soviets]—and if necessary, with *everything* in the bucket."

36. Moshe Sharett's personal diary, translated in Livia Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism* (Belmont, MA: Association of Arab-American University Graduates, 1986), 49.

37. Meron Medzini, "Reflections on Israel's Asian Policy." In Michael Curtis and Susan Aurelia Gitelson (eds), *Israel in the Third World.* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1976), 75.

38. France, Israel's chief patron, promised Israel 72 Mystère planes, 200 tanks, and large quantities of ammunition and parts, assuring Israeli military superiority to Egypt. France was Israel's chief arms supplier until the 1967 war. In return, Israel aided France in its 1954–1962 war against Algerian independence (attacking Algerian rebel bases in Libya). Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 165. Sylvia Crosbie, *The Tacit Alliance.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974) 107. Israel also served British political and commercial interests in South Africa into the 1960's. Israeli also received weapons (tanks) and aid from Germany—by 1965, German aid was twice that from the U.S.

39. Jabotinsky referred to the Zionists' "unshakable resolve to keep the whole Mediterranean in European hands. . . . The independence of Syria is understood by France, Italy, and Britain alike as a most fateful attempt against the security of their colonial empires. . . . In every East-West conflict we will always be on the side of the West, for the West has represented a more superior culture than the East over the last thousand years . . . and we today are the most prominent and loyal bearers of the culture. Our interest lies in expanding the British Empire even further than intended by the British themselves. . . . We can never support the Arab movement." Quoted in Lenni Brenner, *The Iron Wall* (London: Zed Press, 1984), 75–77.

40. To "contain" Soviet influence in the Middle East, the United States and Britain fashioned the 1955 pro-Western Baghdad Pact comprised of northern-tier Muslim states: Turkey, Pakistan, Iraq (temporarily), and Iran. On the other hand, Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt turned away from the United States and obtained arms from the Soviet Union. In response, Eisenhower sent the Sixth fleet to threaten

Syria. The marines landed in Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait in 1958 in an effort to secure oil and stem a seeming communist "revolutionary tide."

41. Donald Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem* (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988), 35.

42. Martin van Creveld, *The Sword and the Olive* (New York: Public Affairs, 1998), 172, 176–77.

43. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 40.

44. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 235–36. Interviewed in 1976, Dayan exonerated the Syrians and placed most of the blame on deliberate Israeli provocations. See Dayan quote in text above or here: "At least 80 percent of the clashes were started [when] we would send a tractor to plow some [off-limits] DMZ area and knew in advance that the Syrians would start to shoot. If they didn't shoot, we would tell the tractor to advance further until in the end the Syrians would get annoyed and shoot. And then we would use artillery and later the air force also, and that's how it was."

45. In addition to threats from Eshkol and Rabin, the *Jerusalem Post* reported on an inevitable major military clash that, according to authoritative sources, would "take the wind out of Syria's sails once and for all." Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, *Dangerous Liaison* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991), 137.

46. See note 31.

47. Syrian or Fatah cross-border raids were limited and no excuse for war. As Moshe Dayan told the Knesset on October 1966: "There is no wave of infiltration today." Michael Oren, *Six Days of War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 81. Indeed, the "operational achievements" of Palestinian raids across borders were, since they began in early 1965, "not impressive by any standard," according to Yehoshaphat Harkabi, former head of Israeli Military Intelligence. Norman Finkelstein, *Image and Reality* (New York: Verso, 2001), 133.

48. *The Rabin Memoirs*, cited by Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 116.

49. Cable of Assistant Secretary of State Lucius Battle to Washington. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 108.

50. Yitzhak Laor, "Orchestrated Panic," *London Review of Books*, 1 November 2007, 25.

51. "There is general agreement among commentators that Nasser neither wanted nor planned to go to war with Israel." Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 237. Nor did *Israeli leaders* such as Eban, Ben-Gurion, Rabin or Begin think so. Eban admitted in his memoirs that "Nasser did not want war, he wanted [political] victory without war." Abba Eban, *Autobiography*, cited in Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 147. Ben-Gurion told Rabin: "I very much doubt whether Nasser wanted to go to war." Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 239. Rabin never thought that Nasser wanted war. See "Rabin: Nasser Wanted Gains without War," *New Outlook* (June/July, 1977), translation of an article in *Yediot Ahronot* and cited in Tivnan, *Lobby*, 64. Menachem Begin publicly admitted: "The Egyptian army concentrations in the Sinai approaches do not prove that Nasser was really about to attack us. We must be honest with ourselves. We decided to attack him."

Norman Finkelstein casts heavy doubt on Michael Oren's claim that Egypt was about to attack Israel. See Michael Oren, *Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 95, 120, and Finkelstein's "Abba Eban with Footnotes," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (Spring 2003). Benny Morris also questions the notion that Egypt was intent on war. See his review of Oren's book (*Jerusalem Report*, 21 August 2002).

52. John Cooley, *Green March, Black September* (London: Frank Cass, 1973), 161. Nasser had demanded partial removal of UN peacekeeping troops situated on the Egyptian side of the border with Israel, his message to the Arab world that he was not hiding behind the UN. Removal of UN troops would enable an Egyptian force to cross the Egyptian-Israeli border in defense of Syria were Israel to attack Syria. But this was interpreted by the Israeli public as opening Israel to an intended Egyptian attack. Had the Israeli leadership thought the same, they would have allowed those UN peacekeeping troops to be posted on the *Israeli* side of the border. They did not.

53. David Hirst, *The Gun and the Olive Branch: The Roots of Violence in the Middle East* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977), 210. Abba Eban condemned later admissions by Israeli generals that Israel faced no danger from Egypt in 1967, not because they were false, but because they undermined "the moral basis of our political position"—propaganda that sustains public support. Finkelstein, *Image and Reality*, 219n409.

54. Johnson relied on multiple U.S. intelligence estimates. Steven L. Spiegel, *The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 141.

55. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 217.

56. Israeli Generals, including IDF Chief Yitzhak Rabin and Chief of Central Command Narkiss "regretted Israel's inability to seize the West bank and Jerusalem in 1948. . . . To rectify Israel's failure in 1948 [was] a miraculous chance." Michael Oren, *Six Days of War*, 135, 155, 191–92, 253–57.

57. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 210.

58. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 209.

59. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 228.

60. Richard Helms to Walt Rostow, CIA secret sturdy, "Israeli Objectives in the Current Crisis—Soviet Policy and Miscalculation," June 6, 1967. Cited by Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem* 230.

61. Amman Embassy to Sec. State, Secret flash cable 4098A, 2:33 p.m., June 6, 1967. Cited, Neff, *Warriors* for Jerusalem, 246–48.

62. Sachar, A *History, Vol. I*, 655.

63. After six-hours of careful reconnaissance, Israel planes jammed the *Liberty's* transmissions, torpedoed the hull containing electronic gear and destroyed all the life rafts. Miraculously the ship did not sink. "Dreaded canisters of napalm turned the *Liberty* into a floating hell of flames and screaming men. The wounded [171] and dead [34] were everywhere." Neff, *Warriors*, 255. Some believe that Israel attacked the U.S. intelligence ship to hide detectable Israeli war crimes, the murder of about 1,000 Egyptian POWs in the Sinai, the view and estimate of Aryeh Yitzhaki, an Israeli military historian working in the army's history department after the war. For a detailed

account of the attack on the *Liberty*, the reasons and the Washington cover-up, see James Bamford, *Body of Secrets* (New York: Anchor Books, 2002), 201–39.

64. U.S officials believed it to be deliberate. The CIA also considered it intentional. The ship was flying huge American flags clearly visible during the many hours of extremely close Israeli air surveillance—the Israeli pilots and U.S. sailors waved to each other! James Ennes, *Assault on the Liberty* (New York: Random House, 1979), 154. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 356.

65. Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 397.

66. Abba Eban. Reported by Thomas L. Friedman, "Eban in '87 on Fringe of Politics," *New York Times*, 14 June 1987, 3.

67. For example, Israel bulldozed 850 homes in Qalqilya, 360 at Beit Awa. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 292.

68. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 293.

69. Meron Benvenisti, *Intimate Enemies* (Berkeley: University of California, 1995), 191.

70. Neff, *Warriors for Jerusalem*, 297.

71. Israel downed many Syrian planes and, according to Syrian sources, one air attack destroyed the entire village of Dail, killing some 500. Neff, *Warriors Against Israel* (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988), 103. Israel shot down a Cairo-bound Libyan civilian airliner that strayed over the Israeli-occupied Egyptian Sinai, killing 106.

72. Tessler, *A History*, 479–80.

73. The U.S. supplied 22,300 tons of equipment plus 88 aircraft, surpassing Soviet resupply to Syria and Egypt, Neff, *Warriors Against Israel*, 221, 231, 338, 339.

74. "We had been stalling the Soviets for twenty-four hours on a cease-fire in place." Henry Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Boston: Brown and Co., 1982), 504. Israel also violated a UN cease-fire on October 22 with Kissinger's complicity. Department of State, Flash Top Secret Moscow #13148, "Eyes Only for [Brent] Scowcroft from Kissinger," October 21, 1973. Cited in Neff, *Warriors Against Israel*, 271.

75. Nixon gave Israel $1.5 billion in 1975 on top of $2.2 billion during the war.

76. Totals: 8,100 Arabs killed, 8,000 wounded, and 8,531 taken prisoner or missing; 2,838 Israelis killed, 8,800 wounded, and 508 taken prisoner or missing. The Arabs lost 2,300 tanks and 401 aircraft; Israel lost 840 tanks and 103 aircraft. Neff, *Warriors Against Israel*, 305.

77. Fred Kouri, *The Arab-Israeli Dilemma*, (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1985), 381.

78. At this time, Yitzak Rabin was prime minister, having succeeded Golda Meir in 1974.

SEARCH FOR GLOBAL INFLUENCE

Weapons Diplomacy, the Political Use of Arms

Israel's Search for Global Influence

Israel was the clear hegemonic power in the Middle East from the 1960s. Yet, like the United States, Israel also sought a larger, global influence to be accomplished through "weapons diplomacy," the foreign sale of weapons. Whereas the United States sold weapons to win the loyalty of other nations in a Cold War race with the Soviets, Israel had its own reasons.

First, Israel needed to counteract its diplomatic isolation from Third World nations that were scornful of Israel's "imperialist" wars against Arab states and Israel's support for apartheid South Africa. Following the 1967 "Six Day" war, twenty-nine African countries broke diplomatic relations with Israel. In reaction, Israel heightened its production and sale of heavy weapons such as tanks, missiles, fighter planes, warships, armored vehicles, and nuclear technology to worldwide clients, not only in Africa, but in Asia, Europe, and Latin America.[1] Israel needed friends at the United Nations and sale of weapons seemed to be one route to gain their fealty.

Second, Israel could advance politically as a "strategic asset" for White House administrations by stepping in as their weapons *proxy* when Congress prohibited the arming of pro-West dictators or right-wing "anti-socialist" militias such as the Nicaraguan "Contras."

Third, Israel sought to "contain" imputed enemy (Arab) states by arming nearby or surrounding *non-Arab* states—a "periphery strategy" designed to outflank Arab states.

Fourth, Israel and U.S. weapons sales were lucrative, *and* they opened doors for transnational corporations, commercial investment and access to foreign natural resources such as oil, natural gas, diamonds, gold, copper, uranium, coal, manganese, and timber from the Middle East, Africa, Central America, and Indonesia. Israel and the United States both depended, for example, on South Africa for three-quarters of their chromium imports vital to the manufacture of aircraft engines.[2] Indeed, Israel's chief export industries, weaponry, high technology, and processed diamonds, were dependent on South African and Congo natural resources.[3] To sell weapons for profit as well as political and commercial needs made sense.

Background on U.S Cold War Motivations for Weapons Diplomacy

With the rapid decline in European colonialism following World War II, the Cold War between the United States and Soviet Union became an intense race for global influence over newly independent non-aligned states. Britain, militarily and financially exhausted by the war, was unable to maintain its worldwide colonies—once a population of 700 million, after World War II it was reduced to five million. Colony independence occurred most notably in India, Palestine, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Sudan, Malaya, West Indies, and tropical Africa. France, too, lost its grip on Algeria and Indo-China, the Dutch lost Indonesia and the Portuguese lost ground in Africa. Only four African countries were independent in 1950, thirty were independent by 1962, and in 1977 virtually all of Africa was independent. Former colonies, now fledgling states, became U.S. or Soviet targets for political alignment and penetration. Many of them, with their histories of European autocratic rule and internal ethnic division, were unprepared for democratic government and, hence, were vulnerable to civil war, military rule, or dictatorships—and thus open to outside influence through weapons sales.

The United States, anticolonialist by reputation, nevertheless supported the retention of some of the remaining European colonies in order to preclude Soviet influence, for example in Kenya, Uganda, and Angola.[4] More anticommunist than anticolonialist, the United States sold arms to groups seeking to overthrow "left-leaning" governments. The examples of such "regime changes" are many.[5]

Israel, Britain, and the United States also solicited the loyalty of pro-West African dictators through weapons sales—dictators such as Amin in Uganda, Mobutu in Zaire, Bokassa in the Central African Republic, and Vorster in

apartheid South Africa. In the Americas, U.S. weapons supported pro-West autocratic regimes, military juntas, and right-wing insurgents in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Argentina.

The historic era of outright colonization and maintenance may have passed after World War II, but in the face of the cold war, neocolonialist overthrow of "leftist" governments or support of pro-West dictators through weapons sales persisted for another four decades.

Israel as a Proxy for U.S. Weapons Sales

In the late 1970s, the U.S. Congress called a halt to White House military training for and weapon sales to human rights violators. Yacov Meridor, chief economic coordinator in the Begin cabinet, advised the United States in 1981: "Don't compete with us in South Africa, don't compete with us in the Caribbean, or in any other country where you can't operate in the open. Let us do it. You sell the ammunition and equipment by proxy, Israel will be your proxy."[6] And in 1983, Prime Minister Begin secretly offered such surrogate services to the United States.[7] In 1984, when the Boland Amendment forbid the White House to aid the Nicaraguan Contras, President Reagan and Prime Minister Shamir formally agreed to coordinate their activities in the Third World, an agreement by which Israel become an unreachable arm of covert U.S. policy.[8] Knesset member General Matityahu Peled described Israel as the United States' "dirty work contractor."[9]

This U.S.-Israeli relationship provided Israel with many advantages; not only military alliance with the United States and massive U.S. economic aid, but U.S. diplomatic protection from UN Security Council condemnations. Most importantly, Israel acquired U.S. weapons technology for its own use, sale, or pass-through to other states. This huge support of the Israeli weapons industry enabled Israel to gain global penetration of, and political influence over, many states, especially pariah states lacking legitimate sources of weapons.

Israel's "Periphery" Strategy: Arms to "Contain" Arab States

Israel also sold arms to *non-Arab* states near, or on the periphery of, Arab states—a strategy modeled on the U.S. "containment" of the Soviet Union.[10] The goal was to outflank Arab (or Muslim) states by arming states hostile to their Arab or Muslim neighbors—a way, hopefully, of curbing the actions of these enemy states. To mention some examples of this periphery strategy: (a) Israel armed Christian Ethiopia as a counterforce to neighboring Egypt;[11]

(b) armed and trained Christian separatists against the Muslim-Arab Sudanese government;[12] (c) armed and trained forces in (non-Arab) Turkey to oppose Syria;[13] (d) armed Christian Phalangists against Palestinians in Lebanon;[14] (e) armed Hindu India in its conflict with Muslim Pakistan;[15] (f) recruited Druze (non-Muslim) fighters to destabilize Syria,[16] and (g) armed Iran (non-Arab) and trained Kurds during Iran's war with Iraq.[17]

Dominance versus Human Rights

Israel has not concerned itself with human rights issues arising from indiscriminant weapons sales. Israeli apologists have explained that Western civilization was (and is) under attack (whether by communists or Islamo-fascists) and that Israel is proud to be an outpost of Western culture fighting for democracy and freedom from foreign aggression. And yet this point is overshadowed by the fact that Israeli weapons have *not* gone to states facing foreign aggression as much as states seeking to oppress or exploit their own people.[18] Other Israeli apologists of the Realpolitik persuasion point out that Israel has only followed the accepted "way of the world." And to be sure, the moral issue is not Israel's alone to answer. Indeed, Israel's disregard of human rights in the name of common practice (or even of its own security) is nothing unusual, and its violations are no greater (nor no less) than those of the duplicitous British, French, Soviets, and Americans. All have traditionally pursued dominance and even supported terrorism through weapons sales without qualm and with much hypocrisy. Nonetheless, an international legal if not moral issue remains. Israel as well as others have supported terrorist regimes committing war crimes. The human cost is seen in their facilitation of crimes once perpetrated by Somoza, Pinochet, Marcos, Duvalier, Amin, Mobutu, Bokassa, and Vorster (see chapter 6).

The Veiled World of Arms Trafficking

In democracies, government support of terrorism, abuses of human rights, or other forms of domination of other peoples or states, requires either governmental secrecy or the manufacture of public consent. When governments of allegedly "open" societies conduct secret operations unknown to the public to whom they are democratically responsible, a contradiction exists. It is true that most covert government activities do *eventually* leak out after documents finally become declassified, operatives write memoirs or foreign press reports filter in. In time, governmental actions are exposed or unravel, sometimes by accident, such as the Iran-Contra Affair, the Eisenhower U-2 lie,

Kennedy's Bay of Pigs, Hasenfus' plane load of Contra weapons, the Lavon Affair, and Israel's attack on the *USS Liberty*. And yet the information becomes public too late. Governments count on the fact that public knowledge of covert operations will be outdated or a matter of indifference by the time it is discovered.

Israel's role in the training of foreign troops and sale of weapons has also come to light belatedly and uncertainly since proper documentation requires multiple sources. Some reliable sources concerning IDF Military Intelligence and the Mossad (Israel's CIA) do exist. One source is a 1991 study of covert Israeli intelligence operations by Ian Black and Benny Morris. These authors note that "written evidence is the exception rather than the rule in the field of intelligence and security"—that information has to pass through "the sieve of Israel's stringent laws of military censorship."[19] They draw on Israeli and foreign newspapers, journals, books, and interviews with former intelligence personnel. There also exists information on Israel's weapons production and sales reported by the *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute* (SIPRI), although this source reveals nothing of the thriving "black" or "grey" market of weapons transfers.

The "grey" market is complex. It includes legitimate purchases transferred to illegitimate recipients—a subterfuge involving *transshipment* to intermediary states (a "drop-off") en route to a final embargoed destination.[20] (Paraguay was once a favorite drop-off.) Or when the government is sensitive about the final destination of its arms, it can issue fake "end user" certificates. Another very common conduit and effective disguise for illicit arms transfers is state-run front companies called "cutouts."[21] Private arms merchants also disguise their trail through a maze of fictitious foreign companies.[22] In Israel, sales of government-owned and manufactured weapons, such as by Israel Aircraft Industries, are often secretly arranged by retired army officers.[23]

Summary

Israeli weapons diplomacy was a policy of global arms sales aimed at the attainment of global "power, influence, and prestige."[24] While sales were highly profitable and opened roads for business interests and access to foreign natural resources, the goal was primarily political. Through weapons sales, Israel hoped to develop loyal friends at the UN. It also sought to "contain" Arab countries through weapons support of their surrounding neighbors. But it was as a surrogate arms seller for U.S. administrations (which were blocked by Congress or the UN) that opened for Israel an even wider clientele, as well

as an advantageous relationship through which Israel could acquire U.S. weapons technology for its own use, sale, or pass-through to other states.

Notes

1. Aaron Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach: Arms Sales as Diplomacy* (Washington: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1985) 23, 24. Howard Sachar, A *History of Israel*, Vol. II (New York, Oxford University Press, 1987), 250, Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel*, Vol, I (New York: Knopf, 1986), 829. *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute* (SIPRI), 1980 Yearbook, 86.

2. "South Africa and U.S. Allied Through Trade and Diplomacy," *Washington Post*, 28 January 1985.

3. In the mid-1980s, Israel's industrial annual exports were about $3.5 billion ($1 billion in diamonds, $1 billion in arms, and $1.5 billion in high technology products, all dependent on African minerals, precious, rare, or industrial. Aaron Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach* (Washington: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1985), 54, 63, 65, 152, 154.

4. Kenya and Uganda were not independent until 1963 and 1962, respectively. The United States, fearing Soviet pressures, made no objection to British retention of Kenyan lands for white settlers and incarceration of 150,000 blacks in Nazi-style concentration camps. Chris McGreal, "Shameful legacy," *Guardian Weekly*, 24–30 November 2006, 18.

5. The United States unseated the government in Iran, installing the pro-West Shah in 1953, after the government nationalized the British Oil Company. In the name of anticommunism and in face of Dutch colonialist incapacity, the United States covertly "rescued" Indonesia (and its tin, rubber, timber, natural gas, and copper) from Soviet influence by means of installation of the pro-West General Suharno (at the cost of many hundreds of thousands of lives). In Vietnam, which had slipped from French colonial hands, the United States took up covert regime change and finally outright war against Vietnam's Communist government. The United States supported regime change in South and Central America, for example, in Chile and Guatemala.

6. *Ha'aretz*, 25 August 1981. Quoted in Jane Hunter, *No Simple Proxy, Israel in Central America*, Washington Middle East Associates, Washington, DC, 1987, 79–80.

7. Begin's government offered in 1983 "to act as a U.S. proxy in areas were U.S. congressional restraints or human rights concerns raise obstacles to direct U.S. aid." Edward Cody, "Salvador, Israel Set Closer Ties." *Washington Post*, 17 August 1983.

8. *Ma'ariv*, 10 April 1984 (see Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Middle East and Africa, April 10, 1984, 1–2).

9. Matityahu Peled, "Israel and the Arms market," *Ha'aretz,* 4 August 1985, cited by Beit-Hallahmi, *Israeli Connection*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1987), 78.

10. Ian Black and Benny Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991), 182–88.

11. Michael Brecher, *The Foreign Policy System of Israel* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972) 343. In the 1960s, Shimon Peres, with U.S. help, administered a major economic and military program to build Christian Ethiopia into a "second Egypt," an attempt to counter and diminish Egyptian influence.

12. Black and Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars*, 186. Bloch, Jonathan, and Fitzgerald, Patrick *British Intelligence and Covert Action* (London: Junction Books, 1983), 159.

13. This occurred from 1958 to 1978. Black and Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars*, 187–88. Beit-Hallahmi, *The Israeli Connection*, 16–17.

14. See chapter 7.

15. Amy Waldman, "The Bond Between India and Israel Grows," *New York Times*, 7 September 2003, 13. Sharon proposed that Israel bomb Pakistan's nuclear facility from an Indian base. Israel Shahak, *Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies* (London: Pluto Press, 1997), 32. Israel launched spy satellites over Iran with Indian rockets fired from Indian territory. Mark Tran, "Israel satellite to spy on Iran," *The Guardian Weekly*, 25 January 2008, 11.

16. Black and Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars*, 76–77.

17. Black and Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars*, 184, 428. Samuel Segev, *The Iranian Triangle* (Tel-Aviv: *Maariv*, 1981). It is notable that Israel and the United States armed *opposite* sides in the 1980–1988 Iran-Iraq war and that this did not spoil their partnership. The United States armed Iraq in order to win over Saddam Hussein and his oil to the West—having lost control of Iranian oil in the 1979 Khomeini revolution. On the other hand, Israel armed Iran to keep Iraq distracted by protracted war. Israel and the United States understood and accepted each other's motives. Neither needed the Iran-Iraq war to end. Seymour Hersh, "U.S. Secretly Gave Aid to Iraq Early in Its War Against Iran," *New York Times*, 26 January 1992, 1. Moreover, the United States saw that Israel's weapons connection with Iranian moderates might keep the Soviets out of Iran and lay down a line for future U.S.-Iranian detente.

The reality was that United States and Israel needed each other. Thus, there were no serious repercussions even over Israel's "systematic and growing pattern" of violations of U.S. law, (e.g., selling secret Patriot anti-missile missile technology in the 1990s). U.S. State Department inspector general's report, April 1, 1992, cited by David Hoffman, *Washington Post*, April 2, 1992. The United States also ignored Israel's arming of apartheid South Africa lest the U.S. be legally forced to terminate U.S. aid (U.S. 1986 Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Bill, Section 508).

18. For example, a substantial proportion of arms sales to Latin America has been devoted to the suppression of internal dissent, (e.g., Uruguay, Peru, Paraguay, Chile, Columbia, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala). *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute* (SIPRI), 1981 Yearbook, 114.

19. Black and Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars*, xii, xiii. Exchange visits by military generals and government officials or arms shipments and military operations on the ground may be discovered by investigative journalists. Also, inadvertent admissions by Israeli or foreign leaders occur, (e.g., Dayan's disclosure of Israeli arms to Marxist Ethiopia (1978) or Sharon's disclosure of arms to Khomeini's Iran (1981)). Books by

disgruntled Israeli intelligence officers such as Victor Ostrovsky ("By Way Of Deception") and Ari Ben-Menashe ("Profits of War") represent grievous blows to Israeli military censorship.

20. Another "grey" technique is the minor modification of a weapon so that it technically escapes embargo. For example, the Israeli KFir 2 Jet, powered by an American J79 engine (forbidden by U.S. law from going to South Africa), metamorphosed as the South African Cheetah. The U.S.-financed development of the Lavi fighter in Israel turned up in South Africa in a version called the Simba—a transfer deemed "unconscionable" by a Congressional Caucus. Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, *Dangerous Liaison: The Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1991), 290–91.

21. For example, a private U.S. company (Integrated Technologies International Co.) with CIA links gave a Chilean company (Cardoen) the technology for cluster bombs despite a UN embargo. A different U.S. company (Gamma Corporation, a CIA cutout) additionally sold Cardoen the necessary fuses. Israel then purchased these fused cluster bombs from Cardoen, evading, thus, the U.S. prohibition on cluster bombs to Israel. Ari Ben-Menashe, *Profits of War: Inside the Secret U.S.-Israeli Arms Network* (New York: Sheridan Square, 1992), 241–43. Chile also supplied Iraq with Anthrax, mustard gas, and chemical weapons, according to Ben-Menashe, *Profits*, 241–43.

22. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 119.

23. All arms sales are monitored and approved through Israel's Defense Ministry Sales Office. Requests come from all levels: the IDF, military and diplomatic missions in foreign states, representatives of government-owned or private arms manufacturers, independent dealerships (owned by former IDF officers or government officials), and private Israeli arms merchants (300 world-wide). Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 99. Bishara Bahbah, *Israel and Latin America: The Military Connection* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 93. *New York Times*, February 7, 1982.

24. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 38, 113.

History of Israel's Global Weapons Sales

Africa

As described in chapter 5, Israel faced the scorn of newly decolonized African states because of its 1956 and 1967 attacks on Egypt and military alliance with apartheid in South Africa. The image of Israel was that associated with imperialist Europe. The 1973 Yom Kippur war only highlighted Israel's continuing aggressive occupation of the African continent. These new African states were further disenchanted with certain political acts such as Israel's support for Portugal's colonial domination of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau. Israel reacted to this rejection with a vigorous program of weapons sales designed to gain the fealty of these immature African states, themselves often embattled in civil strife.

South Africa: Formerly British-ruled, South Africa retained a white-ruled, apartheid system until 1989. Its military alliance and political friendship with Israel began in 1955 with the purchase of Uzi submachine guns, followed in 1962 with purchase of thirty-two Centurion tanks. That same year, South Africa reciprocated with a ten ton shipment of uranium to fuel Israel's nuclear reactor.[1] The United Nations Security Council (Res. 181) imposed an embargo on arms to South Africa in 1963. Nevertheless, Israel modernized South Africa's armored vehicles and tanks and later gave South Africa the right to produce Israeli-designed battle tanks.[2]

The two nations were deeply committed to major weapons exchanges. When France, for example, cut off arms to Israel in condemnation of Israel's

1967 war, South Africa stepped in and provided Israel with its own French-supplied Jets. Israel reciprocated with Shafrir air-to-air missiles and refueling planes that enabled South Africa to attack anywhere in sub-equatorial Africa.[3] Israel also began to train South African forces during its 1974 invasion of Angola and continued to do so for many years after.[4]

Prime Minister John Vorster visited Israel in 1976 and signed a pact that deepened their military and business collaborations[5]—"the root of the pact is a mutual exchange of materials and military know-how."[6] Israel supplied patrol boats, surface-to-surface Gabriel missiles, automatic guns, antisubmarine torpedoes, 105 mm self-propelled howitzers, air-to-air rockets, antitank missiles and various electronic and counterinsurgency equipment.[7] Also shared was a full-fledged "secret" nuclear weapons cooperation program that was sufficiently obvious in 1977 to elicit UN condemnation and an arms embargo (UN Res. 418). In 1979 and 1980, Israel and South Africa tested tactical nuclear weapons,[8] and Israel provided the Jericho missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads.[9]

Thirty-five percent of Israel's total arms sales, prior to 1980, went to South Africa.[10] Then in 1981, Ariel Sharon visited South Africa and further increased Israel's commitment, providing thirty-six Kfir jets, hundreds of Gabriel missiles, howitzers, missile boats, four hundred U.S.-made armored personnel carriers, U.S.-made recoilless rifles and much else.[11] The South African government acknowledged this "continuing high-level contact between South Africa and Israel,"[12] and the Head of South Africa's military industry admitted that "Israeli technological assistance permits South Africa to evade arms embargo."[13] The importance to Israel was equally great. *Ha'aretz* referred to South Africa as "Israel's second most important ally, after the U.S."

The attitude of the United States toward South Africa in the 1980s was mixed if not duplicitous.[14] Reagan viewed South Africa as aligned with the West and he supplied weapons technology to South Africa in violation of 1986 UN embargoes (Res. 591) and U.S. Congressional sanctions by sometimes using Israel as the go-between.[15]

The mutual identification between Israel and South Africa existed on many levels: social, ethnic, economic, and military.[16] Most obviously they shared an apartheid problem for which they jointly incurred Third World and international censure. *New York Times* journalist C. L. Sulzberger observed:

> There is a remarkably close if little known partnership between Israel and
> South Africa. Prime Minister Vorster even goes so far as to say Israel is now

faced with an apartheid problem—how to handle its Arab inhabitants. Neither nation wants to place its future entirely in the hands of a surrounding majority and would prefer to fight.[17]

Israel and South Africa, though pariah states for others, saw themselves as fortresses of white-European "survival"—outposts of Western civilization midst Arab and African peoples. An article in *Ha'aretz* bemoaned that "the Third World, with Soviet guidance and Arab financing, has been carrying on for years an offensive against two states tied to the West: Israel and South Africa."[18] Both countries based their survival as colonists on dominating force above any other consideration. Both espoused toughness in the face of Third World "terrorism" and, as world victims, believed they had need of and the right to have nuclear weapons. Neither country openly questioned what part their own behavior played in eliciting Third World disapproval.

The Congo: Formerly the Belgian Congo, then Zaire (1965-1997), now the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Congo personifies the ravages of colonialism in Africa. King Leopold II of Belgium was given this territory as his personal property at the Berlin Conference of 1885. Millions ended up enslaved or murdered. After the Congo gained its independence in 1960, an army mutiny and the mysterious death of Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba (a CIA assassination target) brought Col. Joseph Mobutu (Mobutu Sese Seko), a military man trained in Israel, to head the army. In 1965 Mobutu appointed himself president and was awarded huge CIA subsidies and Israeli military support.[19] Israel sold tanks to Mobutu that were transshipped through France, West Germany, Italy, Denmark, and Canada. Israel also provided military training and equipment for Mobutu's army and elite commando battalion.[20]

In 1973, Mobutu broke relations with Israel over its continuing occupation of the Egyptian Sinai. The United States continued to provide aid in fear of Soviet encroachment.[21] Relations with Israel resumed in the early 1980s after Israeli officials (Ezer Weizman, David Kimche, and Ariel Sharon) offered military training, weapons and a gift of ten million dollars. Gen. Ehud Barak met with Mobutu and outlined Israel's military aid program. And Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir promised to "influence Jewish organizations in the United States . . . [to] help in improving [the Congo's] image."[22] At Israel's request, the U.S. Congress made a $20 million grant to the Congo, out of which Mobutu paid Israel for the training of its army.[23] Israel became Mobutu's chief supplier of weapons and training.[24]

In a country marked by exceptional wealth of natural resources (gold, copper, cobalt, diamonds, zinc, oil, timber, and uranium), Mobutu accumulated

a personal fortune of many billions of dollars. The people lived on 22 cents a day and more than one-third died of malnutrition.[25] Mobutu was, until his end in 1997, singled out by Amnesty International as one of the most oppressive rulers in Africa. Repeated insurrections, sometimes involving foreign troops, took the lives of about two million civilians.

Uganda: Uganda achieved independence from Britain in 1962. The first prime minister, Milton Obote, promoted Idi Amin as deputy commander of Uganda's army and air force. Amin, who received his military training in Israel, was fully in charge of the military by 1966. Israel sold tanks and planes and trained the Ugandan air force.[26] Amin, supported by the CIA, the British MI6 and the Mossad, carried out a coup in 1971 against the "left-leaning" Obote, who was anti-Zionist, threatened to nationalize British-held property in Uganda. It was thought that Amin would be a "useful puppet and come to rely on a large Israeli military presence for his survival."[27] It was not to be. Israeli influence ended in 1972 when Israel declined to infuse money and jet fighters needed by Amin to attack Obote, then in exile in Tanzania. The country was in violent upheaval between Amin and Obote's rivalrous tribes as well as economic collapse. For cold war reasons the United States aided Amin until his end in 1979.[28]

Zimbabwe (formerly Rhodesia): White Rhodesia declared independence from Britain in 1965. The United States backed the white minority government in its fight against black insurgents by providing U.S. mercenaries and shipments of oil. Israel supplied the white regime with Uzi submachine guns and U.S.-made Bell helicopters in violation of a 1977 UN mandatory arms embargo.[29] These helicopters were sold by the U.S. to the Israeli air force and then transshipped to South Africa through private U.S. and Israeli companies.[30] Black majority rule came in 1980.

Angola and Mozambique: Portugal, a dictatorship and the poorest country in Western Europe in the 1960s, retained its colonial empire in Africa (Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and Angola) rich in diamonds, oil, natural gas, copper, and other minerals. South Africa, the United States, Great Britain, and Israel were heavy supporters of Portugal's suppression of black liberation movements. Israel supplied SA-7 missiles, artillery shells, and Uzis.[31]

The Portuguese-backed white Angolan government was overthrown in 1974 by a Marxist-influenced liberation force (MPLA). South Africa and pro-West guerrillas (UNITA), aided by Israel and the CIA, invaded Angola.[32] Despite a Congressional ban on U.S. involvement (Clark Amendment, 1976), the United States and Israel continued to support a South African invasion of Angola and Namibia.[33] In the early 1980s, Israel partnered in South Africa's attempt to turn Mozambique, by then independent,

back into a Portuguese colony. South Africa had primary responsibility for an estimated 1.5 million deaths in this cold war fight against newly liberated Portuguese colonies.[34]

Central America

The United States Tradition of Neocolonialism in the Western Hemisphere

In 1823, President Monroe declared Central and South America to be the exclusive domain of the United States. Although the Monroe Doctrine failed to keep the Spanish out of the Dominican Republic, it did pressure the French in Mexico and led to the Spanish-American War in 1898. Theodore Roosevelt expanded the Monroe Doctrine in 1904 with his "Corollary" that the United States was free to intervene militarily in event of any European interference. U.S. colonialist policy led to the occupation of the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Uruguay, Argentina, and the Philippines. In fact, between 1900 and 1921, the United States military intervened twenty-eight times in Central America and Mexico.[35] Latin America was considered U.S. turf, and neocolonialist regime change a U.S. entitlement. This habit not only persisted until World War II, but intensified with the Cold War.

Nicaragua: The Somoza family dominated Nicaragua from the 1930s to 1979. It controlled the economy and blocked all efforts at peaceful political and social change. The United States faithfully supported this Somoza family rule.[36] Israel had a special reason for supporting the regime: gratitude to the Somozas for having provided diplomatic cover for Jewish agents buying arms in Europe in the 1940's. Israel's sale of weapons to the Somoza government began in 1957.[37]

When poverty and corruption galvanized a 1961 insurrection against the Somozas by the FSLN "Sandinistas," Israel continued to back the Somoza dictatorship. Israel supplied tanks, planes, boats, helicopters, missiles, and machine guns—in fact, 98 percent of all arms to Nicaragua in the 1970s.[38] The Sandinista insurrection was put down with such "savagery" toward the civilian population that the U.S. Congress cut off arms to Somoza's National Guard in 1978. Israel continued to supply weapons until the end of Somoza's rule a year later.[39] The country was in ruins, littered with 40,000 corpses, the treasury robbed, the economy devastated.[40] Smith Hempstone commented on the success of Israel's weapons diplomacy: "Israel knows the difference between its friends and its enemies, and refuses to make moral judgments about the friends' policies. . . . You will find Nicaragua casting its ballot [at the UN] in support of Israel."[41]

Matters did not end when the Somoza family was overthrown in 1979. The United States *reorganized* Somoza's former National Guard, known as the "Contras," to attack the newly installed and liberal Sandinista government. The Contras were trained in the U.S. Army School in the Panama Canal Zone and were based in Honduras for forays into Nicaragua. Ariel Sharon secretly supplied the Honduran base with sophisticated Kfir jet fighters, armored tanks, Galil assault rifles, and training for officers, troops, and pilots,[42]—creating the strongest air force in Central America.[43]

Reagan considered the Contras to be his anticommunist "freedom fighters" against the "socialist" Sandinista government, which had nationalized some industries, instituted land reforms, and improved public health and education. When it became publicly known in 1983 that Israel had been secretly supplying weapons to the Contras, Reagan acknowledged that it had been at his request.[44] He then signed a National Security Decision Directive (III) formally establishing strategic cooperation with Israel for the purpose of "coordinating activity in the third world."[45] Israel, as arms supplier, became an unreachable arm of covert U.S. policy.[46] Although Congress prohibited all military aid to the Contras (Boland amendment,1984), the White House continued its attempts to secretly finance the Contras by profitable sale of U.S. arms to terrorist Iran through Israel (Iran-Contra Affair, 1985–1986).[47]

El Salvador: For most of its history, El Salvador has been ruled by military dictators that cast the population into abject poverty.[48] The Kennedy administration saw in popular unrest a potential Marxist threat. In the early 1960s he established a Central American military command under U.S. supervision which trained the Salvadoran secret police as well as thousands of Central American army officers, including future dictators.[49]

By the 1970s, popular resistance to the Salvadoran government had broken out and was countered by the army supported by CIA and Israeli advisors. After the Congressional cutoff of weapons to human rights abusers in 1977, Israel supplied over 80 percent of El Salvador's weapons, continuing through 1981.[50] These included scores of jets and other planes, rocket launchers, hundreds of Uzi submachine guns, napalm, and more.[51] Salvadoran army bombing campaigns depopulated areas suspected of supporting rebels and death squads circulated.[52] Residents were rounded up and taken into rural "pacification programs."[53] Israel's ambassador in El Salvador pledged Israeli technical assistance with these programs, a field "in which we are considered specialists."[54] One hundred Israeli advisors worked in counterinsurgency training and installed computer systems to identify opponents of the government.[55]

   Guatemala: The elected "leftist" President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman was overthrown in a 1954 CIA coup. He had, for example, redistributed the United Fruit Company's fallow land to working people. Thereafter, Guatemala remained under extended military rule, though challenged by repeated insurrections. From 1960 through the 1980s the military government used, reportedly with Israeli assistance, paramilitary death squads against suspected guerillas, their potential sympathizers and critics of the government.[56] After the 1977 U.S. arms cutoff, Israel built Guatemala an airbase and a munitions factory, becoming Guatemala's largest supplier of weapons for the next decade.[57] In 1982, Israeli military advisors helped to develop and carry out Plan Victoria, a scorched earth campaign in which the Guatemalan army bombed, strafed, and burned large numbers of villages.[58] An estimated 100,000 peasants escaped across the border to Mexico or into mountainous areas.[59] Although "indiscriminate use of violence" by the murderous Guatemalan army was noted by U.S. officials, Reagan gave Israel a green light to support this army.[60] Israel was cited by Guatemalan Chief of Staff Lucas Garcia as "the only country that gave us support."[61]

   Jane Hunter summarizes: "Three successive military governments and three brutal and sweeping campaigns against the Mayan population, described by a U.S. diplomat as Guatemala's 'genocide against the Indians,' had the benefit of Israeli techniques, experience, and hardware."[62] One and a half million civilians were forced into "pacification" programs.[63] Journalist Alexander Cockburn concludes that "both the U.S. and Israel bear rather serious moral responsibility" for Guatemala—200,000 killed in four decades.[64] Despite a 1996 formal peace, conflict persists.[65]

South America

Chile: Nixon's national security advisor, Henry Kissinger, worried in 1973 that socialism in countries like Chile would become a "contagion" factor that might encourage Euro-Communism or social reforms in Third World countries. Accordingly, the CIA aided the military overthrow of Chile's elected president, Salvador Allende. Augusto Pinochet then ruled until 1990 in an environment of state terror with thousands of political assassinations, detentions, and expulsions. Israel sold Pinochet infrared homing (Shafir) missiles, fast patrol boats, radar systems, antitank missiles, and more.[66]

   Argentina: Israel's weapons diplomacy extended to Brazil (Gabriel missiles and helicopters), to Ecuador (Kfir fighters, Nesher jets, Arava transports, and Barak missiles for its navy) and to Columbia (Arava transports, Kfiri fighter

bombers, Shafir and Gabriel missiles).[67] But Israel's largest South American client was Argentina. Rafael Videla, military dictator, who pursued his infamous "Dirty War" (death squad "disappearances" of 30,000 citizens) from 1976 to 1981, purchased much of his weaponry from Israel—in fact, 30 percent of Israel's total weapons sales in the 1970s went to Argentina.[68] Despite Carter's resistance to selling arms in areas of conflict, Israel sold Mirage (Dagger) fighters, Gabriel missiles, Skyhawk fighters, etc. to the military junta and, during and after the 1982 Falkland War, defied a Western alliance ban on weapons to Argentina by building and rebuilding its air force.[69]

Other Areas

Iran: In 1953 the CIA and Britain's MI6 toppled Iran's prime minister, Mohammed Mossadegh, in response to his nationalization of British oil interests. Israel sold the newly installed pro-West Shah large quantities of arms and trained Iran's military officers in ground and air warfare.[70] The Israeli Mossad and CIA jointly trained the Shah's terrorist secret police (SAVAK).[71] Israel sold over $100 million worth of weapons per year until the Shah was overthrown by the Khomeini Islamic revolution of 1979.[72] Then, during the protracted Iran-Iraq war (1980–1989), Israel sold weapons to Iran through indirect channels, about $500 million worth between 1980 and 1983.[73] By strengthening Iran's military, Israel hoped to weaken and distract Iraq.[74]

Indonesia: Indonesia was another case of "contagious" socialism intolerable to the United States. In 1965, a military coup led by pro-American General Suharno against the parlimentary government, succeeded with covert U.S. and British help.[75] As many as 600,000 were killed, mostly landless peasants.[76] In 1975–1976, Indonesia, armed by the United States, invaded and annexed neighboring East Timor on claim of forestalling Soviet influence—an annexation not recognized by the UN. East Timor separatists fought on. Israel supplied the Indonesians with 28 American Skyhawk fighters and 11 gunship helicopters when their arms were depleted in the course of the 1979 massacre of Timorese civilians.[77] The Washington Post reported that "the U.S. government is fronting an arms deal in which Israel, without being publicly identified as the source, is selling Indonesia used warplanes obtained from the United States."[78]

Taiwan: After World War II, the United States trained and armed the Taiwanese Nationalist army and air force, enabling Taiwan's dictator, Chiang Kaishek, to oppose union with mainland communist China. When Nixon sought rapprochement with Mainland China in the 1970s, he feared alienating China

by continued support of Taiwan. Israel stepped in as weapons supplier and Tai-wan became one of Israel's most important partners.[79] In the early 1980s, Israel supplied Taiwan with American-made tanks, missile boats, Shafir and Gabriel missiles, and artillery.[80] Moreover, Israel sold and shared nuclear and chemical warfare technology with Taiwan. This created a nuclear alliance between Is-rael, Taiwan, and South Africa, known as the "Fifth World," a cause of great international concern.[81]

Summary and Observations

Israel's weapons sales extended its influence worldwide. The dependence of many states on Israeli weapons was, as Aaron Klieman notes, under-stood by Israel as its way to achieve prestige, power and influence glob-ally.[82] This strategy importantly depended on Israel being the major recip-ient of U.S. weapons technology and seller of U.S military equipment. Moreover, Israel, as a proxy weapons supplier, became a covert arm of U.S. administrations seeking to circumvent Congressional and UN bans on weapons to human rights abusers—pro-West dictators, military juntas, and right-wing insurgents.

The weapons diplomacy of the United States and its partner has been ex-plained primarily in terms of the U.S. Cold War rivalry with the Soviet Union, that is, as a means to gain political alignment from otherwise neutral or wavering states, or as a means to impose regime change in "leftist" states through support of rightwing insurgents. Weapons diplomacy has also been a highly lucrative business and a means by which U.S and Israeli industries and corporations have gained access to foreign markets and natural resources.

The human rights abuses by the recipients of these weapons have largely been ignored by Israel, the United States, the Europeans and Soviets—as have the consequences of adding the fuel of weapons to burning conflicts be-tween states.[83] Yitzak Shamir candidly stated, "We sell to everyone."[84] This seeming indifference to human rights in the pursuit of political goals—not Is-rael's alone—was also implicit in Ben-Gurion's 1959 policy statement: "we ask ourselves one simple question: What is good for Israel?"[85]

It is, indeed, the duty of a state to provide security for its citizens. How-ever, to fail to see the needs of abused others, or to contribute to their abuse, injures Israel's image. Israel intended through weapons sales to reverse its po-litical isolation arising from disapproval of its "imperialist" wars and support of apartheid South Africa. Yet morally dubious weapons sales, even if win-ning fealty from client states, also isolates Israel through loss of respect.

But perhaps what is more short-sighted is that weapons diplomacy, a supposed tool for acquiring global influence, prestige, and global immunity from criticism, can be mistaken for an effective foreign policy. The answer to solving Israel's political problems would seem to turn less on acquiring friends than on negotiated settlement with the immediate and relevant states and parties.

Notes

1. Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, *Dangerous Liaison: the Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), 293. Leonard Beaton, "Must the Bomb Spread? The Case of India, Egypt and Israel." *Jewish Observer and Middle East Report*, 14 January 1966. Also, *The Wall Street Journal*, 23 April 1976.

2. "The Israeli Connection." *The Economist*, 5 November 1977, 91. Israel also sold radar and guerilla equipment.

3. The South African navy also acquired its training strategy, tactics, and technology from Israel.

4. In 1976, a Knesset member asserted that hundreds of Israeli soldiers were attached to South African forces as instructors and participants in training maneuvers. *New York Times*, 1 June 1976. *The Economist*, "New Scramble for Africa." 19 September 1981. As late as 1986, an Israeli journalist wrote, "It is a clear and open secret, known to everybody, that in army camps [in South Africa] one can find Israeli officers in not insignificant numbers who are busy teaching white soldiers to fight black terrorists, with methods imported from Israel." A. Tavori, "The South African Hypocrisy Connection. " *Davar*, 1 April 1986, 5 [Hebrew]. Cited in Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, *The Israeli Connection*, (New York: Pantheon Books, 1987), 121.

