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ABSTRACT

The aim of this project is to observe the evolution of the Israel Lobby. The project looks at specific conflicts in history beginning with the Iraq War of 2003 in order to present that by this point in history the Israel lobby had already gained ground in American politics. The project then goes back in history to directly contrast this moment of strength by observing the American Jewish community during the Holocaust, the creation of the Jewish state in 1948, the Suez Crisis of 1956, the Six-Day war in 1967, and finally the Yom Kippur war of 1973. The project does not look at the specific causes of the conflicts, but it looks at the role played by the Israel lobby during these events. Because this thesis is very historical, it includes several primary sources as well as interviews in order to support its argument. This thesis is significant because it explores an under discussed subject; the Israel Lobby is constantly observed as the entity that exists today, but scholars overlook its history and the way in which it was able to become this powerful entity. It is necessary to look at the lobby’s history because it enables other lobbies to learn from its experience; in the case of this project, the lobby I am most concerned with is the Arab lobby. Therefore, the Arab lobby can learn from the steps that the Israel lobby has been through in order to build a coalition that has a weighted voice in the American political scene.
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Introduction

In the first season of the well-known series *House of Cards*, the main character, a Democratic majority leader in congress, derails the nomination for Secretary of State by leaking documents which show that the nominee had allegedly made anti-Israel comments. In response to this scandal, the Israeli Prime Minister stated that the Secretary of State was anti-Semitic. The secretary of state fell under severe attacks in the political scene; therefore, he was removed from his position because the president-elect did not want to have an individual who had come under so much fire in such a critical position. This episode exemplifies the importance of Israel in American politics.

This summer of 2015 witnessed a very intense negotiation process between Iran and the United States. Interestingly enough, the Israel Lobby was very involved in this process. “The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) spent what appears to be a record $1.67 million” (Ho, 2015, para 1) in order to enable the Congress to acquire the power to “review...[the] Iran nuclear deal” (Ho, 2015, para 1). What is even more interesting than this enormous sum of money spent, is the fact that AIPAC succeeded in its goal since a bill was passed and became an actual law which “established a 60-day period for Congress to consider the agreement” (Ho, 2015, para 2). Regardless of the actual outcome of the Iran Nuclear deal, the Israel Lobby wanted a review, and the Israel Lobby acquired the review. This very recent example demonstrates the power that the Israel Lobby has today.

A previous "deputy national security advisor in Israel" (Freilich, 2015) stated, “AIPAC is not just a lobby... It is a magnificent creation of the American Jewish community and other supporters of Israel, and has become a vital component of the US-Israel relationship in its own right” (Freilich, 2015). This quote, just like the
previously provided example, is important because it projects the power that AIPAC currently holds. However, it also suggests that AIPAC had not always existed as a member of the Israel Lobby; it had been established by certain people such as the American Jewish community. Therefore, this project aims to investigate and understand the Israel Lobby’s evolution and transformation over time. In addition to this, the project aims to present that the Israel Lobby was not always able to influence U.S. foreign policy, and has not always achieved its goals.

**Conceptual Framework**

In this project, I will evaluate the development of the Israel Lobby from the late 1930s, specifically during the Holocaust years, until today by looking at theories on lobbying and ethnic groups within the American political scene. According to Walt and Mearsheimer, the Israel Lobby consists of different pro-Israel “individuals and organizations” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 5) that aim to shift American “foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 5). Alison Weir, from the Council for the National Interest (Weir, 2014) lists fifty-five organizations that fall under the Israel Lobby.

It is important to note that most of the literature that is written about the Israel Lobby tackles the subject from the foreign policy debate angle; whereas, this project will mention six key organizations that are part of the lobby: the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (CoP), Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA), the Emergency Committee For Israel (ECI), and the American Jewish Committee (AJC) (Weir, 2014). These five have been chosen based on the fact that they constantly appear throughout the literature. They will be evaluated using existent theories on lobbying as well as influence.
Therefore, this project will look at how and when the organizations associated with the Israel lobby started to gain success in their efforts to “encourage legislators to sponsor favorable legislation, craft legislation that conforms to its interests, change the wording of a bill, and give prominent place on a committee's agenda to favorable bills and amendments” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 777).

The method employed to observe the development of the Israel Lobby in this project is theory guided process tracing. Theories of how lobbies function will be used to evaluate the lobby’s strength and evolution. Hence, it will look at the Israel Lobby and whether it conforms into these theories about lobbying. By tracing the evolution of the Israel Lobby over time and by observing its ability to gain power, this method will allow for the increased understanding not only of lobbies in general, but also of whether the Israel Lobby functions appropriately within the theory or takes extreme measures in order to fight for its causes. The project will explain the links between the American Jewish community during the Holocaust, and the Israel Lobby of today. Hence, it will show how the primary focus of American Jewry during the Holocaust was that of seeking the safety of the European Jews who were being harmed by the Nazis (Schoenbaum, 1993, p 26), and how this concern has now transformed into one of supporting Israel by influencing U.S. foreign policy (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 116). The purpose is to understand the way in which the Israel Lobby was able to evolve to the point of power in American politics. Through this project, findings show that during the Holocaust time period, the American Jewish community lived in fear and disconnection from the European Jewry. By 1948, American Zionists were united for the cause of the state of Israel, but after their goal was achieved their “proto-lobby” vanished. During the 1956 war, the Israel Lobby appears to have been largely inactive, and by 1967 it did not play a major role
since the American environment was already pro-Israel. It is only after 1967 that we see a major shift in behavior amongst the American Jewish Community. By the 1973 war, the Israel Lobby was active in the political scene and able to influence foreign policy issues related to Israel. After the 1973, the Israel lobby is able to develop itself and become more aggressive in its method due to new leadership. With the case of the 2003 Iraq war, this strength becomes very obvious.

An appropriate client for this project is the Arab Lobby in the United States. There are three significant organizations that fall under the Arab Lobby: the Arab American Institute, the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, and the National Network for Arab American Communities, all of which aim to target American foreign policy matters that are relevant to the Arab world (“Foreign Policy,” 2015) (“American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee,” 2015) as well as “empower the Arab American community” (“Mission & Vision,” 2014). Essentially, by answering the questions raised in this project, the Arab Lobby, and specifically these three organizations, can learn effective lobbying from the “magnificent creation” (Freilich, 2015) of the Israel Lobby. They can learn how to gain power and how to influence Congress in a way that promotes Arab interests. In addition to this, as per Barari’s concern regarding the Arab world, the project will also provide a deeper understanding of Jewish influences, and a significant modification of the incorrect assumptions and “ideas” (Barari, 2009, p 4).
Chapter 1: Literature Review

In this literature review, I will relay the contemporary academic debates on the power and influence of the Israel lobby and relate it to general theories of lobbying and the role of ethnic lobbying groups in US foreign policy. I will then use this debate to provide a conceptual framework for the analysis of the development and evolution of the Israel Lobby from 1939 through today; there will be special emphasis on the period between 1939 and 1967.