5. South African capital was already heavily invested in Israeli industries: EL Al airline, clothing manufacturers (Ata), dress factories, banks, mortgage and insurance companies, foundries, resorts, etc. Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, Vol. 1, (New York: Knopf, 1986), 716.

6. The *Johannesburg Star*, report on Prime Minister Vorster's visit to Israel in 1976. Cited in *United Nations Centre Against Apartheid, Special Report*. "Relations Between Israel and South Africa." No. 5–77. (February 1977): 11.

7. *The Economist*, 5 November 1977, 90–91.

8. CBS-TV news reported on February 21, 1980 that the 1979 flash detected off the coast of South Africa was an Israeli-South African nuclear test. On March 23, 1993, South Africa acknowledged that it possessed nuclear weapons in the late 1970s. *Peace, Security and Conflict Resolution: SIPRI-Unesco Handbook* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 183. South Africa subsequently relinquished its nuclear program.

9. See R. Walters, *South Africa and the Bomb: Responsibility and Deterrence*. (Trenton, NJ: African World Press, 1986).

10. *SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) World Armament and Disarmament Yearbook*, 1981, 84, 86.

11. Amnon Kartin, "The Arms Map." *Hadashot*, 8 June 1984 [Hebrew]; also *The Apartheid War Machine: the strength and deployment of the South African armed services.* (London: International Defense and Aid Fund, 1980). Both cited in Beit-Hallahmi, The *Israeli Connection*, 118.

12. Yodel Marcus, "Sharon's End." *Ha'aretz*, 1 October 1982, 5. *South Africa 1984, Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*, Johannesburg, 1984.

13. *Davar*, 17 December 1982, citing the journal of the *Israeli Labor Party*.

14. Michael Klare, "Evading the Embargo: Illicit U.S. Arms Transfers to South Africa," *Journal of International Affairs* (Spring/Summer, 1981): 15-28. At various times France, Britain, and West Germany also reportedly stepped in as direct suppliers of conventional arms. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 152.

15. "During the Nixon Administration, for instance, it was an explicit but undeclared policy of the United States to provide South Africa with military technology and dual-use items that could be disguised as civilian products." Andrew Pierre, *Cascade of Arms: Managing Conventional Weapons Proliferation* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 1997), 55. Shimon Peres' authorized biography explains: "Israel's main role in the partnership was as a go-between. There were countries such as . . . South Africa, that the United States wanted to assist. It was very convenient to give the aid via Israel." Matti Golan, *The Road to Peace: A Biography of Shimon Peres* (New York: Warner Books, 1989), 119. U.S. sanctions (on top of UN sanctions) banned all American investment in and export from South Africa, but estimates were that this was only 10 percent effective. *Issues Before the 42nd General Assembly of the United Nations*, John Tessitore and Susan Woolfson, Eds. (New York: Free Press, 1988), 21.

16. Israelis immigrated to South Africa in numbers second only to the United States. The two countries engaged in athletic competitions (international boycotts ignored), music and dance performances, university exchange programs, employment, business, public-relations campaigns, etc. Shamir, Rabin, Eban, Dayan and Sharon made a large number of secret visits to South Africa. Israel helped to get South African goods into Europe and the United States. For example, cheap-labor goods were exported first to Israel for final assembly and labeled as "made in Israel" and reexported to Europe and the United States as Israeli duty-free products. See Kunirum Osia, Israel, *South Africa and Black Africa* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1981). Also, *The Wall Street Journal*, April 23, 1976 and UN Report (A/AC.115/CRP.25) on the Relations Between Israel and South Africa, 20.

17. C. L. Sulzberger, "Strange Nonalliance," *New York Times*, 30 April 1971, 39.

18. A. Schweitzer, "Why South Africa?" *Ha'aretz*, 6 August 1985 [Hebrew].

19. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "CIA's secret subsidy to Israel," *Boston Globe*, 14 February 1977. Also, Edward Behr, *Wall Street Journal*, 22 February 1977. Leopold Yehuda Laufer, *Israel and the Developing Countries: New Approaches to Cooperation.* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967), 171. "American support for . . .

Mobutu Sese Seko . . . left a legacy of debt, violent ethnic conflict and weak institutions." Editorial, "Dancing With Dictators," *New York Times*, 1 September 2002.

20. Israel sold tanks, Galil, Uzi, M-16 rifles and artillery shells in the 1970s. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach: Arms Sales as Diplomacy*. (New York: Pergamon–Brassey's, 1985), 140.

21. *London Financial Times*, 4 December 1979. The West supports Mobutu because "there is no alternative" to blocking Soviet influence. Evans and Novak described the CIA investment in Israeli activities in the Congo as "one of the best dividends from this CIA investment" in all Africa. Evans, Rowland and Novak, Robert "The CIA Secret Subsidy to Israel." *Washington Post*, 24 February 1977, A15.

22. Reuter, *Boston Globe*, 20 January 1983.

23. Z. Barak, "Israel Persuades Its Friends in Congress to Support Military Aid to Zaire." *Yediot Aharonot*, 8 March 1983 [Hebrew] cited by Beit-Hallahmi, *The Israeli Connection*, 59.

24. Sharon "defended Israel's new arms and military aid agreement with Zaire . . . as a step towards increasing Israeli influence in Africa." UPI, *New York Times*, 22 January 1983. *Los Angeles Times*, 13 January 1983.

25. Jonathan Kwitny, *Endless Enemies: The Making of an Unfriendly World*. (New York: Congdon and Weed, 1984) 101. The infant mortality rate was over 10 percent.

26. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 140. SIPRI, *Arms Trade Register*, 1975, 89.

27. Jonathan Bloch and Patrick Fitzgerald, *British Intelligence and Covert Action* (London: Junction Books, 1983), 162. Michael Kaufman, "Idi Amin, Murderous and Erratic Ruler of Uganda in the 70's, Dies in Exile" *New York Times*, 17 August 2003, 32. Israeli colonel Baruch Bar-Lev was instrumental in Amin's coup.

28. Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman, *The Political Economy and Human Rights* (Boston: South End Press, 1979) Vol. 2, Chapter 5, note 44, 326–27; and chapter 11, note 22. The United States funneled many $100,000 packages to Amin, Bokassa (Central African Republic) and others. Lowell Weicker, "Stop Subsidizing Amin's Murders," *Christian Science Monitor*, 21 August 1978; Bernard Nossiter, "How the CIA keeps Idi Amin in whiskey," *New Statesman*, 13 October 1978; *Washington Post*, 11 September 1978. Amin caused to be murdered some 300,000 civilians. Michael Kaufman, "Idi Amin, Murderous and Erratic Ruler of Uganda in the 70's, Dies in Exile," 32.

29. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 140.

30. United Nations Document 79-28658 (November 2, 1979). *Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa, Special Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on recent developments in the relations between the United States and South Africa.* Citing *Rand Daily Mail*, 30 January 1979.

31. Israel licensed the manufacture of Uzis to Portugal as well as to other states The Uzi, a gun found throughout Africa in the hands of starving African youths, became the established route to power, extortion, murder, rape, and AIDS. See Ryszard Kapuscinski's, *Shadow of the Sun*.

32. Treverton, *Covert Action*, 156. Cuban soldiers, with Soviet support, entered Angola to defend the new Marxist-influenced government opposed by South African

forces (October 1975). The CIA supplied $25 million in military equipment until Congress blocked further covert support. Harry Rositzke, *The CIA's Secret Operations* (New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1977), 182. In this classic cold war conflict, Kissinger encouraged Israel to support South Africa's invasion despite a Congressional ban (Clark Amendment, 1976). Israel sent military instructors and equipment for anti-guerilla warfare. *The Guardian*, 7 July 1976. "The Israeli Connection," *The Economist*, 5 November 1977, 91. For a full account of South Africa's brutal war in Angola see John Ya-Otto, *Battlefront Namibia*, (Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill Co., 1981).

33. Drew Middleton, "South Africa Needs More Arms, Israel Says," *New York Times*, 14 December 1981." Beit-Hallahmi, *The Israeli Connection*, 64. In 1986, the United States approved more money for CIA weapons to Angola. Gregory Treverton, *Covert Action: The Limits of Intervention in the Postwar World* (New York: Basic Books, 1987), 220. James Brooke, "CIA said to Send Rebels in Angola Weapons via Zaire," *New York Times*, 1 February 1987. Alan Ben-Ami, "U.S., Israel involved in Angolan arms affair, too," *Jerusalem Post*, 19 December 1986.

34. The death toll of infants and young children alone was 850,000. Dereje Asrat et al., *Children on the Front Line*, 3rd edition, (UNICEF, 1989).

35. Julia Sweig, *Friendly Fire: Losing Friends and Making Enemies in the Anti-American Century* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006), 4.

36. President Franklin Roosevelt said, "He may be an SOB, but he's our SOB."

37. Shimon Peres wrote to Somoza, "Out of an awareness of the excellent and friendly relations between our two countries, we have tried, within our limitations, to provide every possible assistance to the success of your mission." Matti Golan, *Shimon Peres: A Biography* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982), 81. "A Backward Glance: Reckoning Israel's Debt to the Somozas," *Israeli Foreign Affairs* 1, no. 1 (December 1984): 3. 133.

38. *SIPRI Yearbook* 1974, 282; 1975, 240; 1977, 330; 1980, 96. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 135. *New York Times*, 19 November 1978. "Nicaragua: Israel Helps Out," *Newsweek*, 20 November 1978, 68.

39. Robert Cullen, "U.S. Won't Attempt to Prevent Israeli Arms Sales to Somoza," *Miami Herald*, 18 November 1978. Cynthia Arnson, "Israel and Central America," *New Outlook*, (March/April 1984): 20. Also, Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, *Dangerous Liaison*, 315. Noam Chomsky, *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), 291.

40. Noam Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* (New York: Verso, 1991), 73.

41. Smith Hempstone, "It's Logical for Israel to Continue Supplying Weapons to Nicaragua," *Washington Post*, 3 December 1978.

42. Susan Morgan, "Israel Selling Fighter Jets, Thanks to Honduras?" *Christian Science Monitor*, 14 December 1982. Sharon met the contras in Honduras two days after a Reagan visit, and according to a Honduran functionary, "Sharon's trip was more positive. He sold us arms. Reagan only uttered platitudes, explaining that Congress was preventing him from doing more." Clarence Lusane, "Washington's Proxy: Israeli Arms in

Central America," in Ellen Ray and William Schaap, eds. *Covert Action: the Roots of Terrorism* (New York: Ocean Press, 2003), 146. "Sharon Met Contras in 1982," *Israeli Foreign Affairs* (October 1985).

43. *New York Times*, 6 December 1982. Israel advisors reportedly trained Honduran pilots. Edward Cody, "Nicaraguan Rebels Go Covert Again," *Washington Post*, 12 November 1983.

44. Philip Taubman, "Israel Said to Aid Latin Aims of U.S.: Seized PLO. Arms Reported Going to Nicaragua Rebels," *New York Times*, 21 July 1983.

45. Charles Babcock, "U.S.-Israeli Ties Stronger Than Ever," *Washington Post*, 5 August 1986. Quote is from Shamir interview, *Hatzofe*, December 16, 1983. "Formal agreement, covert U.S.-Israeli actions," Ma'ariv, 10 April 1984.

46. Secret aid to the Contras came not only from Israel but reportedly from pro-U.S. Taiwan, South Korea, and possibly Saudi Arabia. J. McCartney, "Others Said to Supply 'Contras,'" *Philadelphia Inquirer*, May 31, 1984. Bob Woodward, "CIA Sought Third-Country Contra Aid," *Washington Post*, 19 May 1984.

47. Israel had a wide open channel in Iran, selling nearly $500,000,000 in weapons to Khomeini's Iran between 1980 and 1983.

48. In 1932, the Salvadoran military massacred 30,000 civilians in a rebellion. James Dunkerley, *The Long War: Dictatorship and Revolution in El Salvador* (London: Verso, 1982), 29 and *passim*.

49. Between 1950 and 1980, 2097 Salvadorans, 3334 Guatemalans, 3834 Hondurans and 5679 Nicaraguans participated in the U.S. *International Military Education and Training* program. *DOD Foreign Military Sales and Military Assistance Facts*, December 1980, in Arnon Hader, *The United States and El Salvador: Political and Military Involvement* (Berkeley, CA: U.S.-El Salvador Research and Information Center, 1981), 126.

50. Hader, *The United States and El Salvador*, 1981, Appendix 13, 127. From 1975 to 1979, 83 percent of El Salvador's imported weapons came from Israel. *SIPRI Yearbook*, 1980, 97. Also, Larry Remer, "Israeli Weapons Industry Goes Boom: But Its Arms Draw Fire As a Moral Issue Abroad," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 July 1981. In the 1970s Israel was the largest seller of aircraft and other weapons as well as supplier of an estimated 100 Israeli advisors. Clarence Lusane, "Washington's Proxy: Israeli Arms in Central America," in Ray and Schaap, *Covert Action*, 147.

51. *SIPRI Yearbook* 1976, 1979; Aaron Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach: Arms Sales As Diplomacy* (New York: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1985), 135. Wayne Biddle, "Salvador Officer Cited Napalm Use." *New York Times*, 9 October 1984. "A Burning Question in El Salvador," *Newsweek*, 8 October 1984, 17. Also, "Napalm: Made in Israel, Used in El Salvador." *Israeli Foreign Affairs*, December 1984. Hunter, *Israeli Foreign Policy: South Africa and Central America* (Boston: South End Press, 1987), 101.

52. Nearly 40,000 civilians were murdered between 1979 and 1983, another 30,000 by 1992. Alan Nairn, "Behind the Death Squads," *Progressive* (May 1984). Former Salvadoran Undersecretary of the Interior, Francisco Guerra y Guerra, in interview with Jane Hunter. *Israeli Foreign Affairs* 1, No. 2 (January 1985): 8. The secret service conducted death squads according to Salvadoran and U.S. officials. Craig

Pyes, *Salvadoran Rightists: The Deadly Patriots* (Albuquerque: Albuquerque Journal, 1984), 6. The 40,000 figure is from Jane Hunter, *Israeli Foreign Policy,* 105. Gross mutilation of men, women and children was commonplace. Daniel Santiago, "The Aesthetics of Terror, the Hermeneutics of Death," *America*, 24 March 1990.

53. James LeMoyne, "El Salvador's Refugees: Many Peasants Get Caught," *New York Times*, 1 July 1986. "People are displaced from conflicted or rebel-held zones in an effort to drain away support from the guerrillas, and then these people are herded into camps where they are monitored and controlled." Chris Hedges, "Salvador plans to resettle 500,000 displaced persons," *Christian Science Monitor*, 28 September 1984.

54. Robert Block, "Israel to Aid El Salvador in Areas tied to Counterinsurgency," *Reuters North European Service*, 22 February 1986.

55. "Keeping Track: Israeli Computers in Guatemala and El Salvador," *Israeli Foreign Affairs* 1, no. 4 (March 1985): 3. Clarence Lusane, "Washington's Proxy: Israeli Arms in Central America," in Ray and Schaap, *Covert Action*, 147.

56. Israeli noncommissioned officers are reported to have been hired for private "death squads" which spread to the killing of dissidents in El Salvador. David Gardner, "How Israelis act as surrogate for U.S. in Central America," *Financial Times*, 27 November 1986. There were about 300 Israeli advisors working "in the security structures and in the army" who "helped Guatemalan internal security agents hunt underground rebel groups." Edward Cody, "El Salvador, Israel Set Closer Ties," *Washington Post*, 17 August 1983. Jane Hunter, *Israeli Foreign Policy*, 115.

57. Supplied between 1977 and 1982: Kfir fighter planes, Arava planes, troop helicopters, armored cars, 50,000 Galil rifles with 5 million bullets, 1,000 machine guns, 185 tons of ammunition and light arms, 10,000 high-explosive antitank ammunition. Sources: *SIPRI Yearbook*, 1977 through 1982. *Christian Science Monitor*, 28 October 1981. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 135. Bishara Bahbah with Linda Butler, *Israel and Latin America: The Military Connection* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1986), 79. James Nelson Goodsell, "Growing Arms Race in Central America May Heat Up Region," *Christian Science Monitor,* 28 October 1981. After 1977, Israel was the sole provider of military aid. Clarence Lusane, "Washington's Proxy: Israeli Arms in Central America," in Ray and Schaap, eds. *Covert Action*, 148. *The Economist*, 3 April 1982. Air base reported by Dan Rather, CBS Evening News, February 16, 1983.

58. See Jane Hunter, *Israeli Foreign Policy*, 118.

59. See George Black with Milton Jamail and Norna Stoltz Chinchilla, *Garrison Guatemala* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984): 155.

60. National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, *Report* [Kissinger Commission Report] (Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office, 1984), 100. For example, 400 Mayan villages were destroyed, some 17,000 murdered in the 1982–1983 period alone. "Guatemalan Power Play," Editorial, *New York Times*, 1 August 2003. Leslie Gelb, "Israel Said to Step up Latin Role: Offering Arms Seized in Lebanon." *New York Times*, 17 December 1982.

61. Reported by Yoav Karni, "The Israel-Guatemala Connection," *Ha'aretz,* 7 February 1986, translated in *Al Fajr*, 14 February 1986.

62. Hunter, *Israeli Foreign Policy*, 111. Clarence Lusane, "Washington's Proxy: Israeli Arms in Central America," in Ray and Schaap, *Covert Action*, 148.

63. The "pacification" program (forced relocation) enabled inequitable land distribution in favor of the rich and the Generals. The program was designed to suppress the people's ability to organize against the government. Hunger forced many Mayan Indians to surrender. The "model villages" were organized into patrols of civilians, enlisted out of fear of torture or execution, required to turn in quotas of subversives amongst their fellows. Marlise Simons, "Guatemalans Are Adding A Few Twists to 'Pacification,'" *New York Times*, 12 September 1982. In 1984 the U.S. embassy estimated that 700,000 men (900,000 in 1986) had been enrolled in village "civil defense" units, armed with Israeli assistance. "Civil Defense Is Fact of Life In Guatemala," *New York Times*, 4 March 1984.

64. Alexander Cockburn, "Sharing Responsibility for Guatemalan horrors," *Wall Street Journal*, 24 February 1983. From 1954 to 1984, 200,000 Guatemalans, mostly civilians, were killed. Chris Hedges, *War Is A Force That Gives Us Meaning* (New York: Public Affairs, 2002), 13. Sweig, *Friendly Fire*, 8. Stephen Kinzer "The CIA's Cover Has Been Blown?" *New York Times*, 6 July 2003, WK 7. Amnesty International. *Guatemala: A Government Program of Political Murder* (London: Amnesty International Publications, 1981), 5.

65. Billy Briggs, "Guatemala's time of reckoning," *Guardian Weekly*, 16–20 February 2007, 20. Still lacking in 2002 were adequate military reforms, control of public corruption or control of violence against human rights activists, judicial workers, and journalists. U.S. State Department, notes, www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn.

66. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 137. *SIPRI Yearbook* 1978, 260; 1981, 219; 1982, 410. *Newsweek*, 11 October 1976.

67. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 136-37. *SIPRI Yearbook* 1977, 314; 1979, 210–11; 1981, 219; 1982, 210–11. *New York Times*, 27 May 1982. *Jerusalem Post*, 30 May 1982. Bishara Bahbah and Linda Butler, *Israel and Latin America: the Military Connection* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 74–76.

68. *SIPRI Yearbook* 1980, 86.

69. Israel sold Gabriel, Barak, and Shafir missile systems, patrol boats, 22 more Mirage planes, 22 Kfir fighter bombers, and 24 A-4 Skyhawk fighters. *SIPRI Yearbook* 1978, 258; 1979, 204–5; 1982, 207. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 137, 156. *New York Times*, May 9, 1982, 6. *Washington Post*, December 7 and 16, 1982. Christine Dugas, "Arms from Israel," *Progressive*, (June 1981). John Bushnell, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, "noted that since the [western alliance] ban was imposed, Argentina had bought about $2 billion in weapons, mostly in Europe [France] and Israel." *New York Times*, 8 May 1981. See Larry Rohter, *New York Times*, 25 March 2006, A3.

70. Ian Black and Benny Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991), 327. Leslie Gelb, "Iran Said to Get Large-Scale Arms from Israel, Soviet Union and Europeans," *New York Times*, 8 March 1982. Also, Benjamin Rivlin, and Jacques Fomerand, "Changing Third World

Perspectives and Policies Toward Israel." in Michael Curtis and Susan Aurelia Gitelman (eds.), *Israel in the Third World* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1976), 333. In 1977, Shimon Peres exchanged Israeli long-range missiles for oil. Elaine Sciolino, "Documents Detail Israeli Missile Deal with the Shah," *New York Times*, 1 April 1986.

71. Israel oversaw SAVAK techniques according to Richard T. Sale, "SAVAK: A Feared and Pervasive Force," *Washington Post*, 9 May 1977, A7. Black and Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars*, 183. The CIA also helped with torture technique seminars based on Nazi methods, according to Seymour Hersh, *New York Times*, 7 January 1979. SAVAK executed some 300 of its tens of thousands of political prisoners. In 1976, Iran had "the highest rate of death penalties in the world, no valid system of civilian courts and a history of torture which is beyond belief. No country in the world has a worse record in human rights than Iran." Reza Baraheni, "Persia Today: No Magic Carpet Rides," *Matchbox* (Amnesty International), Fall, 1976.

72. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 158.

73. Cited by Cockburn, *Dangerous Liaison*, 393. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 159. Half the arms to Iran were "being supplied or arranged by Israel," according to Leslie Gelb, "Iran Said to Get Large-Scale Arms from Israel, Soviet and Europeans," *New York Times*, 8 March 1982. Also, *New York Times*, 24 August 1981. Weapons included ammunition, refurbished jet engines, parts for U.S. tanks, aircraft tires and, in 1984, antitank weapons. See *SIPRI* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1982) xxviii. *The Economist*, 29 August 1981, 42. For the $500,000,000 figure see *International Herald Tribune*, 19 March 1984. Also, E. Eytan, "Israel Sold Arms to Iran—Including 50 Ground-to-Ground Missiles." *Yediot Aharonot*, 13 July 1983.

74. On the other side, the United States supported Iraq as a bulwark against Iran's Islamic regime and for access to oil. The United States provided Iraq with strains of high-quality anthrax suitable for germ warfare between 1978 and 1988. Nicholas Kristof, "Revolving-Door Monsters," *New York Times*, 11 October 2002, Op-Ed A33. "Presidents Reagan and Bush Senior were worse than silent when Saddam was at his most genocidal. During the Anfal campaign of 1987-88, tens of thousands of Kurds were slaughtered in mass executions or fumigated with lethal gases. After the gas attacks were documented, the U.S. continued to ladle out credits for Iraq to buy American grain and manufactured goods." *New York Times*, 14 December 2002. Credits jumped from $500 million to $1 billion (Samantha Power, PBS interview, January 21, 2004).

75. A prior 1958 coup attempt against the parliamentary government of "leftist" leaning President Sukarno failed. A U.S. National Intelligence Estimate in September 1965 warned that Indonesia could become a "powerful example for the underdeveloped world . . . a credit to communism and a setback for Western prestige." *Foreign Relations of the United States*, annual reports (State Department, Washington, DC), Vol. 26, 292.

76. Mark Curtis, *Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World* (London: Vintage, 2003) 388–91. "Suharto," *Guardian*, January, 2, 2008, 35.

77. *SIPRI Yearbook 1981*, 224. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 142. Chomsky, *The Fateful Triangle*, 26. Motti Bassuk, Davar, October 17, 1993. Ignacio Klich, "The New Carve-up," *South*, April 1982. Some 300,000 to 1,000,000 died by execution, starvation or saturation bombing.

78. George C. Wilson, "U.S. Is Fronting Israeli Sale of Jets to Indonesia," *Washington Post*, 5 October 1979.

79. Israel also became the U.S. preferred route for weapons to *Mainland* China in the early 1980s. Thomas L. Friedman, "Israel and China Quietly Forge Trade Links," *New York Times*, 22 July 1985. Hunter, *Israeli Foreign Policy*, 15. Extensive references in Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 166n65.

80. *SIPRI Yearbook 1983*, 275, Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 45, 142. John Yemma, "Israeli Guns for Worldwide Arms Market," *Christian Science Monitor*, 27 December 1982. Also S. Frenkel, "Thou Shalt Sell Arms, " *Haolam Hazeh*, 31 August 1983, cited in Beit-Hallahmi, *The Israeli Connection*, 27.

81. Yoav Karni, "The Secret alliance of the 'Fifth World,'" Yediot Ahronot, 22 November 1981. Jack Andersen wrote, "Israel, South Africa and Taiwan will soon begin joint production of strategic cruise missiles. . . . U.S. intelligence agencies have known for years that the three nations were working together on nuclear weapons development. . . . In cold, hard geographical terms, the triumvirate's new missile capacity means that Israel—which already has a stockpile of 200 or more nuclear bombs—can deliver warheads from its own backyard to any of its Arab enemies in the Middle East, and even deep inside the Soviet Union. South Africa could annihilate targets anywhere in the southern part of the continent, Taiwan would be able to destroy Peking and other cities in mainland China from secure launching sites on its own soil or from naval vessels far out to sea." *Washington Post*, 8 December 1980. The United States has leaned hard on Taiwan to abandon its nuclear program. *The Economist,* 22 October 2005, 32.

82. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 38, 113.

83. For example, conflicts between Argentina and Chile, Peru and Ecuador, Honduras and Nicaragua, India, and Pakistan.

84. Larry Remer, "Israel Weapons Industry Goes Boom, *Los Angeles Times*, 29 July 1981.

85. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 99.

COLONIZATION AFTER 1967: GREATER ISRAEL AND THE ILLUSORY PEACE PROCESS

꙳ঌ৩ৎ꙳

Begin, Peres, Shamir,
and the Madrid Conference

Following Israel's military capture of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Egyptian Sinai, and Syria's Golan Heights in 1967, Israel began, in violation of the Geneva Conventions, to colonize these Arab lands through confiscation of land for the building of Jewish settlements. This confiscation has increased further with every subsequent prime minister as it does today—denounced by President Carter as the "creeping annexation" of Palestinian land. The so-called Palestinian-Israeli "peace process" was premised on the idea that Israeli would *return* the 1967 occupied lands to the Palestinians in exchange for final peace. This "land for peace" idea is embodied in UN Resolution 242.[1] But giving back confiscated Palestinian land upon which Israel has illegally built Jewish settlements, some now comprising cities, has been seen by most Israeli leaders as largely unacceptable. Peace process negotiations, "land for peace," involve less and less land for peace. Thus, negotiations would have decreasing substance and increasingly move toward Israel's possession of most or all of Palestinian territory, (i.e., "Greater Israel").

Menachem Begin, 1977

Two events shocked the PLO in 1977. First, Menachem Begin, former Irgun terrorist and Greater Israel hawk, was elected prime minister. He was a man intent on the rapid building of Jewish settlements on the occupied West Bank, Gaza, Golan Heights, and Sinai. The second shock was Anwar Sadat's offer of a peace treaty with Israel, a treaty that would have effectively

separated the Palestinians' cause, and that of the Syrians, from Egyptian in-
terests and influence.

However, Begin ignored Sadat's offer and focused on building Jewish set-
tlements on Palestinian land. President Carter bluntly pointed out that the
settlements were "illegal" under the Fourth Geneva Convention, insisting
that "there has to be a homeland provided for the Palestinian refugees."[2] Be-
gin ignored Carter, whose popularity in America fell, and, in 1978, Begin
launched an air, sea, and land invasion of Lebanon with 20,000 troops ("Op-
eration Litani") in retaliation for a terrorist attack on an Israeli bus.[3] His
larger intent was to set up a pro-Israel government in Lebanon. First, he
would have to remove Egypt from the circle of power through a peace treaty.[4]
At Camp David, Begin agreed to an Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai within
three years in exchange for a formal peace treaty with Egypt and open use to
Israel of the Suez Canal and Strait of Tiran—an additional inducement was
$3.2 billion in U.S. aid.

Begin also promised Carter that he would negotiate "full autonomy" for the
Palestinians.[5] Instead, he doubled the number of West Bank settlements over
the next several years, tripling the settler population on supposed grounds of "se-
curity."[6] Moreover, he imposed Israeli law in all occupied territories (illegal un-
der Hague and Geneva Conventions) and in 1981 annexed the Syrian Golan
Heights under a storm of international protest.[7] Begin also assigned Ariel
Sharon, his Defense Minister and later National Infrastructure Minister the task
of gaining *de facto* sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza. Sharon devoted
himself to confiscation of Palestinian land and construction of settlements to
create "irreversible facts on the ground."[8] He also: (1) fired Palestinian mayors
and replaced them with Israeli collaborators; (2) intensified military operations
by authorizing the use of live ammunition at demonstrations, jailing of demon-
strators without charge, collective punishment, curfews, demolitions, etc); and
(3) encouraged settlers to take the law into their own hands.[9]

Begin's Goals: Extermination of the
PLO Leadership and Control of Lebanon's Government

Begin's cabinet included not only Ariel Sharon, but Yitzhak Shamir, a fellow
ex-terrorist, as foreign minister. This ultranationalist triumvirate was com-
mitted to the deportation of Palestinians, the destruction of the PLO, the
destabilization of Syria, and the control of Lebanon. The control of Lebanon
had been envisioned by Jabotinsky in the 1930s and by Ben-Gurion in 1956:
"annexing the area up to the Litani River and turning the rest of Lebanon

into a Christian Maronite [pro-Israel] state."[10] Begin's invasion of Lebanon in 1978 had failed to set up a pro-Israel government and he wished to try again. Defense Minister Sharon, was equally anxious to do so and had even more adventurous plans to control most of the Middle East.[11]

Israeli Need of Pretext for War against Lebanon

With Egypt effectively neutralized through the Camp David peace treaty of 1979, Israel had a free hand, not only in Palestine and the Golan Heights, but in Lebanon. Begin could be sure that Egypt would not open a second front to protect Lebanon from Israel.[12] The aim of the war was to destroy the PLO leadership (headquartered in Beirut) in order to weaken Palestinian resistance in the West Bank and Gaza,[13] attack Syrian forces normally posted in Lebanon, and establish a pro-Israeli Christian Maronite government in Lebanon.

But a pretext for war was lacking. True, the Israel-Lebanon border had been a scene of many mutual cross-border attacks by the PLO and IDF.[14] But in July 1981, Israel and the PLO signed a U.S.-sponsored cease-fire. The PLO honored this cease-fire, leaving Israel no pretext for invasion of Lebanon. Even more problematic for Israel, the PLO had, by its restraint, gained respect from the United States—an situation "more terrifying to the government of Israel than a powerful terrorist PLO."[15] In December, Sharon appalled the American mediator, Philip Habib, by informing him that Israel planned to invade Lebanon.[16] Undeterred by Habib's reaction, Israel breached the cease-fire and bombed Lebanon in April of 1982. Still, the PLO honored the cease-fire.[17]

Frustrated, Sharon unleashed a massive invasion of Lebanon in June 1982. He called it "Operation Peace in Galilee," as though it were against PLO terrorism in Galilee.[18] The war proved a nightmare for both Israel and its victims. It had (1) failed to install a pro-Israeli government in Lebanon; (2) failed to destroy the PLO leadership in Beirut; (3) strengthened the Syrian-Lebanese bond; (4) killed some 20,000 to 30,000 Palestinian and Lebanese civilians; (5) sparked the formation of Hizbullah, a small militia committed to forcing Israel out of Lebanon,[19] and (6) shamed Israel by the IDF-assisted massacre of defenseless Palestinian civilians in the Sabra and Shatilla refugee camps.[20]

This failure and disgrace of the Begin-Shamir-Sharon government probably led to Begin's resignation in 1983—although Shamir and Sharon would both become prime ministers in the future. Begin had accomplished one

positive thing: he made peace with Egypt. Even if the intent was to draw off Egypt in order to give Israel a free hand to attack the PLO, Syria and Lebanon, Begin did make peace with Egypt. This remains the singular and most significant achievement of all Arab-Israeli negotiations.

Yitzhak Shamir and Shimon Peres as Interim Prime Ministers

Shamir, as Begin's Foreign Minister, had supported the Lebanon war and had failed to stop the Sabra/Shatilla massacre. Nevertheless, upon Begin's resignation, Shamir was chosen to be the interim prime minister by Herut, the dominant coalition wing of the conservative Likud party. Shamir chose Moshe Arens as his foreign minister, a man described as "a Sharon hawk with polish." Shamir, himself, has been described as "not a bargainer . . . a two-dimensional man . . . one dimension the length of the Land of Israel, the second, its width," a reference to his Greater Israel intent to possess the whole of Palestine.[21] To that end, Shamir announced his policies as simply: (1) no Palestinian state, (2) no recognition of the PLO, (3) Jerusalem under exclusive Israeli sovereignty, and (4) more and expanded Jewish settlements in the occupied territories.[22]

A year later, in 1984, new Israeli elections took place and resulted in a standoff between Shamir and Shimon Peres. Shamir failed to win decisively because he was mistrusted by Kach party vigilante groups and ultranationalists seeking to forcibly deport Palestinians from the occupied territories. To resolve the standoff, Shamir and Peres agreed to *alternate* the premiership, two years each, starting with Peres.

Peres refused to talk with the PLO and in October 1985 sought its destruction by bombing PLO headquarters in Tunis, killing 71 and wounding 100. This action elicited world condemnation and mass protests throughout the Arab world. Six days later, in revenge, four renegade PLO extremists (the Palestinian Liberation Front) hijacked the *Achille Lauro* and demanded release of some Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails. A Jewish-American tourist Klinghoffer was shot and his body thrown overboard, a revolting act that rang around the world. The PLO condemned the act but was nevertheless blamed.

Otherwise, Peres continued with the policy of settlement building in the occupied territories and by the time (1986) his two-year premiership had rotated to Shamir, the settler population had again doubled.[23] Shamir also continued that building and additionally constructed road networks on Palestinian land for Jewish settlers use only. These road networks were designed to separate Palestinians into decreasingly small enclaves that were cut off from each other and surrounded by Jewish settlements.[24]

The Intifada, 1987

Whereas Shamir believed that the weakening of the PLO would lead to Palestinian submission, it only added to existing widespread desperation. It caused a resurgence of Palestinian self-reliance and activism.[25] A grass-roots rebellion, known as the "intifada" ("shaking off") against Israel's military occupation, took *both* Arafat and Shamir by surprise. Palestinian youths, with little to lose and less of a future, turned militant. Older teenagers threw stones at cars and soldiers, younger ones barricaded roads with rocks, children set tires ablaze with gasoline, adults boycotted Israeli goods and refused to pay Israeli taxes or to work in Israel. This protest was in response to the abuses of occupation, the confiscation of land and water, the imprisonment of political figures, and restrictions on the export of Palestinian products and produce.[26]

Shamir's Defense Minister, Yitzhak Rabin, promised to end the intifada in a few weeks with an "iron-fist" policy: "force, might, and beatings . . . to instill fear of the IDF."[27] The legs and hands of young Palestinians were broken to prevent their running or throwing stones.[28] Collective punishments intensified. Schools, universities, and charitable societies were closed, hundreds of homes were blown up, whole communities were placed under curfew, sometimes without access to food. A close aide of Arafat's was assassinated by the Mossad, and Jewish settlers felt free to kill Palestinians with impunity.[29]

Two years into the intifada, six to seven hundred Palestinians were shot or beaten to death, 15,000 to 20,000 injured. Arrests and imprisonment approached 50,000, and many prisoners were tortured.[30] Shamir sought cabinet approval for an "open-fire" policy—authority to shoot stone-throwers on sight (in violation of international law). Ariel Sharon (Shamir's Minister of Industry and Trade) denounced Rabin's "iron-fist" policy as too timid. Deportation of all Palestinians from the occupied territories became a popularly accepted topic for debate in Israel.[31]

At the same time, some Israelis questioned whether military occupation of Palestinian territories was serving Israel's security interests. Abba Eban pointed out that Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank, even if it led to a Palestinian state, posed no threat to Israel's security. After all, Israel had a mobilizable force of 540,000, some 3,800 tanks, and 682 aircraft whereas the PLO had "8,000 men in scattered places, zero tanks and aircraft, a few guns and no missiles, but a variety of hand grenades, mortars, stones, and bottles."[32] Nevertheless, Rabin continued with his military crackdown. Twelve-hundred Palestinians were killed between 1987 and 1993 at the cost of 160 Israeli lives.[33]

Arafat Proposes a Two-State Solution and Shamir Rejects Negotiations

In Algiers in November 1988, Arafat and the Palestine National Council (PNC) took the historic and painful step of recognizing Israel's legitimacy. But Arafat also declared the Independent State of Palestine consisting of Gaza and the West Bank with East Jerusalem as its capital.[34] In a special UN session in Geneva the following month, Yasir Arafat made a speech at the UN in which he renounced all forms of terrorism, accepted unconditionally UN Resolution 242 and 338 (peace in exchange for the land Israel had occupied in 1967), and recognized Israel's right to exist. Shamir, who had been reelected prime minister in 1988, declared the PNC and Arafat statements to be propaganda moves and branded the PLO as "forever" a terrorist organization.[35]

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker pressed for negotiations to achieve Israeli military withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza, insisting that Israel give up its "unrealistic vision of Greater Israel." Baker believing that Israel's security was obtainable through peaceful resolution, called for an end of settlement activity and the granting of Palestinian political rights. Instead of negotiating, Shamir defiantly added religious and ultranationalist parties to Likud, creating in 1990, "the most right-wing government in Israel's history"[36]— Moshe Arens, Defense Minister; David Levy, Foreign Minister; and Ariel Sharon, Housing Minister. Baker was furious with Shamir's obstructionism. "Take this number: 202-456-1414 [the White House]," Baker chided, "When you're serious about peace, call us."

The Gulf War: Problems for George H. W. Bush, Shamir, Saddam Hussein, and the Palestinians

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 brought new challenges to the U.S. and Israeli relationship. Saddam Hussein suggested that he would withdraw from Kuwait if Israel would withdraw from all occupied Arab territories. By linking these two occupations, Hussein became a hero to the Palestinians. Whether Hussein's offer was genuine or not, Bush and Shamir were disturbed and insisted that the two occupations were unrelated. Still, Hussein had made a disquieting point about U.S. hypocrisy: that the United States tolerated violent military occupations when done by friends.[37]

Shamir's desire to have Israel join in the U.S. military attack on Iraq was also problematic. Bush demanded that Shamir back off since Israeli military action would only focus more attention on Israel as a ready aggressor.[38] But during the war, Iraq launched 39 low-technology Scud missiles into Israel, a

show of defiance of Israel and courage to the other Arab states. While these missiles killed no one, the psychological impact in Israel was great. Sharon called for a tank charge on Iraq through Jordanian territory, the only way, he claimed, to retain Israel's military credibility.[39] He also alluded to Israel's "bomb in the basement." Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney also warned Iraq that Israel might retaliate with *nonconventional* weapons were Iraq to use chemical weapons, which had once been supplied by the United States.

Bush managed to curb Israel and thereby hold together his Arab coalition (including Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia) against Iraq, as well as suppress talk about Israel's nuclear bomb. It was just its chafing for war that lost Israel its standing with the United States: "far from being a strategic asset, [Israel] was widely perceived as an embarrassment and a liability."[40] The Palestinians, too, lost ground. In despair and exhausted by the intifada, they were now universally condemned for their enthusiasm for Saddam Hussein who they believed had taken up their cause.[41]

The Madrid Conferences: Israel Evades Negotiation

Following the Gulf War, in October 1991, the United States sponsored the Madrid Peace conference intended to address festering relations between Israel and the Palestinians and Arab states. Shamir flouted the peace negotiations by adding to his cabinet an advocate for forced deportation of Palestinians from the West Bank. To deport Palestinians contrary to international law, rather than return their land in exchange for peace in conformity to UN 242,[42] undermined the very premise of a peace conference. Shamir was forced to the negotiating table by a U.S. threat to withhold $10 billion in loan guarantees.[43]

The conference fell into chaos. When the United States pressed Israel to stop settlement building in the occupied territories, Shamir produced a plan to double the Jewish settler population—a plan "not just incompatible with the peace process: it was intended to wreck it."[44] And when the Palestinians declared their willingness to live in mutual security and self-determination, side by side with Israelis, Shamir expounded on the unquenchable Palestinian intent to destroy Israel. Then, in response, Syria and Israel went for each other's throats. The Syrian foreign minister condemned Israel as a terrorist state led by a terrorist, that is, Shamir himself, former commander of the "Stern Gang" LEHI, and demanded that Israel return the Golan Heights.

Shamir illustrated throughout his tenure a nearly unbroken record of maintaining the Greater Israel posture: military dominance, territorial acquisition and avoidance of negotiation. After he left office in 1992, Shamir

admitted that he had used stalling tactics (a "yes-but-no" strategy) at Madrid: "I know how to display the tactic of moderation, but without conceding anything on the goal—the integrity of the Land of Israel . . . [and I only regret] that in the coming years I will not be able to expand the settlements in Judea and Samaria [West Bank] and to complete the demographic revolution in the Land of Israel. I would have carried on autonomy talks for ten years, and meanwhile we would have reached half a million people in Judea and Samaria"[45] (which is the actual total today).

Notes

1. UN Security Council Resolution 242, passed after the 1967 war, called for "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent [1967] conflict." It referred to the right of states to "live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries," and emphasized the "inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war." The Resolution did not speak of land *for* peace, but called for *both* the return of land and peace—popularly referred to as "land for peace." An ambiguity exists in UN 242. The initial draft called for "the" (all) territories, and that reading is consistent with the clause referring to the "inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war." However, the United States dropped the word 'the' at the last minute in order to gain for Israel a seeming loophole, perhaps return of only *some* occupied territory. But since it is inadmissible to acquire territory by war, that is, *any* territory, it follows that all occupied territory (West Bank, Gaza, Sinai, and Golan Heights) must be returned in order to conform to UN 242.

2. Spiegel, *The Other*, 332. Carter's domestic popularity plummeted. Begin showed his contempt for Carter by sending warplanes over PLO headquarters in Beirut.

3. This 1978 operation was a retaliation for the killing of 34 Israelis. Over 1,000 Palestinian and Lebanese civilians were killed and 100,000 to 200,000 fled their homes, according to Amnesty International Country Report, July 1996 (Index MDE 15/42/96). Chomsky reports 2,000 killed, 250,000 made refugees. Noam Chomsky, *The Fateful Triangle* (Boston: South End Press, 1983), 99. Benny Morris reports only 300 killed. Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 501.

4. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 369.

5. Jimmy Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 48–50. Begin had already made explicit prior commitment to his coalition partners not to relinquish Israeli sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza. Tessler, *A History of the Israeli Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 546–47.

6. Don Peretz, *The West Bank: History, Politics, Society and Economy* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986), 62–66.

7. An annexation violating UN 242 and Camp Davis agreements with Carter.

8. Sharon was "the most aggressive advocate of toppling the [Jordanian] royalist regime in favor of a Palestinian state and then, little by little, driving the Palestinians of the West Bank across the river." Avi Shlaim, *Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 476, 543.

9. Israel's Karp Report, May 1982. Editorial, "Twenty-month cover-up," *Jerusalem Post.* February 9, 1984, 8. Matters were as bad on the Golan Heights. An Israeli Supreme Court Justice referred to IDF actions in the Golan Heights as "barbarisms." Editorial, *Ha'aretz*, 15 March 1982. For details, see Tessler, *A History,* 560.

10. Avi Shlaim, *Collusion Across the Jordan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 237, 392. Jabotinsky in the 1930s had also hoped that a Christian Lebanon would be allied with Zionism; Simha Flapan, *The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities* (New York: Pantheon, 1987), 20.

11. Sachar, *A History of Israel, Volume II*, 172. Sachar's summary of the 1980 Sharon plan: "Intended first [was] to crush the PLO as a military-political factor in Lebanon, then in Palestine, and subsequently to complete the annexation of the West Bank and Gaza. . . . Sharon would proceed to unseat King Hussein and give Jordan over in its entirety to the Palestinians. . . . Syria and Iraq were to be destabilized . . . and [Lebanon to retain] a Maronite-dominated regime under the presidency of Bashir Gemayel [loyal to Israel]. . . . The implications of this master plan were clear, and they far transcended the destruction of Palestinian guerrilla concentrations along Israel's northern frontier, or even of PLO influence in the West Bank." Avi Shlaim also notes Sharon's intent: "The destruction of the PLO would break the backbone of Palestinian nationalism and facilitate the absorption of the West Bank into Greater Israel. The resulting influx of Palestinians from Lebanon and the West Bank into Jordan would eventually sweep away the Hashemite monarchy and transform the East Bank [Jordan] into a Palestinian state." 396.

12. William Quandt, *Camp David: Peacemaking and Politics* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1986), 321. Tessler, *A History,* 507.

13. The goal of the invasion was "to install a friendly regime and destroy Mr. Arafat's Palestinian Liberation Organization. That, the theory went, would help persuade Palestinians to accept Israeli rule in the West Bank and Gaza Strip." James Bennet, *New York Times*, January 24, 2002. Sharon believed that the PLO was the *cause* of Palestinian resistance on the West Bank. A U.S. State Department official observed: "The Israeli government believes it has a Palestinian problem because of the PLO; not that it has a PLO problem because of Palestinians." M. Thomas Davis, *40 Km into Lebanon: Israel's 1982 Invasion* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1987), 68. Cited in Tessler, *A History*, 829n64.

14. The northern part of Israel (Galilee area) was once a heavily Palestinian area, in fact, allotted to the Palestinians by the UN Partition Resolution. Now under Israeli control, it was a tinderbox. Driven from their homes during the 1948 and 1967 wars, 400,000 Palestinians from Galilee lived in refugee camps across the border in southern Lebanon where they were barred from citizenship or decent work. In May

1981, Israel bombed PLO concentrations in southern Lebanon and headquarters in West Beirut, killing hundreds. The UN condemned these attacks and the United States withheld U.S. fighter plane deliveries to Israel.

15. Danny Rubinstein, "A Political PLO Is More Dangerous Than a Powerful PLO," *Davar*, September 6, 1982. A version of this article appeared in Danny Rubinstein, "PLO's Future," *New York Times*, 14 September 1982, A27. Israeli historian Yehoshua Porath agreed that Israel hopes that the PLO "will return to its earlier terrorism . . . will lose part of the political legitimacy that it gained . . . [and] undercut the danger that Palestinians might become a legitimate negotiating partner for future political accommodations." *Ha'aretz*, 25 June 1982.

16. Habib: "General Sharon, this is the twentieth century. . . . You can't go around invading countries like that, spreading destruction and killing civilians. In the end your invasion will grow into a war with Syria, and the entire region will be engulfed in flames." Ze'ev Schiff and Ehud Ya'ari, *Israel's Lebanon War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), 66.

17. For more on the PLO abiding by the cease-fire see Tessler, *A History,* 571–72.

18. "It was not the case that PLO aggressiveness left the Jewish state no choice but to go to war. On the contrary, the PLO has shown considerable restraint during eleven months between June 1982 and the cease-fire agreement signed the preceding July; and it was Israel's determination to clean out PLO strongholds in southern Lebanon, rather than any recent aggression by Arafat's guerrillas, that provided the impetus for the invasion." Tessler, *A History*, 571.

19. Israel withdrew most of its forces by 1985, though some remained with Israel's proxy South Lebanon Army in a security zone in the south of Lebanon. The IDF had further fights with Hizbullah, for example, a Rabin invasion in 1993 and a Peres invasion in 1996. Despite using enormous fire power, the IDF failed to quell Hizbullah rockets. The IDF finally withdrew from Lebanon on May 24, 2000.

20. The press referred to Israeli "war crimes" and reminded the public about Begin's history as perpetrator of the 1948 Deir Yassin massacre of civilians and Sharon's 1953 massacre at Qibya.

21. Avishai Margalit, "The Violent Life of Yitzhak Shamir," *New York Review of Books* (May 14, 1992): 24.

22. By 1983, the year of Begin's retirement, Israel controlled 35 percent of West Bank land and 80 percent of West Bank water. There were about 27,500 Jewish settlers on the West Bank. Meron Benvenisti, *The West Bank Handbook: a Political Lexicon* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986), 49 Douglas Jehl, "Water Divides Haves From Have-Nots in West Bank," *New York Times*, 15 August 1998, A3. Edward Said, "The Mourning After," *London Review of Books*, 21 October 1993.

23. There were 60,000 Jewish settlers at the time that Shamir rotated back into office (1986). Tessler, *A History*, 671. Edward Said and Christopher Hitchens, Eds. *Blaming the Victims* (London: Verso, 1988), 252.

24. Geoffrey Aronson, *Creating Facts: Israel, Palestinians and the West Bank* (Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1987), 97.

25. Uri Avnery, "The Intifada: Substance and Illusion," *New Outlook* (December 1989): 13.

26. Mark Tessler, *A History*, 690.

27. Joshua Brilliant, "Rabin: Use of Blows Instills Fear of IDF," *Jerusalem Post*, 26 January 1988.

28. Tessler, *A History,* 697.

29. For example, settlement leader Pinchas Wallerstein, who shot two young Palestinians in the back (one died) for burning a tire on a road in 1988, was sentenced to four months of community service.

30. Torture was "virtually institutionalized" according to *Amnesty International;* judged to be "systematic and routine" by *B'Tselem.* Cited in Norman Finkelstein, *The Rise and Fall of Palestine* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 68.

31. Deportation ("transfer") was *not* the official position of Likud. In a poll taken by the *Jerusalem Post* in August 12, 1988, half of all Israelis leaned towards this approach. Tessler, *A History*, 709.

32. Abba Eban, "Israel, Hardly the Monaco of the Middle East," *New York Times*, 2 January 1989, 23. Eban cites figures from the Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv University.

33. Between 1987 and 1993, "Israeli troops had killed somewhere between 1,160 and 1,283 Palestinians; an estimated 130,472 Palestinians were injured; 481 expelled; 22,088 held in administrative detention; 2,533 houses demolished or sealed; and 184,257 trees uprooted. By 1994, an estimated 120,000 Palestinians had spent time in Israeli jails. During the same period the number of Israelis killed totaled 160." Donald Neff, *Fallen Pillars: U.S. Policy towards Palestine and Israel since 1945* (Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2002), 192. Neff cites *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* (April/May 1994); Barton Gellman, *Washington Post*, 10 March 1995 and *B'Tselem*, Information Fact Sheet, (January 1998).

34. Jordan, which had annexed the West Bank in 1950, ceded its rights to Jerusalem and the West Bank to the PLO. The declared Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza gained *de jure* recognition from over 55 states including the Soviet Union, China, India, Greece, Yugoslavia, Sri Lanka, Malta, and Zambia. Mark Tessler, *A History,* 722. Also, Jerome Segal, "Does the State of Palestine Exist?" *Journal of Palestine Studies* (Autumn 1989): 30.

35. In May of 1989, Shamir seemed to take a less rigid approach, which he later admitted to be a stalling tactic. He claimed a willingness to discuss some degree of Palestinian autonomy (not a Palestinian state) with *non*-PLO Palestinian representatives , a maneuver designed to undermine the authority of the PLO. Ariel Sharon, Shamir's Housing Minister and the engine behind settlement building, was highly critical of negotiations with *any* Palestinians.

36. Avi Shlaim, "Prelude to the Accord" *Journal of Palestine Studies* (Winter, 1994): 5–6.

37. Hussein's charge of hypocrisy gained some plausibility in October 1990 when 21 Muslim worshippers were killed (hundreds of others injured) by the IDF when the

worshippers were confronted by extremist Jews asserting control over Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem. The UN condemned the IDF violence, but the United States did nothing—highlighting U.S. tolerance for the violence of friends.

38. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 474. Israel was prepared to bomb any nuclear reactor facility found in Iraq, as it had in 1981, to assure its military dominance in the Middle East.

39. Sharon had additional motives for wanting to advance through Jordan. He had for years wanted to destabilize Jordan in order to convert it into *the* Palestinian state. The Gulf War was his chance. "Ariel Sharon was the most aggressive advocate of toppling the [Jordanian] royalist regime in favor of a Palestinian state and, little by little, driving the Palestinians of the West Bank across the river." Shlaim, Avi, *The Iron Wall*, 477.

40. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 484.

41. Palestinians did not approve of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Yet they saw Saddam Hussein as a *populist* Arab leader who opposed corrupt and authoritarian monarchist Arab nations such as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Hussein was the only Arab leader who declared himself ready to fight on behalf of Palestinian rights. He thus appeared to be a leader of a "bottom-up" revolution that could shake up the United States and the entrenched Shamir government.

42. UN Resolution 242 was interpreted by the Arab nations and the Palestinians to refer to *all* the 1967 occupied territories, whereas the Israelis saw withdrawal from the Sinai alone as full compliance. See note 1.

In 2002, Prime Minister Sharon also claimed that UN Resolution 242 meant that Israel "was not expected to withdraw from all the territories that its forces had entered"—a claim that "withdrawal from territories" definitively meant "not all territories." Ariel Sharon, "The Way Forward in the Middle East," *New York Times*, 9 June 2002, Op-Ed.

43. The usual aid to Israel was $3 billion per year—$77 billion total given through 1991.

44. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 486. The Shamir government spent $1 billion for settlements in 1991 (13,000 new residential units under construction, two to three times the previous rate). Tessler, *A History*, 745.

45. Interview with Joseph Harif in *Ma'ariv*, 26 June 1992. Cited in Shlaim, "Prelude to the Accord," 10.

Rabin and the Oslo Accords

Yitzhak Rabin replaced Shamir as prime minister in June of 1992. Rabin and the Labor party were more inclined to negotiate some degree of territorial compromise with the Palestinians. Rabin had promised the voters an agreement on Palestinian *self-government* within a year, as well as a *freeze* on building of settlements. As a peace candidate, Rabin won by a landslide. Unfortunately, regarding the fundamentals, Rabin and Shamir and their respective parties differed more in style than substance. Avi Shlaim notes:

> Both parties [Labor and Likud] were deeply opposed to Palestinian nationalism and denied that the Palestinians had a right to national self-determination. Both always refused to negotiate with the PLO, and this refusal was absolute rather than conditional. Both were also unconditionally opposed to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state.[1]

Rabin's Settler Policy and Roadway Separation Plan

As an ex-military man, Rabin viewed all matters from the perspective of Israel's security—insisting that "security takes precedence over peace." That is, he focused on security as apart from peace rather than security achieved through peace.[2] When Rabin authorized new settlements, he justified them as necessary for Israel's "security," (i.e., Israel's military needs).

At the same time, Rabin expanded *existing* settlements, his way to circumvent his campaign promise to freeze settlements. By enlarging existing

settlements no matter how small, Rabin increased the settler population enormously. He added 11,000 homes for 50,000 new settlers and approved 10,000 new homes for Jews in the East Jerusalem section of the West Bank.[3] Nicholas Guyatt notes, "Rabin's tenure as prime minister marked one of the largest expansions of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories since their acquisition in 1967. . . . His settlement policy was substantially the same [as Shamir's]."[4]

Rabin, like Shamir, seized Palestinian land to construct by-pass road networks for Jewish settler use only. These road networks linking Jewish settlements with each other and Israel, encircled and separated Palestinian towns from each other and Israel. These road networks effectively locked Palestinians into enclaves and often cut them off from their own land.[5] Rabin budgeted $930 million in 1994–1995 for the expansion of existing settlements, new security settlements and road construction, all of which covered some 65 percent of the West Bank by the end of his tenure.[6] Aggressive confiscation of land for settlement and road building inflamed Palestinian protest.

Rabin Sabotages Madrid Peace Conferences

Rabin illegally deported 416 alleged Hamas activists following the murder of an Israeli border policeman. The Arab nations protested and the Madrid conferences, which had continued, finally collapsed. The deportations had increased Rabin's domestic popularity, yet led to retaliations (the murder of thirteen Israelis) primarily by Hamas.[7] In response, Rabin closed off completely the West Bank and Gaza from Israel. Palestinian labor in Israel ended, leaving 120,000 families without income.

In 1993, Rabin also ordered air and artillery attacks on Lebanon in a cruel and futile campaign to stampede 300,000 civilians northward in an effort to pressure the Lebanese government to disband Hizbullah and give the IDF, in Lebanon since 1982, a free hand in southern Lebanon.[8]

Talks with Syria Fail

Rabin embarked on protracted bilateral talks with Syria. He employed a "divide and conquer" strategy, calculating that peace with Syria would weaken the Palestinians by depriving them of Syrian support and reduce pressure on Israel to make concessions.[9] But the talks about the Golan Heights with Syrian president Hafez al-Assad failed. Both Rabin and Assad were determined and inflexible.[10] Assad insisted that *peace*, through Israel's return of the Golan Heights, was the best guarantor of Israel's security.

The 1993 Oslo Accords Shepherded by Peres

Rabin sent off Shimon Peres, his Foreign Minister (and long-time political rival), to negotiate matters that Rabin considered of limited importance.[11] In Oslo, Peres and his deputy, Yossi Beilin, conducted informal, non-governmental talks among some university-based Israeli citizens and PLO officials.[12] Following the failed Syrian talks, Rabin thought that perhaps the Oslo talks could be of use, especially at a time when the popularity of Arafat and his secular PLO/Fatah was on the wane (under scrutiny for corruption). A weakened Arafat could make a good negotiating opponent.

During the Oslo talks, Peres offered to withdraw the IDF from the impoverished and festering Gaza Strip, a territory teeming with refugees that Rabin and the Israeli public wished, not without some guilt, would "sink into the sea."[13] Arafat accepted the offer. He asked, however, that the IDF also withdraw from Jericho—a move designed to extend negotiations into the West Bank. Rabin agreed and the Oslo Accords were born.

Rabin had learned, as Shamir's defense minister, that his "iron fist" methods during the intifada had not worked. Could some kind of limited autonomy in small Palestinian areas, though not a Palestinian state, cool the violence on the West Bank and Gaza that was draining Israeli military and financial resources? The central idea at Oslo was that Israel would gradually withdraw the IDF from small "self-rule" areas in which an elected Palestinian Authority would assume administrative and financial responsibility for social services for Palestinians. How much these self-rule areas might grow in number or extent was a matter for negotiation. However, *no* limits were placed on further Israeli land confiscation for Jewish settlements and roads. Moreover, Israel would retain final military control throughout the *whole* of the occupied territories.

The Oslo Accords *could* have been a true historic breakthrough had they meant an eventual Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza, as the Palestinians hoped and imagined. But Rabin envisioned gradual disengagement only in areas of no interest to his settlement plans or security needs.[14] Moreover, the Oslo Accords explicitly shifted responsibility for *Israel's* security to *Arafat* and the Palestinians. Israel would be under no obligation to negotiate troop withdrawals were Arafat unable to provide that security. This was the Achilles heel of the Accords. Because Arafat and his *secular* PLO/Fatah could not effectively control the *Islamic* militias (Hamas and Islamic Jihad), the Oslo Accords were doomed from the start.[15] IDF withdrawals were conditional on Israel's security, which Arafat could not assure. The Accords contained, thus, Israel's way out of negotiations—a loophole.

The Oslo Accords: An Illusory "Peace Process"

The Oslo Peace Accords of 1993 failed to bring a reduction in tension. It was not just the security-withdrawal issue. The more fundamental reason was that the Accords never addressed or even placed on the negotiating table the four main issues *vital* to Palestinians: (a) the presence of Jewish settlements on Palestinian land, (b) the right of return of Palestinian refugees, (c) the fate of East Jerusalem, and (d) Palestinian statehood. Many Palestinians naively thought that these issues would to be negotiated and result in a sovereign Palestinian state. Others saw that nothing of importance was going to be negotiated.[16] Additionally galling to Palestinian critics of the Accords was the Recognition Letters that affirmed the PLO's recognition of Israel's "right to exist in peace and security" but not the Palestinians' "right to exist in peace and security." There was no call for the renunciation of terrorism or violence by *Israel*, only by the Palestinians. Rabin merely recognized the PLO as a representative of the Palestinian people without mention of their right to security.

The Oslo Accords Sidestep the Protection of Palestinians Afforded by International Law

The Oslo Accords ignored all the rights that Palestinians possessed under international law. The Geneva and Hague Conventions, prohibiting confiscation of land and natural resources and foreign settlement on occupied land, were sidestepped. By signing the Oslo Accords, Arafat had allowed Israel to act as though the conflict was not governed by international law, but merely a *domestic* dispute within the state of Israel, that is, a dispute to be resolved at Israel's discretion by its own chosen means based on its *de facto* military power. President Clinton, contrary to previous administrations, encouraged this shift from international law to domestic problem-solving through his reference to the occupied territories as "disputed," not "occupied" ("occupied" is governed by international law). Israel was assuming powers which, under international law, no "occupier" possesses.

Violence and Worsening Conditions

Ongoing negotiations called for by the Accords went nowhere and were suspended after six months (February 1994). That same month a Jewish settler, Baruch Goldstein, massacred twenty-nine Muslims at worship in Hebron. The PLO demanded the removal of the incendiary presence of 450 Jewish

settlers midst the 160,000 Palestinians of Hebron. Rabin's refusal made clear that the security of Palestinians was not his concern. Hamas vowed to revenge the Goldstein killings and did so in this period of accelerating suicide bombings.[17]

The Oslo Accords proved irrelevant to real life conditions in the occupied territories. Many Palestinian villages lacked adequate services such as the electricity and water bountifully available to Jewish settlers.[18] Health, education, and social services provided by the Palestinian Authority in small "self-rule" areas, proved a financial drain more than a liberation. The Palestinian police had no power to arrest Jewish criminals, nor did "self-rule" include a Palestinian right to make laws or appoint administrators without Israeli approval. And when the IDF did withdraw from the few self-rule areas, these withdrawals proved to be encirclements by IDF tanks and IDF control of all entry and exit points. An additional blow to the Palestinians was Rabin's peace treaty with Jordan (October 1994) which gave Jordan control of the Muslim holy shrines in Jerusalem, considered by the Palestinians to be part of a future Palestinian state.[19]

The Israeli political right was displeased about *any* degree of IDF withdrawal and a rally in Jerusalem turned into a rampage by some ten thousand right-wing Israeli rioters against Arab bystanders in the Old City. Hamas and Islamic Jihad also continued to launch terrorist attacks. Rabin, rather than reduce tensions or mobilize the Israeli political center, played to the Israeli right. Michael Lerner observes:

> He [Rabin] did this in a series of speeches whose main point was not how to build peace, but rather to focus on how little he had given away, on how clever a negotiator he had been, on how he still didn't really trust the Palestinians, on how he would not move too quickly to implement various parts of the [Oslo] agreement, on how he and Israel would remain "tough." Thus, he reinforced the tendency of Israeli media and public discourse to distrust the Palestinians at the very moment when what was needed was the building of a climate of trust.[20]

Oslo II (September 28, 1995), also known as the "Taba Agreements"

After two years of failure, an attempt was made to draft interim agreements to supersede the initial Oslo agreements. A Palestinian council was elected and limited authority was transferred to it. The IDF was to withdraw from a few centers of dense Palestinian population, about 3 percent of the West

Bank, but otherwise to remain throughout.[21] Conditions did not improve. On the Gaza Strip, for example, one million Palestinians were basically imprisoned, lacked land to grow food, water to drink, or even menial jobs in Israel.[22]

The Assassination of Rabin, November 4, 1995

Rabin was assassinated by a right-wing Jewish student who combined religious fanaticism with racist nationalism. He believed that God's chosen people, the rightful owners of the promised land, must deport the Arab enemy committed to the annihilation of the Jews. This assassination created for the both the Israeli and American publics an image of a martyred man of peace cut down by right-wing extremism. Rabin's death, like his initial electoral triumph over Shamir, was portrayed in the media in terms of "dove" versus "hawk." Yet there was little difference in their continuing colonization through settlement expansion, evasion of substantive negotiations concerning Palestinian rights, and denial of a Palestinian state. Rabin's contribution was closer to that of "confounding prospects for peace . . . than the vision of peaceful coexistence which his eulogists have ascribed to him."[23]

Notes

1. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 502–3.

2. "When it comes to Israel's security we will concede not a thing. From our standpoint, security takes precedence over peace." Quoted in Avi Shlaim, "Prelude to the Accord," *Journal of Palestine Studies* (Winter 1994): 13.

3. The U.S. State Department's *Settlement Report* stated in April 1993 that Israel "made no commitment to halt or reduce construction in East Jerusalem [40,000 units since 1967, and] has affirmed its intention to continue settlement construction in . . . Greater Jerusalem." Donald Neff, "Jerusalem in U.S. Policy," *Journal of Palestine Studies* (Autumn 1993): 41.

4. Nicholas Guyatt, *The Absence of Peace: Understanding the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (New York: Zed Books, 1998), 54.

5. "West Bank road plans leave nothing to negotiate," *Middle East International (MEI)*, 25 June 1993. "By-pass road construction in the West Bank: the end of the dream of Palestinian sovereignty," *MEI*, 23 February 1996. Also, LAW, the Palestinian Society for Human Rights and for the Environment, "Palestinians in Wonderland" 9 October 1996, 2. Edward Said, *Peace and Its Discontents* (New York: Vintage, 1996), 41.

6. Shlaim, "Prelude to the Accord," 15. Naseer Aruri, "The Serious Challenges Facing Palestinian Society," *MEI*, 25 August 1995, 16. Mustafa Barghouti estimates 69 percent, "Palestinians at the crossroads," *MEI*, 19 January 1996, 16.

7. Avi Shlaim, "The Oslo Accord," *Journal of Palestine Studies* (Spring 1994): 28.

8. Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 560.

9. Shlaim, "The Oslo Accord," 39.

10. Rabin insisted on security conditions that would damage Assad's domestic image. These included (a) Israeli military occupation of the Heights for up to five years; (b) immediate opening of trade relations, (i.e., domination of the Syrian economy and its industry by a flood of Israeli capital); (c) security arrangements including a DMZ extended to the Damascus suburbs; (d) permanent Israeli warning stations on the Heights infringing Syrian sovereignty.

11. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 504–5.

12. The Israelis were Yair Hirschfeld and Ron Pundak (later, Yoel Singer, an attorney). The PLO officials were Ahmad Qurei (aka Abu Ala) and Mahmoud Abbas (aka Abu Mazen) now president of the Palestinian government.

13. David Remnick, "Checkpoint," *The New Yorker*, February 7, 2005, 55.

14. Nicholas Guyatt, *The Absence of Peace*, 56.

15. Hamas, an *Islamic* organization, had actually been supported by *Israel* as a means to weaken Arafat's *secular* Fatah and PLO. Arafat's inability to control Hamas also related to the popular support Hamas enjoyed. Jeffrey Goldberg explains: "Hamas is not only a terrorist movement but also a social service provider, and it has the support of more than 20 percent of the population. The ministers of the Palestinian Authority have managed to secure for themselves reputations for corruption and venality: in fact, the Palestinian Legislative Council recently criticized the Arafat regime for misusing more than $300 million in public funds. Hamas, on the other hand, is regarded as honest and charitable. A weakened Arafat lacks the strength to fight the Hamas infrastructure; he would be fighting, in some ways, the masses themselves." Jeffrey Goldberg, "From Peace Process to Police Process," *New York Times Magazine*, 14 September 1997, 62–104

16. The doubters included the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine led by George Habash and the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine led by Nayef Hawatmeh. Edward Said also expressed pessimism about significant change: "The PLO has transformed itself from a national liberation movement into a kind of small-town government. . . . All secret deals [Oslo] between a very strong and a very weak partner necessarily involve concessions hidden in embarrassment by the latter. . . . The deal before us smacks of the PLO leadership's exhaustion and isolation and of Israel's shrewdness." Said, *Peace and Its Discontents*, 2.

17. Donald Neff, *Fallen Pillars: U.S. Policy toward Palestine and Israel since 1945* (Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1995), 203–4. After the Goldstein massacre in February 1994, there were 69 Israelis killed by suicide bombers during the next year and a half. There was also a resurgence of suicide bombings in 1996 after Israel's assassination of Hamas Yahya Ayyash ("the engineer") believed to be

responsibility for many suicide bombings. In 1997 the bombings diminished until the intifada of September 2000. Danny Rubinstein (*Ha'aretz*) dates the first suicide bombing to October 1990 after eighteen Palestinians were killed by the IDF in a riot at the Wailing Wall and Hamas called for revenge.

18. West Bank Palestinians received, per capita, one-fifth as much water as Jewish settlers; one-seventh, in Gaza.

19. The Israel-Jordan peace treaty had little effect apart from delineating the Israeli-Jordanian border and allocating more water to Jordan. This treaty scotched Sharon's pet plan to overthrow the Jordanian monarchy and turn Jordan into a Palestinian state ("Jordan is Palestine").

20. Rabbi Michael Lerner, *Healing: Israel/Palestine* (San Francisco: Tikkun Books, 2003), 93.

21. Agreements under Oslo II divided the West Bank into three areas: ("A") those under exclusive Palestinian administrative and security (military) control, comprising about 3 percent of the West Bank; ("B") those under Palestinian administrative control but Israeli security control, comprising about 23 percent of the West Bank; and ("C") those under exclusive Israeli administrative and security control, including land, settlements, and their roads, comprising about 74 percent of the West Bank.

22. Some 5,000 Jewish settlers had possession of one-third of the Gaza Strip—*per capita*, thirty-six times more land and eighteen times more water than the Palestinian. Jad Isaac, "The water conflicts in the Middle East from a Palestinian perspective," (Bethlehem: Applied Research Institute Jerusalem, 1997). Sara Roy, "*The Gaza Strip*" Institute for Palestine Studies (September 1995) 162–75.

23. Guyatt, *The Absence of Peace*, 54.

CHAPTER NINE

☙ ❧

Peres and Netanyahu and Wye River

Upon Rabin's assassination on November 4, 1995, the Knesset recommended that Shimon Peres, former prime minister and foreign ministry in Rabin's cabinet, be assigned the task of forming a new government. He had much public support and vowed to continue Rabin's policies. He did. He brought no peace to Israel or the Palestinians. Like Rabin, he sought to undermine Syrian support for the Palestinians. Again, the Syrian Golan Heights negotiations failed.[1] And relations with the Palestinians continued to suffer with confiscation of more land for Jewish settlements and road networks and continuing closure of Israel to Palestinian labor.[2] Peres also rejected an unofficial proposal for a demilitarized Palestinian state on the West Bank and Gaza known as the Stockholm Accord.[3]

Peres made an effort to display toughness toward the Palestinians in January 1996, just prior to the democratic election of a Palestinian National Authority, a prospective government for a state-in-waiting. One act was the assassination of Yahya Ayyash who had been implicated in suicide attacks in retaliation for the 1994 Goldstein massacre. This assassination only made matters worse. For a disciple of Ayyash blew himself up on an Israeli bus and three additional suicide attacks killed sixty Israelis. With an Israeli election coming up in May 1996, Peres suspended all talks with the newly elected Palestinian National Authority, kept Israeli borders closed to Palestinian workers, and declared war on Hamas and Islamic Jihad. None of this added to his popularity and Likud's Benyamin Netanyahu was waiting in the wings to highlight Peres' ineffectuality.

Operation Grapes of Wrath (April 1996)

In another seeming preelection move, Peres signed a military cooperation agreement with Turkey giving Israel access to a second-front from which to attack Syria where the PLO was headquartered. He also authorized, in April, 2,000 air attacks on Lebanon with intent to destroy Hizbullah, the 300-man militia committed to forcing out the IDF.[4] This Lebanon operation ("Grapes of Wrath") was Peres' undoing. The air attacks killed more than 200 civilians and turned nearly 400,000 Lebanese civilians into homeless refugees. Destruction was heaped on Beirut and the Bekas Valley. Israel was universally condemned for these attacks. Peres had stumbled onto the same perilous stage as had Sharon in 1982. A series of suicidal bombings in retaliation for "Grapes of Wrath" hurt Peres even further, and he lost the May election to Netanyahu.

Netanyahu's "Greater Israel"—Continuing Colonization and Evasion of Negotiations

Netanyahu campaigned on a platform of defeating Palestinian terrorism and fulfilling the Greater Israel vision: incorporation of all of Palestine, that is, no military withdrawal from the occupied territories.[5] Netanyahu was devoted to the nullification of the "dangerous" Oslo Peace Accords and explained his policy intentions to the Knesset in June 1996: (1) construction of more Jewish settlements, (2) retention of Syria's Golan Heights, (3) sovereignty over all of Jerusalem, (4) right of IDF entry into Palestinian self-rule areas, (5) no Palestinian state, and (6) no return of Palestinian refugees.[6]

Netanyahu began his program provocatively, refusing to comply with *previous* Oslo-agreed withdrawals of Israeli forces from Palestinian self-rule areas.[7] Moreover, he authorized more settlements (at Har Homa), withheld Palestinian tax monies illegally, closed Israel to Palestinian goods and labor and other acts leading to riots.[8]

Palestinian Suicide Bombings

All hope for the "peace process" ended. Netanyahu's actions were followed by an acceleration of Palestinian suicide bombings. The Palestinians were full of despair and anger after thirty years of tight Israeli military control and confiscation of the bulk of the arable land and water sources. This led to cycles of mutual Palestinian and Israeli terrorism—Palestinian suicide bombings and Israeli air assaults and "extrajudicial killings" by undercover Israeli

death squads. Natanyahu, like Rabin before him and Sharon after, demanded the unobtainable: an end to all suicide bombings as a precondition for negotiations. Arafat, weakened and unable to contain Hamas, was blamed as a terrorist.[9] He was neither the terrorist that Netanyahu alleged nor the Israeli collaborator that Hamas alleged.

Clinton Tries to Restart the Oslo Accords— the Wye River Memorandum

In October of 1998, President Clinton dragged a reluctant Netanyahu to the signing of the "Wye River" agreements. If enacted, Wye River would have given Israel full political and military control over 63 percent of the West Bank, the Palestinians 6.36 percent, the rest shared.[10] Within a year, Netanyahu had reneged on all Wye River agreements.[11]

> [Netanyahu suspended] the implementation of the second pullback stipulated in the Wye River Memorandum until the Palestinian Authority met a list of five conditions. Most of these were new and were calculated to torpedo the peace process and to put the blame on the Palestinians. The truth of the matter was that the Palestinians had honored their obligations for the second stage of Wye: the PNC ratified the cancellation of the 1968 charter, while the Palestinian Authority issued orders against incitement and continued to cooperate with Israel in security matters. Israel, on the other hand, failed to fulfill its sole obligation for the second stage of Wye: the transfer of 5 percent of the West Bank from exclusive Israeli control to joint Israeli-Palestinian control."[12]

The Collapse of Netanyahu's "Politics of Resentment"

Netanyahu was politically aligned with right-wing parties and classes (the ultrareligious, the Sephardim and the Russian immigrants) who resented the power and snobbery of the "old elite" Labor Party (e.g., Rabin, Peres) dominated by secular Ashkenazi Jews. Netanyahu had been able to defeat Peres by the slimmest of margins only by stirring class resentments. This worked until Netanyahu's "coalition of the rejected" underwent its own internal splits. The ultra-Orthodox Sephardic Party (Shas) disliked the Russian immigrant party ("Israel in Ascent" led by Natan Sharansky) even more than it disliked the Ashkenazi Labor party.[13] In turn, the Russians resented Netanyahu's accommodation to the Sephardim and their disreputable Shas leader, Aryeh Deri, convicted of bribery.

The collapse of Netanyahu's coalition also related to the fact that he was widely seen as "unreliable," not only by the Israeli press, military leaders, and professional politicians, but by Clinton, Mubarak, King Hussein, and his own right-wing base.[14] This perception related to the basic contradiction in his political strategy. On the one hand, Netanyahu was devoted to the project of annexing the West Bank to Israel. On the other hand, he tried to cater to centrist and left-of-center swing voters. He made promises to the left (the Wye River agreements), but broke those promises in order to regain the right-of-center. Contradictions and broken promises led to his downfall.

Netanyahu also suffered defections from within his own administration. His foreign minister, David Levy, criticized his boss for "destroying the peace" and scuttling the Oslo Accords, and both Levy and the defense minister resigned. Netanyahu had been dismissive toward his ministers and mistrustful of his security chiefs, thinking them soft on Palestinians. Yossi Peled, a respected army general, defected on grounds of Netanyahu's untrustworthiness. Even Shamir, himself once caught up in contradictory promises, advised voters not to trust the deceptive Netanyahu.[15]

Netanyahu Caught in Israel's Swing Vote

Netanyahu was also a victim of the swing vote in Israel. This vote, not clearly left/secular nor right/religious, swings right (more nationalistically) in times of stress (e.g., during Palestinian-Israeli violence) and swings left (more liberally) during periods of relative calm. Baruch Kimmerling labels this polarity in attitudes that between the "primordial" (the "right") and the "futuristic."(the "left").[16] Avishai Margalit explains:

> The primordialists believe that throughout history there have always been enemies of the Jewish people, whose genocidal intent is the only historical constant, from Pharaoh . . . to the German Nazis and now the Arabs. . . . If only, say the primordialists, we could rid ourselves of the enemies from within—the left—and create Jewish unity, then no one could destroy us. The futurists [the left] want a "normal" Israel that would be like other well-ordered nations—a country in which individual rights and minority rights are respected, including the rights of the Arab minority in Israel.[17]

This swing vote between the rightist "primordialists" and the leftist "futurists" is less about religion than *perceived stress*. The middle Israeli electorate vote depends on whether they see Israel as under threat or not—vacillating between the paranoia of the primordialists (the Netanyahu attitude)

and the more optimistic futurists. In the May 1999 election campaign, Ehud Barak convincingly offered peace and hope for the future, while Netanyahu overplayed his more paranoid vision of a world of anti-Semitic predators. The vote swung to the left and Barak won the prime ministership.

Netanyahu, son of a right-wing father who had been an advisor to Jabotinsky in the 1920s, was one of the most politically orthodox of the "Greater Israel" prime ministers since Ben-Gurion. He was more hostile to the Palestinians than Jabotinsky had been, though less militarily destructive to the Palestinians than Ariel Sharon would prove to be.

Notes

1. Peres failed to exchange the Golan Heights for peace with Syria even though he thought that Israel's presence on the Golan Heights was no defense against Syria's surface-to-surface missiles. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001) 553.

2. Rabin and Peres increased settlements by 49 percent during their combined four-year rule. Peres budgeted $600 million in January 1996 for West Bank road building. Peres planned to keep Palestinians out of Israel yet hoped to profit from their cheap labor by placing Israeli factories on the border of Palestinian areas. Nicholas Guyatt, *The Absence of Peace*, 57. The plan was abandoned in favor of importing cheap labor from Asia and Europe.

3. The plan was undertaken without the knowledge of Rabin or Peres by Yossi Beilin and Arafat's deputy, Mahmoud Abbas, along with two Palestinian and two Israeli academics. It called for the swap of 6 percent of the West Bank (containing 75 percent of all Jewish settlers) for an equal amount of land to be added to Gaza. The remaining Jewish settlements would come under Palestinian sovereignty. Israel would have sovereignty over Jerusalem, whereas the Palestinian capital would border on Jerusalem. The Muslim holy places would have an extraterritorial status.

4. Hizbullah is a Lebanese militia spawned by the Begin-Sharon 1982 invasion and massacre of Lebanese villagers. Hizbullah was devoted to the removal of the IDF from Israel's self-declared "security zone." Israel and Hizbullah accused each other of breaching a U.S.-brokered cease-fire. In fact, Hizbullah's obsolete Katyusha rockets attacked Jewish settlements in northern Galilee and Israeli air attacks struck civilian targets beyond its security zone in Lebanon.

5. Inspired by Jabotinsky, the central theme of Netanyahu's 1993 book ("A Place among the Nations: Israel and the World") was the right of the Jewish people to the whole Land of Israel. He denied that the Palestinians have a right to self-determination and compared the Arabs to Nazi Germany, the Palestinians to the Sudeten Germans, and Israel to the small democracy of Czechoslovakia, victim of Hitler.

6. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 571.

7. For example, Israel agreed in 1995 to redeploy the IDF from the West Bank city of Hebron. Netanyahu failed to comply.

8. Netanyahu approved the opening of an ancient tunnel that borders on the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif (site of the Dome on the Rock and the al-Aksa Mosque sacred to both Jews and Muslims) without informing Islamic authorities. A riot resulted that was violently suppressed, killing about eighty Palestinians and fifteen Israelis.

9. Had Arafat been able somehow to curb Hamas, the military wing of the Muslim Brotherhood (a popular social service organization supporting and supported by many Palestinians) his authority with Palestinians would have eroded. Hanan Ashrawi observed, "The more the PLO shows it can deliver on the Israelis' principal demand, security, the less it is accepted by its own people."

10. Of the remainder (30.64 percent), 20.64 percent was to be under Palestinian political control and joint Palestinian/Israeli security control, while 10 percent to be under Palestinian political but exclusive Israeli security control. All percentage figures concerning the Wye agreement are taken from the *New York Times*: Steven Erlanger, "Arafat and Netanyahu in Pact on Next Steps Toward Peace," *New York Times*, 24 October 1998, A6: Ethan Bronner, "Filling In Peace's Details Is the Painful Part," *New York Times*, 25 October 1998, Sec. 4, 1.

11. "Avi Shlaim explains his disenchantment with Ehud Barak," *London Review of Books*, 25 January 2001, 28.

12. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 605.

13. The underprivileged, less educated and poorer Sephardim resented the more skilled and economically successful Russian Jews. Shas officials insinuated that the Russians were not Jews and that their women were prostitutes.

14. Margalit, "Israel: Why Barak Won," *New York Review of Books*, 12 August 1999, 47.

15. "Many Israelis [were] accusing him of exacerbating the country's divisions by his paranoid personal style, duplicity, deviousness, and inability to get on with his colleagues." Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 607.

16. Baruch Kimmerling, in Asher Arian and Michele Shamir, Eds. *The Elections in Israel—1996* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: The Israel Democracy Institute, 1999), 36. Cited by Margalit, "Israel: Why Barak Won," 49.

17. Margalit, "Israel: Why Barak Won," 49. Left-leaning parties: Labor, Meretz, and Arab; right-leaning: Likud, Shas, National Union, United Torah Judaism, and National Religious Party.

Barak and Arafat at Camp David

Ehud Barak was elected prime minister in May 1999 as a peace candidate, as a centrist, as a disciple of Rabin and as a supporter of the Oslo Accords. In reality he was critical of the Accords. Like Netanyahu, Barak ignored or violated the Oslo Accords and delayed compliance with agreements that Netanyahu had made at Wye River. In fact, the whole legacy of the Oslo Accords "read like a litany of promises deferred or unfulfilled. Six years after the agreement there were more Israeli settlements, less freedom of movement, and worse economic conditions."[1] Settlement building and roads for Jewish settlers proceeded at a frenetic pace under Barak—the classic Zionist maneuver of creating of facts on the ground to preclude a Palestinian state.

Barak repeated the efforts of Rabin and Peres to isolate the Palestinians by undermining their Syrian support through a deal with Israel over the Golan Heights. When this failed, he sought to assure the exclusion of Palestinian labor by authorizing the import of foreign workers.[2]

Barak preferred a final status agreement with the Palestinians rather than piecemeal Oslo negotiations. As an inducement to Arafat, Barak agreed in September 1999 at Sharm el-Sheikh to some IDF withdrawals from small areas of the West Bank and release of 700 Palestinian prisoners from Israeli jails. Later, he promised the Palestinians a safe corridor between Gaza and the West Bank and a 6.1 percent handover of the West Bank. Although Barak kept none of these promises, the right-wing faction in Barak's coalition government was alarmed that he might offer more concessions. The coalition frayed over this and other issues and Barak barely survived a no-confidence motion

in the Knesset. He sorely needed a final agreement with Arafat to restore his flagging political position and he pressed Clinton for an immediate final-status summit with Arafat at Camp David.

The Camp David Summit, July 2000

Arafat asked for preparatory talks to help ensure success at the summit. Clinton refused. Arafat was also mistrustful because of Barak's previously broken promises. He saw Barak as holding all the cards and worried that Barak would impose an all-or-nothing ultimatum. He surmised that if he did not accept, he would be blamed (despite Clinton's false assurances otherwise).

It was not, however, as though Arafat had no need of a final deal. The Palestinians were in despair and their suicide bombings were cited by Israel as justification for political impasse. Yet Arafat felt manipulated. Barak's furious settlement building seemed to be, in itself, a manipulative strategy: "take what's now offered while there's still something left." Even Barak's *lapsed* agreements could be seen as an *inducement* to make a deal (i.e., make a deal or forget about old agreements). To counter this impression, Clinton gained from Barak promises to honor his *prior* commitments, *whatever* the outcome of the summit promises Barak broke.

This famous summit has been widely depicted as one in which Arafat stubbornly rejected Barak's historic and generous offer, the "best offer" ever made by any prime minister. Analysis of the history and dynamics of the Camp David negotiation suggests something different.

The Style of Negotiations

Robert Malley (Special assistant to Clinton at Camp David) and Hussein Agha wrote:

> Barak apparently took the view that, faced with a sufficiently attractive alternative, the Palestinians would have no choice but to say yes. In effect, each successive Palestinian "no" led to the next best Israeli assessment of what, in their right minds, the Palestinians couldn't turn down. The final and largely unnoticed consequence of Barak's approach is that, strictly speaking, there never was an Israeli offer . . . the Israelis always stopped one, if not several, steps short of a proposal. The ideas put forward at Camp David were never stated in writing, but conveyed orally. . . . Barak refused to hold any substantive meeting with him [Arafat] at Camp David out of fear that the Palestinian leader would seek to put Israeli concessions on the record.[3]

Yet Barak's ambiguous and floating offers do not explain or justify Arafat's own silence. Did the suspicious Arafat count too much on international law or UN resolutions calling for Israeli withdrawal and right of refugee return? When John Lister (U.S Foreign Service) describes the impasse in terms of the fluid bottom-line nature of Barak's unwritten proposals, he does not consider Arafat to be blameless:

> Barak succeeded in undercutting himself by presenting, usually through American intermediaries, "bottom line" offers that were inevitably improved upon once the Palestinians rejected them. It was unnecessary for the Palestinians to negotiate as long as Barak was negotiating with himself. But the larger issue of whether Arafat was prepared to sign even the most improved-upon Israeli offer is doubtful.[4]

The ambiguity at Camp David is summarized by Malley and Agha:

> Ask a member of the American team and an honest answer might be that there was a moving target of ideas. . . . Ask Barak and he might volunteer that there was no Israeli offer and, besides, Arafat rejected it. Ask Arafat and the response you might hear is that there was no offer; besides, it was unacceptable.[5]

Some Ideas Raised at the Summit

Apparently, Barak did manage to suggest that Israel annex 9 percent of the West Bank, an area containing 150,000 Jewish settlers and 120,000 Palestinians. (Presumably, the Palestinians would be relocated.) Compensating for the 9 percent loss, the West Bank was to be enlarged by 1 percent from Israel land. The area that Barak proposed to annex to Israel would, it appears, have been strategically located so as to control much of the water supply of the West Bank.

More importantly, an impression was left with the media that the Palestinians would have a *sovereign state on the remaining 92 percent* of the West Bank (100−9+1=92). What, then, would be the fate of the settlements, roads and security zones remaining on nearly half of the West Bank? Barak said nothing about the voluntary or forced evacuation of all these settlements and security zones.[6] Nor did Barak address the question of who would possess the Jordan River Valley, the wide easterly swath of the West Bank (from which Palestinians today are largely excluded).[7]

Since Barak made no clarification or commitment on these matters, Arafat had little reason to believe that the Palestinians were being offered

sovereignty over 92 percent of the West Bank. The offer, it appeared, was for Palestinian sovereignty over pieces of land *between* Jewish settlements, roads, and security zones—perhaps half of the West Bank on which 2.3 million Palestinians would remain isolated on four separated enclaves. If *that* was the offer, then, as Jimmy Carter later observed, "there was no possibility that any Palestinian leader could accept such terms and survive."[8]

Concerning Jerusalem, Barak proposed that the Palestinians could have sovereignty over the Muslim and Christian quarters of the Old City in East Jerusalem (half of 1 percent of Jerusalem) and a loosely defined "permanent custodianship" over the Haram al-Sharif, third holiest site in Islam. A false impression was left that Barak was willing to *divide* Jerusalem to accommodate a Palestinian capital. In fact he suggested that the Palestinian capital be in the West Bank town of Abu-Dis, *outside* of East Jerusalem.[9] For Barak, as for every prime minister, Jerusalem was "the united capital of Israel forever."

Concerning the highly sensitive issue of refugees, Barak spoke only of "a satisfactory solution" in which Israel would have *sole discretion* concerning the number of refugees it might permit to return to Israel. This would replace UN 194 (III): "the right of [all] Palestinians to return to Israel in peace or be compensated for their lost property." To be sure, the return of Palestinians to Israel was politically unrealistic. Yet rhetorically, Arafat could not have acceded to Israeli sole discretion in this matter given the bitter memories of the shattering dispossessions of Palestinians in 1948 and 1967.[10] Barak gave Arafat no reason to think that the refugees could either return to Israel or be compensated.[11]

Barak also demanded that the signing of any final agreement be accompanied by a Palestinian declaration of the "end of the conflict."[12] This sounds reasonable except that it would have finalized the inapplicability (not a mere ignoring) of international laws and UN Resolutions such as 242 and 194— the few bargaining cards in the Palestinian deck. Were the *Palestinians* to agree that the conflict had officially ended, then no legal basis in international law would exist for future negotiations over a whole host of issues still unaddressed.

Arafat saw Barak's proposals as evasive, tricky, and destined to undermine his position with Palestinians back home. With nothing offered regarding the fate of Palestinian refugees or the removal of Jewish settlers on presumably "sovereign" Palestinian soil, the "best offer" of any prime minister would not have been defensible or acceptable to the Palestinian people. Barak's foreign minister, Shlomo Ben-Ami, a key participant at Camp David, later admitted: "If I were a Palestinian I would have rejected Camp David as well."[13]

Internecine Political Warfare (Barak, Sharon, Netanyahu) and the September al-Aqsa Intifada

Following the failed Camp David summit, Barak was politically threatened from the right by Netanyahu. A third player, Ariel Sharon, was a less probable candidate for prime minister, given the serious political and moral damage he had done to Israel by the Lebanon debacle in 1982. Nevertheless, with political instincts honed, an ambitious Sharon believed he could outflank Netanyahu by courting Netanyahu's *hard-right* supporters. To this end, he made a defiant march on September 29, 2000 under heavy armed guard (some 100 soldiers and policemen) to the highly contentious site of the Temple Mount and al-Aqsa mosque[14]—the very site that right-wingers accused Barak of nearly giving away to Arafat at Camp David. This march sparked a Palestinian riot. Sharon had flaunted his commitment to sovereignty over the Temple Mount and determination to intimidate the Palestinians.[15] Sharon's message to Netanyahu: "no one can out-right me."

The riot at the Temple Mount/al-Aqsa Mosque grew into what today is known as the "al-Aqsa" intifada. Almost daily clashes for several months took the lives of 350 Palestinians and 50 Israelis. Barak had part responsibility, for he had granted Sharon permission to make this provocative march—perhaps in hope that Sharon could successfully pull right-wing voters away from Barak's more feared opponent, Netanyahu.[16] It was a bad miscalculation. *Sharon* won the election six months later (February 2001), the most decisive election win in Israeli history.

The result of the al-Aqsa uprising left Palestinians even more miserable. With Israeli borders closed and Palestinian unemployment at 40 percent, "2.3 million people [were consigned] to an open-air prison. . . . Acres of Palestinian olive groves and farmland bulldozed by the Israeli army . . . the economic punishment meted out by the Israeli occupation forces [was] savage, the brutality with which Israel tried to put down the popular uprising drew widespread condemnation."[17] The immediate effect of the violent uprising was that Clinton attempted to bring some peace by *restoring* the failed agreement at Camp David—a last ditch effort just before Sharon was about to take office and Clinton leave office.

Clinton's proposals in December 2000 were similar to those of Barak but with several differences: (a) Israel would annex four to 5 percent of the West Bank (with an equal amount of compensating Israeli territory); (b) Jerusalem would be divided along existing demographic concentrations, e.g., East Jerusalem would go to the Palestinian state; and (c) Israel agreed to drop its demand that Arafat declare an official "end of the conflict" that would

undermine the applicability of UN 242 and 194.[18] What was *not* clearly different was the fate of the Jewish settlements, possession of the West Bank's Jordan Valley, or the fate of Palestinian refugees—although descriptions of Clinton's proposals vary among observers.[19] Arafat saw some degree of hope, though John Mearsheimer finds it "hard to imagine the Palestinians accepting such a state. Certainly no other nation in the world has such curtailed sovereignty."[20] In any event, agreement failed and Sharon and G. W. Bush were in office two months later.

Barak's Dilemma

As has been seen, Barak's need to obtain an agreement with the Palestinians to shore up his political position was counterbalanced by pressure from the right to give away as little as possible. In this respect, he followed previous prime ministers in their attempt to engage in a "peace process" while maintaining colonial control over Palestinian territory.[21] Barak did seek a "make or break" negotiation at Camp David but his evasiveness and broken promises regarding agreements at Oslo, Wye, and Sharm el-Sheikh infected the negotiations. Nor was Arafat an effective leader, perhaps too fearful of criticism from his own people. He was right that he would be blamed were there no agreement, and Barak did prove his deceit by breaking his promise to Clinton to fulfill earlier commitments.

Notes

1. Robert Malley and Hussein Aga, "Camp David: The Tragedy of Errors," *New York Review of Books*, August 9, 2001, 59. Malley was Special Assistant to President Clinton for Arab-Israeli Affairs and a participant in the Camp David summit.

2. Barak authorized 100,000 undocumented workers from East Asia and Central Europe to replace Palestinian workers, gaining cheap labor without the security risk of Palestinians.

3. Malley and Agha, "Camp David," 62. "Bottom lines and false bottoms: the tension, and the ambiguity, were always there."

4. John Lister, "'Middle' Politics: looking again at the peace process," *Middle East Policy*, Vol IX, No. 3 (September 2002), 27. Lister served in the U.S. embassy in Tel Aviv, 1997–2001, where he covered Palestinian affairs in the Gaza Strip.