A. The Israel Lobby Now

One of the first works to present the idea of the extreme power of the Israel Lobby was Paul Findley’s (1985) book entitled They Dare to Speak Out. In this book, Findley provides his own personal experience with the Israel Lobby, and then applies that to the experience of other senators. Findley was a Republican congressman who was “being opposed by pro-Israel activists because of...[his] work on Middle East Policy” (Findley, 1985, p 19). He explains that he was never anti-Israel (Findley, 1985, p p.22); only trying to be fair with regard to Palestine. This was, however, enough to eliminate him from congress. When Findley asked why this had happened to him, “Doug Bloomfield, a friend on the AIPAC staff...[stated], “you were the most visible critic of Israeli policy. That’s the best answer I can give” (Findley, 1985, p 23). Therefore, Findley’s entire book is trying to understand how and why the Israel lobby was able to do this. Hence, the strength of this book is that the author is speaking from a direct event that had happened to him. In addition, the source provides an insider’s perspective on the lobby’s actions.
Another critical study by an American scholar, Rubenberg (1986), has proposed that “the objective power of the pro-Israeli groups grew tremendously in the years after 1967” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 15), explicitly providing a historical benchmark that underscores the Israel Lobby’s appearance as a power in American political scene. Rubenberg (1986) uses a mixture of sources ranging from speeches to academic books and biographies to document the relationship between Israel and the United States, and includes a chapter on the Israel Lobby. She describes the lobby’s main aim as being able to “assure Israel that its interests became American policy, even as U.S. interests were compromised along the way” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 15). This statement is critical because it presents the Israel Lobby as having the unusual power to push American foreign policy, even if they may be contrary to U.S. interests. The depth and variety of the sources used in this work strongly support her argument, even though she only devotes one chapter to the Israel Lobby.

Similar to Rubenberg (1986), Tivnan, (1987) and Lind (2002) also address the extreme power of Israel Lobby in the United States. Both authors provide minimal historical context and perspective about the creation of the Israel Lobby. With regard to Tivnan (1987), he states “that most American Jews preferred to remain Americans” (Tivnan, 1987, p 30). However, he does not emphasize on any of the necessary details for such a claim; this further supports the point that literature on the Israel Lobby tends to overlook the historical American Jewish community. As for Lind (2002), he explains that the Israel Lobby is not one organization, and that different “groups” (Lind, 2002) constitute it. He also states that “the Israel lobby is united not by a consensus about Israeli policies but by a consensus about U.S. policies toward Israel” (Lind, 2002). In his article, he mentions two major factors that, he believes, enable the Israel Lobby to obtain such dominance: monetary power and reach within the
government (Lind, 2002) (Rubenberg 1986). Lind (2002) suggests the Israel Lobby is “far too powerful,” but similar to the case of Tivnan (1987), does not discuss the reasons how and when this change has occurred.

Providing many answers to the gaps left open by Rubenberg (1986), Tivnan (1987), and Lind (2002) is the book entitled *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* by Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer (2007). This book, which “generated a firestorm of criticism” (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007, p viii), was “ground breaking” (McDonald, 2007, p 33) because it was the first of its kind “to discuss the lobby’s role in shaping U.S. policy” (Mearsheimer and Walt, 2007, p ix) In their book, Walt and Mearsheimer (2007) go through every significant event in the Middle East in the late 20th century and early 21st century and tie them back to the Israel Lobby’s impacts. For example, they discuss the Iraq war of 2003, the Lebanese War of 2006, and Iran. Hence, Walt and Mearsheimer (2007) published a source that was much stronger than the books that came before them. The variety of sources used in this book is tremendous, including newspaper articles, governmental and congressional documents, speeches by presidents, and research center publications to provide a strong foundation for their argument.

In response to Walt and Mearsheimer’s provocative book, Foxman (2009), President of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), and Lieberman (2009) attempted to counter the argument that the Israel Lobby has the capability to influence U.S. foreign policy. However, there are certain ironies in their rebuttals that need to be noted. For example, the ADL is considered to be a key component of the Israel Lobby (Weir, 2014). In addition to this, the information Foxman provides in order to counter Walt and Mearsheimer’s (2007) arguments regarding terrorist organizations attacking the U.S. because of the country’s “support to Israel” (Foxman, 2009, p 62), are from the
Washington Institute for Near East Policy, which is another member of the Israel Lobby (Weir, 2014).

In addition to Foxman and Lieberman, there are several other authors who argue against the extent of the Israel Lobby’s ability to influence U.S. foreign policy (Freidberg, 2006) (Ross, 2006) (Ben-Ami, 2006) (Shultz, 2007). There is the voice of Freedland (2009), who takes the middle ground between Walt and Mearsheimer (2007), stating that the lobby does not control U.S. foreign policy, but it still has a strong existence in the U.S. (Freedland, 2009). Like Freedland (2009), Verbeeten (2006) argues that the Israel Lobby does not control U.S. foreign policy, but is still “able to constrain or modify it [foreign policy]” in ways that benefit Israel (Verbeeten, 2006).

What this controversy shows is the lack of genuine debate about the extent and ability of the Israel Lobby to influence U.S. foreign policy is the application of theories about how lobbies function, and how lobbying takes place to what the Israel Lobby does. This application of theories on the Israel Lobby is needed because it will enable us to understand how powerful the lobby really is, as well as when and how the change took place.

B. Lobbying

When authors discuss the influence of the Israel Lobby in specific, they fail to do so through the techniques of lobbying such as those mentioned by Hojnacki and Kimball (1998). Therefore, by mixing the specific Israel Lobby with the criteria for powerful lobbying by Hojnacki and Kimball (1998), this presents a new perspective of the issue. To add to that, it weakens the arguments by authors such as Foxman, mentioned earlier, who very much oppose the argument that the Israel Lobby has influence on U.S. foreign policy because these opposing authors also do not use
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general lobbying criteria to support their argument.