5. Malley and Agha, "Camp David," 65.

6. "Based on past experience, not only will the settlers stay, but the settlements will be expanded. And if the settlements stay, of course the Israeli army will stay as well to protect them, and thus the situation will remain as it is now—namely, the Palestinian "state" will consist of 42 percent of the West Bank." Tanya Reinhart,

Israel/Palestine (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002), 46. Statistics in this paragraph from Reinhart, *Israel/Palestine* 18, 21, 33, 42.

7. *B'Tselem* and the *Guardian Weekly* reported on Israel's "de facto annexation" of the Jordan Valley. *Guardian Weekly*, 17–23 February 2006, 10.

8. Jimmy Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 153. Colin Powell later observed: "Palestinians should have a real state, not a phony state that's diced into a thousand different pieces." James Bennet, "Israel Clamps Down on West Bank and the Gaza Strip," *New York Times*, 27 January 2003, A3.

9. Because Barak referred to Abu-Dis outside Jerusalem as "Al Quds" (meaning "the holy city," the *Arab* name for Jerusalem), it seemed, incorrectly, that Barak was making an important concession regarding Jerusalem.

10. Palestinian representatives embracing the two-state solution expected refugees to return to the Palestinian state (not Israel) and Jewish settlers in the occupied territories to return to Israel. Some thought that if Jews were going to stay in the West Bank, then Palestinians should be allowed to return to their former homes in Israel. Reinhart, *Israel/Palestine*, 54.

11. Israel's core idea regarding Palestinian refugees is that it was the responsibility of the *international community* to solve the problem. "The idea was that the international community would contribute $20 billion over a period of 15 to 20 years to settle all the refugees' claims. The funds would be given as compensation to refugee households and as an aid grant to countries that would rehabilitate refugees." Uriya Shavit and Jalal Bana, "Everything you wanted to know about the 'right of return' but were afraid to ask." *Ha'aretz Friday Magazine*, 6 July 2001. Cited by Reinhart, *Israel/Palestine*, 58.

12. Reinhart, *Israel/Palestine*, 30.

13. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, "Letters," *London Review of Books*, 11 May 2006, 4.

14. The Temple Mount for Muslims is known as Haram al-Sharif, cite of the Dome on the Rock and the al-Aqsa Mosque.

15. Some observers think that, given the Camp David failure, the Palestinians were ready to riot anyhow. Avishai Margalit, "The Middle East: Snakes and Ladders," *The New York Review of Books,* 17 May 2001, 20. Ehud Olmert believes that it was Sharon who lit the fire.

16. Margalit, "The Middle East," 20.

17. Shlaim, "Avi Shlaim explains his disenchantment," *London Review of Books*, 25 January 2001, 29.

18. UN 242 and 194 were written back in as a basis for agreement. Documentation of the Taba negotiations was prepared by EU Special Representative to the Middle East Process, Ambassador Miguel Moratinos. *Ha'aretz*, 15 February 2002, cited by Reinhart, *Israel/Palestine*, 213, 220.

19. Benny Morris refers to the evacuation of "most settlements." *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict 1881–2001* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 670–71. John Mearsheimer summarizes the Clinton plan: "The plan apparently en-

visions a Palestinian state divided into three cantons, each separated from the other by Israeli-controlled territory. In particular, the West Bank would effectively be divided in half by Jewish settlements and roads running from Jerusalem to the Jordan Valley. The Gaza Strip and the West Bank are already geographically separated by Israeli territory. Palestinian neighborhoods in East Jerusalem would become part of the Palestinian state, but two of these neighborhoods would be islands surrounded on all sides by Israeli territory—outposts cut off from their homeland. The Clinton plan lets Israel maintain military forces in the strategically important Jordan River Valley. This means Israel would control the eastern border of the Palestinian state. Israel says it might be willing to remove its forces after six years, but there is no guarantee that it would actually do so. And why should it? The strategic value of the Jordan Valley to Israel—which is great—will not diminish over time. Moreover, the Palestinians will not be allowed to build a military that could defend them, and they would have to let the Israeli army move into their new state if Israel declared a national state of emergency. This stricture has echoes of the infamous Platt Amendment of 1901, which gave the United States broad rights to intervene in Cuba but which poisoned Cuban-American relations for more than thirty years. Finally, Israel could hold ultimate control over the Palestinians' water supply and air space. It is hard to imagine the Palestinians accepting such a state. Certainly no other nation in the world has such curtailed sovereignty. Even if the Clinton plan is accepted, the new state is sure to be a source of boundless anger." *New York Times*, Op-Ed. January 11, 2001.

20. Mearsheimer, *New York Times*, Op-Ed. 11 January 2001.

21. "It was Ehud Barak, following in his predecessor's footsteps, who undermined them [Oslo negotiations]. The Accords are about identifying and cultivating common interests: Barak has all but destroyed the faith of the Palestinians in the possibility of co-operation and coexistence with Israel. What is at stake in this conflict is not Israel's security, let alone its existence, but its 1967 colonial conquests. Under General Barak's leadership the Israeli army is waging a colonial war against the Palestinian people. Like all colonial wars it is savage, senseless and directed in the main against the long-suffering civilian population." Shlaim, "Avi Shlaim explains his disenchantment," 29.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

✲✺✴✺✲

Ariel Sharon: Force over Peace

Ariel Sharon is a strong and forceful man and has never equivocated in his public declarations nor deviated from his ultimate purpose. His rejection of all peace agreements that included Israeli withdrawal from Arab lands, his invasion of Lebanon, his provocative visit to the Temple Mount, the destruction of villages and homes, the arrests of thousands of Palestinians and his open defiance of President George W. Bush's demand that he comply with international law, have all been orchestrated to accomplish his ultimate goal: to establish Israeli settlements as widely as possible throughout occupied territories and to deny Palestinians a cohesive political existence.

—Jimmy Carter[1]

The United States had held out some hope that Barak wanted peace. That hope for peace faded when Sharon took office in February 2001. The policies of earlier prime ministers found their most unapologetic expression in Ariel Sharon who was devoted to the use of military force to solve political problems. He was adamantly opposed to a Palestinian state and shunned all negotiations that might head in that direction. And he used military force in several different ways to ensure that no Palestinian state would ever exist. First, he sought to *crush* all Palestinian resistance in hope of obtaining Palestinian submission to Israeli terms. Second, Sharon's use of force encouraged Palestinian terrorism and, by keeping it going after every lull, could be used to justify a *refusal* to negotiate a Palestinian state. Either way, by crushing

145

Palestinian resistance or encouraging Palestinian resistance, the *danger* of peace negotiations could be avoided. Palestinian terrorism had a political utility. Israeli Journalist David Grossman noted: "every time there is a decline in violence, Sharon rushes to carry out another 'targeted liquidation' of one or another Palestinian commander, and the fire flares again. Anytime Palestinian representatives declare their willingness to renew negotiations and halt violence and suicide attacks, the response from Sharon's office is dismissal and derision."[2] Third, Sharon's use of force also had use by destroying the Palestinian *institutions* needed to support the viability of a Palestinian state. Henry Siegman (Council on Foreign Relations) observes:

> The war to which he [Sharon] assigns far greater priority than the war against terrorism is his war to prevent the emergence of a viable Palestinian state. Behind the cover provided by his war on terrorism (which remains a failure), Sharon has been highly successful in destroying virtually all of the essential supporting institutions of Palestinian national life. Brutally administered military curfews, border closings, and other restrictions have turned Palestinian cities and towns into huge detention centers. Much of the infrastructure built with international donor support since the 1993 Oslo Accords have been reduced to rubble, along with the Palestinian economy and most of the Palestinian Authority's civil institutions. Sharon has been able to do this without much international criticism by making it appear that the devastation of Palestinian national life caused by the Israeli Defense Forces was forced on him by Palestinian terrorism.[3]

Overview of Sharon's Past Military Adventures and Assiduous Settlement Building

General Sharon's earliest proposed solution to the "Arab problem" was to forcibly deport Palestinians to Jordan or other Arab states.[4] This meant for him an "endless war and no peace during his lifetime" against the Palestinians and the supporting Arab states.[5] Sharon's war against the Arab states began in the early 1950s when he led his infamous Commando Unit 101 raids against Egyptian and Jordanian villages, earning him a reputation as "a commander who would repeatedly escalate confrontations with the Arabs."[6] In 1953, he led a massacre of 69 Palestinian men, women, and children trapped in their homes in the Jordanian village of Qibya—an "overly zealous" response that "set a pattern."[7] Sharon led unprovoked raids on a Syrian army post as well as raids on Egyptian army camps in Gaza, Kuntilla and at al-Sahba, in an effort in 1955 to prod Arab nations into wars they would lose.

In the 1956, 1967, and 1973 wars against Egypt, Sharon's methods against Arabs shocked even his own troops.[8] His most destructive campaign to annihilate the PLO leadership and set up an Israeli client government in Lebanon led to the killing of more than 20,000 civilians. This 1982 invasion of Lebanon culminated in an IDF-assisted massacre of unarmed Palestinian refugees that shamed his nation.

Regarding the Palestinians in the occupied territories, Sharon originally advocated their direct deportation, then worked to squeeze them out of the West Bank and Gaza by confiscating their land for Jewish settlements. This last method of preventing a Palestinian state, adopted by all prime ministers, was a Sharon specialty during his tenure in the Begin administration. Sharon tripled the number of Jewish settlers and planned a ten-fold increase within a decade.[9] He also intensified military operations against Palestinians on the West Bank and Gaza (live ammunition at demonstrations, imprisonment of demonstrators, collective punishments, curfews, and house demolitions) and encouraged Jewish settlers to take the law into their own hands.[10] By the early 1990s, when Sharon was Israel's housing minister, more than 100,000 Jews occupied Palestinian land.[11] By the end of his tenure as prime minister, there would be four times that number. He had fulfilled his promise not only to continue the colonization of Palestine, but to never divide Jerusalem, never relinquish control of the West Bank's Jordan Valley and never permit Palestinian refugees to return to Israel.

Sharon's War on Terrorism

While Sharon was confiscating Palestinian land, he was also declaring war on Palestinian terrorism, the chief cause of which was that very confiscation of Palestinian land.[12] He ordered the army to end all Palestinian violent resistance and, in October of 2001, F-16 fighters, Apache helicopter gunships and tanks destroyed whole communities in the West Bank cities of Tulkarm, Jenin, Qalqilya, Ramallah, Bethlehem, and Beit Jala and laid siege to Arafat's compound in Ramallah.[13] Kofi Annan was "profoundly disturbed by the increasing use of heavy weaponry by Israel in civilian areas."[14] The Arab states, too, were inflamed by Israeli behavior.

George W. Bush needed at the time to create an Arab coalition to increase the credibility of his war on Iraq. He sent General Anthony Zinni in March of 2002 to negotiate an Israeli *pullback* of forces from Palestinian territories in an effort to woo Arab states. Sharon refused. In fact, that June the IDF invaded more Palestinian cities in the West Bank after a series of suicide bombings.[15]

Sharon sought justification for this destruction by conflating his war on terrorism with Bush's war on al-Qaeda—referring to his war against the Palestinians as his war against global "Islamo-terrorism"—as though he and Bush were fighting the same monolithic enemy.[16] After ordering the assassination of Sheikh Yassin, a moderate and revered Palestinian, Sharon bragged that he had gotten "our bin Laden."[17] The underlying and specific intention behind Sharon's "war on global Islamo-terrorism" was the prevention of a Palestinian state—quite unlike Bush's intention: the conquest of Iraq.

Exploiting the "War on Terrorism": No Palestinian State

Sharon knew what everyone knew: that state violence (so-called "retaliation") *increases* terrorist resistance against the state.[18] Jimmy Carter observed that "the policies of Mr. Sharon have greatly strengthened these criminal elements [suicide bombers], enhanced their popular support, and encouraged young men and women to sacrifice their own lives in attacking innocent Israeli citizens."[19] The *New York Times* editor wrote:

> Our reservations are not over the [Israeli] impulse to respond militarily but over the long-range effectiveness of policies that rely heavily on the use of force. . . .[Israel] must realize that no matter how many tanks it sends to the West Bank, only a commitment to withdraw from occupied lands and permit the building of a Palestinian state, in return for normal relations with its Arab neighbors offers a way out. . . . Military responses have caused only minimal interruption to the Palestinian terrorist infrastructure while fanning the flames of anger and resolve. . . . Return of land . . . remains the only viable long-tern option.[20]

Return of land is the widely acknowledged solution to Palestinian terrorism, yet Sharon declared (as had all his predecessors) that negotiations can come only *after* Palestinian calm is achieved—a calm precluded by IDF "retaliations" causing massive civilian injuries. And when calm did prevail, each lull was followed by Israeli attack, restarting the violence.[21] Sharon's paradoxical intent was both to fight terrorism and stimulate it—"exploit it politically," to avoid negotiations that could lead to a Palestinian state.[22]

When U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold lectured Ben-Gurion on how Israeli militancy toward Egypt was counterproductive, he assumed that Ben-Gurion was seeking peace.[23] But Ben-Gurion was seeking to prod Arab states into wars they would lose. That is, Israeli provocative "retaliations" were

not counterproductive. Their goal was territorial expansion through war.[24] Sharon, too, needed to provoke, lest negotiations be forced upon him. When Bush advised Sharon, astonishingly, to "give hope to Palestinians and encourage them to end violence" by *proposing a Palestinian state*, he was ignoring Sharon's main goal, defeat of that state. Sharon *increased* Israeli attacks.[25] A UN Mission Report noted that Israeli policies seem frequently "perversely designed to *encourage* the continued action by Palestinian militants."[26] Henry Siegman summaries:

> The war Sharon is waging is not aimed at the defeat of Palestinian terrorism but at the defeat of the Palestinian people and their aspirations for national self-determination. In this war, Palestinian terrorism has been not an enemy but an indispensable ally, providing Sharon with the pretext that enabled him to proceed relentlessly with the implantation of Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. Sharon's assurances that he is committed to the launching of a peace process once Palestinian terrorism is vanquished is a lie intended to gain time for securing the irreversibility of the settlement enterprise.[27]

A Summary Description of Peace Proposals Rejected by Sharon

1) *The George Mitchell Report on Israeli-Palestinian Violence, May 21, 2001*

Senator Mitchell's recommendations were modest: Palestinians should stop terrorism, Israel should renounce violence and freeze all settlement activity, both sides should return to security cooperation and the peace process, plus some other recommendations.[28] The Mitchell Report warned that the government of Israel "should give careful attention to whether settlements, which are focal points for substantial friction, are valuable bargaining chips for future negotiations or provocations likely to preclude the onset of productive talks."[29]

2) *Arab League states offer peace with Israel—Beirut and Riyadh Declarations, 2002 and 2007*

Saudi Arabian Crown Prince Abdullah bin Abd al-Aziz proposed in February of 2002 that the Arab League offer Israel diplomatic recognition, normalized relations, and guarantees of security in exchange for Israeli conforming with UN Resolution 242—withdrawal from virtually all territories occupied since the 1967 war. This Beirut plan was unanimously approved by the twenty-two Arab League states, again in March 2007 at Riyadh. The text also called for a Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital and a "just solution" to the Palestinian refugee problem (presumably either repatriation or compensation in accordance with UN Resolution 194 of 1948). In exchange the Arab

League would "consider the Arab-Israeli conflict at an end and enter into a peace agreement with Israel."[30] Saudi officials stated that such normalized relations with Israel did not preclude Israeli sovereignty over the Western Wall in the Old City or over Jewish neighborhoods in East Jerusalem.[31] This historic offer, a final peace that Israel said it always wanted, was, as noted by Siegman, "greeted with a yawn"—"Mr. Sharon's refusal to take notice of the new Saudi position should finally bring home to President Bush and his advisers that Mr. Sharon's insistence that there be no negotiations until all Palestinian violence ceases can only be an excuse to hold onto the West Bank and Gaza."[32]

3) *The "Road Map"—November 2002*

The Arab world was critical of the United States for its pro-Israeli stance and indifference to the plight of Palestinians. As mentioned above, Bush needed an Arab coalition (Jordan, Egypt, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, and Turkey) to make the U.S. war on Iraq seem less another instance of Western imperialism. Bush pressed Israel to pull its forces out of the West Bank and Gaza and, at the UN, the United States called for an immediate cease-fire in Israel (UN Res. 1397).

In June 2002, Bush supported the idea of a *provisional Palestinian state* contingent on the political ouster of Arafat. In November, Bush announced a new "Road Map" for resolution of the conflict (sponsored by the Soviets, the UN, the European Union, and the United States—the "Quartet"). This Road Map called for changes divergent from Sharon's chosen policies. In addition to the proposal for a provisional Palestinian state, the Road Map called for (1) a freeze on settlements, (2) an end to Israeli attacks in Palestinian civilian areas, (3) an ease of travel restrictions on Palestinian officials, (4) a lifting of curfews, and (5) a proper return of at least part of the tax revenues collected from Palestinians.[33] The Palestinians were expected, in turn, to (1) resume security cooperation with the United States and Israel, (2) call for an end to armed attacks on Israelis, and (3) install a new cabinet and prime minister to take over for Arafat.

Arafat fully accepted the Road Map after some initial objections.[34] Though Bush spoke of the "horrific" living conditions of the Palestinians, (e.g., pervasive malnutrition, sale of belongings, destruction of communities, and a growing sense of isolation), the Road Map was designed less for the betterment of Palestinians than as means to hold together his Arab coalition.[35] Sharon expressed "concern" about the Road Map, wanted changes, and claimed to accept it "in principle."[36] Jimmy Carter read this "in principle" as a rejection,[37] as did Saeb Erekat, Palestinian chief negotiator.[38] Once again, Sharon's demand for "absolute calm" from Palestinians as a *precondition* for

negotiations was his own construction, not a stipulation of the Road Map.[39] The Road Map, and a provisional Palestinian state, faded from view once Bush told Sharon in 2004 that he would *not* oppose big Jewish population centers on Palestinian land.[40]

4) *The "Geneva Accords"—October 2003*

Another attempt to negotiate a peace was the Geneva Accords, an unofficial "understanding" between a group of left-Zionists led by Yossi Beilin and a group of senior Palestinian figures led by Yasser Abed Rabbu. Sharon was disturbed, calling these Accords "subversive, freelance diplomacy."[41] Its two key provisions were: Israeli withdrawal from some 98 percent of the Palestinian Occupied Territories (compensated by 2 percent of Israeli land), and refugee return only with Israel's consent.[42] Israel would retain the major settlements around Jerusalem (like Pisgat Ze'ev and Ma'ale Adumim) while some of East Jerusalem would be under Palestinian control (not to include the Jewish Quarter or Western Wall). Of the 400,000 Jewish settlers in East Jerusalem and the West Bank, Israel would evacuate up to 30 percent.[43] Jewish settlements along the West Bank's borders would remain with Israel.[44]

This package did not satisfy the aspirations of either Sharon or the Palestinians (especially concerning the refugees and retained Jewish settlers). Sharon continued to insist that any negotiations come only after an end to Palestinian violence.[45]

Sharon's Disengagement from Gaza, August 2005

On April 14, 2004, Sharon surprised the world with his announcement of an uncharacteristic plan to withdraw settlers and troops from the Gaza Strip. In 1993, at the time of the Oslo Accords, Gaza had been recognized as a financial and military drain on Israel, if not a burden on the Israeli conscience—a sinkhole of poverty and rage inhabited mostly by Palestinian refugees from the 1948 and 1967 wars. In 2004, the Gaza Strip contained densely packed squalid refugee camps and suffered vast unemployment, poverty, and malnutrition.[46] It remains encircled by a high electronic fence with guard towers to keep Palestinians out of Israel. At the time, Jewish settlers in Gaza (8,000 out of a population of 1,300,000) controlled 40 percent of the arable land and 50 percent of the water resources.[47]

Given Sharon's history of sedulous settlement building and adamant statements about never giving up a single Jewish settlement, this plan was notable. At the same time, the plan called for continuing Israeli strategic control over Gaza: retention of exclusive authority over the airspace, borders,

and territorial waters. On Sharon's plan, Israel would retain full control over all movement of persons and goods in or out of the Gaza Strip and retain the right to reenter Gaza in case of military need. Israel would also continue to control electricity, water, gas, and petrol as well as collect customs duties.[48] By retaining this right to reenter and by controlling all of Gaza's utilities, Israel was able to reinvade and lay siege to Gaza since 2006.[49]

Sharon saw no advantage in holding onto the Gaza Strip and much demographic disadvantage: "Gaza cannot be held on to forever. Over one million Palestinians live there, and they double their numbers with every generation."[50] Palestinians in Gaza, the West Bank, and in Israel (Arab-Israelis) would soon outnumber the total number of Jews in Israel. Thus, to separate Gaza from Israel made demographic sense, as well as military and economic sense, and, with borders under Israeli control, security sense.

Ultranationalist Israelis protested this impending loss of territory, but Sharon assured them that by giving up Gaza the West Bank was secured—a *quid pro quo*—"there will be building in the [West Bank] settlement blocks . . . [the Ariel settlement to be annexed] as part of Israel forever."[51] The Gazan withdrawal, was, in effect, a *down payment* on the West Bank, a political deal to *preclude* a Palestinian state. Sharon's chief political strategist confided: "A central purpose of the Gaza withdrawal plan was to take Palestinian [West Bank] statehood off the table indefinitely."[52] Another advisor, Dov Weissglas, admitted that "the [Gazan] disengagement is actually formaldehyde . . . it applies the amount of formaldehyde that's necessary so that there will not be a political process [regarding the West Bank].[53] Sharon had maneuvered into a position in which he could claim, when confronted by the Americans, that faced by ultranationalist outrage, he was caught in the middle and could not be expected to give up the West Bank.[54]

⌒

Looking back, it can be seen that Sharon was, on the face of it, the exemplar of Jabotinsky's belief that "the Arabs could only be dealt with from a position of unassailable strength . . . [through] force rather than diplomacy." Virtually all prime ministers held this view.[55] But Sharon was the most deeply committed to the use of force and avoidance of all negotiations concerning Palestinian land. Sharon, however, failed to appreciate a *second phase* in Jabotinsky's strategy toward the Palestinians, that of *negotiation*. Jabotinsky had believed that once the Palestinians understood the invincible force of the Jews, they would accept their losses and negotiate a satisfactory agreement. In today's terms, the Palestinians *have* accepted the loss of their home-

land in historic Palestine. Indeed, they are prepared to accept the last 22 per-
cent (Gaza and the West Bank) as their homeland (as they announced in
1988 and 1993). Moreover, the Arab League states support this small state as
a practical form of justice for the Palestinians.

Nevertheless, Sharon continued to reject all negotiations that might have
led to that Palestinian state, behaving as though military domination was the
sole route to security. The real danger of the Jabotinsky strategy, as Shlaim
points out, was that "Israeli leaders, less sophisticated than Jabotinsky, would
fall in love with a particular phase of it [military domination] and refuse to
negotiate."[56] Sharon, obsessed with force, did just that. He failed to recognize
the practical, even *self-serving* principle of accommodation to a losing peo-
ple's need for some degree of justice. It was as though he thought that the vic-
tor should simply "have it all" without consequence.

Tony Judt described Sharon's path as a "road to nowhere" because of
Sharon's failure to see that peace must be made through accommodation to
the needs of those who are being oppressed. Peace through military submis-
sion is "perhaps the most dangerous of all colonialist illusions. It is a denial
of the experience of our century to suppose that men [the colonized] will sac-
rifice their passions for their interests. That is why, in their treatment of their
Arab subjects, the Israelis are on the road to nowhere."[57]

Notes

1. Jimmy Carter, "America Can Persuade Israel to Make a Just Peace," Op-Ed,
New York Times, 21 April 2002, WK13.

2. David Grossman, *Death as a Way of Life: Israel Ten Years After Oslo* (New York:
Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003), 185.

3. Henry Siegman, "Partners for War," *New York Review of Books*, 16 January
2003, 25.

4. For description of Sharon plans for deportation of Palestinians to Jordan, see
Naseer Aruri, "The Threat of Peace," *MEI*, No. 722, 2 April 2004, 26. Avi Shlaim,
The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World (New York, W. W. Norton, 2001), 396, 477,
543. As prime minister, Sharon retained his early ideas about deportation of Pales-
tinians. James Bennet, "Crossing Jordan: The Exit That Isn't on Bush's Road Map,"
New York Times, 18 May 2003, Section 4, 1.

5. Sharon told this to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (June 10, 2002).
Robert Novak, "Sharon and the Senators," 17 June 2002, www.townhall.com.

6. Jeffrey Goldberg, "Arafat's Gift," *The New Yorker*, 19 January 2001, 55.

7. Sachar, *A History of Israel*, Vol. II, 170. Elmo Hutchison, *Violent Truce: a Mili-
tary Observer Looks at the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1951–1955* (New York, Devin-Adair,
1956), 44.

8. Sharon was accused by his superiors of exceeding his orders and causing many Israeli casualties in the Suez war. Jeffrey Goldberg, "Arafat's Gift," *The New Yorker*, 29 January 2001, 55. In the 1973 war, Sharon demonstrated his "indifference to official procedures or even to public accountability." Sharon's methods "shocked many of his troops and upset his superiors." Sachar, *A History of Israel*, Vol. II, 170.

9. Sachar, *A History of Israel*, Vol. II, 171.

10. Israel's Karp Report, May 1982. See Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloominton: Indiana University Press, 1994), 560.

11. "Israel's Historic Miscalculation," *New York Times*, 26 April 2002, Editorial A28.

12. "Over the last two years, as the world has focused on the violence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the underlying causes of the violence have been largely ignored, even as they have intensified. Rather than reverse the effects of the occupation, Israel has used the years since the Oslo peace accord was signed in 1993 to double the number of Israeli settlers living in the occupied territories, now numbering nearly 400,000, half of whom live in occupied East Jerusalem. [Under] Sharon, more than sixty new settlements have been erected. According to a recent Israeli human rights report, Israeli settlements now control almost 42 percent of the West Bank, not including Palestinian East Jerusalem [on the West Bank]. Israeli settlements and bypass roads have virtually encircled occupied East Jerusalem, making it impossible for Palestinians to develop and expand their most important urban center—and making a mockery of the idea of a shared capital. . . . By electing a [Israeli] leadership committed to evacuating [Jewish] settlements rather than building them, to end the occupation rather than intensifying it, Israelis can undermine the Palestinian extremists and help bring an end to the horrors of the past two years." Saeb Erekat, "Saving the Two-State Solution," *New York Times*, 20 December 2002. Op-Ed, A39.

13. James Bennet, "Israeli Troops in No Hurry To Leave West Bank Towns: Sharon Ignores U.S. Pleas to End Action," *New York Times*, 30 October 2001, A6.

14. Ian Williams, "Going to the UN," *Middle East International (MEI)*, No. 671, 22 March 2002: 8.

15. In August 2002 the IDF did pull out of Bethlehem, and in October pulled out of Jenin. Joel Greenberg, "Israel Eases Its Hold on Jenin and Plans Pullback From Hebron," *New York Times*, 19 October 2002, A5.

16. Roane Carey and Adam Shatz, *The Nation*, 12 April 2004, 7.

17. Naseer Aruri, "The Threat of Peace," *Middle East International*, 2 April 2004, 27.

18. Olmert, on the other hand, claims *not* to know, as in his March 2008 defense of military operations against Hamas: "nobody in the world would deny that striking at Hamas strengthens the chance for peace." Rory McCarthy, *The Guardian Weekly*, 7–13 March 2008, 2.

19. Jimmy Carter, "America Can Persuade Israel to Make a Just Peace," Op-Ed, *New York Times*, 21 April 2002, WK13. Brian Urquhart (former UN Undersecretary-General) observes: "it would not be surprising if the F-16 attacks had not inspired

many teenagers with [a suicidal bombing] ambition." Brian Urquhart, "Reflections on the Mitchell Report," *New York Review of Books*, 21 June 2001, 85.

20. "The Limits of Force," *New York Times* (editorial), 30 March 2002, A14.

21. Henry Siegman: "The Sharon government seeks pretexts to avoid a political process, not ways to renew it. The targeted assassinations and reprisals, including the destruction of Palestinian homes in refugee camps, during the three-week period in which Yasir Arafat succeeded in lowering the violence dramatically, seemed clearly intended to provoke retaliations from Hamas and Islamic Jihad in order to avoid being cornered into political negotiations." Henry Siegman, "Will Israel Take a Chance," *New York Times*, Op-Ed, 21 February 2002, A23.

22. Roane Carey and Adam Shatz, *The Nation*, 12 April 2004, 7.

23. Hammarskjold: "You are convinced that the threat of retaliation has a deterrent effect. I am convinced that it is more of an incitement to individual members of the Arab forces than even what has been said by their own governments. You are convinced that acts of retaliation will stop further incidents. I am convinced that they will lead to further incidents. . . . You believe that this way of creating respect for Israel will pave the way for sound co-existence with the Arab peoples. I believe that the policy may postpone indefinitely the time for such co-existence." Brian Urquhart, "Reflections on the Mitchell Report," *New York Review of Books*, 21 June 2001, 84.

24. Ben-Gurion's protégé, IDF Chief Moshe Dayan, retaliated in order to *incite* the Arab nations: "From 1954, the retaliatory strikes were, as seen by Dayan, designed to prod this or that Arab state into a premature war with Israel. Dayan wanted war." Benny Morris, *Israel's Border Wars, 1949–1956* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 138.

25. John Kifner, "Sharon Rejects Proposals for Interim Palestinian State," *New York Times*, 17 June 2002, A8. Elisabeth Bumiller, "Bush Urges Immediate Work on Palestinian State," *New York Times*, 9 June 2002, 1. Instead of nourishing calm, Sharon unleashed massive Israeli attacks and assassinated Sheikh Yassin, a top Hamas leader willing to come to terms with Israel.

26. UN Special Coordinator For The Middle East Peace Process, Alvaro De Soto. Mission Report (May 5, 2007), emphasis added. Cited in *Journal Of Palestine Studies*, 145, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1, (Autumn 2007): 189.

27. Henry Siegman, "Sharon's Phony War," *New York Review of Books*, 18 December 2003, 16.

28. Mitchell Report: "The IDF should consider withdrawing to positions held before September 28, 2000, which will reduce the number of friction points and the potential for violent confrontations. The GOI should ensure that the IDF adopt and enforce policies and procedures encouraging non-lethal responses to unarmed demonstrators, with a view to minimizing casualties and friction between the two communities. The GOI should lift [border] closures, transfer to the PA all tax revenues owed, and permit Palestinians who have been employed in Israel to return to their jobs; and should ensure that security forces and settlers refrain from the

destruction of homes and roads, as well as trees and other agricultural property in Palestinian areas."

29. Brian Urquhart, "Reflections on the Mitchell Report," *New York Review of Books*, 21 June 2001, 84.

30. Michael Jansen, "Palestine and Iraq," *MEI*, No. 672, 5 April 2002, 7, 8.

31. Siegman, "Will Israel Take a Chance," A23.

32. Siegman, "Will Israel Take a Chance," A23.

33. Steven Weisman, "U.S. Still Trying to Unfold Mideast Road Map," *New York Times*, 15 November 2002, A13. Full text found on nytimes.com/world.

34. James Bennet, "Arafat Will Appoint a Prime Minister, a Major U.S. Demand," *New York Times*, 15 February 2003, A4.

35. Steven Weisman, "U.S. Still Trying to Unfold Mideast Road Map," *New York Times*, 15 November 2002, A13.

36. Sharon agreed to Road Map stipulations that Jewish settlements be frozen and all "outposts" dismantled if erected after March 2001. Neither was done. Indeed, the Israeli Housing Ministry funneled $6.5 million for more building (January 2000 to June 2003), mostly for outposts provided with electricity, water, telephone, roads, and IDF protection. Elissa Gootman, "Israel Sent Millions to Illegal Settlements," *New York Times*, 6 May 2004.

Sharon may have later modified his earlier position of removing all Palestinians from the West Bank, for in 2004 he seemed to accept some Palestinians, albeit confined to apartheid-style cantons in the West Bank. Naseer Aruri, "The Threat of Peace," *MEI*, 2 April 2004, 26. Sharon's "advisers say he envisions a demilitarized state in less than half the West Bank, interrupted by settlement blocks." "Straight Talk From Ariel Sharon," *New York Times*, 28 May 2003, editorial.

37. Carter concluded that "Israel has officially rejected [the Road Map] basic premises with patently unacceptable caveats and prerequisites." Chris McGreal, "Carter says Israeli 'colonizing' blocks peace," *Guardian Weekly*, 24–30 March 2006, 7.

38. Saeb Erekat, Saving the Two-State Solution, *New York Times*, 20 December 2002. Op-Ed, A39. Erekat believed that Sharon's "in principle" acceptance of a provisional Palestinian state (just prior to the Israeli election in January 2003) was an election-eve fig leaf. Erekat noted that Sharon seemed to have in mind "a ghetto 'state' surrounded by Israeli settlements, with no ability to defend itself, deprived of water resources and arable land, with an insignificant presence in Jerusalem— sovereign in name only. Palestinians will never accept such a future."

39. The Bush Road Map does *not* stipulate that an end of Palestinian terrorism is a precondition for negotiations. It was Sharon's (and Rabin's) position that Palestinian calm must come before negotiations.

40. The Bush administration has all but abandoned the Road Map's call for two states and freeze on settlements. He has "shamefully failed to pressure Israel. . . . Instead, Mr. Sharon is pursuing his own road map for Israel, one that includes erasing all vestiges of the Oslo peace accords, battering Palestinian militants whenever and wherever possible, even when innocent civilians are in the line of fire, and incorpo-

rating areas of the West Bank behind Israel's new security barrier—as well as cutting Israeli losses in Gaza." *New York Times*, 28 October 2004, editorial.

41. Greg Myre, "Israeli Warns Powell on Peace Team; He rejects Criticism," *New York Times*, 3 December 2003, A3.

42. Haim Baram, "Public confused," *MEI*, 24 October 2003, 13. On 14 April 2004, G. W. Bush declared that a just solution would be a Palestinian state and settlement of Palestinian refugees in that state rather than in their former homes in Israel. Roger Cohen, "Her Jewish States," *New York Times*, 8 July 2007, magazine.

43. Graham Usher, "The Geneva debate," *MEI* No. 714, 5 December 2003.

44. *New York Times*, 6 December 2003, A6.

45. Greg Myre, "Israeli Warns Powell," A3.

46. Roy, "A Dubai on the Mediterranean." The poverty rate is 70 percent. More than half the population eats only one meal a day. Jimmy Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 176.

47. Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid*, 168.

48. Sara Roy, 'A Dubai on the Mediterranean,' *London Review of Books*, 3 November 2005, 15.

49. Gaza came under heavy military attack in June 2006 and, in late 2007, was largely under siege by means of Israeli cutoff of fuel, electricity, and crop export. Gaza's drinking water wells, three treatment plants, and four storm-water pumping stations came to near standstill at the end of March 2007—40 percent of households without running water. Annie Kelly, "Gaza: taps don't run, toilets don't flush," *Guardian Weekly*, 21 March 2007.

50. Sharon television address, reported by Chris McGreal, *The Guardian Weekly*, 19–25 August 2005.

51. Sharon interview with the *Jerusalem Post* at the time of the Gaza withdrawal. Sharon added that further construction will take place in the Ma'ale Adumim settlement, designed to link it to Jerusalem despite Washington's objections. Chris McGreal, "Sharon promises to expand West Bank as Gaza is cleared," *The Guardian Weekly*, 26 August–1 September 2005, 1. Sharon oversaw the construction of 3,500 new housing units in February–March 2005 alone, with 6,391 more approved, Graham Usher, "Gaza for the West Bank?" *MEI* 4 March 2005, 11. B'Tselem, cited in *New York Times*, 20 March 2005.

Sara Roy reports the following from the West Bank: 6,400 new settlement houses were planned and forty-two settlements were being enlarged to include colleges, hotels, and commercial and park areas. Of the proposed forty tunnels between Jewish settlements, twenty-eight were completed. East Jerusalem was isolated from the rest of the West Bank. Virtually all-Jewish settlements in the West Bank would be retained. The West Bank land lying outside the carving path of the Wall under construction would be annexed to Israel. Of the 120 Jewish settlements in the area north of Nablus, four would be evacuated, though Israel would retain security over the area, including military bases already there. Sara Roy, 'A Dubai on the Mediterranean,' *London Review of Books*, November 3, 2005, 15.

52. Editorial, "Pulling Out of Gaza," *New York Times*, 28 October 2004, A28.

53. Interview in *Ha'aretz*, fall of 2004 cited by David Remnick, "Checkpoint," *The New Yorker*, 7 February, 2005.

54. "Straight Talk From Ariel Sharon," editorial, *New York Times*, 28 May 2003. "Some [ministers] think he wants the right-wingers to bind his hands, to provide him cover with Washington to resist or even kill the peace plan; others say he is slowly leading his government to accept it." James Bennet, "Crossing Jordan: The Exit That Isn't on Bush's Road Map," *New York Times*, 18 May 2003, Section 4, 1.

55. Avi Shlaim, "Avi Shlaim explains his disenchantment," 28. Moshe Sharett was the exception, a prime minister (1953–1955) who sought some accommodation with the Arabs.

56. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 599.

57. Tony Judt, "The Road to Nowhere," *New York Review of Books*, 9 May 2002, 4–6.

❧❧❧

Olmert and the 2006 Lebanon War

Following Sharon's incapacitating stroke in January 2006, Ehud Olmert became the acting, then elected, prime minister and leader of the new governing Kadima Party that Sharon had formed prior to his stroke. Olmert stated that he would continue Sharon's policies and would have peace talks with Mahmoud Abbas (President of the Palestinian National Authority and PLO leader), but only after *all* violent Palestinian acts had ended.[1] Olmert comes from the far right—his father was a militant in the Irgun. He voted against the 1979 peace treaty with Egypt and the 1993 Oslo Accords. It was thought, however, that he was more pragmatic, seeing a small Palestinian state (the two-state solution) as the only way to keep Israel a predominantly Jewish state—thus solving Israel's "demographic problem."

And yet a viable Palestinian state was decreasingly likely under Olmert. Reportedly, he planned to retain 85 percent of the Jewish settlers on the West Bank,[2] annex the eastern strip of the West Bank (the Jordan Valley),[3] and extend Jewish settlements so as to cut the West Bank in half (north from south).[4] These plans would have precluded a Palestinian state. At the Annapolis summit (November 2007), Olmert pledged to freeze settlements, but, in fact, expanded them. The Israeli housing ministry unveiled in December of 2007 the "biggest settlement project since 1967" at Atarot. And construction progressed at Har Choma (a project involving 15,000 housing units).[5] In March 2008, Israel announced further plans to build 1,300 homes in Ramat Shlomo on Palestinian land. Then in June, the Jerusalem city

council unveiled plans to build 40,000 new apartments with an unspecified number of them on Palestinian land.[6] Moreover, Olmert rebuffed U.S. pressures to ease travel restrictions for Palestinians or to curb West Bank military raids.[7] An impression remains that while Olmert feared for the ethnic purity of Israel (thus supported a two-state solution), he could not resist the Sharon strategy of crowding the Palestinians out by confiscating their land.

Olmert's moment to prove his commitment to Sharon policies came earlier, however, with his wars against Hamas, Hizbullah, and Lebanon in the summer of 2006.

Olmert's War against Hizbullah in Lebanon

Motivation for Israel's 2006 war against Hizbullah can be understood on three levels: (1) Hizbullah's supportive response to Hamas' ongoing hostilities with Israel, (2) extension of decades of war between Israel and Hizbullah in Lebanon, and (3) Hizbullah's function as proxy for both Syria and Iran in their conflicts with Israel.

Background: Israeli-Hamas Hostilities Erupt in June 2006

The precipitating event on June 25 was the Hamas abduction of an Israeli soldier. Hamas said that it hoped to exchange the soldier for 95 women and 313 children (out of 11,600) held in Israeli jails.[8] If that was the intent, it was poor timing and a provocative act. For Israel was already attempting to bring down the Hamas government, elected in January 2006, through a variety of means: (a) withholding of Israeli and U.S. moneys from the Palestinian Authority, (b) assassinating Hamas members, (c) supporting secular Fatah in its conflict with Islamic Hamas, and (d) attacking Gaza by air and artillery despite a lengthy Hamas cease-fire.[9] While there existed some precedent for a prisoner exchange, and Israel did hint at the possibility,[10] the killing of two Israeli soldiers in the course of the abduction seriously complicated matters.

Israel responded to the abduction with more air strikes and a 3,000 troop invasion of Gaza. Bridges linking the northern and southern parts of the Gaza Strip were bombed, as were Palestinian government offices and the Islamic University. Sixty Hamas government officials, including eight cabinet ministers and the speaker of the Palestinian parliament, were arrested in an attempt to undermine the Hamas government. Some 230 Gazans, including, 60 children, were killed.[11] Months later, a power station was destroyed leaving much of the Gaza Strip without electricity or water. (The invasion and siege of Gaza persists as of this writing.)[12]

Explanations vary as to why Israel chose this violent course. Some in Israel believe that Prime Minister Olmert and Defense Minister Peretz, not being military men, needed to earn their warrior credentials.[13] Others argue that *both* Olmert and Hamas *extremists* wanted to distract attention from a Palestinian peace plan offered in May 2006 by *moderate* Hamas leaders and Fatah. The plan called for recognition of Israel in exchange for withdraw from all occupied territories and acceptance of a Palestinian state. Neither Olmert nor Hamas extremists were at that time ready to accept a small Palestinian state.[14]

The Hamas militia, of course, was the real enemy, not the abduction. Hamas would not accept "Israel's right to exist" unless Israel also accepted the right of a Palestinian state to exist—anything less would have been political suicide for Hamas.[15] Because Fatah had been more accommodating, Israel and the United States supported Fatah and Abbas as a counterforce to Hamas, their effort to isolate and discredit the Hamas government.[16]

Israel's Motivations for War on Hizbullah

1) *Hizbullah's support to Hamas*

After Israel attacked the Gaza Strip and imprisoned the Hamas Palestinian government, Hizbullah (the chief militia in, and historic defender of, Lebanon since Israel's 1982 invasion) *also* abducted two Israeli soldiers! Hizbullah offered a prisoner exchange. But this copycat abduction seemed an obvious show of symbolic support for Hamas *and* a dare to Israel to attack Hizbullah, as it had Hamas. Hizbullah saw itself as the lead and only remaining Arab militia willing to resist Israeli anywhere in the Middle East.

Hizbullah might have believed that a prisoner exchange was possible—Israel had done so in 2004.[17] But the unintentional killing of three Israeli soldiers in the course of abducting one was a provocation that Israel could not ignore. The abduction alone was a taunt.[18] In response, Olmert ordered the bombing of Beirut, north and south Lebanon, and roads and bridges connecting 350 cities, towns, and villages. His intention was to inflict enough suffering on the civilian population to force the Lebanese government to curb Hizbullah. Hizbullah counterattacked, firing Katyusha rockets over Haifa and some fifty other Israeli sites.

Some Israeli journalists such as Tom Segev explained Olmert's militancy and avoidance of negotiation as a reflection of his personal weakness.[19] But that view overlooks history: that Israel has never tolerated provocations of any sort without swift demonstration of its dominance, the historic cornerstone of Israeli foreign policy.[20]

2) *An extension of decades of wars between Israel and Lebanon and Hizbullah*

Israel's war against Hizbullah in 2006 was nothing new. Israel and Hizbullah had been fighting steadily from 1978 until 2000. (Hizbullah was a small 300-man militia possessing obsolete rockets and had been formed with the specific intent of forcing Israel to retreat after its 1982 invasion.)[21] Since the 1950s, Israel had wanted to establish a client state in Lebanon. For that purpose, Israel poured money into a Christian Phalangist client militia during Lebanon's civil war in the 1970s. In 1978, Israel openly invaded southern Lebanon with 20,000 troops in a large-scale air, sea and land assault ("Operation Litani") in attempt to establish a pro-Israel government. The attempt failed and several thousand civilians were killed, a quarter million made refugees.[22]

Four years later, in 1982, Ariel Sharon mounted an even more massive, countrywide invasion of Lebanon with 80,000 troops, 1240 tanks, and 1520 armored personnel carriers. He sought both to set up a client government and exterminate the PLO headquartered in Beirut. The loss of civilian life was more than 20,000. Hizbullah fought for the next eighteen years to remove Israel, during which time, Israel mounted sophisticated air and land attacks. Yitzhak Rabin ordered further air and artillery assaults in 1993 in a cruel campaign to stampede 300,000 Lebanese civilians northward to pressure the Lebanese government to disband Hizbullah, and give Israel free reign in southern Lebanon.[23] In 1996, Shimon Peres ordered still more air attacks on Lebanon ("Grapes of Wrath"): 2,000 bombing raids on Hizbullah and Shiite villages, major destruction in Beirut and the Bekaa Valley, and 400,000 civilian refugees.

Olmert's war with Hizbullah in 2006 followed this tradition: the terrorization of civilians and use of massive military force against weak but dispersed Hizbullah forces. Sporadic cross-border Hizbullah-IDF exchanges persisted even after 2000. The 2006 war was an extension of Begin's 1978 war, Sharon's 1982 war, Rabin's 1993 war, and Peres' 1996 war.

3) *Hizbullah as a proxy for both Syria and Iran in their conflicts with Israel*

Syria lost its Golan Heights to Israel in 1967 and failed to win it back in 1973. Too weak to fight Israel, Syria found through support of Hizbullah a surrogate, proxy and messenger: "Syria still lives!" Israel needed to show *Syria*, through Hizbullah, that Syria was powerless before Israeli power and resolve. Israel's bombing of a Syrian nuclear facility in September of 2007 underscored the point.

Regarding Iran, Israel warned for some years that it would attack if Iran dared to achieve nuclear parity[24]—and warned again in June 2008 through a conspicuous military maneuver involving 100 Israeli bombers. Israel had

made it clear that it would not tolerate a balance of military power in the Middle East. Nor would Israel or the United States tolerate Iranian influence in Iraq. Iran's response to Israeli threats was to arm Hizbullah. The Israeli defeat of Hizbullah, armed by both Iran and Syria, was an important show of Israeli hegemony in the Middle East—even if only in the form of defeating the *surrogate* of its enemies. Because Israel was unable to defeat Hizbullah definitively, Olmert's political position in Israel weakened and, for additional reasons, Olmert resigned in September 2008.

In sum, it can be seen that Syria and Iran, seeking to counter Israel and the United States, found their voice in Hizbullah. The basic political problems behind the Israeli-Hizbullah war in Lebanon in 2006 were (a) Israeli tensions with Syria over Israel's continuing occupation of the Golan Heights, (b) Israeli (and U.S.)[25] tensions with Iran over issues of nuclear parity and influence in Iraq, and (c) Hizbullah alignment with Hamas in its battles with Israel. Israel's destructive war in Lebanon, condemned internationally, injured Israel and left it to focus on Hamas in a continuing and unproductive war.

Notes

1. Jimmy Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 180.

2. It is widely believed that in a few years Olmert would have removed 15 percent of the near half million settlers. Amos Elon, "What does Olmert Want," *New York Review of Books*, 22 June 2006, 54. Olmert's initial plan was to remove only 15,000 Jewish settlers (3.3 percent) from 17 West Bank settlements, replacing them with IDF troops. Conal Urquhart, "West Bank pullout plan ready," *The Guardian Weekly*, 10–16 March 2006.