Therefore, to understand both the methods in which the Israel Lobby works, the claims brought against it as being all-powerful, as well as the lobby’s history, it is essential to discuss how lobbies function and are formed in general, as well as the specific nature of lobbying groups that represent ethnic minorities. Shain (1994), in his work “Ethnic Diasporas and U.S. Foreign Policy,” focuses on how “the American political system” (Shain, 1994, p 812) enables different ethnic groups to play a part in the political scene and have an important role in “U.S. foreign policy” (Shain, 1994, p 812). What is very significant about this piece is that the author refers to numerous types of interest groups that exist in America: “Greek, Armenian, Irish, or Jewish descent… African, Arab, Cuban, Filipino, Haitian, Korean, and Mexican” (Shain, 1994, p 812). Therefore, he first focuses on the general idea of lobbying, but also provides historical examples of how different ethnic groups have played a role in impacting American foreign policy. His sources are comprised of Academic books and journals as well as newspaper articles; therefore, his research is extremely well supported.

While Shain (1994) begins by giving general examples of interest groups, Hojancki and Kimball (1998) move one step further by very concretely defining what it means to lobby by devoting an entire section to the subject, which is a significant strength of their article. They also add to Shain (1994) by discussing the technicalities of lobbying. They emphasize that a predominant idea regarding lobbies’ behavior is that they generally “are more likely to lobby their allies in committee than their opponents or undecided members” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 775). They state that this behavior changes when the lobby or organization starts to have connections
with the “legislative district. It then can work directly to build coalitions in Congress in addition to relying on legislative friends” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 775).

There are clear connections between Hojnacki and Kimball’s description of lobbies and Paul Findley’s They Dare to Speak Out. Findley was eliminated from Congress because he was no longer regarded as an “ally” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 775); Findley’s example very openly presents the Israel Lobby’s evidence of power. Hojnack and Kimball also explain that lobbying results in the following: “A group will encourage legislators to sponsor favorable legislation, craft legislation that conforms to its interests, change the wording of a bill, and give prominent place on a committee's agenda to favorable bills and amendments” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 777). Therefore, the strength of this article is that it is extremely informative when attempting to understand general lobby behavior.

Looking at lobbying from a dissimilar angle than Hojnacki and Kimball’s (1998), Hall and Wayman (1990) look at the financial properties of lobbying. They explain that money is actually critical in the lobbying process because it leads to “access” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803). This access is essential because it

“Becomes an important proximate goal of the interest group pursuing a legislative agenda. Access is central to stimulating agency. It gives the group the opportunity to let otherwise sympathetic members (and their staffs) know that some issue or upcoming activity is important to them” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803).

Therefore, it enables more people who have the power to control or change policies to gather to your side. Hence, this study goes one step further than Hojnacki and Kimball (1998) because it discusses the impact money has on lobbying. This study emphasizes that there is a direct “connection between” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 814) money provided by lobbying “and the legislative involvement of
sympathetic members” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 814). In addition to this, the study underscores that the member of congress the money is provided to “already” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 814) has to be in support of the cause (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 814), which was also mentioned by Hojnacki and Kimball (1998).

Again, Hall and Wayman’s theories are very beneficial and can be applied to the Israel Lobby. Lind (2002), for example, underscored how the Israel Lobby has access to money and definitely uses it for its own interests. In addition, “Open Secrets,” an organization that collects data on funds provided by different “interest groups” (“OpenSecrets,” 2015), presents the names of all of the different congressmen, as well as the amount of money they were paid by the Israel Lobby between 2009 and 2015. For example, Marco Rubio received “$147, 430” (“OpenSecrets,” 2015) as a Republican senator. He is currently running for president, and although no exact statistics could be located presently about how much money he has been provided by the Israel Lobby for this campaign, he did make a very clear statement about Israel during the Republican presidential debates:

“There is no moral equivalence between Israel and those who seek to destroy her...Understanding the fundamental truth is essential to being the next Commander-in-Chief... It’s a struggle to safeguard the future of Israel” (Rushing, 2015, para 3-4).

Similarly, Senator Kelly Ayotte who explains that "Israel is our closest and most reliable ally in the Middle East,” (“Graham, Mendez, Ayotte,” 2014), and was responsible for a resolution in Congress maintains Israel’s “right to self-defense” (“Graham, Mendez, Ayotte,” 2014) during the war with Palestine in the summer of 2014, received “$151,048” from the Israel Lobby (OpenSecrets,” 2015). These examples provide further evidence of the lobby’s power with regard to the application of Hall and Wayman’s (1990) theory.
Cumberlege (2004) writes about lobbying with regard to nursing rights. However, her advice is extremely broad and can be applied to lobbying in general, specifically with regard to how lobbies develop. For example, she provides simple techniques and steppingstones as to how organizations can learn to be good lobbyists. Firstly, she says they need to have a clear idea of what they want to accomplish. The next step she emphasizes is for all backers of the case to be united together. The third step is to look at the matter from the perspective of the individual or organization you are attempting to lobby; she underscores that it is necessary the have the matter being lobbied linked to the individual or organization you are lobbying.

Cumberlege (2004) and Terry (2005) both emphasize the necessity of having “connections” (Cumberlege, 2004, p.30), even though Terry (2005) tends to delve into more detail with regard to the Israel Lobby. A major strength in Terry (2005) is the fact that she uses numerous historical examples of how lobbies function. As for Grossman and Helpman (1994), they go one step further than both Cumberlege (2004) and Terry (2005) because they provide detailed steps as to exactly how lobbies attempt to acquire what they want. They claim that lobbies collect data that is in direct support of their cause and present “it to powerful politicians” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1). The lobbies also target the general public in order “to win voter sympathy” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1). Thirdly, and very importantly, lobbies occasionally act out obtrusively in an attempt to “coerce rather than persuade” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1). Finally, lobbies pay money to anyone in the political picture who can advance their cause. Therefore, the strength of Grossman and Helpman (1994) is that they add on to Cumberlege (2004) and Terry (2005) and this enables them to paint a clearer picture of how lobbies work.
Therefore, these previously mentioned theories on how lobbies work, acquire influence, and the significance of money with regard to lobbying are important because they enable us to evaluate the Israel Lobby’s power today. However, they also enable us to look at the process and evolution of the lobby’s power over time and when it became a key entity in American foreign policy creation. The previously mentioned Tivnan (1994) mentioned 1967 as a turning point for the Israel Lobby. However, he does not discuss the details of why this was so. Tivnan (1987) also tackles the issue of the Israel Lobby by addressing a chapter to every U.S. president. However, he does dedicate an entire chapter to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Therefore, with Tivnan’s (1987) example, we see the obvious flaw of failing to link theories on lobbying to the Israel Lobby, a theme that appears to be lacking in most literature on the Israel Lobby. Thus, it is important to go back in history in order to explore the Israel lobby from its very beginning and to question if it was always the powerful entity that it is today.