3. "It is impossible to abandon control of the eastern border of Israel," Olmert declared. *Chris McGreal*, "Israel excludes Palestinians from Jordan Valley," *Guardian Weekly*, 17–23 February 2006, 10.

4. Chris McGreal, "Israel sets deadline for drawing final borders," *Guardian Weekly*, 17–23 March 2006, 9. Chris McGreal, "Carter says Israeli 'colonizing' blocks peace," *Guardian Weekly*, 24–30 March 2006, 7. Avi Dichter, former head of Shin Bet, senior member of Kadima, confirmed this new policy.

5. Amos Elon, "Olmert and Israel: The Change," *New York Review*, 14 February 2008, 25.

6. Toni O'Loughlin, "Rice attacks Israel over settlement plans," *Guardian Weekly*, 20–36 June 2008, 6.

7. "World Briefing," *New York Times*, 15 March 2008, 8.

8. Jimmy Carter, in April 2008, proposed the return of the abducted Israeli soldier in exchange for release of 71 Palestinian men (already approved for release by Israel)

plus 500 women and children held in Israeli Jails. Israel refused. Jimmy Carter, Interview, *PBS*, 27 April 2008.

   9. Hamas observed a unilateral eighteen-month cease-fire during these and earlier provocations. Rashid Khalidi, *The Iron Cage: the Story of the Palestinian Struggle for Statehood* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006), ix, x.

   10. Conal Urquhart, "Israel hints at prisoner swap," *The Guardian Weekly*, 14–20 July 2006.

   11. *The Economist*, 9 September 2006. Some Gazan militants had been firing into Israel a dribble of homemade rockets without fatalities for more than a year.

   12. The Gaza Strip is under Israeli military occupation and siege by restriction of food, electricity, and fuel supplies—said by Israel to be in retaliation for Hamas rocket firings, which, in turn, Hamas says are in retaliation for Israel's invasion of Gaza.

   13. A senior Israeli official: "Olmert needs to prove that he is Sharon." Ethan Bronner, "Sharon Set The Stage His Heir Reacts On," *New York Times*, 6 August 2006, Sec. 4, 4.

   14. *The Economist*, 1 July 2006, 41. Moderate Hamas leaders such as Ismail Haniya accepted a coexistence between Israel and a Palestinian state within the 1967 boundaries—a recognition of Israel *and* a Palestinian state. In May of 2006, Hamas leader Abdel Khaliq al Natsheh signed an agreement with Fatah leader Marwan Barghouti (and other moderates) calling for this two-state solution—one already accepted by the Arab League in 2002 (Beirut Declaration). *Extremist* Hamas members were threatened, however, when President Mahmoud Abbas proposed to take this plan to the public, a referendum concerning a two-state plan, unless the extremists approved it. Neither Olmert nor hardline Hamas welcomed this showdown, and they may have taken a way out though the Israeli-Hamas violence. Rashid Khalidi, "What Hamas must do," *London Review of Books*, 6 July 2007, 11.

   15. Since Israel has no completed internationally-accepted borders other than that allotted by the UN in 1947, Hamas leader Mousa Abu Marzook asked whether recognition of Israel included 1948 war gains and illegal settlements in the West Bank. "Where are the borders of the Israel we are supposed to recognize?" Cited in Ali Abunimah, *One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006), 166.

   16. Israel is "seeking ways to bolster Mr. Abbas as a brake on Hamas." Isabel Kershner, "Fatah Militants Lay Down Their Arms to Bolster Abbas," *New York Times*, 22 July 2007, 3. The United States treated Fatah as though it had won the 2006 election—"funding, arming and directly encouraging agents within it to reverse the outcome of the election." Karma Nabulsi, "Palestine must be allowed to decide," *The Guardian Weekly* 22 June 2007, 17. In June 2007, the United States lifted its political and economic embargo on Fatah ($40 million to the UNWRA) as part of a further effort to isolate Hamas. In July 2007, Israel released 255 Fatah (Aksa Brigade) prisoners in an effort to strengthening Fatah over Hamas. *Guardian Weekly*, 27 July–2

August 2007, 2. "The U.S. clearly pushed for a confrontation between Fatah and Hamas." Alvaro de Soto, "End of Mission Report," May 5, 2007. Cited in *The Guardian Weekly* 22 June 2007, 6, 17.

17. Seven hundred prisoners were exchanged for one Israeli businessman and three dead Israeli soldiers. Louise Richardson, *What Terrorists Want* (New York: Random House, 2006), 181.

18. Charles Glass, "Learning from its Mistakes," *London Review of Books*, 17 August 2006, 8.

19. Olmert did engage in unnecessary bravado: "we will demolish them and nothing is going to hold us back."

20. Goldman: "To brook nothing, tolerate no attack, cut through Gordian knots, and shape history by creating facts seemed so simple, so compelling, so satisfying that it became Israel's policy in its conflict with the Arab world." *The Autobiography of Nahum Goldmann: Sixty Years of Jewish Life* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), 289–90.

21. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 619.

22. This invasion was explained as "retaliation" for a terrorist killing of 35 Israelis on a bus. Amnesty International Country Report, July 1996 (Index MDE 15/42/96). It resulted in one to two thousand civilian deaths. Chomsky reports 2,000 dead, 250,000 made refugee. Noam Chomsky, *The Fateful Triangle* (Boston: South End Press, 1983), 99.

23. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: Norton, 2001), 560. The United States brokered a cease-fire to no avail, each side blaming the other, 559.

24. Vali Nasr ("The Shia Revival") points out that Iran's interest in nuclear capacity also relates to its rivalry with the "Sunni axis" (Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and Baathist Iraq)—Hizbullah and Iran being largely Shiite.

25. In 2007, the United States took a hostile line against Iran and rejected Iranian overtures for normal relations. Nicholas Kristof, "Hang Up! Tehran Is Calling," *New York Times*, 21 January 2007, 15. Also "In 2003, U.S. Spurned Iran's Offer of Dialogue," *Washington Post*, 18 June 2006.

A May 2003 Iranian proposal to the United States offered "full transparency for security that there are no Iranian endeavors to develop or possess WMD [and] full cooperation with the IAEA based on Iranian adoption of all relevant instruments." The Iranians also offered support for "the establishment of democratic institutions and a non-religious government" in Iraq; full cooperation against terrorists (including "al-Qaeda"); and an end to material support to Palestinian groups like Hamas. In return, the Iranians asked that their country not be on the terrorism list or designated part of the "axis of evil;" that all sanctions end; that the U.S. support Iran's claims for reparations for the Iran-Iraq War as part of the overall settlement of the Iraqi debt; that they have access to peaceful nuclear

technology; and that the U.S. pursue anti-Iranian terrorists. Peter Galbraith, "The Victor?" *The New York Review*, 11 October 2007, 8.

It appears that in 2008, the United States favors regime change over attack on Iran, believing that it can influence Iranian politics through moderate Iranian councils to block President Ahmadinejad.

PROSPECTS

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

✎✎✎✎✎

One-state, Two-states,
or Continued Apartheid?

Palestinian Demographics

The total number of Palestinians living in or outside of Palestine is about 10.3 million. Of these, 1.3 million reside in Israel as Arab-Israeli citizens. Another 4 million live in 22 percent of historic Palestine under Israeli military rule. Of this 4 million, about 2.5 million live on the West Bank, 1.5 million on the Gaza Strip. Other Palestinians, numbering about 5 million, live in the diaspora: Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, North and South America, and other Gulf or Arab states. Of all Palestinians, about 4.5 million are refugees who receive help from the UN (Relief and Works Agency), many living in camps in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria.

Arab-Israelis, those Palestinians who in 1948 never fled the land that comprises Israel today, were placed under military rule for nearly two decades before receiving Israeli citizenship. They live in a state of political powerlessness, poverty, geographical isolation, social and employment discrimination, and inadequate public services—a kind of "soft" apartheid. Peretz and Doron conclude, "for all practical purposes, Israeli Arabs are excluded from society."[1]

In contrast, Palestinians under military occupation on the West Bank live under a "hard" apartheid, locked in by checkpoints, surrounded by road networks (for Jews only), and high barriers around both Gaza and the West Bank.[2] Although Israel withdrew its settlers and troops from Gaza in 2005,

Israel fiercely invaded Gaza again in its war against Hamas in 2006. There are, as of this writing, virtually no remaining industries in Gaza.[3] Electricity and petrol needed for pumping out sewage, operating wells, and running hospitals, is severely restricted by Israel. About 80 percent of the Gazan population depends on humanitarian relief.

The Needs of Israelis and Palestinians in 2008

The central and pressing political problems facing the Palestinians and Israelis are: (a) the Palestinian need of a sovereign state on the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and (b) the Israeli desire for a state predominantly for Jews, a state now under demographic threat because of increasing numbers of Arab-Israelis and surrounding Palestinians soon to outnumber the Jewish population of Israel.

Two main solutions have been proposed. The "two-state" proposal is for a sovereign state for the Palestinians on the West Bank and Gaza, side by side with Israel. This solution would satisfy both the Palestinians' national aspirations and Israelis' demographic concerns about the enlarging Palestinian population in the region. The chief difficulty with this proposal is that Jewish settlements are scattered throughout the West Bank and would have to be relinquished in order to create a viable Palestinian state.

In contrast, the "one-state" proposal envisions an enlarged democratic Israel that would include the West Bank and Gaza and be shared by Jews and Palestinians alike.[4] This represents the democratic ideal, yet it poses formidable difficulties that seem to preclude its achievement. First, this new and enlarged Israel would no longer have a Jewish majority population, a prospect which leads most Jewish Israelis to reject the one-state solution. Moshe Dayan once stated clearly: "There can be no doubt that only this country and only this people can protect the Jews against a second Holocaust. And hence, every inch of Israeli soil is intended for Jews only."[5] Olmert has said, regarding the one-state solution, "it would mean the end of the Jewish state."[6] Second, the one-state solution would mean that Palestinians would have to fight for equal rights in a state that is now structurally, systematically, and socially discriminatory toward Arab-Israelis and Palestinians. The result could be a civil war between populations that have demonized each other for over a century.

The two-state solution appears to be more practical, although not easily accomplished. Not only would the Jewish settlements have to be relinquished, but water would have to be equitably divided in order to create a vi-

able Palestinian state. Still, the two-state solution is widely supported by the international community—both in the West and by twenty-two Arab League states, as well as by the Palestinian and Israeli populations. Two-thirds of Israelis and 84 percent of Palestinians are in favor.[7] A state on the West Bank and Gaza may represent only partial justice from the Palestinian perspective, yet it is acceptable to them and is a clear formula for permanent peace. Giving up Jewish settlements on the West Bank—a shift in Israeli thinking from acquiring Palestinian land to relinquishing it—would be an emotionally difficult step.[8] Yet that relinquishment would preserve the theological, political, historical, and emotional meaning of the whole Zionist project, a sovereign Jewish state—and create the same for Palestinians. The two-state solution incorporates the historical reality that Jews and Palestinians each desire ethnic homogeneity (seek separate ethnic nationalisms) more than democratic mixing.

The Proponents of a Single Integrated Israeli State

Some major scholars favor the one-state solution because it represents the democratic ideal. These include Tony Judt, Virginia Tilley, Ali Abuminah, Joel Kovel, Ali Jarbawi (Birzeit University), Edward Said, and Amos Elon. Amos Elon wants to see Israel become a *secular* "state of all its citizens" instead of the "state of all Jews" (the Knesset definition of Israel). Historian Tony Judt proposes, too, that Israel transform itself into a true democracy, one in which the Jewish majority would no longer be privileged, the Arab-Israelis no longer consigned to second-class status. Judt envisions a modern multi-ethnic democratic Israel instead of a dated and separatist state:

> The very idea of a "Jewish state"—a state in which Jews and the Jewish religion have exclusive privileges from which non-Jewish citizens are forever excluded— is rooted in another time and place. Israel, in short, is an anachronism.[9]

To be sure, Israel has fallen behind modern times, for it is highly discriminatory toward Arab citizens and lacks a true constitution, the classic instrument to assure human rights and equality for all citizens.[10] Birth of a truly democratic Israel would gain significant international approval.

Some Palestinian leaders also advocate the one-state solution, if only from a *default* position—believing that Israel will never permit (nor the Americans demand) the creation of a viable Palestinian state. Saeb Erekat, chief negotiator for the Palestinian Authority, believes that even if Israel permitted such

a state, it would at best be "a ghetto state surrounded by Jewish settlements with no ability to defend itself, deprived of water resources, and arable land, with an insignificant presence in Jerusalem and sovereign in name only."[11] Thus, difficult as it might be, Erekat thinks that the one-state solution is the only alternative, and that Palestinians, as Israeli *citizens*, would be able to fight for equal rights in a true democracy. Others such as Khaled Amayreh, a Hebron-based journalist, argue the same conclusion for different reasons: that Israel and the West Bank are *already* "inextricably intertwined."[12] Michael Tarazi, a Harvard-trained legal advisor to the Palestinians, agrees with Amayreh: "The [Jewish] settlements mean that the egg is hopelessly scrambled. Basically, it [Israel] is already one state. It's one country, the same electricity grid, and the same aquifers. Except that the three million Christians and Muslims in Gaza and the West Bank don't have the same rights as the five million Jews in Israel, and the Arabs in Israel are second-class citizens compared with the Jews. Now the cause is justice and equality."[13]

Clearly, the feasibility of the two-state versus one-state solution turns on Israel's willingness to evacuate Jewish settlements versus Israel's willingness to sustain revolutionary changes in governance and accept demographic diversity. The argument made below is that the ingrained structural, systematic and social discrimination that exists in Israel today largely *precludes* the one-state solution.

The Discriminatory Experience of Arab-Israeli Citizens Argues against the One-State Solution

One test of the idea that an influx of Palestinians could effectively fight for equal rights in Israel is the experience of Arab-Israelis who have already for half a century engaged in that struggle. It is clear that the Israeli government and its Jewish citizenry see Arab-Israelis as aliens.[14] Arab-Israelis have been able to fight "for survival, not equality."[15] David Grossman refers to Israel's "deeply ingrained, institutionalized racism against the Arab [Israeli] minority."[16] Palestinians who remained in Israel in 1948 were held under martial law for eighteen years. These Arab-Israelis lost most of their land to Israeli confiscation.[17] Today, after sixty years, Arab-Israelis are denied state benefits, equal employment, adequate water and electricity, education, and cultural freedom.[18] Israel, in its own opinion (Or Commission, 2003), behaves in a "neglectful and discriminatory" manner towards its Arab-Israeli citizens.[19] Would this end were Palestinians from the occupied territories to flood in and fight for equal rights?

Would the new Palestinians, anymore than Arab-Israelis, have access to *political power* essential for gaining equal rights in a new Israel? The system argues against it. In the current political system, political *parties* are elected, not individuals (except for the prime minister). Consequently, political candidates must conform to the ideology of major parties (and be a favorite within that party) in order to have a significant chance of government position. They must, also, by law, swear that Israel is a "Jewish and democratic state."[20] This is one reason why there are few Arab-Israelis in the Knesset and few in important government positions. Between 1967 and 1998, no Arab-Israeli ever served as a cabinet minister; none served as a member of the Security and Foreign Affairs Committee; none chaired any Knesset committee; none directed any state-owned enterprise or government bureau (including the branch that handles Arab communal and religious interests).[21] Although comprising 20 percent of the Israeli population, Arab-Israelis in 1998 held seventeen of 1,300 senior government positions, ten of 5,000 university posts and garnered, on average, 5 percent of Knesset seats.[22] Were Palestinian Arabs to be able to fight for equal rights in a shared Israel, the political system, the *means* to power, would have to be dramatically altered.

Structural Discrimination against Arab-Israelis: Israel's "Invisible" Government

Other major obstacles to a one-state solution consist in Israel's agencies of institutional discrimination—sometimes referred to as Israel's "invisible" government or "the glass wall."[23] In Israel, quasi-governmental agencies are the guardians of *unofficial* discrimination against non-Jews. These agencies include the Jewish National Fund and the Jewish Agency, both explicitly chartered by the government to serve Jewish interests only.

Jewish National Fund (JNF): The JNF bars Arab-Israeli use of 94 percent of the land of Israel. Before Israeli statehood, the JNF was a privately-owned, land-purchasing agency that used contributions from the American public for goals "directly or indirectly beneficial to persons of Jewish religion, race or origin." Once Israel was established in 1948, the government made the JNF the sole instrument for the development and use of Israel's land.[24] At the time, only 6.6 percent of all of mandatory Palestine was owned by Jews.[25] Three-quarters of what subsequently became Israel was land confiscated from Palestinians who fled Irgun and IDF terror in 1948.[26] Another 18 percent (two-thirds of which was confiscated from Arab-Israeli Palestinians) was acquired by the JNF in the early 1960s.[27] In total, about 94 percent of Israel

remains under the control and charter of the JNF for Jewish use only.[28] Arab-Israeli citizens may neither rent nor work on this National Land.[29] Yitzhak Efron, a former official of the JNF, notes:

> The economic impact of our land purchases and our activities on Arabs is not considered. . . . The government would have to look after all citizens if they owned the land; since the JNF owns the land, let's be frank, we can serve just the Jewish people.[30]

The Jewish Agency (JA): The JA was the pre-state Jewish government-in-waiting. Upon statehood, the Israeli government assigned the JA primary responsibility for Jewish immigration, settlement, and development in Israel. During the first quarter century after statehood, the JA financed the immigration of 1.4 million Diaspora Jews, providing all their settlement needs cost-free (food, clothing, medical care, generous benefits, grants, employment, and housing). No assistance was given to Arab-Israelis who were discriminated against in employment, civil service positions, schools, and health services. When two-thirds of their farmland was confiscated, they resorted to menial construction jobs and remained segregated in isolated villages without adequate services.[31] The JA, not an official part of the government, freely discriminates against Arab-Israelis. Yosef Lichtman, former official of the JA acknowledged, "Arab villages are of course ineligible [for our economic assistance] because this is a Jewish Agency."[32] Another official of the JA, Adam Kahan, explained:

> The activities of the Jewish Agency in subsidizing economic development in the Jewish sector may create problems—gaps—between Arabs and Jews in Israel, but the mission of the Jewish Agency is a Jewish one. There is no role for the Jewish Agency in solving such problems.[33]

In sum, obstacles to Palestinian success in obtaining equal rights in a one-state solution would be formidable: political powerlessness, exclusion from land use, exclusion from government and university positions, and neglect of school and health services. Many additional social restrictions exist, for example, intermarriage between Jews and Muslims is prohibited.[34] All this would have to be changed in a one-state solution. No wonder three-quarters of Palestinians (and Jewish Israelis) oppose that solution.

Some Objections to the Two-State Solution

Claims are made that the two-state solution would not end Palestinian terrorism—a claim based on a denial that statelessness and oppressive

military rule are the root causes of Palestinian terrorism. It is true that Hamas extremists once opposed the two-state solution, but Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, the spiritual/political founder and leader of Hamas, unlike the extremists, always took a moderate and pragmatic position: that Hamas would cease its war with Israel were the Palestinians to be granted a state on the West Bank and Gaza.[35] In May of 2006, Marwan Barghouti, the most popular and influential leader of Fatah, joined forces with Abed al-Halak Natashe, a trusted spokesman for Hamas, and endorsed the two-state proposal.[36] Hamas prime minister, Ismail Haniyeh stated in June 2006, "We have no problem with a sovereign Palestinian state over all our lands within the 1967 borders, living in peace."[37] Hamas sought accommodation, twice proposing cease fires to end both Hamas rocket attacks and Israeli attacks.[38] Israel rejected these proposals. In 2008, Hamas again announced that it would recognize Israel's "right to exist" and comply with *any* permanent-status agreements made by Fatah and Israel if a majority of Palestinians agreed to it through a referendum.[39]

Ehud Olmert once claimed, as did Ariel Sharon, that there is no Palestinian "peace partner" (not already assassinated) with whom to negotiate the two-state solution. And yet, basically, Israel *needs* no negotiating partner. Shimon Peres once observed: "From our point of view, it is really not a negotiation of give and take, because the PLO can give very little to Israel. They don't have land, they don't have authority, and they don't have means. In many ways it is a negotiation with ourselves, because what is driving us is the Question: what sort of an Israel do we want to have in the future?"[40] Were the Knesset to simply announce acceptance of a viable and sovereign Palestinian state on pre-1967 borders, then the Arab-Israel conflict would *end*, as would Israel's demographic anxieties.[41]

If No Solutions are Adopted, Then Continuing Apartheid and/or Palestinian Emigration?

Since 1967, Palestinians have been squeezed onto ever-smaller, noncontiguous pockets of land—"pens" surrounded by Israeli tanks that make "South African apartheid pale."[42] Daniel Barenboim expresses some shame: "We have a powerful army. We have the atomic bomb. But the psychology of what comes out of Israel has the tone of the Warsaw ghetto."[43] The encirclement of Palestinians by road networks that bypass and separate their communities, by a "security" wall that snakes through the West Bank, by an electronic fence that encloses the Gaza Strip—these all speak of an entrapped and apartheid existence for the Palestinians.

Continuing settlement building and Israeli raids on the West Bank and Gaza raise many questions.[44] Is this an apartheid strategy or an attempt to encourage Palestinians to leave the occupied territories? The settlement building and impoverishment of life for Palestinians has, in fact, encouraged emigration, some 100,000 during a recent two-year period.[45] In 2006, 40,000 professionals left for other countries.[46] Thirty-five percent of adult Palestinians wish to leave the occupied territories, though most are too poor to do so.[47] The "demoralizing flight" of Palestinians reported by the UN is clearly related to the destruction of the social and economic fabric of the Palestinian community: confiscation of land and water; destruction of homes and crops;[48] denial of employment and poverty in a collapsing economy;[49] grave malnutrition of children;[50] confiscation of Palestinian moneys;[51] imprisonment without charge.

The condition of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories may be a matter of indifference to Israeli leaders. It may also represent a hope that intolerable conditions will make forced deportation unnecessary because "voluntary" emigration will accomplish that end. That there is talk in Israel of removing Arab-Israelis from Israel is not an encouraging sign.[52]

Prospects

Under present conditions the picture is grim: continuing mutual terror; confiscation of Palestinian land and U.S. focus on Israeli security alone. Carter reports that "there is no evidence at all that Israel is willing to have peace with the Palestinians if it means relinquishing the Palestinian land that it has confiscated and colonized."[53]

But if Israel is unwilling to relinquish land, then the two-state solution is off the table. At the same time, the one-state solution is rejected by the Israeli leadership and public, would "entail a difficult reappraisal of [Israel's] every cliché and illusion."[54] Stalemate, apartheid and mutual terror remain.

History suggests that ethnic separation (i.e., partition) will ultimately prevail. The two-state solution is already supported by the Israeli and Palestinian publics, the international community, and the whole Arab world. What is lacking is a concerted and joint effort by both Israeli and U.S. statesmen.

Israel's intransigence regarding solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict is partly a product of biblical fixations and insecurities related to the Holocaust.[55] How likely is it, it may be asked, that a historically victimized people will willingly reform their own institutions and forego their whole political purpose (a Jewish state) in order to appease and mix in a single state with an enemy people soon to be the majority? And yet even the prospect of partition of Palestine, two states side by side, has met with resistance. Israel's in-

transigence may be a product of an *excess of security*, its possession of superior military power. How likely is it, it may be asked, that the victor can imagine that he must divide his territorial spoils (two states) with his all-but-defeated enemy in order to obtain peace, especially when the "way of the world" says that military power is the end in itself?

Nevertheless, I believe that the Israeli public both wants ethnic separation *and* questions the morality of oppressing the Palestinians. The two-state solution, favored by Shlomo Ben-Ami, former Barak foreign minister, makes immediate and practical sense.[56]

I. F. Stone once made an implicit and hopeful appeal that the Jews would, as a people, be different in character from their former oppressors:

> How we act toward the Arabs will determine what kind of people we become: either oppressors and racists in our turn like those from whom we have suffered, or a nobler race able to transcend the tribal xenophobias that afflict mankind.[57]

Notes

1. Don Peretz and Gideon Doron, *The Government and Politics of Israel* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998), 61.

2. Sara Roy, 'A Dubai on the Mediterranean,' *London Review of Books*, 3 November 2005, 16. The 20-foot-high concrete wall will snake 400 miles through West Bank land and intrude so as to divide the West Bank in half. At least 366,000 Palestinians will be left on the *outer (Israeli) side of* the wall (presumably later to be transferred to the *inside (Palestinian) side* of the wall). John Kifner, "On Old Green Line, a Fence and Fears Are Rising," *New York Times*, 16 June 2002, 6. Geoffrey Aronson, "Report on Israeli settlement in the Occupied Territories," *Foundation for Middle East Peace* (Washington, DC) July–August 2003, cited in *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1, Fall 2003, 142. Kofi Annan reported to the United Nations that almost 400,00 Palestinians (16.6% of the West Bank population) will be stranded on the Israeli outer side of the wall. Ian Williams, "Israel's charm offensive falters," *Middle East International (MEI)*, No. 714, 5 December 2003.

3. The entry of materials needed for industry are severely restricted by Israel, as is the exit of products or agricultural produce. American Near East Refugee Aid (ANERA). No. 160 (Spring 2000).

4. Another proposal is that of fashioning the Palestinian state be fashioned by combining existing Arab-Israeli areas in Israel and Palestinian areas in the occupied territories. This sort of gerrymander would leave the Jewish settlements intact and rid Israel of its Arab-Israelis. But the resulting Palestinian state would neither be viable nor contiguous in its geographic composition.

5. Edith Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 109.

6. *Ha'aretz,* 13 November 2003.

7. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 140, Vol. XXXV, No. 4 (Summer 2006) 119. *Ha'aretz*, 20 November 2003. Friedman, "One Wall, One Man, One Vote," *New York Times*, 14 September 2003, Op-Ed.

8. Tilley, Virginia, *The One-State Solution: A Breakthrough for Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Deadlock* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005).

9. Tony Judt, "Israel: The Alternative," *New York Review of Books*, 23 October 2003, 8.

10. Though Israel has no constitution, it does have laws explicitly forbidding discrimination in employment on religious, ethnic, or national grounds. Yet "there is no enforcement mechanism outside normal criminal procedures. Consequently, discrimination is basically unchecked, prevails widely and in practice is sanctioned by the norms of Jewish economic and social life." Alan Dowty, *The Jewish State: A Century Later.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, 195. Of course, in the occupied territories matters are much worse. The military justice system rarely finds settler (or IDF) guilt for crimes against Palestinians. Henry Siegman, "Grab more hills, expand the territory," *London Review of Books*, 10 April 2008, 16.

11. Saeb Erekat (Chief Negotiator, Palestinian Authority), *New York Times*, 30 December 2002.

12. Ali Abunimah, *One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006), 164.

13. Jeffrey Goldberg, "Among the Settlers: will they destroy Israel?" *The New Yorker*, 31 May 2004, 67.

14. Ian Lustick refers to the "deep segmentation of Israeli society:—a society in which Jews tend to see themselves as 'Jews' over and against 'Arabs' whom they see not a 'Israelis' but as aliens." Ian Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State: Israel's Control of a National Minority* (Austin: University of Texas, 1980), 86.

15. Raef Zreik, "Part II: The Palestinians in Israel," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 129, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1 (Fall 2003): 44. About 40 percent of Arab-Israeli "internal refugees" turned to low-paying construction and industry jobs because, with much of their land confiscated, they were unable to farm. Lacking upward mobility and facing barriers to white-collar jobs, the average Arab-Israeli family has less than half the income of a Jewish family and 1.5 times the unemployment. Peretz and Doron, *Government and Politics*, 59.

16. David Grossman, Speech at the Rabin Memorial, November 4, 2006, *Ha'aretz,* translated by Orr Scharf.

17. Two-thirds of Arab-Israeli land and water was confiscated. Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel* (London: Monthly Review Press, 1976), 130. Peretz and Doron, *Government and Politics*, 57. Zreik, "Part II: The Palestinians in Israel," 43.

18. An Arab public school receives less than one-quarter the state support given a Jewish public school, one-twelfth that of a Jewish religious school. Arab schoolteachers are selected and promoted by the Shin Bet (Israel's FBI). Textbooks promote Zionism only (Palestinian history and literature excluded). Computers and after-

school programs are rare. No University teaches Arabic and less than 1 percent of university lecturers are Arab-Israelis. For an inside view of the Arab-Israeli life by a Jewish-Israeli, see Susan Nathan, *The Other Side of Israel: my journey across the Jewish/Arab Divide* (New York, Doubleday, 2005)

19. Or Commission report summary in *Ha'aretz,* 2 September 2003. See Walter Lehn, "The Jewish National Fund," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. III, No. 4 (Summer 1974): 74n2. Gabriel Piterberg, a Jewish-Israeli academic refers to "the chauvinist, anti-Arab militancy with which Israel's society is awash, and the increasing support for . . . transfer of Israel's Palestinian [Arab-Israeli] citizens." "Travels in Israel," *London Review of Books*, 21 September 2006, 18.

20. *Basic Law: The Knesset, section 7A (Amendment No. 35)*. Nadim Rouhana and Nimer Sultany, "Redrawing the Boundaries of Citizenship: Israel's New Hegemony," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 129, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1 (Fall 2003): 11.

21. Peretz and Doron, *The Government and Politics of Israel*, 59. Recently, in 2007, there was talk, with much objection, about making an Arab-Israeli the Minister of Science.

22. All quotes and statistics from Dowty, *The Jewish state,* 195, 200. "Army service is another form of discrimination. The military, forbidden to Arab-Israelis, is a source of important benefits in employment, housing and education" (198). Ian Lustick notes, "Arabs have been so completely cut off—socially, culturally, linguistically, psychologically, etc.—from the Jewish population [that their] political potential [has been] substantially reduced." Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 87.

23. Jonathan Cook, *Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State* (London: Pluto Press, 2006), 1.

24. The JNF is connected to the government by a covenant. The JNF Board for Land Reclamation and Development establishes land policies in accord with the Israeli Minister of Agriculture and supervises the Land Development Administration. The JNF continues to operate as an independent agency of the World Zionist Organization.

25. Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 174. Lehn, "The Jewish National Fund," 74n2.

26. Eighty percent of JNF land was confiscated from Arabs who fled in the 1948 war according to an editorial, "Who Needs the JNF?" *Ha'aretz* 23 September 2007.

27. The Palestinians who did *not* flee, the Arab-Israelis (dubbed the "present absentees"), lost two-thirds of their land by the 1960s. The Israeli government claimed that they had "abandoned" their land if they happen to have visited, however briefly, any former Palestinian village in 1948 that was *subsequently* incorporated into Israel. Compensation for about 25 percent of the expropriated land was paid at about one-fifth its market value.

28. Abdeen Jahara, "Zionism and Racism" in *Arab World Issues* No. 3 (Detroit: Association of Arab-American University Graduates, 1976). The remaining 6 to 7 percent of the land is owned by Jewish (4 percent) or Arab-Israelis (3 percent). However, land owned by Arab-Israelis has been put under the jurisdiction of Jewish

regional councils that refuse to give Arab citizens permits to develop it. Nathan, *The Other Side of Israel*, 144. Peretz and Doron report that only 5 percent of Israel's land is privately owned. Peretz and Doron, *Government and Politics*, 61.

29. Charles Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 31. Also, Lehn "The Jewish National Fund," 93. An exception: Arab-Israelis may lease land for one year at exorbitant rates relative to Jewish rates. Not being Jewish, Arab-Israelis may not move to West Bank Jewish settlements. Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 181–82.

Sometimes a *Jewish*-Israeli will lease more land than he can use and will illegally sublet the excess to an Arab-Israeli at inflated prices. Such violation subjects the Jewish lessee to fines or confiscation of his leased land without compensation. In 1976 seven Jewish settlements leasing land to Arabs were fined several hundred thousand pounds (*MEI* No. 63 (September 1976): 20. A Jewish farmer lost his land when an Arab bought and harvested tomatoes from his former field (Yediot Aharonot, 3 May 1971). In many cases individual Arabs have sublet or been hired to work the very same lands which were expropriated from them. Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 296n69. Occurrences of subletting or working the land by Arab-Israelis have been condemned as a "national sin" by the former director-general of the JNF, referred to as an illegal "cancer" by one Minister of Agriculture. Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 108. *Ha'aretz* December 13, 1974; *Maariv*, July 3, 1975. Assuming that the occupied territories would be annexed by Israel in a one-state solution, it is unclear whether Palestinians would be allowed to own or use this land.

30. Interview with Yitzhak Efron in Jerusalem, 10 April 1976 reported by Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 296n62.

31. Abdeen Jahara, "Zionism and Racism" in *Arab World Issues* No. 3 (Detroit: Association of Arab-American University Graduates, 1976).

32. Yosef Lichtman interview in Jerusalem, April 10, 1974, reported by Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 296n63.

33. Interview with Adam Kahan in Jerusalem, 10 April 1974, reported by Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, 296n64.

34. Arab-Israelis are forbidden to marry Jewish-Israelis or live in Israel with a Palestinian spouse from the occupied territories. A Jewish-Israeli may also not live in Israel with a Palestinian spouse. Jacqueline Rose, *The Question of Zion* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 51. In July 2003, the Knesset passed a law prohibiting Palestinians from obtaining citizenship, permanent residency, or even temporary residency when they marry Arab-Israeli citizens. If they are already in Israel, married and with families, they may legally be deported. In January 2006, Israeli police dragged out thirty-six women and deported eight, some pregnant, others with children from the Palestinian village of Jaljulya in Israel. Ilan Pappé, "Ingathering," *London Review of Books*, 20 April 2006.

35. Yassin refused to recognize the Jewish state (as Israel refuses to recognize the legitimacy of Palestinian national aspirations) though spoke of a "hundred-year truce" with Israel. Rather than negotiate, Israel imprisoned Yassin for eight years,

then assassinated him in 2004 under Sharon's administration. Another founding member of Hamas, Mahmoud Zahar, took the same position as Sheikh Yassin and arranged a truce on suicide bombing in March 2005. Jonathan Steele, "Trust the Palestinians' choice," *Guardian Weekly*, 3–9 February 2006.

36. Jimmy Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006), 213. Barghouti says that "Hamas is ready for a two-state solution. They will say so when Israel recognizes Palestinians' rights as equal human beings." Roger Cohen, "Her Jewish State," *New York Times*, 8 July 2007, magazine, 69.

37. Carter, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid*, 203.

38. Jimmy Carter. Interview, *PBS*, April 27, 2008.

39. Henry Siegman, "Gaza's Future," *London Review of Books*, 7 February 2008, 12. Hussein Agha and Robert Malley, "Into the Lion's Den," *New York Review*, 1 May 2008, 58. Hamas has now agreed to recognize Israel's "right to exist" and comply with any agreement with Israel acceptable to the Palestinian public. Jimmy Carter, Interview, *PBS*, April 27, 2008.

40. Shimon Peres speech in Jerusalem, March 15, 1994, cited by Nicholas Guyatt, *The Absence of Peace: understanding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict* (London: Zed Books, 1998), 81. Because Israel has the military and political initiative, it has the chief responsibility for moving beyond the present impasse, according to Tony Judt. "The Road to Nowhere," *New York Review of Books*, 9 May 2002, 4.

41. On the other hand, if Israel wants to negotiate with Mahmoud Abbas in order to whittle him down, as Barak tried at Camp David, then Israel defeats itself and final peace. There is no percentage in offering to the Palestinians too little to end the conflict.

42. Yigal Bronner, "An outcome too terrible to imagine," *Ha'aretz*, 19 September 2003.

43. *The Guardian Weekly*, 10–16 December 2004, 19.

44. "World Briefing," *New York Times*, 15 March 2008, 8.

45. Interview with Arnon Soffer, Haifa University, former Sharon advisor. *Jerusalem Post*, reported by Saree Makdisi "Closed off, Walled in," *London Review of Books*, 1 September 2005, 11. Margalit "The Suicide Bombers," 39.

46. Peter Gubser, *American Near East Refugee Aid* (ANERA) Part Two: Report on Palestine, Israel, Jordan to Board of Directors (27 November–8 December 2006), 8.

47. Poll for Birzeit University done by Nader Said. Steven Erlanger, "Years of Strife and Lost Hope Scar Young Palestinian Lives," *New York Times*, 12 March 2007, A1.

48. About 2,500 houses have been demolished by the IDF in the past five years. Makdisi, "Closed off, Walled in," 11. The regular practice of uprooting a major Palestinian crop, olive trees, has recently included the killing of grazing flocks by toxic chemical in areas under exclusive Israeli control (confirmed by Bir Zeit University and the Israeli Nature Protection Authority). Reported by *Amnesty International*, News Service No. 106, 25 April 2005.

49. More than half of Palestinians live below the poverty line on less than $2 per day. Michele Esposito, Quarterly Update on Conflict and Diplomacy, *Journal of*

Palestine Studies, 129, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1 (Fall 2003): 126. Palestinians can neither enter Israel for work nor market their produce. Avishai Margalit "The Suicide Bombers" *New York Review of Books*, 16 January 2003, 38. Half are unemployed. Peter Gubser, ANERA, 7. Also, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, cited in Erlanger, "Intifada's Legacy at Year 4," 16. The UN estimates that the economy in 2007 will be 35 percent smaller than in 2005. Sara Roy, "The Gaza Economy," *Palestine Information Center Brief #143*, 20, 2006. According to ANERA, no. 160, (Spring 2000), 80 percent of the Gazan population depend on humanitarian assistance and 95 percent of industrial operations have stopped due to Israeli ban on imported materials.

50. Malnutrition of Palestinian children relates to closures and confiscation of farmland: 22 percent of Palestinian children under age five suffer from grave malnutrition; 15.6 percent of children over five suffer from acute anemia and related sicknesses; 61 percent of Palestinian households eat one meal per day. Jean Ziegler, special *rapporteur* of the UN Human Rights Commission, November 2003 report. Food consumption fell over 30 percent in three years. Blame was squarely placed on the methods adopted by Israel: closures, curfews, hindered circulation of people and merchandise, and expansion of settlements and military zones around agricultural land. Ian Williams, *MEI*, No. 714, 5 December 2003, 18. Also, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, cited in Steven Erlanger, "Intifada's Legacy at Year 4: A Morass of Faded Hopes," *New York Times*, 3 October 2004, 16. Half of Palestinians do not have reliable access to food. Peter Gubser, ANERA, 7.

51. Israel illegally withholds $600 million of tax and customs revenues belonging to Palestinians. Greg Myre, "Hamas Rebuffs Palestinian President Over Israel," *New York Times*, 23 September 2006, A3. Greg Myre, "Hamas Dismisses Israeli Concessions to Abbas," *New York Times*, 25 December, 2006, A6.

52. There is "increasing support for . . . transfer of Israel's Palestinian [Arab-Israeli] citizens." Israeli academic, Gabriel Piterberg, "Travels in Israel," *London Review of Books*, September 21, 2006,18. Olmert rejects a multiethnic society, recently adding to his coalition government Avigdor Lieberman's right wing party (Yisrael Beiteinu) advocating the strip of citizenship from some Arab-Israelis. In 2006, parties campaigning for frank deportation of Palestinians from the occupied territories won eleven of 120 seats in the Knesset.

53. Jimmy Carter, Interview, *PBS*, 27 April 2008.

54. Tony Judt, "The country that wouldn't grow up," *Ha'aretz*, 2 May 2006.

55. Judt, "The Road to Nowhere," 4. Judt also cites biblical and Holocaust claims. "Most Israelis are still trapped in the story of their uniqueness. For some this lies in the primordial presence of an ancient Jewish state on the territory of modern Israel. For others it rests in a God-given title to the lands of Judea and Samaria. Many still invoke the Holocaust and the claim that it authorizes Jews to make upon the international community. . . behind every Israeli refusal to face the inevitability of hard choices stands the implicit guarantee of the United States."

56. "Israel must admit once and for all that the territorial phase of Zionism has ended, dismantle most of the West Bank settlements and create a viable Palestinian state as soon as possible." Shlomo Ben-Ami, "A War to Start All Wars," *Foreign Affairs*, September–October 2008, 156.

57. I. F. Stone, "Holy War," in *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*, Walter Laqueur and Barry Rubin, eds. (New York: Penguin, 1984), 324.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

~~~◈~~~

Terrorism

Terrorism is a complex and highly charged topic and, given the rhetorical power of the word, warrants examination. Formally declared wars between states are increasingly rare as "fighting terrorism" becomes the more common form of warfare in this century. In this context, the question of who is responsible, and on what grounds, becomes as blurred and full of self-justification as do wars between states.

If we accept the definition of terrorism as the intentional harming of non-combatants for political purposes, then it must be recognized that terrorism is, in fact, employed by states (terrorism "from above") as well as by small (non-state) groups. Whether we are talking about a state's acts of intentional harm to its own citizens (Stalin, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot), colonized peoples, or citizens terrorized during wartime for no clear military purpose (Dresden, Hamburg, Tokyo, Hiroshima, Nagasaki), state terrorism has a long and devastating history.

The Reasons for Terrorism and the Rhetoric of Blame

Terrorism is a morally abhorrent means to attain a political end. The abhorrence it inspires does nothing, however, to explain the circumstances in which it is used or how to assign responsibility for its use. Maxime Rodinson believes that "it is hypocritical . . . [to] condemn acts of rebellion in the name of some universal morality, while forgetting about the weight of the oppression and the crimes o the oppressor."[1] This then raises questions about who

is the oppressor? Are the Palestinians, for example, oppressing the Israelis or vice versa? Who threatens whose security? Who provokes whom? Who merely "retaliates"? Is the IDF retaliating for Hamas rockets fired on Sderot or is Hamas retaliating for the IDF bombing of Gaza? Does the label "terrorist" establish culpability? Slavoj Zizek notes:

> When the Israeli army, in what Israel itself describes as a "war" operation, attacks the Palestinian police and sets about systematically destroying the Palestinian infrastructure, Palestinian resistance is cited as proof that we are dealing with terrorists. This paradox is inscribed into the very notion of a "war on terror"—a strange war in which the enemy is criminalized if he defends himself and returns fire with fire.[2]

Zizek distinguishes between "terrorism" (the language of blame) and "resistance" or "retaliation" (the language of self-defense). The Israeli press makes use of this same distinction, referring to Hamas "terrorism" and IDF "retaliation"—a slant denying the *mutuality* of their terrorism.

Citizens prefer to see their state's military actions as defensive rather than terrorist, indeed, as legitimate actions *against* terrorism.[3] Max Weber defined the state as "that agency within society which possesses the monopoly of legitimate violence." States claim, too, that their killing of noncombatants is unintentional ("collateral damage"[4]), thus not terrorist. Their use of conventional weapons also seems to make state actions seem more legitimate.[5]

Israel's "war on terrorism" is not generally understood to be a mutually terrorist war, a killing of each other's civilians that provokes both Israeli and Palestinian escalation of the killing. When a major military power takes an action, for whatever reason, that inevitably kills innocent men, women, children—such as dropping a 500 pound bomb into residential areas of Gaza—that "collateral damage" can be, as Jimmy Carter says, "considered to be terrorism."[6] During the past twenty years in Israel/Palestine, 83 percent of civilians killed (those innocent of any involvement in hostilities) have been Palestinian. Of children killed, 91 percent have been Palestinian. More recently (2006 and 2007), 95 percent of all noncombatant civilians who have been killed have been Palestinian.[7] These figures suggest that the rhetoric of terrorism—without excusing the wrongness of Palestinian terrorism—has been used to deny the existence of a *two-sided* terrorist "war on terrorism." There exists a moral (that is, immoral) equivalence between the Israelis and Palestinians.

The assignment of the term "terrorism" to non-state groups only, as though state terrorism does not exist, cuts off examination of the causes of

conflicts between states and non-states by automatically fixing blame by the very use of the term "terrorist." The term *does*, indeed, apply to non-state groups killing civilians, but may equally apply to states. Tony Judt observes:

> Since September 11 the very words "terrorism" and "terrorist" have silenced rational foreign policy debate. "Terrorist" risks becoming the mantra of our time, like "Communist," "capitalist," "bourgeois," and others before it. Like them, it closes off all further discussion. The word has its own history: Hitler and Stalin typically described their opponents as "terrorists." Terrorists really exist . . . [but] "terrorist" . . . is a protean rhetorical device.[8]

The Context of Non-State Terrorism

While the harming of civilians for political purposes, whether by non-states or states, is shocking and reprehensible, indeed a war crime, there are reasons for its occurrence. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter's national security advisor, observes that non-state terrorism has a context or an antecedent condition that most often relates to oppression by foreign occupation:

> The public has been told repeatedly that terrorism is "evil," which it undoubtedly is, and that "evildoers" are responsible for it, which doubtless they are. But beyond these justifiable condemnations, there is a historical void. It is as if terrorism is suspended in outer space as an abstract phenomenon, with ruthless terrorists acting under some Satanic inspiration unrelated to any specific motivation. Missing from much of the public debate is discussion of the simple fact that lurking behind every terrorist act is a specific political antecedent. That does not justify either the perpetrator or his political cause. Nonetheless, the fact is that almost all terrorist activity originates from some political conflict and is sustained by it as well. That is true of the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland, the Basques in Spain, the Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, the Muslims in Kashmir and so forth.[9]

The Antecedents of Terrorism in Palestine

Israeli military domination of the Palestinians, choking off the air of a community, has contributed to Palestinian terrorism seen today. This is, however, a more universal phenomenon in that nearly all organizations that use terrorism, especially suicide bombings, "have been fighting to evict an occupying power from a national homeland."[10] Terrorism, the last resort of a desperate and weak people, in addition to its wrongness, is a *symptom* of a devastating political condition.[11]

At the same time, terrorism has a more *personal* face, with more specific conditions and personal motivations that lead individuals to volunteer to be suicide bombers. For example, Palestinians willing to kill others and themselves arise under devastating conditions of military occupation, namely, a lack of water and food, massive unemployment, arbitrary imprisonment, confiscation of land, house demolitions, and Jewish settler and IDF terrorism. The individual terrorist is bred in an environment of concrete and explicit humiliation, confinement, and destruction of family and home at the hands of the IDF. The goal of terrorist organizations may be to liberate the community from oppression. But individuals who willingly participate may also be responding more immediately to misery, personal loss, and desire for retaliation.

Who Are the Individual Terrorists and What Do They Want?

Suicide bombing has become the only available and most prevalent form of Palestinian protest. Suicide bombers are widely viewed as religious crazies who are psychologically sick. But a closer look reveals something different.[12] Palestinian bombers show normal variation in emotional adjustment, education and gender and, by and large, they have *not* been active members of religious groups such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad, or al-Aqsa Brigade.[13]

Palestinian terrorist organizations seek, and believe they can achieve, liberation from their Israeli overlords through terrorism.[14] But the motivations of individuals who volunteer to perform suicidal terrorist acts are more mixed. One stimulus, for example, may be a chance witness of the death of innocents, sparking a desire for retaliation. It is well known, for example, that suicide bombings increase after Israeli helicopter gunships or bomb attacks kill many civilians.[15] To see the death of one's own people is, of course, a clear trigger for retaliation whether Palestinian *or* Israeli. Binyamin Ben-Eliezer, former Israeli Defense Minister, notes: "unfortunately, while the IDF is carrying out these necessary actions [assassinations in refugee camps], the operations themselves become a hothouse that produces more and more new suicide bombers. The military actions kindle the frustration, hatred and despair and are the incubator for the terror to come."[16]

Interviews with Caught-in-Time Palestinian Suicide Bombers

Ben-Eliezer interviewed imprisoned (intercepted) suicide bombers and explored their personal reasons for choosing to volunteer.[17] He cites, for example, Arien Ahmed, a twenty-year-old Palestinian, who changed her mind at

the very last minute. She had intended to avenge the death of her beloved fiancé, a militant whom she believed the IDF had killed. "I was in distress. I was depressed. You [Israelis] killed my friend." Ben-Eliezer asked whether she and her fiancé had lived together, Arien replied, "No, of course not. There's no such thing in our culture. But we were friends and he was killed." The impulse to retaliate for a profound personal loss seemed to be a powerful and compelling motive, less abstract than the politics of community liberation. Nor did she "dwell on the glories of martyrdom." Her recruiters did tell her that she would rejoin her slain fiancé in paradise, a religious notion she "recalled thinking stupid." Asked if she had wanted to kill innocent Jews in order to avenge her fiancé's death, she responded, "I don't know what I wanted. I was very hurt and angry. We [my friends] were sitting together one evening talking about how they wanted to organize a reprisal action against all the military actions and everything that Israel had done to them in the last months. I sat and listened. I thought about Jad. And all of a sudden I said to them, you know what? I'm going to do a suicide bombing." Retaliation for a personal loss was central.

Another intended suicide bomber, Rasan Stiti, blocked from his mission by Palestinian intelligence and arrested by the IDF, had different, less personal and more nationalistic and religious reasons. Ben-Eliezer asked Rasan why he decided to commit suicide. He declared, "No, that's not it. That's not right; I didn't go to commit suicide. I went to die a martyr's death. I spent a month in the mosque. I learned there how important it is to be a shaheed (martyr). It is the loftiest objective. It's very important for the Palestinian people nationally and religiously. It's the biggest and most holy thing you can do. And then you receive all the rewards in Paradise. I wanted to participate in the liberation of my people, to fulfill the sacred commandment, to be a source of pride to my people and my friends." Asked further about killing innocent people, women and children, and whether he hated the Jews that much, Rasan replied, "No, not at all. I don't hate Jews. That's not it. I just wanted to take part in my people's war of national liberation. It's a holy war for the liberation of occupied Palestine. That's what I was thinking all the time."

Whereas Arien blamed the Israelis for a personal loss she wished to avenge, Rasan embraced ideas about martyrdom (common to all saints and soldiers),[18] liberation of Palestinians from occupation, and respect gained from the community for committing this act.

Zaydan Zaydan, eighteen, was sent by *Islamic Jihad*. He had dropped out of school and been unable to find work other than brief menial jobs. He said that he didn't want revenge, just martyrdom which would enable him to

choose seventy people to join him in paradise. He insisted that he intended to kill only soldiers whom he described as overwhelming adversaries. "I know the individual Israeli citizen is innocent like us. Unfortunately we are victims of our leaders, sitting on their chairs. . . . People living in the [Israeli] state, enjoying life, have someone to protect them. . . . I don't live in this situation. I don't feel I'm secure. As long as life continues like this, you will have people who think like me." He insisted that he wanted peace, but said he saw little chance of it.[19]

Mahmoud Arien Marmash, a twenty-one-year-old bachelor, recorded this message: "I want to avenge the blood of the Palestinians, especially the blood of the women, of the elderly, and the children, and in particular the blood of the baby girl Iman Hejjo whose death shook me to the core." Another young man in his twenties from a refugee camp near Nablus collected the shrapnel that killed his cousin, a Fatah commander, and stuffed it into the TNT container used as a bomb. Tyseer al-Ajrami, from a different refugee camp in Gaza, was married with three infants. He explained that he was retaliating for the killing of five children in Khan Yunis the week before. A woman of eighteen, Mirvat Massoud, was inspired by her cousin's suicide bombing and enraged by reports of a van of Palestinian schoolchildren hit by shrapnel.[20]

Avishai Margalit (Hebrew University) has studied these diverse motives and concludes that the "main motive of many of the suicide bombers is revenge for acts committed by Israelis, a revenge that will be known and celebrated in the Islamic world."[21] Margalit questions why *suicide* is essential for revenge. "Aren't there other ways to avenge?" he asks. He concludes that in the mind of the bomber, making *oneself* the victim of one's own act puts the tormenters to moral shame.

Dr. Iyad Sarraj, a Palestinian psychiatrist in Gaza City, has watched this suicide bombing with growing alarm. He believes that Palestinian children are equating death with power. "They are creating a new kind of culture," he said, arguing that they are compensating for the powerlessness of their parents facing restrictions and humiliations at the hands of the Israelis.[22] Humiliation is "extremely important in explaining why terrorists are so successful in recruiting large numbers of young men," observes Jessica Stern, a Harvard scholar who has interviewed terrorists around the world.[23]

The Historic Context of Islamic Terrorism

Looking beyond the personal motivations of suicide bombers, and even beyond the intent of Palestinian organizations to liberate their community, there is also an even wider context for this terrorism that relates to a history

of Western domination of Islamic lands. George W. Bush and the neoconservatives ignore this history, preferring to think that terrorism must be a built-in feature of the Islam faith. The neocons lump together the conflicts in Palestine, Iraq, and 9/11 as though they were the self-same product of an *inherent* sickness within Islam, a monolithic and violent "Islamo-fascistic" hatred of freedom.[24] In their view (contradicted by Osama bin Laden himself),[25] Islamic terrorism is *unrelated* to Western domination of Islamic lands, past and present. Nicholas Kristof notes that "anybody who has met Al Qaeda supporters knows that the terrorists are motivated in part by American foreign policy, principally the American military bases in Saudi Arabia and, to a lesser extent, Palestinian rights."[26] But Zbigniew Brzezinski also understands Islamic terrorism as a response not only to the U.S. and Israeli injurious takeover of the Middle East, but to the long history of European colonialism in the region:

> American involvement in the Middle East is clearly the main impulse of the hatred that has been directed at America. There is no escaping the fact that Arab political emotions have been shaped by the region's encounter with French and British colonialism, by the defeat of the Arab effort to prevent the existence of Israel and by the subsequent American support for Israel and its treatment of the Palestinians, as well as by the direct injection of American power into the region. Yet there has been a remarkable reluctance in America to confront the more complex historical dimensions of this hatred. The inclination instead has been to rely on abstract assertions like terrorists "hate freedom."[27]

Islam's Historic Encounter with French and British Colonialism

The antecedents of Islamic resistance reach back before U.S. involvement to centuries of European domination of the Middle East. European colonialism in the Middle East left an accomplished Islamic people aggrieved.[28] For example, following Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798, Western armies and capital overran Islamic lands. The British and Dutch divided South-East Islamic Asia; the British, French, Germans, and Italians took over Islamic Africa; the Russians swamped Central Asia and Africa; and the British and French carved up the Middle East (Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, Iran, Iraq) between themselves. By the end of World War I, most of the Islamic world in Africa, South-East Asia and the Middle East was under European rule or influence.

Focusing just on the Middle East, it is helpful to recall that Britain invaded Egypt in 1882 and, before that, seized territory in the Arabian Peninsula and the Persian Gulf. Britain stifled Islamic movements toward democracy and

controlled Egypt until 1952 through puppet monarchs. Britain also exercised League of Nations mandate power over Palestine, Transjordan, and Iraq after 1920 and brutally suppressed Arab rebellions in Palestine (1936–1939) and Iraq (1920 and 1941). France, too, dominated Islamic peoples, for example in Algeria, invaded in 1830 and ruled until 1962. France invaded Tunisia in 1881, and ruled Morocco from 1906 to 1956, suppressing a 1925 revolt with massive air and land forces. France assumed mandate power in Syria in 1920 and warred against Arab insurrections in 1920, 1925–1926, and 1945.

In sum: the Europeans dominated the Islamic Middle East through military force for well over a century. Through their control of Arab regimes and potentates, "constitutional rule and democracy was stifled" and reform was "feared" because it could strengthen opposition to European expansion and military domination.[29]

Islamic Reform Movements

Popular resentment grew against the dominating European powers and local *autocratic regimes* serving those powers.[30] Moreover, under Western influence, many states lost something of their Islamic character, for example, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Pakistan, Algeria, and Tunisia. After World War II, matters actually worsened when decolonization of some Islamic countries created political vacuums that opened states to civil war, despotic rule, and continued Western influence.

In response to regimes grown distant from and oppressive toward their own people, reform movements emerged. One such, founded in 1928, was the Muslim Brotherhood which sought to restore a sense of meaning within the Islamic frame.[31] The mosque became a pathway for dissent in the absence of viable political parties or free press.[32] Lebanese scholar Fouad Ajami observes, "The fundamentalist call had resonance because it invited men to participate . . . [in] contrast to a political culture that reduces citizens to spectators and asks them to leave things to their rulers."[33] Thus, a place was found for opposition ("jihad")[34] to repressive Islamic regimes.[35] The Muslim Brotherhood was not opposed to democracy.[36] Rather, it was opposed to Western democracies that *discouraged reforms* in order to control Islamic states. Criticism of the West and West-oriented governments centered on their materialistic lifestyles and use of naked military power to dominate Islamic peoples. While the Muslim Brotherhood has been described as "fundamentalist," its most radical spokesman, Sayyid Qutb, did at least call for "a very modern kind of revolution against deification of men [rulers], against injustice, and against political, economic, racial, and religious prejudice."[37]

The United States Inherits the Mantle
of British-French Colonialism

The United States has been seen in the Islamic world as a neocolonialist friend of Arab autocrats, as a champion of Israel's domination of Palestinians, and as an exploitative intruder in Middle East affairs.[38] The classic example of U.S. interference was its 1953 overthrow of the Islamic Iranian government, followed by U.S. support[39] of the Iraqi war against Iran (1980–1989) after the Islamic Iranian government was restored in 1979. Arab reformists have also been critical toward U.S. support of repressive factions in Afghanistan (the Taliban and al-Quaeda) in the 1979 war against the Soviet Union. And of course U.S. interference in the Arab Middle East affairs was overt with its attacks and invasions in oil-rich Iraq in 1991 and 2003, as well as its continuing alliance with the repressive oil-rich Saudis. Equally blatant has been the longtime U.S. championing of Israel in its wars against the Palestinians and Islamic states.

This is the historical background of conflict between Islamic groups and the United States. But today's conflicts have separate and specific reasons: the U.S.-Israeli denial of a Palestinian state and the U.S. domination of Iraq and Middle East oil.

Summary

The intentional killing of civilians, those who have taken no part in hostilities, is, under international humanitarian law, a *war crime*. This prohibition is absolute and applies equally to every state and non-state (small group) organization. Non-state terrorism is typically a reaction to foreign occupation of a homeland, whereas state terrorism is typically a reaction to challenge to state authority and control. The purpose, generally, of non-state terrorism is political liberation—to be gained through sympathetic international attention or domestic citizen demand for change in government policy. The motivations of individual suicide bombers appear to be more personal and diverse. Interviews with Palestinian bombers suggest reactions to humiliation, oppressive living conditions, unjust killings, personal losses, and belief in religious or community reward. Islamic terrorism also has a larger historical context: a century of European colonial domination followed by American and Israeli territorial expansion into Islamic lands.

Palestinian and Israeli state terrorisms have been mutually provocative and are morally equivalent. In absolute numbers, Israel's killing of civilians has been far greater. This reaches from the present, back to Israel's ethnic

cleansing of Palestinians in 1948, its military assaults on the West Bank and Gaza during the past forty years, and its vast killing of Palestinian and Lebanese civilians in 1982 and after.

State terrorism by the established world powers has been far deadlier than nonstate terrorism. The goals of state terrorisms include: (a) suppression of nonstate group challenges to state rule or colonization, (b) pursuit of ethnic homogeneity through ethnic cleansing, and (c) terrorist bombing of civilians to induce foreign governments to submit to demands.[40]

Notes

1. Maxime Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973), 93.

2. Slavoj Zizek, "Are we in a war? Do we have an enemy?" *London Review of Books*, 23 May 2002, 3.

3. States ordinarily portray their wars and terrorist actions as defensive. "Every war is carefully justified as a defensive war by the government involved, and by all political parties, in their official utterances." Joseph Schumpeter, *Imperialism and Social Classes* (New York: Porcupine Press, 1986), 64–98. Adolf Hitler portrayed his war against the Jews as "defensive"—against Bolshevik barbarism as "preventive." Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders* (New York: Harper Perennial Library, 1993), 10. Terrorists, too, make similar moral claims—they "go to considerable lengths to justify their actions on moral grounds," Louise Richardson, *What Terrorists Want:Understanding the Enemy, Containing the Threat* (New York: Random House, 2006), 16.

4. State killing of noncombatants is ordinarily explained as *unintentional,* a "collateral" consequent of self-defense. Rebuttal focuses on three points. First, the killing of noncombatants (e.g., dropping bombs and firing artillery into civilian areas to kill a suspected terrorist) is an act with predictable and inevitable consequences. Second, wars that are neither necessary nor just, yet kill innocents may be considered terrorist. Third, states intentionally attack civilian populations, whether (a) their own citizens (Armenians, Jews, and Slavs in the Holocaust, Stalin's Great Terror), (b) colonized peoples (native Americans, Australian aboriginals, Palestinians, South Africans), or (c) foreign populations in wartime killed without clear military purpose (Dresden, Hiroshima, etc.).

5. Dr. Nizar Rayan, Hamas leader in Gaza, noted, ironically, "if we had weapons like the Israelis, we would kill them in a way that is acceptable to Americans." Bennet, "Rash of New Suicide Bombers Exhibit No Patterns or Ties," *New York Times*, 21 June 2002, A10.

6. Interview of Jimmy Carter by Charlie Rose on *PBS*, on April 28, 2008. Israel's use of antipersonnel cluster bombs in Lebanon has left up to one million unexploded submunitions ready to explode when encountered by civilians. Peter Gubser, Middle East Report, *American Near East Refugee Aid (ANERA),* October 28, 2006.

7. All statistics are from *B'Tselem, The Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories*. From 1987 to 1993, 88 percent of the inflicted deaths were Palestinian. Donald Neff, *Fallen Pillars* (Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2002), 192.

8. Tony Judt, "The Road to Nowhere," *The New York Review of Books*, 9 May 2002, 4–6. "Repressive regimes of every shade are today quick to identify with an international war on terror, hoping to get American support for local conflicts. Washington welcomes such recruits to its cause. But these allies of convenience are fueling widespread suspicion that the war on terror is being used as a new cover for old repression." Tony Judt, "The Wrong War at the Wrong Time," *New York Times*, 20 October 2002, Op-Ed, 11.

9. Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Confronting Anti-American Grievances," *New York Times*, 1 September 2002, Op-Ed, 9.

10. "Suicide bombing is primarily a response to foreign occupation," according to Corey Robin, "Dragon-Slayers," *London Review of Books*, 4 January 2007. Christian Caryl, "Why They Do It," *The New York Review of Books*, 22 September 2005, 29.

11. Brian Urquhart (former UN Undersecretary-General): "The fact that the vast majority of the Palestinians have become refugees or the inhabitants of occupied territories has made their position both fatally weak and, since [small group] terrorism is the weapon of the weak, certain to foster extremism. Only an agreement that brings demonstrable benefits, and at least some justice to the Palestinian people, can gradually reduce the bitterness, resentment, and sense of hopelessness on which extremists feed." "Reflections on the Mitchell Report," *New York Review of Books*, 21 June 2001, 84.

12. The research of Scott Affran, National Center for Scientific Research in Paris and the University of Michigan, supports the notion of psychological normality: "It is the general consensus that [suicide] martyrs hate democracy, and are crazies—this is not true. These people showed no sign of psychopathology. They were from middle and upper class families. Poverty is not a factor. The factor is diminishing expectations. No matter how rich or poor, if you have not achieved what you expected, you are more likely to back a radical policy." Don Van Natta, "Terror's Ultimate Weapon," *New York Times*, 24 August 2003, WR, 1.

13. James Bennet, "Rash of New Suicide Bombers Exhibit No Patterns or Ties," *New York Times*, 21 June 2002, A10. The common denominator between groups that use suicide terrorism is not their religiosity but the territorial nature of their struggle (e.g., the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka, Hezbullah in South Lebanon, Hamas in Israel, the PKK in Turkey). See Robert Pape (*Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism* (New York: Random House, 2005).

14. In his global survey of terrorism, Robert Pape, concludes that terrorist organizations believe in the efficacy of their actions. Moreover, he notes that terrorist goals of ending oppression "makes strategic sense"—"it works," as in Northern Ireland. Robert Pape, *Dying to Win*, 61. Louise Richardson is less convinced, but acknowledges that terrorism can be effective (e.g., suicide bombing led to an immediate flight

of U.S. Marines from Lebanon in 1983). Richardson, *What Terrorists Want*, 17, 124. However, circumstances matter: Jewish terrorism against British forces succeeded at a time when Britain was exhausted by World War II, whereas Palestinian terrorism against the British in 1936 failed because Britain was ready for war.

15. Mia Bloom, *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror* (New York: Columbia University Press), 2005.

16. Vered Levy-Barzilal, "Heaven Can Wait," *Ha'aretz magazine*, 21 June 2002, 6–9.

17. Levy-Barzilal, "Heaven Can Wait," 2002, 6–9. All quotes from this source unless otherwise noted.

18. Terrorists, like soldiers, are honored by the community and imagine being remembered and saluted in the remote future. Ernst Jünger (1895–1998) wrote in *Storm of Steel* (43) about pride in sacrifice of soldiers during World War I. "I learned . . . that life has no depth of meaning except when it is pledged for an ideal, and that there are ideals in comparison with which the life of an individual and even a people has no weight."

19. James Bennet, "In Israeli Bed, Failed Bomber Tells of 'Love of Martyrdom,'" *New York Times*, 8 June 2002, 1.

20. Steven Erlanger, "Years of Strife and Lost Hope Scar Young Palestinian Lives," *New York Times*, 12 March 2007, 1.

21. Avishai Margalit, "The Suicide Bombers," *New York Review of Books*, 16 January 2003, 37.

22. "New Suicide Attackers Are Rising Untrained From Anger of the Street," *New York Times,* 21 June 2002, A10.

23. Nicholas Kristof, "Behind the Terrorists," *New York Times*, 7 May 2002, Op-Ed, A13.

24. Richard Perle and David Frum in their *An End to Evil: How to Win the War on Terror* (New York: Random House, 2004) make the argument that "Islamofascist" terrorism arises from *outside* the West and from *within* the Islamic world, rooted in a "cultural malaise . . . a radical strain within Islam [driven] by a murderous hatred of the United States" and its friends (i.e., Israel). Also, Michael Oren, *Power, Faith and Fantasy: America in the Middle East* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007). Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong* (New York: Oxford University, 2002). Lewis argues that fundamentalism, theocracy, and terror are inherent in the "oriental Muslim tradition," 153.

25. Bin Laden described many U.S. iniquities in the Middle East, including U.S. support of the autocratic Saudi regime, support of Israeli oppression of Palestinians, the bombing of Afghan villages, and killing of Iraqi children with U.S. sanctions (more than 500,000 deaths). For sanction deaths, see UNICEF Information Newsline, August 12, 1999, or Ramsey Clark report to UN Security Council, November 14, 1997.

26. Kristof, "Behind the Terrorists," A13.

27. Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Confronting Anti-American Grievances," *New York Times*, 1 September 2002, Op-Ed, 9.

28. Until the eighteenth century, the leading civilization in terms of spread and creativity was Islamic, a civilization cross-fertilized by knowledge of China and India in the East and Spain and Africa in the West. A shared language, religion, and law were practiced with many advances in scholarship, mathematics, physics, poetry, astronomy, prose, and architecture made. Francis Robinson, "Present shadows, past glory: Islamic responses to centuries of Western power," *Times Literary Supplement (TLS)*, 6 September 2002, 14, 15.

29. Rashid Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 15, 19. Britain occupied Egypt in part to head off a move toward parliamentary democracy. See Juan Cole, *Colonialism and Revolution in the Middle East: Social and Cultural Origins of Egypt's Urabi Movement* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993). After World War I, Britain prevented a popular Egyptian delegation from going to the Paris Peace Conference, sparking a 1919 revolution. After granting Egypt limited independence in 1922, Britain retained forces on Egyptian soil. "Similar frustrating experiences faced the parliaments and peoples of Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan, where Britain and France for decades maintained a military occupation against the will of the majority." Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire*, 57. Tariq Ramadan also describes how colonial powers protected their interests by supporting authoritarian systems of government. See Malise Ruthven, "The Islamic Optimist," *New York Review of Books*, 16 August 2007, 64.

30. Western-controlled monarchist rule lasted into the early 1950s in Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia (a virtual U.S. protectorate after World War II).

31. An increasing secularization of Arab countries under Western influence (Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Jordan) created a backlash of organizations devoted to restoring to the polity the principles of Islam. The Muslim Brotherhood, founded in Egypt by Hasan al-Banna, established an educational, economic, military, and political infrastructure. Threatened by its power, Nasser, secular in orientation, banned the organization in 1954, imprisoned over a thousand of its leaders and executed six.

32. Fareed Zakaria, "Why Do They Hate US? The Politics of Rage," *Newsweek*, 15 October 2001, 33–34.

33. Fouad Ajami, *The Arab Predicament: Arab Political Thought and Practice since 1967* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 30.

34. The meaning of 'jihad' is 'struggle.' It has multiple contexts: (a) an intellectual struggle to discover the law, (b) a personal struggle against the "lower self" of baser human impulses, (c) a political struggle to assure Islam as a principle of government, and (d) militance against oppression.

35. The Saudi regime, facing criticism for being repressive, sought to deflect domestic attention from its record at home by financing fundamentalist religious schools throughout the Arab world. However, rather than teach Islamic toleration, these Saudi-financed schools taught a rigid, puritanical brand of Islam called Wahhabism. Similarly intolerant, the Pakistani dictator Gen. Zia ul-Haq squashed political dissent and set up scores of Wahhabi schools throughout the country with Saudi financing. But wahhabism was not representative of Islam.

36. Wide debate exists concerning the compatibility of Islam and democracy. See Lawrence Davidson, *Islamic Fundamentalism: An Introduction* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2003), 93. John Esposito, *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 189. When the public is involved in electing representatives and judges but the Quran is still the basis of law, Esposito calls this a "limited democracy." Many Islamic reformers and scholars argue for the compatibility of Islam and democracy. For example, Muhammad Abduh, late nineteenth century Islamic reformer, thought so, as did Hassan al-Banna, founder of the Moslem Brotherhood in 1928. He favored a British-style parliamentary system, and his grandson Tariq Ramadan leads today a political organization that recognizes Western constitutional structure. Ian Buruma, "Tariq Ramadan Has an Identity Issue," *New York Times*, magazine, 4 February 2007, 39. Islamic modernists have "advocated Islamization of selective Western institutional models such as parliaments, educational structures and court systems" and legislatures elected by the people. Davidson, *Islamic Fundamentalism*, 11. Noah Feldman, *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), 121. Feldman disputes the claim that Islam and democracy are incompatible. He examines the actual Islamic and democratic developments in many countries and finds that most Muslims embrace both Islamic and democratic values. *After Jihad: America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2004).

37. Malise Ruthven, "The Rise of the Muslim Terrorists," *New York Review*, 29 May 2008. Quoting Albert Bergesen, "Qutb doesn't seem to have hijacked Islam for political purposes as much as called for a return to Islam's original religio-political compact." *The Sayyid Qutb Reader: Selected Writings on Politics, Religion, and Society* (London: Routledge, 2007).

38. UN Special Envoy to Iraq, Lakhdar Brahimi, reported: "There is no doubt that the great poison in the region is this Israeli policy of domination and the suffering imposed on the Palestinians, as well as the perception of the body of the population in the region and beyond, of the unjust support of the United States for this policy." Warren Hoge, "U.N. Distances Itself From an Envoy's Rebuke of Israel and the U.S." *New York Times*, 24 April 2004. Also of concern to Muslims is the oppression of Muslim minorities in non-Muslim states, for example, in the Balkans, in Chechnya under the Russians, in India (where Hindu revivalists demonized Muslims), and in Kashmir (where Muslims came under Indian martial rule).

39. For example, the United States, after 1984, supplied Iraq with nerve gas, anthrax, and much money. Nicholas Kristof, "Revolving-Door Monsters," *New York Times*, 11 October 2002, Op-Ed A33.

40. The classic cases of states killing their own citizens or those under colonization or military occupation have to include: twelve million Jews, Slavs, and others under Nazi control; the twenty million killed during Stalin's rule; more than one million Armenians under the Turks; two or three million Cambodians under Pol Pot; three million Congolese under Belgium rule; one million Bengalese under British control; and vast numbers of native Americans, Australian aboriginals, and African

Blacks exterminated by Europeans. Wartime civilian deaths are ordinarily written off as unintentional "collateral damage" in pursuit of "just" wars. Yet the firebombing or atomic bombing of Dresden, Hamburg, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Tokyo, and hundreds of cities was done without clear military reason—acts "unjust and unimaginable," if not "technically" Allied war crimes, according to Jörg Friedrich. The firebombing of Dresden, Hamburg, and Berlin killed 593,000 civilians. The bombing of Japan's 67 largest cities killed 50–90 percent of the urban population (100,000 in Tokyo in one night). More than twice as many civilians than soldiers were killed during World War II (38 versus 15 million). See Martin Gilbert, *The Macmillan Atlas of the Holocaust* (New York: Macmillan, 1982), 11. Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 486. Chris Hedges, *War Is A Force That Gives Us Meaning.* (New York: Public Affairs, 2002), 13.

The Paradox of Nationalism

Jewish nationalism reflects a universal ideal, the right of a people to self-determination. However, fulfillment of this ideal involved the occupation and colonization of a territory already occupied by another people, the Palestinian Arabs, who were themselves seeking self-determination after centuries of oppressive Ottoman rule. The resulting conflict can be seen, thus, from competing perspectives: (1) the rightful restoration of an ancient Jewish homeland, or (2) the rightful possession by Palestinians of a homeland continuously maintained for centuries. This struggle underscores the problematic nature of nationalist aspirations: the ideal of national self-determination that simultaneously entails the removal or military domination of another people.

Nationalism, though the cornerstone of the modern political world, is problematic. It has two faces. It is associated with liberalism, the value of the common man and a people's right to live free of domination by foreign powers (so-called "emancipatory nationalism"), and yet this focus on self-determination can also lead to corruptions: the glorification of the national character, exaggerated citizen allegiance to the state, and chauvinist belief in entitled conquest or colonization of weaker and devalued peoples (so-called "militant" or "hyper" nationalism).

Looking back to the French Revolution, one can see this paradoxical effect: a revolution that began in defense of the liberty of the people followed by a national exuberance that led to Napoleonic wars of conquest and empire-building throughout Europe. Our own American colonists, seeking

national self-determination and freedom from European rule, carried their belief in national entitlement westward in conquest of native Americas, Mexicans, Cubans, Central Americans, and Filipinos. Zeal for a protective unification of Italy, as well as that of Germany in the nineteenth century, was followed by their violations of other peoples through wars and colonizations. After World War II, many newly independent states arose in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Yet here again, even these new-formed states, waving the banner of national liberation, often suppressed their own minorities. The promising liberal and emancipatory thrust of nationalist exuberance can turn to militance against both other states or inward against "misfit" minorities.

The term "nationalism" is often used to refer to these corrupting tendencies: autocracy, militance, national chauvinism, ethnic discrimination, and excess citizen allegiance to the state[1]—the Third Reich being an extreme example. The evolution from "emancipatory" to "militant" nationalism has been no surprise to some political scientists, such as Hans Morgenthau, who sees militance as inevitable in an anarchic world without effective international controls. He notes not only that there are few inherent limits on national pride and adventurism, but states always stand ready to challenge each other.[2]

The Principle Features of Nationalism

Nationalist states are a historical and political fact. Yet nationalism is also an aspiration, a belief, even a *sentiment* about: (1) the *homogeneity of the people*, the idea that the people within a state do (and must) possess a unified national character, and (2) *ethnocentrism*, the idea that the people and their culture are superior to those in other states.[3] The dangers within these ideas are obvious. Liah Greenfeld characterizes nationalism as follows:

> Every member of the "people" thus interpreted partakes in its superior, elite quality, and it is in consequence that a stratified national population is perceived as essentially homogeneous, and the lines of status and class as superficial. This principle lies at the basis of all nationalisms and justifies viewing them as expressions of the same phenomenon.[4]

Greenfeld notes that the idea of a prized homogeneity also accounts for the *positive* aspects of social and moral cohesion found in nationalisms—"the foundation of the moral order of modern society, the source of its values, the framework of its characteristic national identity, and the basis of social integration in it."[5]

On the other hand, Joseph Schumpeter finds the presumed prized homogeneity in nationalism to be malignant. It may generate internal social cohesion, but it also generates chauvinism and hatred for others:

> [Nationalism] alone arouses the dark powers of the subconscious, calls into play instincts that carry over from the life habits of the dim past. Driven out everywhere else, the irrational seeks refuge in nationalism—the irrational which consists of belligerence, the need to hate, a goodly quota of inchoate idealism, the most naive (and hence also the most unrestrained) egotism. This is precisely what constitutes the impact of nationalism. It satisfies the need for surrender to a concrete and familiar super-personal cause, the need for self-glorification and violent self-assertion.[6]

The Power and Illusion of Nationalism

Nationalist sentiments are obviously powerful forces that inspire patriotism and sacrifice. Especially during wartime, citizens see themselves as a single and good people, whereas the enemy is seen, too, as a single but despicable people—an attitude that softens when peace restores the enemy to humanity. The nationalist conviction that there truly exists a homogeneous "we," a single people of united character is what underlies the stance of "we vs. them." Otherwise, how could there be a nation at all—or a superior nation, or ecstatic belonging, or even a war?

The irony is that there is much artifice in the nationalist belief in the homogeneity of the people. Does there exist, for example, a homogeneous Palestinian people? Or a Jewish people? Palestinians, under challenge, might *think* about themselves as one people, but they are a diverse people with clan rivalries, religious hatreds (Muslim, Druze, Bedouin, and Christian) and class contempts (urban vs. peasant). Is there not also something artificial about the supposed national unity of Jews—fractured as they are by mutual hatreds (Ashkenazi vs. Sephardi)?[7] Ilan Halevi comments on the "founding myth of the nation . . . the false idea that all Jews . . . share a single unequivocal character, a common and unchanging essence either national or religious."[8] David Shipler observes, "the passion with which Jews hate other Jews and Arabs hate other Arabs certainly rivals the antipathy between Jews and Arabs."[9] This "as-if" nationalist belief in the unity of "the people" supports war because, as a device, it abstracts and then essentializes the nation *as if* it is composed of a single people, real, separate, and unbridgeable from others. This provides the social cohesion necessary for war.

Curiously, the fact that groups within a nation hate each other does not mean that they relinquish their belief in a *single* national character. Rather, it encourages a desire for "cultural or ethnic purification" through rout of the misfits. While "the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship . . . regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail." (Anderson),[10] that comradeship of the Volk always seems to need some "perfecting."

Many sociologists underscore the point that the notion of a unified people or "nation" is largely a *mental construction*. Ernest Gellner stresses the *falseness* of the construction. It is a fabricated image: "nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist."[11] Benedict Anderson stresses the nation's *imagined style*: "Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined."[12] Liah Greenfeld alludes to the *mental image* of the nation: "It exists as much in the minds of people as in the outside world, and if it loses its grip on the minds of a sufficient majority it cannot be sustained and is bound to vanish from the outside world as well."[13] At the same time, the *idea of belonging* to a unified national entity has powerful emotional and political appeal—"The gods of myth never happened but always are" (Sallust).

Belief in the nation is constructed, too, on beliefs about a shared *ancestral past*. "Authentic" group membership depends on the idea of having a biological and/or cultural root extending to persons persisting as a unified group in former times. This communion with unknown fellows is encouraged by stories about one's people's glorious or traumatic past. Indeed, the state becomes the guardian of this past, as well as the present and future. Ernest Renan wryly defined a nation as "a group of people united by a mistaken view about the past and a hatred of their neighbors."

Immanuel Wallerstein focuses not only on the authentication of belonging through the "invention of pastness," but how that invention of pastness is used to legitimize and advance *contemporary* political goals.[14]

> We may use these categories [inventions of pastness] to explain why things [today] are the way they are and shouldn't be changed, or why things are the way they are and cannot be changed. Or conversely we may use them to explain why the present structures should indeed be superseded in the name of deeper and more ancient, *ergo* more legitimate, social realities. . . . Pastness is a mode by which persons are persuaded to act in the present in ways they might not otherwise act. Pastness is a tool that persons use against each other. Pastness is a central element in the socialization of individuals, in the maintenance of group solidarity, in the establishment of a challenge to social legitimation.

> Pastness therefore is preeminently a moral phenomenon, therefore a political phenomenon, always a contemporary phenomenon.[15]

The real past is, of course, impossible to capture. But the *social* past, a cultural and historical representation of the past, is written in myriad ways. As Faulkner said, "the past is never dead and buried, it isn't even past." The past is used selectively by cultures to inspire contemporary duties—usually to correct today some belief about a historical wrong.[16]

Character Differences between Nations?

Nationalists claim that the unity of the people and their prized national character are different from and superior to that of peoples in other states. Scholars point out that popular ideas about a national character (and differences *between* national character) are largely wishful stereotypes favorable to the self.[17] Nevertheless, enough obvious differences in language, religion, and chosen behavior exist to lead nations to praise themselves and judge others negatively. The tendency is to exaggerate differences, then impose a value judgment and attribute the lesser behavior of others to their (usually bad) character. This is known as the Attributive Error, whereby the *circumstances* of or situational pressures on others are ignored in favor of explaining their behavior as due to personal traits or group *character*.[18]

In the vainglorious search for national differences, substantial *human commonalities* are inevitably ignored. According to sociologists, these commonalities are substantial. Many fundamental human values, needs, commonalities and ideals are shared by peoples across all national boundaries: the concept of justice, a capacity for compassion, care for kin, attachment to tradition, respect for authority, generosity, need to belong, reciprocity, rejection of gratuitous harming of others. Many of these commonalities have deep evolutionary roots,[19] some four hundred aptitudes and values that all cultures share.[20]

Since satisfaction in belonging is often based on a belief that one's group has a unique and prized national character, a focus on human commonalites undercuts that satisfaction—it "levels" people. Thus, "the most messianic nationalists do not dream of a day when all members of the human race will join their nation."[21] Moreover, acknowledgement of commonalities with others suggests, uncomfortably, a likelihood that in the other's situation, one would behave similarly.[22] Ehud Barak acknowledged that, had he been born a Palestinian, he "would have joined a terrorist organization."[23]

Race is another way to dismiss human commonality, separating "us" from "them" in behavior and character. This nineteenth century notion that

minor biological differences between people denote moral, intellectual, or character differences is without scientific basis.[24] It seems that when people prize more of what they believe to be theirs by race or culture, they fail to prize what is theirs as human beings.

Looking for Negative Differences

Some psychologists, sociologists, and evolutionary scientists postulate that there is a human *need* to discover alien traits in others. Such a "drive" to find such differences, no matter how inconsequential, has, perhaps, an evolutionary basis. Brian Rotman: "it seems an undeniable anthropological fact that human groups rely on mechanisms of exclusion, on maintaining differences and the hostilities they generate, to cohere and perpetuate themselves."[25] Negativity towards other groups additionally increases regard for one's own.[26]

Freud referred to the self-regarding need to diminish others, even for minor reasons, as the "narcissism of minor differences," a need he explained in terms of an instinctual aggressive drive.[27] Jacques Barzun describes how entirely *irrelevant* differences result in gratuitous hostility toward others. He gives the example of how, upon separating people (arbitrarily) into two groups, they will *automatically* create prized belonging in "us" and disdain for "them"—what he calls "race-thinking:"[28] Apparently, the nationalist's need to prize his own people over others, illusion or not, is here to stay.

Moral Order or Conformism?

In hypernationalist states, the primary allegiance of citizens is to the state which is seen as the source of all political and social power. This heightens the danger of citizen conformism. Individual morality, which is ordinarily based on a compassion for others, and individual responsibility, which is dependent on personal autonomy, may suffer. Zygmunt Bauman argues (perhaps in the extreme) that morality and conformity are things the state "manipulates"—that national unity is *not* the basis of moral order, as Liah Greenfeld claims, but a product which the state manufactures and exploits.[29] In Bauman's view (or Chomsky's "manufactured consent"), the state is not a humanizing or moralizing force but a power machine that usurps, isolates and routinizes its citizens (Arendt's "banality of evil").[30] Of course, modern societies *are* hierarchical and citizen success and safety *do* in fact require some degree of conformity. But in hypernationalisms, individual morality, and responsibility are more radically shifted to state authority, even in democracies.[31]

Historian Steve Paulsson argues that morality is not the business of states in any event. He maintains that states are in the business of protecting their citizens and, in this respect, the "differences between nations are for the most part differences in their *situations*, and not that of intrinsic moral or other qualities"[32] If true, citizens with private moral concerns in nationalistic states are in double jeopardy.

Racism in the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

The Israeli-Palestinian clash concerns competing national liberation movements and their struggle for the same land. Yet the struggle has degenerated into the usual ethno/cultural "us vs. them" assassinations of each other's national character. Exaggerations about the separate, unbridgeable, and uniquely negative traits of the other have transformed a territorial conflict between two Semitic peoples into a stubborn racist war. The antagonists explain the brutal behavior of the other in terms of defective *character* rather than in terms of the locked *situation* both are in—the aforementioned Attributive Error.

The Israelis see the Palestinians as a cruel people, indifferent to human life, savage, duplicitous, and cowardly; whereas the Palestinians see the Israelis as aggressive, brutal, without remorse, and cowardly—remarkably symmetrical accusations. This racism can be seen in the streets.[33] Israeli leaders publicly express racist attitudes towards Palestinians,[34] and Palestinian leaders openly acknowledge Palestinian racist attitudes toward Jews.[35] It is the racism embedded in all wars and colonizations—the inferiorization of the other—and a militant belief in the entitlements of the better people.

Summary

The paradox of nationalism consists in its contrasting liberal and illiberal aspects. The nationalist seeks liberation and self-determination, yet may aggressively deny these to others. He believes in "the people" yet excludes minorities. He savors his prized national character on the way to chauvinist wars. He pledges allegiance to the state, and erodes his personal morality. He longs for goodness, but sees not the same longing in his enemies.

There is no question that nationalism meets an unquenchable social, political and psychological need for security and identity. At its height, it even offers a quasi-religious sense of election, special destiny, and dignity—even a kind of collective immortality through "our people." In its extreme, however, there is a cost to nationalism, as Anthony Smith warns: the "proliferation

and exacerbation of ethnic conflicts, the persecution of 'indigestible' minorities in the drive for greater national homogeneity, justification of terror, ethnocide, and genocide on a scale inconceivable in earlier ages."[36]

Notes

1. Peter Alter, *Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (London, Edward Arnold, 1994), 35. The central ideology of nationalism is that "the nation is the source of all political and social power and loyalty to the nation overrides all other allegiances." Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991), 74.

2. "Yesterday's oppressed cannot help becoming the oppressors of today because they are afraid lest they be again oppressed tomorrow. Hence, the process of national liberation must stop at some point, and that point is determined not by the logic of nationalism, but by the configuration of interest and power between the rulers and the ruled and between competing nations." Hans Morganthau. Cited by Louis Snyder, *Encyclopedia of Nationalism* (New York: Paragon House, 1990), 1.

3. Nationalism, *in theory*, may be neutral regarding national superiorities, that is, simply be "an ideological movement aiming to attain or maintain autonomy, unity and identity for a social group which is deemed to constitute a nation." The strong tendency, however, is belief in superiority. Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (Harmonsworth: Penguin, 1991), 51.

4. Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 7.

5. Liah Greenfeld, *The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and economic growth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), quoted by John Gray, *TLS* June 7, 2002, 9.

6. Joseph Schumpeter, *The Sociology of Imperialisms* (Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Co., 1951), 11, 12.

7. The Sephardim (North African) and Mizrachim (Iraq and Iran) have been seen by the Ashkenazim (European) as "primitive, culturally undeveloped, religiously medieval, ethnically stunted, . . . generally Other (almost Arab, some would have said.)" Rabbi Michael Lerner, *Healing Israel/Palestine* (San Francisco: Tikkun Books, 2003), 74–75, 219. The Ashkenazim referred to Yememite and Moroccan Jews as "Blacks." Ilan Halevi, *A History of the Jews: Ancient and Modern* (London: Zed Books, 1987), 14.

8. Ilan Halevi, *A History of the Jews*, 166.

9. David Shipler, *Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land* (New York: Penguin Books, 1987), 252.

10. Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verso, 1983), 7.

11. Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964), 169. Ernest Gellner argues that a people's kinship is at least partly *biological*. John Beattie asserts that it is entirely *social* (a language or idiom providing mere form

for content political, economic, or religious). David Schneider argues for the primacy of *cultural* content. See Louis Dumont, *Introduction to Two Theories of Social Anthropology,* ed. and trans, by Robert Parkin (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006).

12. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.

13. Greenfeld, *Nationalism*, 18.

14. When authenticity of self is acquired through connection with an ancestral past, that past can also *impair* the capacity for change. For example, the Zionists were frustrated by the reluctance of traditional ritualistic Jews to *reinvent* themselves in Palestine.

15. Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Construction of Peoplehood: Racism, Nationalism, Ethnicity," in Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (New York: Verso, 1991), 78–79. Emphasis added.

16. For example, biblical versions of the past are enlisted for contemporary purposes in modern Israel. Israel's "title-deed to Palestine" is, according to Ben-Gurion, God's promise to Abraham. *The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954), 100. Jewish settlers justify the killing of Palestinians as the fulfillment of God's command to the Israelites (Deut. 7:2) to kill all Canaanites. Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994) 564–65. The site of ancient Masada is employed to inspire the patriotism of contemporary soldiers.