C. Was This Always the Case?

Looking at the American Jewish Community during the Holocaust reveals that this community was the exact opposite of the Israel Lobby today. The American Jewish community had an obvious lack of power during this specific time period. The first most standard source to use in order to understand the American Jewish community is Sarna (2004). The last two chapters of this book look at modern American Jewish history specifically during WWII. Sarna underscores the anti-Semitism apparent in the United States at the time.

Another significant source from the Shoah Research Center entitled *American Jewry and the Holocaust* will be used. This source emphasizes the general trend in lack of unanimity and cooperation among the American Jewry. The source also
underscores the presence of anti-Semitism in America during World War II, which drove the American Jewry to fear speaking up. It is important to note that the Shoah Research Center is a good source of Jewish opinion since it dedicates all of its work to the Holocaust; therefore, this is the center’s specialization. Another source entitled *Jewish Artists in New York: The Holocaust Years* by Matthew Baigell also speaks in great detail about the Anti-Semitism in the United States and even provides names of famous anti-Semites and rallies organized to denounce Jews. The strength of this book is that it speaks of specific events and figures that show how predominant the phenomenon was. Therefore, with regard to the predominant anti-Semitism, these sources are clearly aligned with one another and underscore the problems American Jewish community faced during the Holocaust; they do not contradict each other on this specific subject.

A final source is Bolkosky (2000). The author studies a specific case of the reaction of the American Jews living in Detroit to the Jewish European Refugees fleeing there from the Holocaust. The author explains that years before the Holocaust began, there were clear signs of anti-Semitism in the United States since “American supporters of Hitler marched in a parade in Washington, D.C…[whereby] the head of the German-American bund, charged the American Jewish community with sabotaging both the German and American economies by boycotting German goods” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 309). Therefore, the source speaks of specific historical events that clearly portray anti-Semitism in the American society. To add to that, the author emphasizes that Jews in Detroit were advised not to speak up “against German policies” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 310) by “national and Detroit Jewish organizations” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 310). Therefore, this caused a clash between such Jewish organizations since, for example, “leaders of the American Jewish
Committee…opposed the attempts by the American Jewish Congress to organize mass protest meetings” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 310), which signifies a lack of coherence and cooperation between the Jewish organizations. Although the author speaks in details of attempts to help the European Jews, he makes an extremely critical statement: “it was as if the Jews of Europe and the Jews of America lived on different planets. No rescue came from the Allies; and American Jews remained disunited” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 315).

This specific case by Bolkosky (2000) is very significant because it underscores all of the points mentioned by all of the previous authors and exemplifies these points through a historical example. Therefore, the strength of this case is twofold: the author uses a specific historical case of American Jewry and Jewish refugees in Detroit, and secondly, he uses very critical sources to support the case such as interviews with figures from Jewish organizations, the meeting minutes of these organizations, and speeches.

As has been mentioned earlier, by looking at the historical context of the American Jewry during the time of the Holocaust, this will reveal the stark contrast between the disunity, lack of organization, and inability, if not reluctance, to pressure the U.S. government to help the European Jews suffering under the Nazis and the power, organization, and effectives of the Israel lobby today. This brief historical section on the American Jewish community is essential because it provides a strong foundation that will clearly reveal the evolution and obvious rise in power of the Israel Lobby over time as will be shown through the different time periods, under American presidents, that will be observed. Not only is this important because it shows the progress made by the American Jewish community, but also because in all of the gathered research, it has not been addressed from this perspective before.
Sources generally speak of the Israel Lobby today, but they never tie it back to the American Jewish community of the past, specifically during the Holocaust. Tivnan (1987) attempts to do so but overly magnifies their role as well as speeds through the event, leading to a flawed chapter. Even with the case of Schoenbaum’s (1993), the focus of his book is not on the role of the Israel Lobby to influence U.S. foreign policy, it is on the state of Israel and its struggle to exist. Therefore, authors who speak of the Israel Lobby and its influence on U.S. foreign policy tend to overlook the community’s past weakness. However, when the American Jewish community’s past state is acknowledged and taken into account, this magnifies the understanding of the sense of power that the Israel Lobby has reached today.

It is important to note that Schoenbaum (1993) mentions key organizations in the U.S. such as the Zionist Organization of America, the American Zionist Emergency Council, the Jewish Agency, and the American Jewish Council. He states that these organizations had a role during the Holocaust; they wanted to “open the doors of Palestine” (Schoenbaum, 1993, p 29) to the European Jews. However, he also states that there was “a war among the Jews and the implicit deadlock among the political authorities” (Schoenbaum, 1993, p 30), which clearly made initiatives by the key organizations ineffective.

Hence, this information leads to an important and under-explored question: how did the Israel Lobby transform into the “magnificent creation” (Freilich, 2015), of the American Jewish Community (Freilich, 2015) who were themselves so extremely weak at point in history, specifically during the Holocaust? According to Rubenberg (1986), the situation began to evolve after 1967. Therefore, at which point after 1939 did the American Jewish community begin to develop effectively the powers explained by Hojnicki and Kimball’s (1998) and Hall and Wayman (1990).
Did they follow through with Cumberlege’s (2004) description of what successful lobbying entails? Answers to these interrelated questions will help us understand how the lobby evolved to what it is now, and will also enable other lobbies to understand the steps to take in order to reach this same position.
Chapter 2: Research Methodology

To address the issue, it will be necessary to trace the history and development of the Israel lobby for evidence of influence and access in accordance with Hojnacki and Kimball (1998) as well as Hall and Wayman’s (1990) theories on lobbying. The most appropriate method to do so is through historical-content analysis, which will enable meticulous research to be done by looking at critical periods in history using the lens of the previously mentioned lobbying theories. By doing so, it will be possible to establish when the turning point for the lobby took place, and how this happened.