17. The usual stereotypes: the thrifty Scotsmen, belligerent Germans, tradition-bound French, naïve Americans, cold Swedes. Yet the tradition-bound French guillotined their king. The belligerent Germans are musically gifted, intelligent, and peaceful. In short, every stereotype fits in some way at some time but changes in response to historical stimuli or circumstance. Hamilton Fyfe, Francis Delaisi, and J. M. Robertson. Snyder, *Encyclopedia*, 235–36.

18. Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil* (New York: Random House, 2007), 258–96. "I was late because the bus was late; you were late because you are inconsiderate."

19. Steven Pinker, "The Moral Instinct," *New York Times*, 13 January 2008, Section 6, 37.

20. A study of fifty nations found "a surprisingly widespread consensus regarding the hierarchal order of values." Schwartz, S. H. and Bardi, A., "Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32 (2001), 268. See also, Richard Stuart, "Twelve Practical Suggestions for Achieving Multicultural Competence," *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, Vol. 35, No. 1, (2004), 5. There is "an astonishingly detailed set of aptitudes and tastes that all cultures have in common. Their shared way of thinking, feeling, and living makes us look like a single tribe." Steven Pinker, *The Blank Slate*, New York: Penguin, 2003, 53. Citing Donald Brown, *Human Universals*, Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1991.

21. Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* 7.

22. Some social psychologists, such as Kwame Anthony Appiah, conclude that less emphasis should be on "character education" and more on establishing *situations*

in which people's better selves can flourish. *Experiments in Ethics* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2008).

23. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, "The Israeli Lobby," *London Review of Books*, 23 March 2006, 5.

24. Genetic differences among "races" are no greater than genetic differences within any one race. Race is a "social construct," according to Herbert Gans (sociologist). Lynn Morgan (anthropologist) notes, "race is not a fact rooted in nature, but an ideology that justifies treating people differently based on the meanings we attribute to physical differences." Cited in "Race: A Word, an Ideology or a Fact?" *New York Times*, Letters, 20 March 2005.

While there are superficial genetic differences between groups (e.g., skin color or sickle cell tendencies in Blacks), these are not markers of "race." For example, sickle cell occurs in whites that have lived in a malarial environment—an adaptive defense against malaria. Skin color is an adaption to the sun. Facial features like Asian eyefolds have most likely developed as a result of sexual selection (cultural ideas of beauty). Such small physical group differences, upon which racial classifications are based, have no known genetic relation to intelligence, temperament, or other behavioral and personality traits. See Donald Brown, *Human Universals* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991). There is no known genetic basis for thinking that the values, needs, attitudes or social capacities of one group are different from another.

25. Brian Rotman, "Monobeing," *London Review of Books*, 17 February 2005, 30. Researchers hypothesize that "people are at a very basic level wired to distrust outsiders." In dangerous situations requiring rapid response, it is thought to be an evolutionary advantage to have an immediate response based on preestablished stereotypes. Nancy Wartik "Hard-Wired for Prejudice" *New York Times*, 20 April 2004, F5.

26. Research at University of Michigan in 1997 by Steven Spencer et al., cited by Wartik "Hard-Wired for Prejudice," F5. "The evil, barbarity, and licentiousness of the colonized Other . . . make possible the goodness, civility, and propriety of the European Self." Michael Hardt and Antonia Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 127. Respect is dependent on standing *within* a community—foreigners, thus, are mistrusted. Jonathan Glover, *Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 28.

27. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents* Vol. XXI (New York: Norton, 1961), 114. Vamik Volkan ascribes the same phenomenon to unconscious projection of one's own negative characteristics (including aggressiveness) onto others, leading to disparagement or aggression toward others. Vamik Volkan, *Blood Lines: from ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press), 89.

28. "Suppose [there exists] a group of thirty to forty fairly congenial people working together in an office or factory; they observe common ways and achieve mutual understanding; they think of themselves as one entity—'the sixth floor' or 'Wing B' or 'the department of such-and such.' Now divide them at random into two parts and move one or the other half to another floor or building, but maintain intermittent

relations through their work. Shortly, 'cultural' differences will develop. Old habits and tolerances will break down, friction and resentment will arise. Soon each group will tend to ascribe unpleasant characteristics to all the members of the other group. It will be a more or less open conflict of 'We' and 'They'—'They' being those impossible people on the tenth floor, who never do what they should and always what they shouldn't . . . 'race' differences." Jacques Barzun, *Race: A Study in Superstition* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), ix. This phenomenon has been repeatedly confirmed by social scientists. See David Berreby, *Us and Them: Understanding Your Tribal Mind* (New York: Little, Brown and Co., 2005), chapters 8 and 10. This "Lord of the Flies" (William Golding) sort of phenomenon was repeated in the Zimbardo guard/prisoner experiment at Stanford University demonstrating arbitrary cruelty. "The sudden transmogrification of likeable and decent American boys into near monsters of the kind allegedly to be found only in places like Auschwitz or Treblinka is horrifying." Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968), 167.

29. Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, 183.

30. Bauman focuses on the chilling effect of bureaucracies and expertisms. Theodor Adorno stresses the danger of excessive or pathologic loyalty to authority, fear *and* over-respect.

31. Even in democratic societies, complicity with authority can be dangerous. For example, in the famous Milgram "obedience to authority" experiments, ordinary U.S. citizens will inflict lethal-level electric shocks on their fellows if responsibility is assumed by a scientific authority. Normal men, as soldiers, will massacre innocents with only implied authority or social pressure. See Chris Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992). Exceptions exist (e.g., the Israeli soldiers who refuse to serve in the occupied territories or pilot planes that bomb civilians). For a good survey of authoritarian situations that determine behavior and override "moral character" or personal values, see Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect*, chapter 12.

32. Steve Paulsson, "The Bridge over the Oeresund: The Historiography on the Evacuation of the Jews of Nazi-occupied Denmark," *Journal of Contemporary History* (1995). Paulsson is Senior Historian, Imperial War Museum and Fellow, U.S. Holocaust Museum.

33. A Palestinian shouts to an Israeli policeman (an Ethiopian Jew), "Go back to the jungle!," and a different Israeli policeman shouts back, "I'm going to fuck your mother!" The Palestinian retorts, "You're the cunt brother of sixty-six whores." Jeffrey Goldberg, "Arafat's Gift," *The New Yorker*, 29 January 2001, 58. An Israeli schoolboy curses two passing Palestinian girls: "Cunts! Do you let your brothers fuck you?" Jeffrey Goldberg, "Among the Settlers: will they destroy Israel?" *The New Yorker*, 31 May 2004, 48.

34. 1982 Kahan Commission Report: "two-legged animals" (Begin); "jackals" suited for "extermination" (Begin); "grasshoppers" (Shamir); "drugged roaches in a bottle" (Eitan); "kill the mosquito" (Barak); "cut off their testicles" (Sharon). Effie

Eitam (former Sharon housing minister) described Palestinians as "creatures who came out of the depths of darkness . . . we will have to kill them all—I know it's not very diplomatic." Jeffrey Goldberg, "Among the Settlers: will they destroy Israel?" *The New Yorker*, 31 May 2004, 59.

35. The PLO admitted in 1970 that "we Palestinians learnt to hate the Jews and everything Jewish." *The Militant*, 9 October 1970. In 1969–1970, Arafat and the PLO called for an end to anti-Semitism and proposed a binational, democratic state over all of Palestine. Palestinian leaders toured the West Bank and condemned the anti-Jewish character of some Arab propaganda. Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, 440. The goal: "a new humane image of the Jew." Alain Gresh, *The PLO: The Struggle Within, Toward an Independent Palestinian State* (London: Zed Books, 1985), 44.

Some Israelis accept part responsibility for Palestinian racism. Moshe Dayan asked: "Why should we condemn their hatred toward us? For eight years they have been sitting in the Gaza refugee camps, while before their very eyes we have been taking possession of the land and villages where they and their forefathers lived." Howard Sachar, *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time* (New York: Knopf, 1986), 596. Amos Oz expressed guilt about what the Jews had done to create Palestinian hatred.

36. Smith, *National Identity*, 176.

❧❦❧

Religion and Possession in Ancient Palestine

Ancient Palestine (Canaan) was part of the "Fertile Crescent," an agricultur-
ally rich and coveted land as well as a trade and military corridor extending
from modern Egypt to Iraq. It was a natural place for the migration for desert
peoples, especially those from the Arabian desert known as Semites, which in-
cluded Arabs, Canaanites, Hebrews, Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians,
Aramaeans, and Akkadians. Other non-Semitic peoples also migrated to the
area from Egypt, the Persian Gulf (Sumarians), the Aegean (Philistines),
Anatolia (Hittites), and Armenia (Hurrians). All these migrations brought
peoples with their own gods, armies, faiths, cultures, and claims. They influ-
enced each other, they warred, they fell, yet had lasting effects.

A quick review of this region's long and complex history may offer some
perspective on claims about exclusive or predominant possession of ancient
Palestine—modern claims that have recently been reductively narrowed to
Jews and Muslims. It is also popular today to picture a violent sectarian, his-
torical struggle between two *faiths*, Islam and Judaism. This exaggeration,
too, creates a false impression that the conflict today in Palestine is sub-
stantively about faith differences rather than possession of a coveted land.
Exaggerations about both a unique ancestral possession and about faith dif-
ferences have been used as justifications, if not banners, in a frankly na-
tionalistic and modern conflict over possession of Palestine.

To survey a nine or ten millennium history is a formidable task even for
an expert, let alone an interested traveler. But I hope that this brief summary
aids in appreciation of the panorama of a history that cannot be enlisted or

reduced to modern claims about biblical or territorial entitlement. Naturally, in the West we are inclined to see the history of Palestine through our theo-centric and ethnocentric prism, specifically, the Judeo-Christian tradition. The glories and struggles of the Israelites and Christians seem to us to be *the* history of Palestine, and we look to the Bible for understanding our faith. Not surprising, the Old Testament, written down over the course of six centuries (1000 to 400 BC?)[1] is neither self-consistent nor always compatible with ancient tablets, archeological studies, or linguistic scholarship. Abraham's very existence, for example, finds little evidence apart from the Bible, written many centuries after his presumed life.[2] The idea, too, of God's Promised Land to Abraham, while it powerfully expresses in the West a faith in territorial redemption, largely distorts the history of Palestine as though it is primarily a history of Judeo-Christian peoples and their beliefs.[3]

Pre-Biblical Egyptian and Sumerian Times and the Hyksos Invasion of Egypt

Experts say that Palestine was settled around 8000 BCE (BC) by people who possessed crops, domesticated animals, gods, and trade. But it would be another *five millennia* before writing was invented, making documented history possible. If we limit inquiry to documented history, what was occurring around 3000 BC? The more western section of the Fertile Crescent (modern Palestine, Syria, Sinai, Lebanon) was under Egyptian control from about 3000 BC to 1800 BC. Egypt enjoyed an especially golden age of prosperity, literature, medicine, land reclamation, and trade from about 2000 to 1786 BC.

In the more *eastern* section of the Fertile Crescent, Mesopotamia (modern Iraq) was controlled by the brilliant Sumerian culture which endured for five hundred years (2850–2360 BC). The Sumerians lived in relative peace and prosperity, traded far and wide, developed the arts (architecture, gem, and metal work) and practiced a highly developed polytheism involving a central God. Akkadians in the north of Mesopotamia adopted the Sumerian culture and dominated the area for another two hundred more years (until 2180 BC). This Mesopotemian empire extended as far west as the Mediterranean Sea.

Around 2100 BC, a semi-nomadic people from the Arabian desert, the Amorites, overran Mesopotamia and Palestine. Life in Palestine suffered major disruption and urban life was in shambles for several centuries.[4] The Amorites established in Mesopotamia the First Babylon Dynasty (1750 BC). A famous Babylonian king, Hammurabi (1728–1686 BC), instituted a Code of Laws that has a remarkable likeness to the biblical Covenant Code. More-

over, biblical stories about the Creation, the Garden of Eden, the Tower of Babel, and the Flood appear to relate to Babylonian myths. Some historians believe that Abraham might have been a contemporary of Hammurabi and that future Israelites were related to the Amorites.[5]

Egypt was weakened by internal political conflicts and fell in 1720 BC to Hyksos invaders coming out of Syria. They seem to have been composed of Amorites, Canaanites, Israelites, and Hurrians.[6] Waves of Hyksos invasions took place at roughly the time of the biblical account of the descent of Joseph and Jacob's family into Egypt.[7] John McKenzie states, "most scholars agree that the Hyksos period is the likely background for the story of Joseph and the settlement of the Israelites in Egypt."[8] Joseph, grandson of Abraham, apparently held a high Egyptian governmental position (equivalent to prime minister) during this period of Hyksos rule. This rule finally came to an end when the Egyptian Pharaoh, Ahmose I, began the expulsion of the Hyksos in 1580 BC, a flight which took place in waves, perhaps lasting until 1290 BC—a date that might correspond to the biblical description of an Israelite exodus from Egypt to Canaan.[9] Still, the biblical stories concerning this period raise many questions. Abraham, God's Covenant, Israelite enslavement in Egypt, Moses, the Exodus, and the subsequent Israelite extermination of the Canaanites are all legends of doubtful authenticity given archeological or other written documentation. For example, the existence of slavery in Egypt has been questioned.[10] And the biblical description of a divinely-commanded Israelite Holy War ("herem")[11] or genocide of the Canaanites is likely a serious exaggeration.[12]

The Israelites and Canaanites

While the Bible draws a sharp distinction between the infidel Canaanites and the Israelites, implying Israelite uniqueness and religious purity, that, too, is apparently overdrawn. The Canaanites and Israelites lived on good terms, intermarried and did not deny each other's gods. They shared a language (Hebrew being a dialect of Canaanite) and the original Israelites may have been Canaanites who later separated themselves off.

The Canaanite god, El, was a name sometimes used in the Old Testament for the Israelite god (later Yahweh).[13] El was the supreme Canaanite god, father of other lesser deities ("Baal" male; "Baalath" female) who were based on a belief that the natural sphere was governed by the mystery cycles of death and resurrection (human and agricultural)—"a highly developed sophisticated religion" not based on local fertility spirits as scholars once thought.[14] The Israelites "would serve Yahweh and Baal side by side in two

compartments or would identify Yahweh and Baal."[15] Canaanite and Old Testament religions were both "henotheistic," that is, postulated a central god without denying the existence of other gods,[16] a tradition found in Babylonian and Egyptian cultures as well.

According to McKenzie, "The influence of the Canaanites upon the Israelites in religion, culture, and other human activities was incalculable."[17] There did seem to be some differences, however. The Israelites, according to the Bible, believed that Yahweh had adopted them in their moment of need.[18] In gratitude, they stressed service to their god for benevolent deeds *already* done (e.g., the Exodus).[19] On the other hand, the Canaanites sought to influence their god *prospectively* to control nature. Another difference was political: local kings ruled the Canaanites. The Israelites thought of earthly kings as a violation of the almighty Yahweh. (Later, however, when faced with a Philistine invasion [below], they elected their first King, Saul.)

Local Uprisings and Settlement in Palestine

Palestine was organized in small city-states with multiple Canaanite kings ruling to their personal advantage, though beholden to Egyptian officials. Canaan society was essentially feudal, composed of patricians, a small middle class and rootless peasants. The disenfranchised peasants, the "Apiru," were composed of Amorites, Israelites, Canaanites, Hurrians, and Hittites, all quite poor. The lowest and most abused eked out an existence as "freebooters and bandits."[20] Sometimes they formed guerilla bands or hired out as mercenary soldiers. However, their joint rebellion finally led to the decline in Canaanite city-states. The Canaanite kings looked to Egypt for help, but Egypt was distracted by battles with the Hittite in Syria and Philistines in the Mediterranean.[21] When the Canaanite kings were finally defeated around 1125 BC, the Apiru diffused throughout the territory. The Israelites, in particular, settled in a loose confederation of two separate tribes in northern Palestine ("Israel") and southern Palestine ("Judah"). These two Israelite tribes had some kind of religion-based connection but lacked central authority, army, government, or community.

The Biblical Story of David and Solomon (1000 BC): A Monarchy and its Dissolution (922 BC)

In 1050 BC, a non-Semitic Philistine "sea people" poured out of the Aegean. Equipped with iron weapons, chariots, and horses, they established a beach-

head on the coast of Palestine. Out of military necessity the *northern* Israelite tribe elected Saul as their king, who, according to the Bible, was in constant and futile battle with Philistine invaders ("Philistine" = "Palestine").[22] The story told is that Saul was challenged by and jealous of David, a charismatic warrior and mercenary. When Saul tried to have David killed, David offered his small mercenary army to the Philistines.[23] Although a vassal to the Philistines, David was nevertheless permitted to be king of the *southern* (Judah) tribe. However, when subsequently elected as king of the northern (Israel) tribe, David, as ruler over a United Kingdom, posed a military threat to the Philistines. It is said that he warred against and defeated the Philistines and controlled all of Palestine. David took the Canaanite city of Jerusalem as his religious and political capital.

The Bible relates (in Psalms) that the Israelites were now committed to monarchy and adopted a new covenant (a new theology) in which God was said to promise: (1) the submission of all foreign nations to David's rule, (2) Israelite possession of Jerusalem (Zion), David's city, and (3) an eternal hereditary rule of the Davidic house.[24] The dynastic succession was troubled from the start when, after forty years, David's sons, Absalom and Adonijah, fought their aging father for rule. David appointed Solomon, a son by Bathsheba, to be king.

Solomon is said to have brought an era of peace, trade, and rich tribute from foreigners. While he built military installations and the Temple in Jerusalem, his was also an era of overspending, burdensome taxation, and imposition of slave labor on both Canaanite and Israelite peasants for the state (1 Kings 9:21).[25] In response, the population rebelled against the monarchy and the unified kingdom broke apart. The northern tribe seceded from the United Kingdom, leaving two rival states, each of diminished importance.[26] Both deteriorated socially and religiously, reverting to the cult of Baal and the golden bull.[27] They even fell into sporadic war against each other. In this weakening, Assyrian and Egyptian military advances brought the United Kingdom of David and Solomon to an end. It had lasted 80 years.

Continuing Change in Palestine:
The Assyrian Empire (722–586 BC)

The Assyrian Empire that included modern Iraq, Syria, and Palestine lasted 136 years. It was a tumultuous time when the populations of Palestine shifted. Most of the northern Israelite tribe was forcibly resettled eastward in Mesopotamia, whereas Babylonians and others under Assyrian domination

were transferred west to Palestine (Samaria). It was also a time of religious doubt. Yahweh and Baal were amalgamated and pagan practices found free reign.[28] Books purporting to be the old Deuteronomic Code of Moses were newly discovered in Judah, yet religious reforms failed.

Moreover, the theology of the Davidic Covenant was under challenge. Yahweh had promised never to forsake the Israelites and to defeat all foreigners. Assyrian domination thus meant that Yahweh came under doubt. Faith was restored, however, by appeal to the early Mosaic Covenant which, unlike the Davidic Covenant, stated that the Israelites would be destroyed if they disobeyed Yahweh's commandments (Deut. 28). Thus, it was the *idolatrous* Israelites themselves who were supposedly to blame for the Assyrian yoke, not Yahweh. Jeremiah and Ezekiel pressed on this solution and condemned the Israelites for their pagan practices: (a) mixing with and marrying into other cultures, (b) exploiting their own people, (c) worshipping false idols, and (c) failing to annihilate the Canaanites and other infidels as commanded in Deut. 7:1–5. Jeremiah scorned the Israelites as rebellious, blindly nationalistic, deceitful, "well-fed stallions" neighing for their neighbor's wives.[29] This self-condemnation, while it preserved Yahweh, nevertheless left the Israelites divided and dispersed.

Babylonian, Persian, Greek (Macedonian), and Roman Conquests of Palestine (586 BC–135 AD)

The Babylonians, successors of the Assyrians, controlled Palestine for fifty years. The political, wealthy, and religious elite of the southern Israelite tribe were transported to Babylon. Others fled to Egypt or east to Moab, Edom, or Ammon. As it turned out, these exiled Israelites were treated well by local authorities in *both* Babylon and Egypt. They established learning centers and flourished commercially in both places. In Palestine, however, Jerusalem was destroyed and those who remained lived a precarious existence.

The subsequent fall of Babylon to the Persians in 538 BC led to some other benefits for some Israelites. Under favorable treatment from Darius and Artaxerxes I, some Israelites moved back to Palestine (to the Judah area, from which the words "Judaism" and "Jew" are derived). The Temple was rebuilt and Ezra was permitted to establish an administration based on Old Testament law (the Torah). The Persian religion, Zoroastrianism (dating from around 1000 BC) shared much with Judaism.[30]

Persian rule lasted another two centuries until 332 BC when the Macedonian/Greek army of Alexander "The Great" swept through the Middle East. Hellenism thrived in art, literature, architecture, and government

in both Syria and Palestine. Alexandria became the principal intellectual center of the Jewish Diaspora. These urban Jews were granted special privileges.[31] They often rejected Judaic customs and laws and avidly absorbed Greek culture.[32] Judah Maccabee opposed this Hellenization of Jews. When Antiochus IV tyrannically outlawed Jewish law and ritual, dedicating the Temple in Jerusalem to Zeus, Maccabee mounted a rebellion. He made progress because the Macedonian forces were distracted in Persia. By 161 BC, he regained Jerusalem (celebrated in Hanukkah).

Throughout the next century, conflict between Macedonian forces and the Maccabee family line alternated with periods of relative peace. However, rivalries within the leadership of the Maccabee family, as well as conflicts between Jewish factions (Pharisees vs. Sadduccees),[33] would eventually undermine Jewish control. Palestine was incorporated into the Roman Empire under Pompey in 63 BC. The Temple in Jerusalem was later destroyed (70 AD) following an unsuccessful rebellion led by Pharisee Zealots.[34] Many Jews were forcibly dispersed in the following years.

Christianity in Palestine

The Pharisees, a Jewish sect dating from the Maccabee period, overlapped with Christians during the Roman rule of Palestine. Their reported mutual hostility was perhaps more a matter of jealousy over status (the chosen?) than theological disagreements. The Pharisees and Christians both believed in the same God, the resurrection of the dead, the existence of angels and spirits, messianism and the Final Judgment. They both pictured the imminent end of history—a final struggle of God and Satan in which the wicked (e.g., the Romans) would perish and the faithful live in everlasting peace.[35] This messianic view arose out of a conviction that a just God would not permit evil on earth, would not allow innocents to suffer nor idolaters to go unpunished—thus, Judgment Day. The Pharisaic rejection of Jesus as the messiah was based on the plain fact that evil still existed in the world.

The Pharisees criticized Jesus for his laxity regarding ritual, his rejection of priestly authority, his association with sinners, and his god-like claim of power to forgive the sins of the rabble. In turn, Jesus criticized the Pharisees for their arrogant exclusiveness and hypocritical devotion to ritual in neglect of the sacred obligation to love God and one's neighbors. Still, the differences were not great. They even shared worship for a few centuries.[36] Paul, a Pharisee, converted to Christianity, as did many other Jews. Christianity was widely accepted by 300AD.

Islam and the Arab Conquest of Palestine (636 AD)

Christianity held vast sway in the Middle East until the arrival of Islamic armies in 636 AD. These armies gradually arose from nomadic peoples from the Arabian Peninsula. These Semitic people lived as fiercely independent Bedouin tribes without central authority until Muhammad's small army gradually conquered their tribes and forged a kind of desert Islamic empire.[37] Muhammad gained Bedouin loyalty by avoiding punishment or exploitation of those he conquered. They agreed to unite, to end intertribal warfare and submit to the will of God. The focus of Muhammad's message was the unity of God, the evils of idol worship and the need for justice (already instilled in communal, nonhierarchical Arab tribes).

Islamic armies came to control Mesopotemia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt by 640 AD. But they drove further and longer: attacked Constantinople in 670, advanced through Persia into Afghanistan, captured part of India, captured Carthage in North Africa, invaded Spain in 711, and conquered territory in Georgia and the Caucasus in 738. Within a century, their rule extended from Spain to India.

Believers in Islam (Muslims) accepted the Abrahamic God of the Jews and Christians but considered Islam to be the "perfection" of the Jewish and Christian traditions. Muhammad's recitations, viewed as divine messages, were compiled in the Quran—the basis of Islamic law (not unlike the Torah for the Jews). Other declarations by Muhammad concerning customs and practices during his lifetime in Medina were recorded in the Sunna, an interpretive guide to the Quran (not unlike the Talmud). Sunni Muslims accepted the Sunna, Shiites did not. (Shiites also held that the succession of the caliphs after Muhammad's death must be hereditary.) Muslims did not consider themselves to be God's special people nor recipients of divine promises. At the same time, Jews and Christians, though "People of the Book," were considered to have corrupted God's laws. While Jews and Christians were second-class citizens, excluded from privileges or elite positions under Muslim rule, they did have a right to worship.[38]

Islamic Factional Disputes: The Umayyads, Abbasids, and Fatimids (661–1070 AD)

While many conquered people converted to Islam, their ethnic diversity and geographical spread outstripped the Muslims' capacity to hold their empire together. Moreover, factional differences arose *within* Islam, infecting dynastic rule. For example, the Umayyads ruling from Damascus were driven out

in 750 (except in Spain) by a Sunni Abbasid faction that built its capital in Baghdad.

The Abbasids achieved a rich and lasting culture sometimes compared to that of ancient Greece. Their trade with Europe and Asia resulted in economic prosperity and their knowledge of distant worlds contributed to high achievements in the arts, sciences, and law.[39] However, after several centuries, rigidity and conformism infected Islamic thinking. Islamic law was taken to be complete, immutable, and infallible. And the old factional quarrels erupted over the issue of hereditary succession rights—leading to a split between the Sunni Abbasids in Iraq and the Shia Fatimids in Cairo.[40]

This weakening through factional dispute created opportunities for Berber and Turk invaders. By 1075, Palestine, Syria, and Baghdad were under the control of the Seljuk Turks, a *non-Arab* people of central Asia origin. Both these Turks and the Berbers, who controlled North Africa and Spain, gradually adopted the Islamic (Sunni) faith of their Arab subjects. Turks in Palestine subsequently became the victims of the Christian Crusaders in 1099. The Christians were in pursuit of religious purity, territorial expansion, dynastic advantage, riches, trade routes, and adventure, but, most ardently, the removal of Turkish infidels from the Holy Land (1099). For a century, Palestine was under Christian control until, in 1187, it was returned by Saladin to Seljuk Turk rule for another century.

The Ottoman Turk Empire (1290–1918)

The Ottoman Turks were also a *non-Arab* people, descendents of tribal warriors from Russia and Asia. They began absorbing the Seljuk Turk Empire in 1290. Gradually they embraced Islam and increasingly ruled the Middle East. They conquered Constantinople in 1453 (ending the Byzantine Eastern Roman Empire) and advanced into Persia, Arabia, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Egypt (Cairo taken in 1517). By 1683, the Ottoman Empire extended to the southern rim of the Mediterranean (Libya, Tunisia, and Algeria) and into Europe (Hungary, Macedonia, Bulgaria). Vienna nearly fell twice.

The Ottoman Turks, while absorbing the Islamic *faith* of Arabs, found in the *ethnic difference* of Arabs reason for exclusion. As a result, Arabs in the Middle East remained in political decline for the next four centuries—in fact, to the end of World War I and beyond. Constraints were placed on Jews, Christians, and Zoroastrian Persians because of their religion. They were permitted to practice their faiths but rarely given permission to build churches or synagogues. Christians were under suspicion of disloyalty as a potential European-inclined fifth column.[41] For persecuted Iberian Jews, able to prosper

in trade, the Ottoman Empire proved to be something of a haven, though not for all Jews.[42] The peasant classes suffered the most, impoverished by exorbitant taxes or conscripted into the army. The Ottoman government did institute some positive advances in the 1800s, for example, land reform and education in Egypt, Tunisia, and Syria.[43]

European Imperialism and the Dissolution of the Ottoman Empire (1830–1918)

Napoleon's occupation of Egypt and Palestine in 1798, designed to block Britain's route to Asia, was a foretaste of European colonialist penetration of the Ottoman Empire. France invaded Algeria in 1830, Syria in 1860, controlled Tunisia in 1881, and subsequently Morocco. Britain occupied Aden (Arabia) in 1839, Cyprus in 1878, and Egypt in 1882. The Europeans discouraged indigenous democratic impulses in these "veiled protectorates" in order to maintain colonialist rule and economic profit.[44] Ottoman territory was also coveted by Russia, for example, in the Crimea and Persia.[45] The Europeans, technologically and financially more advanced, constantly demanded and obtained Ottoman concessions.[46] This led to a gradual and predictable disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, "the sick man of Europe." A final Ottoman political mistake was alignment with the German Central Powers during World War I. Defeat in 1918 led to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire.

The Arabs within the Empire expected to be liberated after four centuries of oppressive Ottoman rule. Instead, traditional Arab territory (Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, Egypt, and Jordan) came under British and French League of Nations "mandate" control in 1920. These territories gained independence during the interwar period, except Palestine, leaving us with the Arab-Israeli conflict today.

Observations

The similarity of the three monotheistic faiths, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, is notable. Each worships the same Abrahamic God. Each advances laws and rituals that, in obedience, impart salvation and membership as a holy people. Each divides the world into good and evil, the pure and the polluted. Each stresses peace, justice, final reward, and punishment. At the same time, each faith is imbued with a self-entitling conviction that the God speaks uniquely to them, that they are closer to God—in truth, holiness, and worth.

Each, being a faith, is unassailable (i.e., safe from empirical refutation). The Jews have classically believed in their divinely appointed election and task as "a light among nations," celebrating their separation from unclean Gentiles. On the other hand, the Christians have seen themselves as superseding any covenant between God and the Jews, themselves the true believers, the "new Israel." Whereas Christians have their Messiah, the Jews await theirs, and the Muslims have their Prophet. Each faith pictures an eschatological end of history with final attainment of peace, justice, and revenge on infidels, if not now, then in the hereafter.[47] Even the ancient henotheisms of the Canaanites, Jews, Babylonians, Sumerians, Egyptians, Assyrians, and Persians have their similarities if simplifications are pressed far enough.

The history presented in this chapter raises questions about the connection between faith and warfare—questions perhaps too global to be answerable. And yet one still wonders what factors lay behind those wars in Palestine. Were they about *ideas* (faith or cultural differences), or more material pssession? We do know that in ancient times, wars were about possession of coveted agricultural lands, property, women, and tithe.[48] But what role did faith or cultural differences play? It seems at least that religious, cultural, or ethnic identity differences provide a *necessary condition* for war—differences that create sufficient *social cohesion* for an "us" to fight "them." And today in Palestine? Is it a religious or ethno-cultural war, as it often seems? Or are those factors that abound in antagonisms only *secondary* to a conflict more directly about possession of land? And if those secondary factors were surmounted? If Arabs and Jews saw themselves as Semitic brothers or neighbors, would the be warring over land or sharing it?

Concerning the modern claim that *ancestral* possession confers title to Palestine—that modern Jews are descended from the Israelites and modern Palestinians from the Canaanites[49]—would not the diversity of peoples and dynasties through five millennia defy assignment of Palestine to *any* one people—even if ancestral lines *could* be validated, or if ancestral possession *could* confer such rights? Or can a faith-based claim to title on grounds that a god bestowed possession on condition of extermination of another people warrant belief in the modern age?

Understandably, Jews and Christians focus on biblical stories that provide them with a cultural heritage. Yet Jewish history in Palestine was a relatively small and brief event among the histories of many peoples (even though this survey draws heavily on biblical sources).[50] From a religious, cultural, and emotional perspective, every people's history is believed both to authenticate their identity and validate their entitlements—a profound and compelling

presumption. Nevertheless, the ancient history of Palestinians and Jews cannot validate modern claims, either political or territorial.

Notes

1. The Old Testament seems to have been written down by multiple authors between 1000 and 400 BC, largely during the period of exile in Babylon. It focuses on a powerful theme in the Book of Exodus on a supposed national liberation from Egyptian slavery.

2. Scholars concur that virtually nothing can be known about Abraham. John Barton, "Out of Samaria," *Times Literary Supplement*, 23 March 2007, 31.

3. David Ben-Gurion refers to God's promise to Abraham as Israel's "title-deed" to Palestine. *The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954), 100.

4. John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 44. The Israelites and Amorites were both Semitic peoples. Note: "Semite" is not a reference to Jews, as in ordinary usage today, but an ethnic term for people who speak a dialect of the Semitic language, such as those who live in Turkey, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Israel, Arabia, and North Africa. The Arabian desert is the probable cradle of all Semitic people. Bernhard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986), 34.

5. Bright, *A History of Israel*, 50. Also Roland de Vaux affirms this connection.

6. Bright, *A History of Israel*, 61.

7. Bright: "Ancestors of Israel doubtless entered Egypt in the Hyksos period, other Israelites came or were brought there at various times." Bright, *A History of Israel,* 139.

8. John McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), 380. "It is not improbable that there was some kinship between the two groups [Hyksos and Israelite]. During no other period is it conceivable that the Israelites could have enjoyed the royal favor which is described in their tradition." (380) Joseph's virtual "prime ministership" in Egypt cannot be explained if the pharaoh were not a Semitic Hyksos king.

9. According to Exodus 12:40, some Israelites were in Egypt for 430 years. Counting from the date of the original invasion (1720 BC), the exodus would have occurred in 1290 BC (1720 − 430 = 1290).

10. Egyptian slavery, in scale and type suggested in the Bible, "did not exist in ancient Egypt or anywhere in that ancient world," according to John Romer, *Testament: The Bible and History* (New York, Henry Holt, 1988), 62. James Kugel, *How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now* (Free Press, 2007); Karen Armstrong, *The Bible: A Biography* (Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2007).

11. Herem or Holy War is the sacrificial dedication of persons, booty, or cities to God. All these belong to God and must be withdrawn from common use through

their complete destruction. Yet cities were destroyed only when they resisted. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 141, 142.

12. Bright, *History of Israel*, 129–33. John Romer, *Testament: The Bible and History*, 69–71, 75–76. Hebrew, in which the Old Testament is written, is a dialect of the Canaanites, the very nation that Joshua presumably destroyed (Romer, 70). Canaanites remained in Palestine for many centuries *after* their alleged extermination.

13. El is a Hebrew word meaning God, and in the Pentateuch (Numbers), El seems to be a synonym for Yahweh. "El Shaddai" is used five times in the Pentateuch. It seems, as with the Canaanites, to have associations in ancient Semitic mythology with the cosmic mountain home of gods—the volcanic god of fire and brimstone. Alter, *The Five Books of Moses*, 339. Both gods, El and El Shahhai, speak through thunder and storm (1 Kings 19:11). Romer, *Testament*, 79. The Israelites were under steady pressure to assimilate Yahweh to the Canaanite Baal. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 317.

14. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 188.

15. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 190. Israelites kept figurines of the Canaanite goddess of fertility and parents named their children after Baal (e.g., Saul and David did so). During the Davidic-Solomon monarchy (1000–922 BC), the worship of Yahweh was more prominent, and the worship of Baal was minimized. When the monarchy broke apart into rival northern and southern states, Baal was again accepted by many Israelites (Bright, *History of Israel,* 261).

16. The monotheism of the Israelites before 6th century BC is "questioned by many historians. . . . A speculative philosophical affirmation of monotheism appears nowhere in the Bible. Nor can we find in the Old Testament the monotheism that is evident in the New Testament. Modern historians have invented the terms 'henotheism' and 'monolatry' to describe the religion of early Israel." John McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 584. Robert Alter concludes, similarly, "Hebrew writers had no difficulty in conceding the existence of other deities, though always stipulating, as here, their absolute inferiority to the God of Israel." Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005), cited by James Wood, *London Review of Books*, February 23, 2006, 5.

17. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 118. For example, Hebrew is a dialect of the Canaanite language.

18. Election refers to Yahweh's choice of the Israelites, not for their special merit but as his "own possession" or "private property," as evidenced through his protection of them by mighty acts when in dire need. Bright, *History of Israel*, 149.

19. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 192. The covenant had similarities to the Hittite-like vassal-king relationship in which the vassal would recognize the authority of no other king, would obey his commands and pay homage.

20. Bright, *History of Israel*, 139, 177.

21. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 128.

22. A need for central authority was imperative, but Saul brought no central government either to the north or south. Bright, *History of Israel*, 190. While fighting the

Philistines, he did achieve a notable victory over the Amalekites from the Negev, a tribe that in the Bible had attacked the Israelites in the Sinai. Some Israelis today believe that the Amalekites are the ancestors of Palestinians.

23. According to the Bible, David was formerly a musician, slayer of Goliath, bandit, and extortionist. Nevertheless, Saul was allegedly deeply jealous of David's exploits and popularity. There is little archeological writings or other evidence that biblical figures such as Abraham, Moses, Saul, Solomon, or David were actual historical figures.

24. Bright, *History of Israel*, 225.

25. The aristocrats "regarded the people as subjects to be possessed body and soul." Bright, *History of Israel*, 223. "Social obligation was no longer to Yahweh's covenant, but to the state."

26. Bright, *History of Israel*, 229.

27. Both in the north and south, obligations were to the state, a privileged class emerged, tribal ties weakened, many shrines were overtly pagan. Bright, *History of Israel*, 260.

28. Sacred prostitution and human sacrifice were practiced and the astral cults (sun, moon, and star deities) of Mesopotamia were admitted into the Temple of Jerusalem. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 362.

29. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 381–82, 399.

30. Zoroastrianism was, like Judaism, "henotheistic"—a monotheistic tendency in which a central deity of unparalleled eminence still did not preclude other deities. The Zoroastrian god, Mazda, is creator, lawgiver, and judge. His ethical law is social as well as individual. Zoroastrianism and Judaism share the concept of an evil supernatural adversary (Satan), and both invoke judgment and retribution after death. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 662–63. The concept of Satan, God's adversary, explains evil in the world. The implication is that God is *not* all-powerful, but that resolution will found eschatologically—God will finally bring the world into right on Judgment Day. Bright, *History of Israel*, 456.

31. The Jews were given special privileges, functioning as middlemen, and were resented by the local Egyptians. Jews reviled the Egyptians as unclean Gentiles as prescribed in Gen. 8: 23, 25. Albert Lindemann, *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 27, 28.

32. Bright, *History of Israel*, 417. Greek colonies in Palestine existed in Samaria, Amman, Acre, Beisan, and just south of the Sea of Galilee. Greek ideas such as stoicism influenced Jewish thinking.

33. The Sadducees, the more priestly and literalist sect, differed from the Pharisees in their denial of the resurrection of the dead and lack of a messianic doctrine. The Sadducees accepted only the Torah versus Pharisaic acceptance of the oral Mosaic tradition of elders (upon which Talmudic interpretations were based). The Sadducees believed in peaceful coalition with foreign rulers, (i.e., collaboration of Hasmonean (Jewish) kings with the Romans, in contrast to the nationalism of Maccabean zealots). Maccabee zealots, in hatred of Gentiles and Jewish collabora-

tors, also employed terrorist methods and forced conversion on predominantly non-Jewish populations in Palestine (I Macc. 2:44–48).

34. Some of these Pharisee Zealots were assassins of both foreigners and Jews suspected of collaboration or compliance with Roman rule. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 947.

35. Jews varied in their views. There were shades of difference between the apocalypticists, nationalists, and legalists, yet "all gave allegiance to the law, . . . all had eschatological expectations and nationalist aspirations." The Sadducees were the exception. They denied the resurrection of the dead and lacked a messianic doctrine. Bright, *History of Israel*, 463.

36. *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Steven Katz, ed., Vol. 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), cited by Stefan Reif, "With and against the Jews," *Times Literary Supplement*, February 23, 2007, 9.

37. Tessler, *History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, 80.

38. Jews and Christians were tolerated with some protections including the right to worship. Michael Bonner, *Jihad in Islamic History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006). Cited by Emmanuel Sivan, "A spreading sway," *TLS*, September 14, 2007, 25. "If subject peoples paid their taxes and did nothing to help the enemies of the Muslims, they were left in peace. These Arabs were not fanatics. Muslims and Christians shared the church of St. John in Damascus, iconoclasm was rare." James Buchan, "Ghosts of the Conquest," *Guardian Weekly*, August 3, 2007, 37.

39. Other Islamic centers included those in Spain where prominent schools of medicine, mathematics, philosophy, poetry, and music flourished. The world's oldest university was founded in Cairo. Scholarly texts from ancient Greece and Rome were translated and preserved.

40. The Fatimids claimed a hereditary line from Muhammad, Fatima being Muhammad's daughter. The Abbasids kept control of Iraq; the Fatimids controlled North Africa, Sicily, Egypt, Palestine, and Syria—the Umayyids in Spain.

41. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001.* (New York, Vintage, 2001), 10.

42. Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 8. However, there were instances of massacres of Jews in Persia and Iraq in the vulnerable extremities of the Ottoman Empire, especially when Jews rose to high positions or elicited Muslim envy. This was not the case in the more self-confident core of the empire.

43. Advances were made in agricultural and industrial methods, transportation, government bureaucracy, military affairs, schools, and educational missions to Europe. Tunisia modernized its tax system, banking, and schools for mathematics, languages, and military sciences. Syria followed suit in 1831. Lebanese Christians, oriented toward Europe, developed world trade, secular schools, and borrowed modern ideas from the West.

44. Rashid Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 18–19. When a rebellion in 1881 led to a nationalist government, Britain bombed Egypt, captured Cairo (10,000 Egyptian soldiers killed) and installed its own consul with

virtually absolute power. The French practiced the same tactics. Tessler, *History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, 108–10.

45. Russia was defeated in the Crimean War of 1853. Britain favored the Ottomans, needing an Ottoman route to India.

46. The Ottomans gave France special privileges in trade and the protection of Christians living in the Ottoman Empire, as a way to regulate relationships with Christian foreign countries, but a situation upsetting to the Arab masses.

47. The idea of the hereafter (resurrection) is shared by the three Abrahamic faiths. While it is sparingly noted in the Old Testament, it is not absent (e.g., Daniel 12:2). Resurrection was a belief of the Pharisaic Judaic sect and is implied in the concept of justice for the righteous already deceased. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 668. See also Jon Levenson, *Resurrection and Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006). Levenson argues that, contrary to a very widespread misconception, the ancient rabbis were keenly committed to the belief that at the end of time, God would restore the deserving dead to life.

48. See Azar Gat, *War in Human Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

49. "The Palestinians are descendents of two ancient peoples, the Canaanite and the Philistines." Tessler, *History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict,* 69.

50. Bernhard Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 8. "Israel's history is a minor sideshow in the larger history of the ancient Near East, and its culture is overshadowed by the more brilliant cultures of antiquity."

Appendix A: Water Wars

Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin judged that "if we solve every other problem in the Middle East but do not satisfactorily resolve the water problem, our region will explode."[1] Access to water has been as important a factor as acquisition of land in the generation of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Indeed, land disputes have often centered on land with access to water sources. Aaron Wolf (Oregon University, consultant to the U.S. State Department) states:

> It seems clear that water was uppermost in the minds of planners and political decision-makers, particularly Zionists, as boundaries were negotiated over the years—at times assuming importance equal to more traditional definitions of security—and that specific territory was sought for its access to the water resources alone.[2]

Israel's conflicts with the Arab states have centered on water-rich territories in Syria and Lebanon. In fact, the struggle for water was "one of the underlying causes for the 1967 six-day war and Israel's invasion of Lebanon."[3] But Israel's struggles with the Palestinians have also been importantly about water resources, especially those on the West Bank.

Israeli Confiscation of West Bank and Gaza Strip Water

Water in Israel comes from three main sources: (1) the Jordan River basin where water that flows into the Sea of Galilee is piped into Israel through the National Carrier System; (2) mountain aquifers beneath the West Bank; and

(3) an aquifer in the western coastal plain of Israel that extends under the Gaza Strip. (An aquifer is a cavernous space in an underground rock formation that collects rainwater.) Both the Jordan River and the Palestinian aquifers have been over-pumped by Israel, reaching or crossing the point where sustainable and unpolluted water sources are threatened. Israel's over-pumping of the Jordan River has turned its weak southern flow into a polluted ditch, a product of saline spring discharges, dumped sewage, and runoff of farmland irrigated with recycled sewage.[4]

About 30 percent of Israel's water supply comes from two West Bank aquifers.[5] About 82 percent of this West Bank water is piped into Israel and Jewish settlements on the West Bank—about 500 million cubic meters (mcm) per year. This leaves Palestinians with 105 mcm or about 18 percent of their own water. A Jewish settler on the West Bank receives 5.6 times more water than a Palestinian.[6] A citizen in Israel is allocated 4.6 times more water than a Palestinian under occupation. The Hague and Geneva International Conventions prohibit the taking of natural resources (water) from occupied territory.

The only way Palestinians can tap into their aquifers is through wells, but Israel has denied them well licenses for the past fourteen years.[7] Jewish settlements have been strategically situated on top of the most plentiful and deepest wells. Tapping these wells has caused the water table to drop so that shallower Palestinian wells dry up, devastating Palestinian agriculture. Peter Beaumont, a Middle East water expert, observes:

> Since its occupation of the West Bank in 1967, Israel has regarded water as a strategic resource to be controlled by military discipline. As a result it has been impossible for the Palestinians to sink wells on their own land without the permission of the military governor. Over the years this permission has rarely been given. . . . The basic aim of their policy would appear to be to ensure maximum recharge of the Mountain Aquifer in the West Bank so that much of this water will then flow into Israel, where it can be utilized by Israelis. In its simplest terms this could be regarded as a form of "water piracy."[8]

Health and Other Consequences of Water Piracy for Palestinians

The United Nations' minimum water standard for maintenance of health and hygiene (drinking, cooking, bathing, sewage removal) is 100 liters per day (lpd) per person.[9] In some Palestinian areas water consumption is as low as 16 lpd, though more generally it is about half the UN minimum standard.

As a result there is insufficient water for animals and agricultural crops, a vital food source for most Palestinian households. Half of the more than 500 Palestinian villages and refugee camps have no piped water. Thus, Palestinians attempt to collect rainwater in rooftop cisterns in order to meet household needs during rainy periods (November–May). These cisterns are vulnerable to Israeli rifle fire and house demolitions.[10] Additional supplies by private tanker trucks are needed, a very high priced option because Israeli checkpoints delay or block delivery.[11] In larger Palestinian cities during the summer months, piped water may run for only one or two days a week.[12] Palestinians resent this deprivation of water for household and crops, and "today look with bitterness to the inequalities in their lifestyle as compared with the Israelis . . . the Israeli villas, the swimming pools, and even such everyday amenities as sewage/waste disposal and clean tap water."[13] Some Palestinians see this as an Israeli plan to force their emigration from the West Bank and Gaza.

Water in the Gaza Strip is especially limited for Palestinians. Jewish settlers in Gaza (prior to the 2005 evacuation) consumed eighteen times more water per person than Palestinians.[14] The Coastal aquifer that extends under Gaza has been radically over-pumped and thus has caused pollution and seepage of seawater, such that 80 percent of the drinking water is, at ten times the normal sodium content, unsuitable for human consumption. Sixteen percent of the wells in the Coastal aquifer area are unusable even for agriculture because of chlorine concentrations and seepage of industrial toxic chemicals.[15]

Israel devotes somewhere between 58 to 80 percent of its available water to agriculture—a remarkable figure given that agriculture accounts for only 2 percent of Israel's gross domestic product (and 3 percent of its civilian labor force). By exporting citrus fruits and flowers that need and contain large amounts of water, Israel ships "virtual water"[16]—what former Water Commissioner Menachem Kantor called a "national larceny." That larceny is largely paid for by Palestinians. Moreover, Israeli water consumption is crippling not only the health and economies of the Palestinians, but that of the surrounding Arab states.[17]

History of Conflict over Water with the Arab States

Water is an underlying factor in conflicts between Israel and the Arab states, all of whom depend on and need to share the same limited supply for their physical and economic survival. The deliberate manipulation of water flow in response to the political climate between states and the disproportionate taking of water from international rivers is known as the "water weapon."

Historically, the importance of water for a Jewish state was obvious to the early Zionists. Their proposals at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference had the explicit goal of garnering water from Lebanon's Litani River, Syria's Yarmuk River and all other sources of the Jordan River.[18] Chaim Weizmann wrote: "so far as the northern boundary is concerned, the guiding consideration with us has been economic, and economic in this connection means 'water supply.'"[19] The entire Zionist program of immigration and settlement depended on water for large-scale irrigation.[20] Ben-Gurion reiterated this goal in 1920: "It is necessary that the water sources, upon which the future of the Land depends, should *not be outside* the borders of the future Jewish homeland."[21]

More southern sources of water such as Lake Huleh and the Sea of Galilee were within Palestine, but their northern *headwaters* (the Hasbani, Dan, Litani, and Banyas rivers) were in Syria and Lebanon. Thus, the Zionists sought control of these northern areas (Syria's Golan Heights and Lebanon's Litani River).

Israel's fight with Syria over water began soon after the 1948 war. A 1949 UN-sponsored armistice between Israel and Syria created three water-rich DMZs, and agreement was reached that riparian rights to use or take water from these areas awaited formal peace treaty. Yet Israel ignored this agreement and in early 1951 began a $250 million development project to drain water from the Huleh area, part of the Jordan River system, for irrigation of the Negev Desert and the Jerusalem corridor.[22] This impinged on Syrian territory within the DMZ and was declared a "flagrant violation" of the armistice by a UN Commission. Nevertheless, Israel persisted and conducted air strikes in the Syrian DMZs, expelling 2,000 Arabs and bulldozing their homes.[23] The UN Security Council called for a cease-fire (May 1951) and for an end of the Israel's water project. Israel nevertheless continued this diversion of water and refused to allow UN observers to monitor this diversion.

In 1953, because of continuing Israeli-Syrian violence in the DMZ, President Eisenhower sent Eric Johnson to try to arrange a water-sharing agreement between Israel, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan. The Arab countries wanted the bulk of the water to remain in the area of its source, the Jordan River basin. On the other hand, Israel wanted the water diverted into Israel and southward to the Negev desert in order to convert that area into a vast industrial and agricultural land for further Jewish immigration. Although the bulk of the water originated in Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon, Johnson suggested allotting 40 percent to Israel, a similar amount to Jordan, 10 percent to Syria and none to Lebanon.[24] The Johnson plan failed to bring agreement.