The starting point of the project will be the Iraq case, the project will then go back in history and start with the Holocaust time period. The Israel Lobby, its creation, rise in power, and role in influencing U.S. foreign policy will be analyzed. Specific cases will be discussed and analyzed such as the Holocaust time period, 1948 and the creation of the state of Israel, the Suez Crisis of 1956, the 1967 war, and the Yom Kippur war of 1973. The aim of looking at these specific events in history is to show the evolution of the ability of the Israel Lobby to fight for its cause, and the degree in which it was able to influence U.S. foreign policy throughout these critical years. Walt and Mearsheimer (2007) have discussed the more recent cases in which the Israel Lobby played a part such as with the Lebanese War in 2006, Iraq (2003), and Iran, and although they have very briefly mentioned the ACWAS issue of 1981 and the Lebanese War of 1982, they have focused on very little discussion of the earlier conflicts of the Holocaust time period, 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973. Hence, they do not target the general past that I aim to discuss; consequently, they have not adequately discussed the way in which the lobby has attained the power that it currently holds. Therefore, this project will look at earlier and critical conflicts, which
will build on the later conflicts the Walt and Mearsheimer (2007) analyze, leading to a full history of the Israel lobby.

The only case that will be regarded as a common denominator between Walt and Mearsheimer and this thesis is the case of Iraq (2003). This case will be discussed briefly in order to show that the Israel Lobby had attained power by the time of this specific conflict, which will serve to provide a very stark contrast from the lobby’s earlier history. Case studies are the most beneficial form of research in this situation because they allow for a clear observation of the Israel Lobby’s behavior and will reflect the extent to which the Israel Lobby is able influence U.S. foreign policy; this will be beneficial because it will present the blatant contrast and lack of influence in the lobby’s past.

In order to study the subject of the Israel Lobby, its evolution, and its influence, extensive research is necessary. This will be done by looking at academic and historical books that discuss the lobby’s creation. When discussing the lobby’s current state, observing funding as well as financial contributions provided by the Israel Lobby to specific U.S. senators will be critical because it will clearly show which senators take the side of the lobby. Preliminary research shows that this appears to be a circular process: the lobby funds specific senators, leading the senators to voice the lobby’s opinions in Congress; the cycle continues in this way. Therefore when looking at such funding, it will also be necessary to analyze congress bills and votes by senators in order check that the senators' habits are in line with the Israel Lobby's stances.

Like Walt and Mearsheimer, it will also be essential to analyze newspaper articles because many statements included in these articles are made by senators supporting the lobby as well as U.S. presidents. In addition to this, it will be necessary
to look at the statements made by the various organizations that make up the lobby. As mentioned in the Conceptual Framework section, the five organizations from the Israel Lobby that will be mentioned are the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (CoP), Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA), the Emergency Committee For Israel (ECI), and the American Jewish Committee (AJC) (Weir, 2014) because of their constant reoccurrence in the literature.
Chapter 3: Lobby Power: The Case of Iraq 2003

The aim of this chapter is to show that the Israel Lobby had been active, long before the war, in lobbying against Iraq. However, it remained rather quiet directly before, as well as during the war (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 242), with the exception of some resolutions. I argue that the quiescence of the Israel lobby in this period was not the absence of clout, but a reflection of it. Given its access to key leaders and its influence, it had already laid the groundwork for bi-partisan support of the US invasion. Although the Israel Lobby was not the cause for war, it was able to build a strong case against Iraq and the threat that it represented.

The influence enjoyed by the various components of the Israel lobby in 2003 would have been unimaginable 64 years earlier during the Holocaust, when the American Jewish community was unorganized and reluctant to apply pressure on the government. As this project will demonstrate, the lobby as it is today developed slowly, with distinct differences in organizational capacity and influence evident in 1948, 1956, 1967, and finally, with the 1973 war, which I argue is the first time we see the very organized system of lobbying that exists today. The Iraq War of 2003 shows a culmination of their efforts and their years of attempting to gain influence as well as have their place in the American political scene.

A. Background: Saddam Hussein and Israel

During the Iran-Iraq war, Saddam Hussein appeared to have seen himself “as the future leader of the Arab world” (Baram, 2012, para 22). “Saddam added, he would tell Begin ‘[Y]our presence here, on this land [Israel before June 1967] is illegal. [I will say] that they have to leave my [Arab] country’. Saddam thus implied that he did not seek bloodshed per se but, rather, the demise of Israel” (Baram, 2012,
Therefore, Israel’s existence was not a question with Saddam; he did not want it to exist on its own terms, but only according to his. Hatred escalated when Israel destroyed Iraq’s “nuclear reactor in…1981” (Baram, 2012, para 5). At the time of the war with Iran, Hussein continued to hate Israel for being “the middleman” (Baram, 2012, para 10) while Iran acquired weapons from the U.S. In 1990, Saddam Hussein stated, “I will burn half of Israel” (Baram, 2012, para 21). Then in 1991, “Iraq fired 39 Scud missile” (Bard, n.d., para 15) against Israel. Thus, there were obvious tensions between Iraq and Israel, and Saddam Hussein was openly vocal against the state.

In 2002, Bush used the Central Intelligence Agency’s then classified publication as a foundation for his argument to go to war in Iraq (Rosen, 2015, para 2). “The document determines that Saddam Hussein had an active chemical weapons program” (Rosen, 2015, para 4). Not only this but, “the intelligence estimate also heavily qualified its evidence of any link between Saddam's regime and al Qaeda, noting that the sources were not entirely reliable” (Rosen, 2015, para 4). Thus, the central issue between 2002 and 2003 was that the U.S. could either go to war in Iraq, or abstain from such military action.

B. Voice of the Lobby

According to one news article published on the 17th of October 2002 by Matthew Berger, The Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations had composed a resolution in which they stated that they were in complete support of Bush’s decision to take action with regard to Iraq’s “weapons of mass destruction and stop weapons development programs” (Berger, 2002, para 2). Therefore the Conference of Presidents’ resolution was composed four days (Berger, 2002, para 2) before Bush had officially “signed” (“H.J.Res. 114 (107th),” 2002) this Iraq
resolution of 2002. Berger notes that the final form of the Conference’s resolution differed from the draft because the draft included the following statement: “the draft had offered support only for unspecified presidential initiatives” (Berger, 2002, para 3), while the resolution in its final form replaced this sentence with the following: “the use of force as a last resort and supports White House efforts to build U.N. and other international backing” (Berger, 2002, para 3). What this difference presents is that “use of force” (Berger, 2002, para 3) was in fact an option that was approved by these organizations. The final resolution states,

“the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations affirms its support for President Bush and the government of the United States in the war against global terrorism. In this struggle, Iraq presents unique dangers. It possesses chemical and biological weapons and, according to numerous accounts, could have a nuclear capability in a short period of time. Such weapons of mass destruction might be supplied to terrorist networks with a global reach, including those who have targeted the United States and others” (“Conference of Presidents Declares Support,” 2002, para 5).