Israel began taking water from the two West Bank aquifers in 1955.[25] And the following year, without consulting Syria or Jordan, Israel also began construction of a pumping station and major conduit called the National Water Carrier (completed in 1964) that was fed from the Sea of Galilee. Syria and Jordan objected to this taking for which Israel had no sovereign right. To prevent this taking, Syria and Lebanon attempted to outflank the Israelis by damming and diverting Syrian water away from the Sea of Galilee.[26] Syria had few other options since petitioning the United Nations regarding past Israeli violations had little effect.[27] And going to war with Israel would have been suicidal. Syria took the remaining option: diversion of the headwaters of the Jordan River. In response, Israel mounted air and artillery attacks.[28] Within a year, in June 1967, Israel attacked Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, gaining control of the headwaters of the Jordan River, Israel's long-held goal.[29]

Israel's Grip on Arab Water after 1967

Immediately after the capture of Syria's Golan Heights, Israel established settlements there to guard Syrian headwaters. In addition, settlements on the West Bank, also captured in 1967, were situated so as to maximize access to West Bank's aquifers, for example, in the Tulkarm-Qalqilya area. Hence, negotiations and UN demands for the return of these 1967 territorial war gains went nowhere. It was not the land but the water on that land that was nonnegotiable.[30]

Nevertheless, a question arose. Were there areas in the Golan Heights and West Bank that could be returned without serious Israeli loss of water? To answer this question in 1979, Prime Minister Begin had his Water Commissioner, Menachem Kantor, draw a "*red line*" within the West Bank that demarcated areas both essential and nonessential for control of Palestinian water. Maps based on this red line concept of a "hydrostrategic territorial imperative" were drawn and redone by the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies in 1991. The Jaffee Center determined that Israel could return more than two-thirds of the West Bank to the Palestinians and more than half of the Golan Heights to the Syrians without endangering Israel's water supply.[31]

Israeli military and political leaders were unhappy with this conclusion. Six retired IDF generals argued against it, insisting that the entire Golan Heights was needed to protect water sources. The Ministry of Agriculture, Rafael Eitan, agreed with the generals and branded the Jaffee maps as "an outline for retreat." The Jaffee report was censored by the military in 1992.[32]

Water Distribution in the Year 2000

The total available water from the Jordan River, the Yarmuk River, and Palestinian aquifers was 1,729 million cubic meters (mcm) per year.[33] Of this total, Israel took 61 percent, Syria took 11 percent, Jordan took 7 percent, and the Palestinians, 12 percent. Israel, with a quarter of the population, took twice as much water as Syria, Jordan, and the Palestinians combined. Israel continues to take 82 percent of the water of the West Bank. It is also likely that Israel takes water from Lebanon's Litani River, contrary to international law.[34]

Summary

Control of water-rich land was a major preoccupation of the early Zionists. In 1948, the conflict between Israel and Syria was as much about water as land. Escalating violence over water sources contributed to the 1967 war, which further enabled Israel to take control of the headwaters of the Jordan River as well as West Bank and Gazan aquifers. Territorial negotiations over the return of the Golan Heights and West Bank have failed, not because of their military-strategic value, but because of Israel's "hydrostrategic territorial imperative."[35]

In the West Bank, Israeli confiscation of underground water began in 1955, but the 1967 war afforded Israel an opportunity to locate Jewish settlements over critical water locations and limit Palestinian water sources. Retention of these settlements has been a major stumbling block for resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. An inequitable allocation of water to Palestinians has imposed on them major health and economic problems.

Notes

1. Stephen Kinzer, "Where Kurds Seek a Land, Turks Want the Water," *New York Times*, 28 February 1999, Sec. 4, 3.

2. Aaron Wolf, "Hydrostrategic" Territory in the Jordan Basin: Water, War and Arab-Israeli Peace Negotiations," in *Water in the Middle East*, eds. Hussein Amery and Aaron Wolf (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000), 111. Wolf is professor of geography at Oregon State University and consultant to the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the World Bank.

3. Conal Urquhart, "Peace canal deal for Middle East," *Guardian Weekly*, 13–19 May 2005, 11.

4. For a detailed account of pollution in Israel and the occupied territories see Alon Tal, *Pollution in a Promised Land: An Environmental History of Israel* (Berkeley: University of Californian Press, 2002).

5. The West Bank generates 605 mcm of the 1750 mcm used by Israel. Peter Beaumont, "Conflict, Coexistence, and Cooperation: a Study of Water Use in the Jordan Basin," in *Water in the Middle East*, 36. Nabil Baddour, "Occupational Hazzard: Slippery When Wet, *Miftah.org*, 1 March 2004, 2.

6. Abd al-Rahman Tamimi, director of the Palestinian Hydrology Group. May 1998. Interviewed by Alwyn Rouyer, "Basic Needs vs. Swimming Pools: water inequality and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict," *Middle East Report*, No. 227 (Summer 2003): 4. Rouyer teaches at the Middle East Center of the School of International Studies at the University of Washington.

The Israeli citizen is allocated 100 cubic meters per year or 274 liter per day (lpd) as compared to 60 lpd for Palestinians. Peter Beaumont, "Conflict, Coexistence, and Cooperation: a Study of Water Use in the Jordan Basin," in *Water in the Middle East*, 33. In the Golan Heights, Jewish settlers are allotted 7 to 10 times more water. Dr. Taysir Mara'i, Director, Arab Association for Development, *Alternative Information Center*. www2.alternativenews.org/fact sheets/golan/

7. Rosina Hassoun, "Save the Musht," *The Link*, Vol. 26 No. 4 (October–November 1993) Hassoun teaches in the Anthropology Department, Michigan State University.

8. Beaumont, "Conflict, Coexistence, and Cooperation," 36.

9. Nurit Kliot, "A comparative framework for sharing scarce water resources: Israel, Jordan, and the Palestine Authority" in *Water in the Middle East*, 195. Dr. Kliot is professor of Geography at the University of Haifa.

10. Extensive shooting of rooftop tanks has occurred in 34 of 152 communities sampled, as well as damage to water pipes and networks in 44 of 105 communities. Forty others report destruction of wells, springs, and cisterns. Palestinian Hydrology Group, Water and Sanitation Hygiene Monitoring Project, *Impact of the Current Crisis Technical Report* 2, Ramallah (August 2002): 40–46.

11. A minimum daily supply of water costs 40–60 cents, a major cost when half of all Palestinians live on $2.00 per day. Oxfam International, "Forgotten Villages: Struggling to Survive Under Closure in the West Bank" (London, 2002), 26. Also, Palestinian Hydrology Group, Water and Sanitation Hygiene Monitoring Project, *Report on the Impact of Closure on Water Supply to Palestinian Villages and Towns*, Ramallah (July 2001): 36. The per capita GDP of Israel is 18 times that in the occupied territories. Greg Myre, "Amid Political Upheaval, Israeli Economy Stays Healthy," *New York Times*, 31 December 2006, 3.

12. In some towns the water supplied has dwindled to one seventh of normal. Water pressure is so low that taps will not flow or toilets flush. *Associated Press*, 8 August 1999. Also, *B'Tselem*, "Summer 2002 in the West Bank: Especially Severe Water Shortages," Jerusalem (August 2002).

13. Hassoun, "Save the Musht."

14. Sara Roy, *The Gaza Strip*, Institute for Palestine Studies, (September, 1995): 162–75. Jacqueline Rose, *The Question of Zion* (Princeton University Press, 2005), 119. Saree Makdisi reports a much lower figure of five times in Gaza. "Closed off,

Walled in," *London Review of Books*, 1 September 2005, 11. The difference may be related to the counting of personal use versus commercial use. Jacqueline Rose reports that the Jewish settler gets fourteen times more water than the Gazan Palestinian and, on the West Bank, seven times more.

15. Industrial wastes, toxins, salts, benzene, toluene, heavy metals, and pesticides infect many wells in Israel and appear to be responsible for a breast cancer incidence in Israel among the highest in the world. Tal, *Pollution in a Promised Land*, 411.

16. Gershon Baskin, "The Clash Over Water: An Attempt at Demystification," *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture* 1/1 (Summer 1994).

17. Beaumont, "Conflict, Coexistence, and Cooperation," 41.

18. Lonergan, "Forces of Change," 48. Kathryn Casa, "The Underlying Problem: Water the Real Reason Behind Israeli Occupations," *Washington Report* (July 1991): 26.

19. Chaim Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, ed. Leonard Stein (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), letter of September 18, 1919.

20. Zionist plans were "completely dependent" on the acquisition of the "headwaters of Jordan, the Litani River, the snows of Herman, the Yarmuk and its tributaries, and the Jabbok [Jordan's Zarqa River]." Uri Ra'anan, *The Frontiers of a Nation: A Re-examination of the Forces Which Created the Palestine Mandate and Determined Its Territorial Shape* (Westport, CT: Hyperion Press, 1955), 87.

21. David Ben-Gurion, *Israel: A Personal History*, trans. Nechemia Meyers and Uzy Nystar (London: New England Library, 1972), 43. Emphasis added.

22. Irving Spiegel, *New York Times*, 21 & 22 January 1951.

23. Ben-Gurion's cabinet voted to empower the IDF to render the DMZs "clear of Arabs." 785 Palestinians were expelled from the villages of Kirad al-Baqqara and Kirad al-Ghannama, about 1,200 from the al-Hamma district. Benny Morris, *Israel's Border Wars, 1949–1956* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 362–63; Donald Neff, "Israel-Syria: Conflict at the Jordan River, 1949–1967," *Journal of Palestine Studies* Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 (Summer 1994): 30–31.

24. Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 362–63.

25. Maurice Garbell, "The Jordan Valley Plan." *Scientific American* 212 (3) 1965, 30.

26. Wolf, "Hydrostrategic," 87. The Hasbani River was diverted westward to Lebanon's Litani River and the Banias River diverted southeast to the Yarmuk. In 1958, Jordan began the project of diverting the Yarmuk River (East Ghor Canal) away from waters Israel was diverting further south.

27. The United States and the Soviet Union were locked in Cold-War opposition so that most armistice violations between Syria and Israel failed to elicit UN condemnations after 1962. Neff, "Israel-Syria," 35, 36.

28. Aryeh Shalev, *Israel and Syria: Peace and Security on the Golan Heights*. Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, Study No. 24 (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Post Publishing, 1994). Generals Yitzhak Rabin and David Elazar were "very aggressive in combat operations over the headwaters in the north. Incidents over these headwaters and over control in the DMZs became an inseparable part of daily routine. . . . A pretty heavy

war was conducted over the water sources." Interview with General Israel Lior, aide-de-camp of Eshkol, cited by Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 229.

29. Moshe Dayan later acknowledged these goals in an interview in 1976 with reporter Rami Tal, as described by Serge Schmemann, "General's Words Shed a New Light on the Golan," *New York Times*, 11 May 1997, 3. See chapter 4.

30. Shimon Pares and Ehud Barak later made explicit this policy. *Jerusalem Post*, January 6, 1996 and January 27, 1996. N. Tarnopolsky, "Water Damps Hopes for Deal with Syrians," *Forward*, 5 January 1996. Ze'ev Schiff, "They are Forgetting the Golan's Water," *Ha'aretz*, 7 June 1995.

31. Wolf, "Hydrostrategic," 102. Saul Cohen, *The Geopolitics of Israel's Border Question*, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), 55. Yehoshua Schwartz and Aharon Zohar, *Water in the Middle East: Solutions to Water Problems in the Context of Arrangements between Israel and the Arabs* (Tel Aviv: Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, 1991).

32. Wolf, "Hydrostrategic," 102.

33. All statistics in this paragraph are from academic studies cited by Kliot, "A comparative framework," 192, 193.

34. Israel had control of southern Lebanon and the Litani River for eighteen years. In 1994 the United Nations' Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) reported that in 1978 Israel started to pump 150 million cubic meters of water from the Litani annually, and that after the 1982 invasion it "drilled an 18-km tunnel which links the Litani to Israel." ESCWA 1994, 8. Israel has also been using the waters of Lebanon's Wazzani River (65 mcm/yr) according to ESCWA, 1994, 8. A Lebanese Minister of State, Michele Eddeh, said in 1998 that Israel was breaking international law by "stealing large amounts of the Litani River's water." Israel barred international field inspections of its "security zone" at the time and a UN resolution designed to resolve the issue was vetoed by the United States. Dr. Hussein Amery concludes that the "weight of evidence" is that Israel has been diverting Lebanese water, and presumably still does today. Hussein Amery, "A Popular Theory of Water Diversion from Lebanon: Toward Public Participation for Peace." in *Water in the Middle East*, 137, 144.

35. Even in the mid 1970s, Syria's military advantage of high territory in the Golan Heights "disappeared completely" with the advent of warfare involving airplanes, missiles, radar, etc. U Thant, *View from the UN* (New York: Doubleday, 1978), 217.

Appendix B: Evolution of Zionism

The fate of the Jewish Diaspora during and following the Middle Ages is well-known: massacres by Christian Crusaders in 1096; the Black Death of 1348; expulsion from Spain, Sicily, and Sardinia in 1492; the Thirty Years War (1618 to 1648) that decimated the German and Jewish population; and the 1648 Chmielnicki-led Ukrainian/Polish peasant revolt affecting the Jewish middle-class. The worst was to come in the twentieth century in Russia and Nazi Germany.

The situation of the Jews did improve, however, in eighteenth century Europe where most Jews lived in cities, often as middlemen: merchants, shopkeepers, craftsmen, small manufacturers, and moneylenders. They found a niche between rural farmers and elite landowners and political leaders. Despite restrictions, Jews achieved relative economic success, not infrequently eliciting envy and resentment. It was, however, the Enlightenment and French Revolution, a time of growing secularization in European culture, that provided an atmosphere of increasing economic and social progress for Jews. The Catholic faith that once fueled the persecution of Protestant Huguenots had, by the eighteen-century, lost some ground to scientific empiricism, tolerance, faith in the individual, and distaste for dogmatism. Progress was seen to be in this world, not the next. In this "Age of Reason," tradition and dogma were also dismissed by many "enlightened" Jews who viewed their own religion as ignorant superstition. Some Jews retained their religious convictions but discarded many rituals (Reform Judaism). Moses

Mendelsson (1729–1786) was among the first of modern Jews to combine Jewish identity with modern values both humanist and secular.[1]

Emancipation of the Jews continued into the nineteenth century. Equal citizenship for Rhineland Jews began in 1812, though it was not completed until the unification of Germany in 1867. In the 1850s, Jews were prominent in banking, industry, communications, the arts and found a place in the ruling elites of Western Europe. The Industrial Revolution and arrival of liberal capitalism had ushered in a world in which achievement was measured less by ethnic or religious background than by productivity (factories, department stores, and investment capital). The Jews were well prepared for this shift: urban, literate, and experienced middlemen. They might be contrasted with Polish farmers who, attached to land and traditional folkways, were left behind by modernity. The urban Jews had little use for these farmers who, in turn, saw the Jews as profiteers. Mutual contempt, fear, and envy arose from conspicuous cultural, ethnic, religious, occupational, and class differences.[2]

The Threat of Assimilation

Increasing secularization of Jews during the Enlightenment raised a question *within* the Jewish community: "Who is a Jew? Is there a Jewish identity without Judaism and traditional religious practices?" Emancipation, too, posed a threat to distinctive Jewish identity. Ideas about human equality, even a decline in anti-Semitism, tended to weaken the Jewish community and its institutions. Tensions regarding Jewish identity led in opposite directions. On the one hand, Jewish assimilation to European liberal society and culture *increased*—some of the wealthier and well-educated Jewish factions even turned to religious conversion.[3] On the other hand, for less privileged and poor Jews, assimilation was not an option. Some rejected assimilation because of traditional Judaic principles of separation from impure Gentiles. Even enthusiasm for emancipation among the Jewish masses had some limits. Jews in Holland, for example, refused emancipation in order to preserve community and separateness.[4]

The Desperate Situation for Jews in Czarist Russia: Pogroms and Mass Migration

Assimilation was not possible for Jews in Czarist Russia. Emancipation was not declared and Jews, often poor and living in the European part of the Russian Empire, the "Pale of Settlement," suffered curtailment of many rights.[5]

Some turned to revolution—perhaps half of the socialist-revolutionaries in Russia were Jews looking for salvation for themselves and others.[6]

In 1881, when Czar Alexander II was assassinated by revolutionary terrorists, Jews were blamed and waves of anti-Semitic violence erupted: 160 pogroms in 1881–1882 after a previous period of relative liberalism. Further pogroms occurred in 1891 and 1903–1905, inspiring a wave of Jewish migration westward to Germany, France, and Britain—doubling the size of the Jewish community in Western Europe.

The influx of poor, eastern, socialist-revolutionary Jews into Europe provoked conservative reaction in Europe, as it had in Russia. And it caused shame and worry for the assimilated Western European Jews. Jewish revolutionaries in Hungary and Germany (e.g., Rosa Luxemburg) after World War I inflamed cries about a "Jewish Bolshevik conspiracy."

A factor further hurtful to Jews in Europe was the popularization of "scientific racism," a nineteenth century notion that significant innate differences exist among "races." This invention of the concept of race—a backlash against Enlightenment ideas about the equality and universalism of mankind—was adopted by Gentiles and Jews alike as a way to explain their superiority to each other.[7]

The Idea of a Jewish State (Political Zionism) and the New Secular Fighting Jew

Of the many Jews who emigrated West between 1882 and 1904, a small number went to Palestine to establish a Jewish state. These "political Zionists" ("Zion," Temple hill in Jerusalem) sought their liberation and emancipation though their own active human effort to build a new state, in contrast to the "religious" Zionists awaiting divine deliverance to the Promised Land, as prescribed in the scriptures. Similar national independence movements were breaking out in the declining Hapsburg and Ottoman empires.

The political Zionists dismissed rabbinical Judaism, traditional cultural practices and the habits of Diaspora Jews. They envisioned a new Jew, free of religion and ritual, no longer passively awaiting the Promised Land. Yehuda Lieb Pinsker in 1882 was one of those who attacked Jewish feebleness, timidity, and apologetics, calling for Jewish "auto-emancipation" rather than emancipation bestowed by others. The so-called "parasitic" Jewish middleman was to be converted into a "man of the earth," one able to labor for the community and fight for his independence. The image was one of turning the humiliated Jew into "something akin to the gentile—aggressive, assertive,

straight-backed."[8] Max Nordau called it "muscular Judaism." This laboring and socialist pioneer was to be tough, self-reliant, industrious, and committed to a sovereign state—the Zionist alternative to *both* assimilation in Europe and revolution in Russia.

The political Zionists made three assumptions: (1) that the assimilation of Jews was an illusion because anti-Semitism was eternal and universal—the solution being sanctuary in a sovereign state for Jews, (2) that Diaspora Jewry would see themselves as "objects of pity" and welcome the Zionist "cure," and (3) that the use of force to dispossess the indigenous Arab population in Palestine was acceptable.[9]

Herzl, Father of Political Zionism

Ironically, two highly assimilated Jews, Theodor Herzl and Max Nordau, agreed with the Zionist's assumption that assimilation was impossible, at least for most Jews.[10] For this reason, they pressed forward in the early twentieth century with the nascent Zionist project begun in Palestine. Herzl was critical of other assimilated Jews—flourishing industrialists, bankers, politicians, artists, and journalists (like himself) in Vienna—who were embarrassed by their poor, uncultured eastern brethren now flocking to Western Europe. He found that he could make use of their embarrassment to raise money for his Zionist project. Wealthy Jews were happy to finance the *departure* to Palestine of those eastern spoilers shamefully poor or politically radical. Herzl wrote:

> The "assimilated" give expression to this secret grievance in "philanthropic" undertakings. . . . For some of these charitable institutions are created not for, but against, persecuted Jews; they are created to dispatch these poor creatures just as fast and far as possible. And thus, many an apparent friend of the Jews turns out, on careful inspection, to be nothing more than an Anti-Semite of Jewish origin, disguised as philanthropists.[11]

This Jewish philanthropic movement grew, yet upper bourgeois Jews almost unanimously rejected the idea of a Jewish *state*.[12] They feared that a mass of Jews in a Jewish state would encourage focus in Europe on the "Jewish problem," tainting their own assimilation. Lord Rothschild appealed to Herzl, "Just a small one [colony in Palestine], 25,000 settlers at the most."[13]

There were other reasons from within the Jewish community for resistance to political Zionism. First, religious Jews objected because they believed that the creation of a political state was heresy, an intervention that usurped

God's own redemptive plan. Second, most Diaspora Jews had no desire to go to Palestine. They found no special reason to join in a secular movement to fight Arabs and work the soil. Of the 3.5 million Jews fleeing Russia between 1880 and 1922, only 85,000 went to Palestine. Third, a small group of Jews objected to the use of force to dispossess or gain the submission of the indigenous Palestinian Arab population. They insisted that the Arabs not only had political and territorial rights, but that it was possible to work together and share Palestine. Martin Buber, Judah Magnes, and Arthur Ruppin pointed out that exclusionary, chauvinist violation of the Palestinian Arab population contradicted Judaic principles of justice and equality. Buber asserted that morality and humanist-socialist values must not be separated from politics. He accused the Zionists of considering only their own struggle, ignoring the Arab's struggle for liberation after centuries of oppressive Ottoman-Turk rule.[14]

It was British power that brought the Zionist project to life. Britain chose for its own imperialist reasons (a foothold near the Suez Canal), to support a Jewish state in Palestine in 1917 (Balfour Declaration). With this support, Palestine became for eastern European Jews a more viable alternative. Following the growing storms in Germany in 1933, and finally the Holocaust, the Zionist project gained wide sympathy in the West. At the United Nations the Zionists demanded a Jewish state over most of Palestine. The Palestinian–Arabs demanded a single democratic state throughout Palestine (but no *further* Jewish immigration). In 1947, the UN recommended partition of Palestine into two states. The Palestinian-Arab state was, however, subverted through Jewish-Transjordanian collusion (see chapter 2).

Palestinian Arab Aspirations for Statehood

For four centuries, the entire Arab-speaking world had been under oppressive Ottoman-Turk rule. With the weakening of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century, a movement for Arab national independence began.[15] By 1905, this movement was manifest, as when Najib Azouri reported: "The Arabs whom the Turks tyrannized, have become conscious of their national, historical, and racial homogeneity, and wish to detach themselves from their worm-eaten Ottoman trunk in order to form themselves into an independent State."[16] However, this aspiration for independence was thwarted—even after the Ottoman Empire was defeated in World War I (1918). Britain and France were given League of Nations mandatory authority over the bulk of the Arab Middle East. By World War II, however, most of the Arab world did

achieve independence after many bloody insurrections against British and French armies.

In one corner of the Arab world, Palestine, independence was never achieved. The Jews took possession of 78 percent of Palestine by military force in 1948 and, again, the remainder of Palestine in 1967. The history of brutal relations[17] between the Jews and Palestinians since the late nineteenth century and reaching to ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians from Israel in 1948 and 1967, has meant that bitter conflict has stretched over more than a century. This conflict was never in doubt from the beginning of Zionism. It is the story of most colonizations. The Zionist, Jabotinsky wrote in 1923:

> [Arabs] look upon Palestine with the same instinctive love and true fervor that any Aztec looked upon Mexico or any Sioux looked upon his prairie. Palestine will remain for the Palestinians not a borderland, but their birthplace, the center and basis of their own national existence.[18] Every indigenous people will resist alien settlers as long as they see any hope of ridding themselves of the danger of foreign settlement. This is how the Arabs will behave and go on behaving so long as they possess a gleam of hope that they can prevent 'Palestine' from becoming the Land of Israel. . . . Nothing in the world can cause them to relinquish this hope, precisely because they are not a rabble but a living people. . . . All colonization must continue in defiance of the will of the native population. Therefore, it can continue and develop only under the shield of force which comprises an Iron Wall through which the local population can never break through.[19]

Summary

Emancipation of the Jews in secularized Western Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries led to their increasing prosperity, governmental position, and cultural assimilation. However, the immigration into Europe of impoverished and socialist-revolutionary Russian Jews created reactionary fears and embarrassment to already assimilated Westernized Jews. The Zionists, denying the possibility of assimilation for the Jewish masses and skeptical about the efficacy of Jewish socialist-revolutionary movements, embarked on a new solution: a sovereign Jewish state in Palestine. Seeking to uplift their humiliated brothers in the Diaspora, the Zionists prescribed an aggressive and pioneering transformational "assent" to Palestine. The Jewish masses demurred, preferring to emigrate to the United States or Europe. Those who did go to Palestine fell into abusive behavior toward the native Palestinian-Arab population and looked to their forceful removal. Palestinian-Arab national aspira-

tions were only one part of a much wider search for independence throughout the whole Arab Middle East following four centuries of Ottoman rule. Although the Europeans usurped control after World War I, the Arab Middle East did gain independence by World War II. Only in Palestine does the struggle continue.

Notes

1. Retaining Jewish identity, Mendelssohn adopted Hebrew in 1750 and within a century there appeared Hebrew novels, poems, and prose journals for the literary intelligentsia.

2. Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State* (New York: Dover, 1988), 87.

3. About 5 percent of the total Jewish population of the world converted to Christianity by 1850. Emile Marmorstein, *Heaven at Bay* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969).

4. Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, *Original Sins: Reflections on the History of Zionism and Israel* (New York: Olive Branch Press, 1993), 19.

5. Basic freedoms of movement, place of residence, language, occupation, worship, and ownership of land were curtailed or regulated by the state. Life was more tolerable in Poland where Jews increasingly attained autonomy and official protection even if anti-Semitism remained. Jews were never expelled from Poland as they were from the other European countries.

6. Jonathan Frankel, *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

7. The Enlightenment was *not*, however, shy about racism regarding negroes. Hume, Voltaire, Kant and many other "enlighted" philosophers were explicitly racist. See David Goldenberg, *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

8. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 21. The Zionist stinging rejection of Diaspora Jews, if, in a sense, anti-Semitic, at least intended to "overcome their humiliation" in reaction to pogroms after the assassination of Czar Alexander II and to the anti-Semitism surrounding the Dreyfus affair. Christopher Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel* (New York: World Publishing, 1965), 189.

9. The "transfer" (removal) idea goes back to the fathers of modern Zionism—"was one of the main currents in Zionist ideology from the movement's inception." Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 139. "All colonization must continue in defiance of the will of the native population . . . can develop only under the shield of force." Ze'ev Jabotinsky, *Writings: On the Road to Statehood* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1959), 251–60. Cited by Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2001), 13–14.

10. Nordau wrote: "The emancipated Jew is insecure with his fellow beings, timid with strangers. His best powers are exhausted in the suppression, or the difficult concealment of his own real character. He becomes an inner cripple." David Vital, *The Origins of Zionism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 363. Leo Pinsker wrote in 1882 about "autoemancipation" of the Jew "everywhere [guests] and nowhere at home." In the Diaspora the Jew was always subject to that "incurable . . . psychic aberration," anti-Semitism. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 49.

11. Herzl, *The Jewish State*, 81.

12. The Jewish Colonization Association insisted, "We cannot participate in any effort to establish a Jewish colony . . . unless the project has a philanthropic, non-political character." Ahmad El Kodsy and Eli Lobel, *The Arab World and Israel* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970), 104.

13. The Complete Dairies of Theodor Herzl, ed. by Raphael Patai (New York: The Herzl Press, Thomas Yoseloff, NY, 1960) Vol. IV, 1296. Cited by Ahmad El Kodsy and Eli Lobel, *The Arab World and Israel*, 104.

14. Buber "detected a frightful hypocrisy in the tendency of most political leaders, regardless of ideology, to include moral issues in their litany of pious concerns, and yet, because of the insidious assumption that 'our cruel and complex world' is not amenable to ethical principles, they nevertheless proceed along the beaten path of national self-assertion and Realpolitik." Martin Buber, A Land of Two Peoples, ed. Paul R. Mendes-Flor (Magnolia, MA: Peter Smith, Publisher, 1994), 13.

15. George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1965), 91.

16. Zeine Zeine, *The Emergence of Arab Nationalism* (Beirut: Khayats, 1966), 75. Azouri was one of the chief spokesmen for Arab nationalism. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 27, 28.

17. Many early Jewish settlers behaved despotically, exploitatively, and brutally according to Morris, *Righteous Victims*, 47, 48.

18. Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky in 1923. Cited in Mordechai Bar-On, *In Pursuit of Peace: History of the Israeli Peace Movement* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1996), 12.

19. Vladimir Jabotinsky, *Writings: On the Road to Statehood* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1959), 251–60. Cited by Shlaim, *Iron Wall*, 13–14.

Bibliography

Abernethy, David B. *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1415–1980*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

Abunimah, Ali. *One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006.

Ajami Fouad. *The Arab Predicament: Arab Political Thought and Practice since 1967*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Alter, Peter. *Nationalism*, 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.

Alter, Robert. *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2004.

Amery, Hussein and Aaron Wolf. eds. *Water in the Middle East*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1983.

Anderson, Bernhard. *Understanding the Old Testament*, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Antonius, George. *The Arab Awakening*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1965.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Experiments in Ethics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Jew as Pariah: Jewish Identity and Politics in the Modern Age*. Ed. Ron Feldman. New York: Grove Press, 1978.

Armstrong, Karen. *The Bible: A Biography*. Boston: Atlantic Monthy Press, 2007.

Aronson, Geoffrey. *Creating Facts: Israel, Palestinians and the West Bank*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1987.

Bahbah, Bishara. *Israel and Latin America: The Military Connection*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.

Balibar, Etienne, and Immanuel Wallerstein. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. Trans. Chris Turner. New York: Verso, 1991.

Ball, George. *Error and Betrayal in Lebanon: An Analysis of Israel's Invasion of Lebanon and Its Implications for U.S.-Israeli Relations*. Washington, DC: Foundation for Middle East Peace, 1984.

Bamford, James. *Body of Secrets*. New York: Anchor Books, 2002.

Bar-On, Mordechai. *In Pursuit of Peace: History of the Israeli Peace Movement*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1996.

Bar-Zohar, Michael. *Ben-Gurion: A Political Biography* (Hebrew). Tel Aviv: 'Am 'Oved, 1977.

Barzun, Jacques. *A Study in Superstition*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968.

Begin, Menachem. *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun*. New York: Nash Publications, 1977.

Beit-Hallahmi, Benjamin. *The Israeli Connection: Who Israel Arms and Why*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1987.

———. *Original Sins: Reflections on the History of Zionism and Israel*. New York: Olive Branch Press, 1993.

Ben-Ami, Shlomo, *Scars of War, Wounds of Peace: The Israeli-Arab Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Ben-Gurion, David, *Israel: A Personal History*. Trans. Nechemia Meyers and Uzy Nystar. London: New England Library, 1972.

———. *War Diaries* (Hebrew). eds. Gershon Rivlin and Elhannan Oren. Tel Aviv: Israel Defence Ministry Press. 1982.

Ben-Menashe, Ari. *Profits of War: Inside the Secret U.S.-Israeli Arms Network*. New York: Sheridan Square, 1992.

Bennis, Phyllis. *Before and After: U.S. Foreign Policy and the September 11th Crisis*. New York: Olive Branch Press. 2003.

Benvenisti, Eyal. *International Law of Occupation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Benvenisti, Meron. *Intimate Enemies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

———. *The West Bank Handbook*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986.

Berreby, David. *Us and Them: Understanding Your Tribal Mind*. New York: Little, Brown, 2005.

Black, Ian, and Benny Morris. *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991.

Bloom, Mia. *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Bonner, Michael. *Jihad in Islamic History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Bowle, John. *Viscount Samuel*. London: Gollancz, 1957.

Brecher, Michael. *The Foreign Policy System of Israel*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972.

———. *Decisions in Israel's Foreign Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975.

Brenner, Lenni. *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*. Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill, 1983.

———. *The Iron Wall*. London: Zed Press, 1984.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1981.

Buber, Martin. *A Land of Two Peoples*. Ed. Paul Mendes-Flor. Magnolia, MA: Peter Smith Publisher, 1994.

Buffet, Cyril, and Beatrice Heuser, eds. *Haunted by History: Myths in International Relations*. Oxford: Berghahn, 1998.

Carter, Jimmy. *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*. New York: Bantam, 1982.

———. *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2006.

Chomsky, Noam. *Towards a New Cold War*. New York: Pantheon, 1973.

———. *The Fateful Triangle*. Boston: South End Press, 1983.

———. *Deterring Democracy*. New York: Verso, 1991.

Chomsky, Noam, and Edward Herman. *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*. Boston: South End Press, 1979.

Cohen, Michael J. *Palestine and the Great Powers, 1945–1948*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Cohen, Saul. *The Geopolitics of Israel's Border Question*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986.

Cole, Juan. *Colonialism and Revolution in the Middle East: Social and Cultural Origins of Egypt's Urabi Movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Collins, Larry, and Dominique Lapierre. *O Jerusalem*. New York: Pocket Books, 1972.

Christison, Kathleen, and Bill Christison. "The Bush Administration's Dual Loyalties," *The Politics of Anti-Semitism*. Eds. Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2003.

Cockburn, Andrew, and Leslie Cockburn. *Dangerous Liaison*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1991.

Cook, Jonathan. *Blood and Religion: The Unmasking of the Jewish and Democratic State*. London: Pluto Press, 2006.

Cooley, John. *Green March, Black September*. London: Frank Cass, 1973.

Creveld, Martin van. *The Sword and the Olive*. New York: Public Affairs, 1998.

Crosbie, Sylvia. *The Tacit Alliance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Curtis, Mark. *Web of Deceit: Britain's Real Role in the World*. London: Vintage, 2003.

Curtis, Michael, and Susan Aurelia Gitelson. *Israel in the Third World*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1976.

Davidson, Lawrence. *Islamic Fundamentalism: An Introduction*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2003.

Dowty, Alan. *The Jewish State: A Century Later*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Dupuy, Trevor. *Elusive Victory: The Arab-Israeli Wars, 1947–1974*. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Eban, Abba. *An Autobiography*. New York: Random House, 1977.

Elon, Amos. *The Israelis, Founders and Sons*. New York: Penguin Books, 1984.

Ennes, James M. *Assault on the Liberty*. New York: Random House, 1979.

Ernst, Morris. *So Far So Good*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Esposito, John. *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Feldman, Noah. *After Jihad: America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2004.

———. *The Fall and Rise of the Islamic State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Fieldhouse, David. *The Colonial Empires from the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.

Finkelstein, Norman. *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*. London: Verso, 1995.

———. *The Rise and Fall of Palestine*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Fisk, Robert. *Pity the Nation*. New York: Atheneum, 1990.

Flapan, Simha. *The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities*. New York: Pantheon, 1987.

———. *Zionism and the Palestinians*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

Frankel, Glenn. *Beyond the Promised Land: Jews and Arabs on the Hard Road to a New Israel*. New York: Touchstone Books, 1996.

Frankel, Jonathan. *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Fredrickson, George, "Colonialism and Racism: The United States and South Africa in Comparative Perspective," *Arrogance of Race*. Middletown, IN: Wesleyan University Press, 1988.

Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End All Peace: Creating the Modern Middle East, 1914–1922*. New York: Henry Holt, 1989.

Gat, Azar. *War in Human Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Gellner, Ernest. *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964.

———. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 1983.

Gilbert, Martin. *The Macmillan Atlas of the Holocaust*. New York: Macmillan (Da Capo), 1982.

Glover, Jonathan. *Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

Glubb, Sir John Bagot. *The Changing Scenes of Life: An Autobiography*. London: Quartet Books, 1983.

Golan, Matti. *The Road to Peace: A Biography of Shimon Peres*. New York: Warner Books, 1989.

Goldenberg David. *Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Goldmann, Nahum. *Sixty Years of Jewish Life: The Autobiography of Nahum Goldmann*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

———. *The Jewish Paradox*. Trans. Steve Cox. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1978.

Goralski, Robert. *World War II Almanac: 1931–1945*. New York: Bonanza Books, 1981.

Green, Stephen. *Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations with a Militant Israel*. Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988.

Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Gresh, Alain. *The PLO: The Struggle Within, Toward an Independent Palestinian State*. London: Zed Books, 1985.

Grossman, David. "Two Years of Intifada." *Death as a Way of Life: Israel Ten Years after Oslo*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.

Guyatt, Nicholas. *The Absence of Peace: Understanding the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. New York: Zed Books, 1998.

Halevi, Ilan. *A History of the Jews: Ancient and Modern*. London: Zed Books, 1987.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hedges, Chris. *War Is A Force That Gives Us Meaning*. New York: Public Affairs, 2002.

Hersch, Seymour M. *The Price of Power: Kissinger in the Nixon White House*. New York: Summit Books, 1983.

Herzl, Theodor. *Complete Diaries*. Ed. and trans. Marvin Lowenthal. New York: Dial Press, 1956.

———. *Complete Diaries*. Ed. Raphael Patai. New York: Herzl Press, 1960.

———. *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Solution of the Jewish Question*. Trans. Sylvie d'Avigdor. London: Central Office of the Zionist Organization, 1946.

———. *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Solution of the Jewish Question*. Trans. Sylvie d'Avigdor. New York: Dover, 1988.

Herzog, Chaim. *The Arab-Israeli Wars*. New York: Vintage Books, 1984.

———. *The War of Atonement*. Tel Aviv: Steimatzky's Agency, 1975.

Hilberg, Raul. *The Destruction of the European Jews*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985.

———. *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders*. New York: Harper Perennial Library, 1993.

Hirst, David. *The Gun and the Olive Branch: The Roots of Violence in the Middle East*. London: Faber and Farber, 1977.

Hitler, Adolf. *Secret Book*. New York: Grove Press, 1961.

Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Hunter, Jane. *Israeli Foreign Policy: South Africa and Central America*. Boston: South End Press, 1987.

Hurewitz, J. C. *The Struggle for Palestine*. New York: Schocken, 1976.

Hutchison, Elmo. *Violent Truce: A Military Observer Looks at the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1951–1955*. New York: Devin-Adair, 1956.

Jiryis, Sabri. *The Arabs in Israel*. London: Monthly Review Press, 1976.

Johnson, Chalmers. *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004.

Kagan, Robert. *The Return of History and the End of Dreams*. New York, Knopf, 2008.

Kapeliouk, Amnon. *Sabra and Shatilla*. Belmont, MA: Association of Arab American University Graduates Press, 1984.

Karabell, Zachary. *Peace Be Upon You: The Story of Muslim, Christian, and Jewish Coexistence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.

Khalidi, Rashid. *Under Siege: PLO Decision-making during the 1982 War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

———. *Resurrecting Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2005.

Khalidi, Walid. *Before Their Diaspora*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1984.

———, ed. *From Haven to Conquest: Readings in Zionism and the Palestine Problem until 1948*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1987.

Khouri, Fred. *The Arab-Israeli Dilemma*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1985.

Kimche, Jon, and David Kimche. *A Clash of Destinies*. New York: Praeger, 1960.

Kimmerling, Baruch. *Zionism and Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing, 1983.

Kissinger, Henry. *White House Years*. New York: Little, Brown and Co., 1979.

———. *Years of Upheaval*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1982.

Klieman, Aaron. *Israel's Global Reach*. New York: Pergamon-Brassey's, 1985.

Kodsy, Amad El, and Eli Lobel. *The Arab World and Israel*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.

Kovel, Joel. *Overcoming Zionism: Creating a Single Democratic State in Israel/Palestine*. London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Kugel, James. *How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now*. New York: Free Press, 2007.

Lamb, Franklin, ed. *Reason Not the Need: Eyewitness Chronicles of Israel's War in Lebanon*. Nottingham, UK: Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1984.

Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Schocken, 1976.

Laqueur, Walter, and Barry Rubin, eds., *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*. New York: Penguin, 1984.

Learsi, Rufus. *Fulfillment: The Epic Story of Zionism*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1951.

LeFeber, Walter. *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad, 1750 to the Present*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1994.

Lenczowski, George. *Soviet Advances in the Middle East*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 1972.

Lerner, Rabbi Michael, *Healing: Israel/Palestine*. San Francisco: Tikkun Books, 2003.

Levenson, Jon. *Resurrection and Restoration of Israel: the Ultimate Victory of the God of Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

Lindemann, Albert. *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Lorch, Natanel. *Edge of the Sword: Israel's War of Independence, 1947–1949*. New York: Putnam, 1961.

Lustick, Ian. *Arabs in the Jewish State*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980.

Masalha, Nur. *Expulsion of the Palestinians: The Concept of "Transfer" in Zionist Political Thought 1882–1918*. Washington, DC: Institute of Palestine Studies, 1992.

McKenzie, John. *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Mearsheimer, John. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2002.

Meir, Golda. *My Life*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1975.

Mishal, Shaul. *The PLO under Arafat: Between Gun and Olive Branch*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986.

Morris, Benny. *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947–1949*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

———. *Israel's Border Wars, 1949–1956: Arab Infiltration, Israeli Retaliation, and the Countdown to the Suez War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881–2001*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Nathan, Susan. *The Other Side of Israel: My Journey across the Jewish/Arab Divide*, New York: Doubleday, 2005.

Neff, Donald. *Warriors against Israel*. Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988.

———. *Warriors at Suez*. Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988.

———. *Warriors for Jerusalem*. Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1988.

———. "Settlements in U.S. Policy," *Journal of Palestine Studies*. Vol. 13, no. 3 (Spring 1994).

———. *Fallen Pillars: U.S. Policy towards Palestine and Israel since 1945*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1995.

Nixon, Richard M. *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. New York: Touchstone Books, 1990.

Oren, Michael. *Six Days of War: June 1967 and the Making of the Modern Middle East*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. *Power, Faith and Fantasy: America in the Middle East*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

Pape, Robert. *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*. New York: Random House, 2005.

Pappé, Ilan. ed. *The Israel/Palestine Question*. London: Routledge, 1999.

———. "The 1948 Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 141, Vol. XXXVL, no. 1 (Autumn 2006).

———. *The Ethnic Cleansing of the Palestinians*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2007.

Parker, Richard B. *The Politics of Miscalculation in the Middle East*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Parkes, James W. *A History of Palestine from 135 A.D. to Modern Times*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1949.

Peretz, Don. *Intifada: The Palestinian Uprising*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1979.

———. *Israel and the Palestine Arabs*. Washington: Middle East Institute, 1958.

———. *The West Bank: History, Politics, Society and Economy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986.

Peretz, Don, and Gideon Doron. *The Government and Politics of Israel*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

Peri, Yoram. *Between Battles and Ballots: The Israeli Military in Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Perle, Richard, and David Frum. *An End to Evil: How to Win the War on Terror*. New York: Random House, 2004.

Phillips, Kevin. *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century*. New York: Viking, 2006.

Pierre, Andrew. *Cascade of Arms: Managing Conventional Weapons Proliferation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 1997.

Pinker, Steven. *The Blank Slate*. New York: Penquin, 2003.

Porat, Dina, *The Blue and Yellow Stars of David: The Zionist Leadership in Palestine and the Holocaust, 1939–1947*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Power, Samantha. *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Harper Collins (Perennial), 2003.

Quandt, William. *Camp David: Peacemaking and Politics*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1986.

———. *Decade of Decisions: American Policy toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Quandt, William, Fuad Jabber, and Ann Mosely Lesch. *The Politics of Palestinian Nationalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Rabin, Yitzhak. *The Rabin Memoirs*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1979.

Ray, Ellen, and William Schaap, eds. *Covert Action: the Roots of Terrorism*. New York: Ocean Press, 2003.

Reinhart, Tanya. *Israel/Palestine*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002.

Richardson, Louise. *What Terrorists Want: Understanding the Enemy, Containing the Threat*. New York: Random House, 2006.

Rodinson, Maxime. *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* New York: Pathfinder, 1973.

Rokach, Livia. *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*. Belmont, MA: Association of Arab-American University Graduates Press, 1986.

Romer, John. *Testament: The Bible and History*. New York: Henry Holt, 1988.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Winning of the West*. New York: Peter Smith, 1889.

Rose, Jacqueline. *The Question of Zion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Sachar, Howard. *Diaspora: An Inquiry into the Contemporary Jewish World*. New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

———. *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*. Vol. I. New York: Knopf, 1986.

———. *A History of Israel: From the Aftermath of the Yom Kippur War*. Vol. II. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Safran, Nadav. *Israel: The Embattled Ally*. Cambridge, MA: Belnap Press, 1978.

Sahliyeh, Emile. *The PLO after the War*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1986.

Said, Edward. *Peace and Its Discontents*. New York: Vintage, 1996.

Said, Edward, and Christopher Hitchens, eds. *Blaming the Victims*. London: Verso, 1988.

Schiff, Ze'ev. *Security for Peace: Israel's Minimal Security Requirements in Negotiations with the Palestinians*. Washington, DC: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 1989.

Schiff, Ze'ev, and Ehud Ya'ari. *Israel's Lebanon War*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

Schlesinger, Arthur. *The Cycles of American History*. Boston, 1986.

Schumpeter, Joseph. *Imperialism and Social Classes*. New York: A. M. Kelly, 1951.

———. *The Sociology of Imperialisms*. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Co., 1951.

Schurmann, Franz. *The Logic of World Power: An Inquiry into the Origins, Currents and Contradictions of World Power*. New York: Pantheon, 1974, 16, 17.

Segev, Tom, *1949: The First Israelis*. New York: The Free Press, 1986.

Shafir, Gershon. *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Shahak, Israel. *Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies*. London: Pluto Press, 1997.

Shalev, Aryeh. *Israel and Syria: Peace and Security on the Golan Heights*. Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, no. 24. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Post Publishing, 1994.

Sheehan, Edward R. E. *The Arabs, Israelis, and Kissinger: A Secret History of American Diplomacy in the Middle East*. New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1976.

Shehadeh, Raja. *Occupier's Law: Israel and the West Bank*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1988.

Shimshoni, Jonathan. *Israel and Conventional Deterrence: Border Warfare between 1953 and 1970*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Shipler, David. *Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land*. New York: Times Books, 1986.

Shlaim, Avi. *Collusion Across the Jordan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

———. *The Politics of Partition*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

———. *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2001.

Smith, Anthony. *National Identity*. London: Penquin, 1991.

Smith, Charles. *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Snyder, Louis. *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. New York: Paragon House, 1990.

Spiegel, Steven L. *The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Stannard, David. *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World.* London: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Stein, Kenneth W. *The Land Question in Palestine, 1917–1939.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Stein, Leonard J. *The Balfour Declaration.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.

Stone, I. F. *Underground to Palestine and Reflections Thirty Years Later.* New York: Pantheon, 1978.

———. "Holy War," *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict.* Eds. Walter Laqueur and Barry Rubin. New York: Penguin, 1984.

Sweig Julia. *Friendly Fire: Losing Friends and Making Enemies in the Anti-American Century.* New York: Public Affairs, 2006.

Sykes, Christopher. *Crossroads to Israel.* Cleveland, OH: World Publishing, 1965.

Tal, Alon. *Pollution in a Promised Land: An Environmental History of Israel.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Taylor, Alan. *Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy, 1897–1947.* Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 1970.

Tessler, Mark. *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Thant, U. *View from the UN.* Doubleday, 1978.

Thomas, Hugh. *Suez.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.

Tibawi, A. L. *A Modern History of Syria.* London: Macmillan, 1969.

Tilley, Virginia. *The One-State Solution: A Breakthrough for Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Deadlock.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

Tillman, Seth. *The United States in the Middle East.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

Tivnan, Edward. *The Lobby: Jewish Political Power and American Foreign Policy.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Toland, John. *Adolf Hitler.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

Toynbee, Arnold. *A Study of History.* Vol. VIII. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Treverton, Gregory. *Covert Action: The Limits of Intervention in the Postwar World.* New York: Basic Books, 1987.

Truman, Harry S. *Memoirs: Years of Trial and Hope.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1956.

Vance, Cyrus. *Hard Choices: Critical Years in America's Foreign Policy.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Vital, David. *The Origins of Zionism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Volkan, Vamik. *Blood Lines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

Weizman, Ezer. *On Eagles' Wings: The Personal Story of the Israeli Air Force.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.

———. *The Battle for Peace.* New York: Bantam Books, 1981.

Weizmann, Chaim. *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*. Ed. Leonard Stein. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Whitelam, Keith. *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Williams, Robert. *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought*. London: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Yaniv, Avner. *Dilemmas of Security*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Zertal, Edith. *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Journals, Periodicals, Papers, and Reports

American near East Refugee Aid Reports
Amnesty International Country Reports
Arab World Issues
Association of Arab-American University Graduates Press, information
Aviation Week and Space Technology
The Beirut Massacre: The Complete Kahan Commission Report
Boston Globe
B'Tselem (Israeli Information Center for Human Rights).
Christian Science Monitor
The Economist
Foreign Affairs
Foreign Relations of the United States, reports
Foundation for Middle East Peace, reports
Guardian Weekly
George Washington Law Review
Ha'aretz
Human Rights Watch
Information Regarding Israel's Security, reports
Institute for Public Policy Research
International Herald Tribune
Israeli Foreign Affairs
Jerusalem Post
Journal of International Affairs
Journal of Palestine Studies
Le Monde diplomatique
Link
London Financial Times
London Review of Books
Los Angeles Times
Middle East International

Middle East Journal
Middle East Report
Nation
New Outlook
Newsweek
New York Review of Books
New York Times
New Yorker
Palestine Information Center Briefs
Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture
Peace Watch
Philadelphia Inquirer
Report on the Impact of Closure on Water Supply to Palestinian Villages and Towns (2001)
Reuters North European Service
Scientific American
Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Yearbooks
Times Literary Supplement
U.S. State Department Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1987
Wall Street Journal
Washington Post
Washington Report on Middle East Affairs

Index

About the Author

Baylis Thomas, Ph.D. is a writer and psychologist. His graduate training in philosophy and psychology at Haverford College, Harvard University, and New York University led to a career examining the sources of individual and group conflict, psychological and political, particularly where myth plays a role for participants and observers alike.