Berger underscores that, generally, American Jewish organizations agreed with this resolution and he named the Jewish Council for Public Affairs as well as the Zionist Organization of America; however, he includes the American Jewish Committee as the exception to the rule, whereby they thought “that it would be inappropriate for Jewish groups to speak out on Iraq at this time” (Berger, 2002, para 15). When looking at this statement, the American Jewish Committee does not state that it will never agree on the rest of the members of the Israel Lobby’s stance with regard to Iraq; it just believed that this moment in history was not the correct “time” (Berger, 2002, para 15). So, there was a possibility for it to change its stance when the time was right for it to do so.

All of the four previously mentioned organizations are part of the Israel Lobby (Weir, 2014). Berger’s conclusion is also inline with Michelle Goldberg’s article
which was published in 2002 as well. Similarly, Goldberg cites the opinions of several American Jewish organizations about the Iraq war, clearly before it had occurred. He explains that generally, most of these American Jewish organizations support the idea of going to war. For example, “Malcolm Hoenlein, executive vice chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, says, ‘In the American Jewish community, there’s a great deal of support for the president’s stand’” (Goldberg, 2002, para 4). In this discourse, we are able to see, generally, a unified position within the Israel Lobby. To add to that, what is very important about this article is that it makes very clear the established link between Iraq and Israel: Saddam Hussein (Goldberg, 2002, para 4). In support of this point, in a recently published article in 2013, until Saddam’s very final moment he is recorded to have stated: “‘Death to America! Death to Israel! Long live Palestine! Death to the Persian magi!’, ” (“Executioner,” 2013, para 2). So, his anti-Israel sentiments were never a secret. The section at the beginning of this chapter regarding the tension between Israel and Iraq also underscores the threat posed by Saddam.

Walt and Mearsheimer also emphasize “Jewish organizations’ ” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 243) stance with regard to Iraq, but they go even one step further by citing an article that observed:

“The attitudes of most American Jews toward the war itself: According to a 2007 Gallup Organization study based on the results of thirteen polls taken since 2005, American Jews are significantly more opposed to the Iraq war (77 percent) than the general American public (52 percent). With respect to Iraq, the larger and wealthier pro-Israel organizations are clearly out of step with the broader population of American Jews” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 243).

Very relevant to the previous paragraph, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA) made the following official statement:
When observing the first document mentioned in JCPA’s official statement, it appears that there were two resolutions regarding Iraq on the same day in 1998. One of these resolutions was entitled “Resolution on the Iraq Crisis” (“JCPA”, 1998). This resolution sees that it is essential to rid Saddam Hussein of his “weapons of mass destruction” (“JCPA”, 1998), and it mentions “Unscom, [which] was established to oversee the destruction of Iraq's missile, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs” (“JCPA”, 1998). The document then concludes by saying that it sides with the American government “in its decision to maintain military preparedness as may be needed” (“JCPA”, 1998). Therefore, it openly believes that if the American government takes armed action against Iraq, this would be justified. As for the second resolution, it is entitled the “Resolution on Solidarity with Israel During the Iraq Crisis” (“JCPA”, 1998). This time, it does not only focus on Iraq, but it also discusses the issue of Israel. The text presents the idea that Saddam Hussein is armed and
“evidently continues to possess the capacity to launch missiles armed with conventional and possibly non-conventional weapons as well” (“JCPA”, 1998), meaning the JCPA is not assuming that he has these weapons, but it is ensuring that he does and it adds that it wants the American government to openly announce “recent statements by senior American officials affirming Israel's right of self-defense” (“JCPA”, 1998). What this resolution presents is that the Israel Lobby had been focused on Iraq for many years, and that this attention directed at Saddam and Iraq did not just start in 2001 after 9/11. The lobbying had obviously been taking place for years.

Almost one week after the 9/11 attacks, William Kristol penned the “open letter to the President [Bush]” (Kristol, 2001), which “was signed by 41 leading” (Avnery, 2003) neoconservatives. The main idea behind this letter was to encourage Bush to focus on four areas: Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine, and Hizbullah in Lebanon (Kristol, 2001). With regard to Iraq, he stated that there may have been a possible connection between Saddam Hussein and Bin Laden, however “even if evidence does not link Iraq directly to the attack, any strategy aiming at the eradication of terrorism and its sponsors must include a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq” (Kristol, 2001). Drawing parallels to the Iraq war in 2003, with regard to the Iran Nuclear Deal and the previously mentioned intense negotiation process in the introduction, there was a senator named Tom Cotton who penned the “letter of 47” (“Letter from Senate Republicans,” 2015), directed at the Iranian government. Tom Cotton’s “senate campaign cost $13.9 million…[and] that doesn’t include the nearly one-million-dollar contribution in supportive political advertising made by Bill [William] Kristol’s Emergency Committee for Israel” (Clifton and Lobe, 2015). Therefore, how ironic is it to make the connection that William Kristol’s organization,
the Emergency Committee for Israel, is part of the Israel Lobby (Weir, 2014)? This is the same man who wrote the letter to Bush promoting the war on Iraq, and the same man who helped finance Cotton, who fought the Iran Nuclear Deal. So it appears that Senator Tom Cotton had followed Kristol’s method so many years later in 2015. It must be noted that the Emergency Committee for Israel is composed of both “Republican Party neoconservatives and Evangelical Christians” (Weir, 2014). According to Walt and Mearsheimer, these neoconservatives were publishing articles in the news in order to propagate the idea for the Iraq War (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 248). Such publications by such individuals were actually used “to reinforce the arguments made by Bush administration insiders” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 250). Therefore, when Walt and Mearsheimer link the neoconservatives to the Israel Lobby this is the reason why:

“key leaders of the major pro-Israel organizations lent their voices to the campaign for war. Of course, many of the neoconservatives themselves had close ties to these organizations. In mid-September 2002, when the selling of the war was just getting under way, Michelle Goldberg wrote in Salon that “mainstream Jewish groups and leaders are now among the strongest supporters of an American invasion of Baghdad” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 241).

In an interview with Congressman Nick Rahall, he affirms the link between the Israel lobby and these neoconservatives by stating,

“there is no doubt a link between the Israeli lobby and the neoconservatives that continues to this day. A closer examination will reveal such in the backgrounds, public statements, and positions taken over the entire careers of those who led us into the Iraq War and even worse, the disastrous decisions made in the immediate aftermath” (N. Rahall, personal communication, March 23, 2016).

Therefore, when relating this to lobby literature, as has been mentioned in the literature review section, these neoconservatives appear to be the Israel Lobby’s “connections” (Cumberlege, 2004, p.30) in the U.S. government during the prelude to
the Iraq war. This method is underscored by both Cumberlege (2004) and Terry (2005). Therefore, when Grossman and Helpman state that “they [interest groups] gather information that supports their positions and make it available to powerful politicians” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1), this shows that the Israel Lobby was actually one step ahead because they had become linked to the neoconservatives within the American government. They did not need to supply these “powerful politicians” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1) with information in order to gain their backing because the support was already there.

C. The American Government’s Stance

According to Krugman, “America invaded Iraq because the Bush administration wanted a war” (Krugman, 2015, para 3). However, according to Bush this was not always the case. When he was asked about this issue, he stated:

“No president wants war. Everything you may have heard is that, but it’s just simply not true. My attitude about the defense of this country changed on September the 11th. We — when we got attacked, I vowed then and there to use every asset at my disposal to protect the American people. Our foreign policy changed on that day, Helen. You know, we used to think we were secure because of oceans and previous diplomacy, but we realized on September the 11th, 2001, that killers could destroy innocent life. And I’m never going to forget it. And I’m never going to forget the vow I made to the American people that we will do everything in our power to protect our people. Part of that meant to make sure that we didn’t allow people to provide safe haven to an enemy. And that’s why I went into Iraq” (“Helen Thomas Asks President Bush,” 2006, para 7).

What can be understood from Bush’s reply is that the American government became inclined to go to war in 2003 only due to September 11th, and although Bush does not mention any concrete facts he had about the link between Iraq and 9/11, he claims “I also saw a threat in Iraq. I was hoping to solve this problem diplomatically…And when he [Hussein] chose to deny inspectors, when he chose not to disclose, then I had the difficult decision to make to remove him.” (“Helen Thomas
According to the U.S. Senate’s official website, the resolution to go to war in Iraq passed with “77 yeas and 23 nays” (“U.S. Senate Roll Call Votes,” n.d.), which is obviously a significant majority. This data reveals that the members of congress were inclined to go to war. The decision did not come from the president since in this case he does not have the authority. If the Congress was not initially inclined to go to war, the roll call would not have appeared with such results since there seems to have been general consensus on the issue.

D. The Outcome

From the previous quote by Walt and Mearsheimer emphasizing the link between the lobby and the neoconservatives with power in the American government, there is evidence to suggest the Israel Lobby had established sufficient access and influence to nudge foreign policy in a direction that fit their interests. Almost one year after these efforts, the Iraq resolution entitled “Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002” (“H.J.Res. 114 (107th),” 2002) was approved. The process happened very quickly according to the timeline relayed on the website dedicated to presenting such governmental documents; it was first “introduced [on] October 2nd, 2002” (“H.J.Res. 114 (107th),” 2002). It then moved forward in the “House” (“H.J.Res. 114 (107th),” 2002) and the “Senate” (“H.J.Res. 114 (107th),” 2002), and by “October 16th, 2002…the president [Bush] signed the bill and it became law” (“H.J.Res. 114 (107th),” 2002). Below are sections from the completed resolution that are most relevant to the thesis:
Whereas Iraq both poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations;

Whereas members of al Qaida, an organization bearing responsibility for attacks on the United States, its citizens, and interests, including the attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are known to be in Iraq;

Whereas Iraq continues to aid and harbor other international terrorist organizations, including organizations that threaten the lives and safety of United States citizens;

Whereas the attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, underscored the gravity of the threat posed by the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by international terrorist organizations;

Whereas Iraq's demonstrated capability and willingness to use weapons of mass destruction, the risk that the current Iraqi regime will either employ those weapons to launch a surprise attack against the United States or its Armed Forces or provide them to international terrorists who would do so, and the extreme magnitude of harm that would result to the United States and its citizens from such an attack, combine to justify action by the United States to defend itself;

(H.J.Res.114, 2002, p 2)
These points highlighted from the resolution are the justification for why the U.S. needed to invade Iraq and remove Saddam. Most of the reasons above linked Saddam to the tragic 9/11 attacks; therefore, it was presented in the method that America was protecting itself even though there were experts who attempted to explain that there was no need for such a war. One example is Brent Scowcroft who was a “national security adviser under Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush” (Scowcroft, 2002). In his article published in 2002, he explains that there is no reason the U.S. should go to war with Iraq since “there is scant evidence to tie Saddam to terrorist organizations, and even less to the Sept. 11 attacks. Indeed
Saddam's goals have little in common with the terrorists who threaten us, and there is little incentive for him to make common cause with them” (Scowcroft, 2002, para 5), and that going to war would actually lead to more harm rather than help. While the war was taking place, 27 “diplomats and military leaders” (“On a Statement,” 2004) published a very critical message in which they stated that:

“The government was ‘motivated more by ideology than by reasoned analysis.’ It has ‘led the United States into an ill-planned and costly war from which exit is uncertain. It justified the invasion of Iraq by manipulation of uncertain intelligence about weapons of mass destruction, and by a cynical campaign to persuade the public that Saddam Hussein was linked to Al Qaeda and the attacks of September 11. The evidence did not support this argument’” (“On a Statement,” 2004, para 2).

This quote shows that the American government had decided to go against what was reasonable and acted irrationally when it went to war in Iraq in 2003.

1. The Lobby’s Influence

If it was already established prior to 2003 that the Iraq war was not the best idea, it is essential to look at the lobby’s influence in relation to such a decision of going to war. In an interview with Lara Friedman, the Director of Policy and Government Relations at Americans for Peace Now, she rejected the idea of the lobby having influence in 2003. When I asked if her organization was a member of the Israel Lobby, she stated: “absolutely, so if the Israel Lobby is defined as groups who are working…because they care about Israel and that is their mission, then absolutely, sure” (L. Friedman, personal communication, March 14, 2016). When asked about the role of the Israel Lobby during the Iraq war, she firmly states:

“As someone who was working on Capitol Hill at that time, there is no doubt in my mind that there were people working very hard on Capitol Hill to convince people to support the Iraq war. Some of those people had nothing to do with Israel, some of those people were Jewish. From what I saw, I saw no evidence at any time, and I am a
pretty well-connected person on the Hill, that AIPAC was actively lobbying for the Iraq war. Zero. And I am someone who collects every piece of paper that they distribute. I don’t think that is accurate, I think it is accurate to say that when you look at the list of people who were most enthusiastic about the Iraq war, many of those are the neocons and many of those people are also very enthusiastic on the right wing of Israeli politics. That doesn’t mean that this was a conspiracy of the Jewish lobby. I will say that we as a Jewish organization [Americans for Peace Now] stayed out of this. This was outside of our mission and we didn’t take any position at all. I know that there are people on my board who felt one way or the other, we did not take a position and I did not see AIPAC in any way playing that role as an organization” (L. Friedman, personal communication, March 14, 2016).

In contrast to Lara Friedman’s statement, I asked Congressman Nick Rahall about the role that the Israel Lobby played during the Iraq war. He explained:

“Yes, I believe the Israel lobby did play a part in leading the U.S. into the Iraq War of 2003 (which I voted against). It must be stressed, however, that it was a very silent role as the lobby knowing full well the division among not only the American people, but among Jewish Members of Congress, as well, that they best hide their fingerprints. So its influence on some key members of Congress was a behind the scenes and plausible deniability existed all around” (N. Rahall, personal communication, March 23, 2016).

Both Lara Friedman and Nick Rahall agree on the fact that the Israel Lobby was not openly active during the war. However, they differ in regards to whether components of the lobby utilized their influence to change the vector of US foreign policy. The difference is that during this period we see members of the lobby trying not to be too “vocal” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 241). The low profile of the lobby in this period may be a result of the fact that the majority of American Jews had voted for the democratic candidate Al Gore, and only a minority of 19% had voted for Bush (“U.S. Presidential Elections,” 2001). Alternatively, they may not have wanted matters to look as if “too open support for an invasion would make it look like the war was being fought for Israel’s sake” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 241). Thus, their
method of action was very similar to the Holocaust time period, which will be seen in the following chapter; however, there was an entirely different shift in power and influence. Although, according to Waxman, they were afraid of being attacked due to “an anti-Semitic backlash” (Waxman, 2009, p 8). This is highly unlikely; it makes more sense that the Israel Lobby was actually afraid of being singled out as having too much power.

What we do know is that AIPAC was in the picture prior to the war since three years before it had taken place, in 2000, it was lobbying congress with regard to Iraqi sanctions. This is an example of what AIPAC sent:
A letter circulating in the House of Representatives urging the president to maintain the critical sanctions program on Iraq has already received signatures. To present a strong statement of congressional unity to the White House, it is imperative that the letter, initiated by Reps. John Sweeney (R-NY), Joe Crowley (D-NY), Doug Bereuter (R-NE) and Tom Lantos (D-CA), receive widespread support.

Over the past decade, Iraq has become the world's second-largest exporter of oil. The U.N. oil-for-food program, supported by the United States, mandates that Iraq spend 90 percent of its proceeds from oil sales for the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people, including food, medicine and infrastructure development. Indeed, the oil-for-food program provides more than enough food to meet the health needs of the Iraqi people. Any malnutrition in Iraq is not the result of sanctions; it is because Saddam is withholding distribution of humanitarian goods to the Iraqi people.

Simply put, under the oil-for-food program, Iraq exports more than enough oil to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. If sanctions were lifted, Saddam could spend the oil revenue to accelerate Iraq's military programs rather than on the humanitarian needs of Iraqi citizens.

It is essential that you contact your representative today and urge them to sign the letter to President Clinton:

1. Send an e-mail to your representative by simply clicking on http://congress.nw.gov/aipac/eocmail.html
2. Call the House members that you know at (202) 225-3121.
3. Forward this message to your friends and ask them send an e-mail to their representatives.
4. Log on to AIPAC's web site at http://www.aipac.org and click on the AIPAC ACTION ALERT button. See which members have already signed the Sweeney-Crowley letter.

**TALKING POINTS FOR SANCTIONS ON IRAQ**

Saddam Hussein is directly responsible for the suffering of the Iraqi people.

Iraq receives sufficient funds under the oil-for-food program to feed its people.

Lifting sanctions on Iraq now would be misguided and dangerous. AIPAC—America's Pro-Israel Lobby http://www.aipac.org

To subscribe to this list, send an e-mail to request.aipacalert@raven.webfirst.com
To unsubscribe from this list, send an e-mail to request-aipacalert@raven.webfirst.com Members of the House of Representative who have signed the Crowley-Sweeney-Lantos Keep Sanctions on Iraq letter as of 3-14:

(AIPAC Action Alert,” 2000)

Linking AIPAC’s message to lobby literature, “groups have two primary legislative goals when a bill is referred to committee: (1) expand the size of their supportive coalition and (2) affect the content and fate of proposed legislation” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 775). In this specific case, they were doing both because they wanted more congressmen to support their position. In addition to this, with regard to legislation, they clearly want the document to be adopted. Hojnack and Kimball explain that organizations that lobby and use “vigorous advocates for its interests is likely to have a greater chance of achieving its policy objectives than” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778) organizations that use passive methods to gain
support. Hence, AIPAC was clearly constantly lobbying against Iraq, since it was doing so three years prior to the Iraq War.

Therefore, to conclude this chapter, according to Dov Waxman, “like the neoconservatives, pro-Israel and American Jewish organizations all adhere to the tenet that American and Israeli interests are completely compatible” (Waxman, 2009, p 8). Therefore, this statement will be made especially clear in the chapter on the 1973 war. It was clear that the Israel Lobby in 2003 had followed the same method of thinking. Thus, the way the Israel Lobby phrases its “interests” (Waxman, 2009, p 8) is directly linked to achieving influence and its goals. In addition to this, as has been seen with the case of the neoconservatives, the Israel Lobby was also able to become friends with the right people who were able to promote these “interests” (Waxman, 2009, p 8) and integrate them into US foreign policy, even when the lobby had remained generally silent during the war, which has been affirmed in the interview with Lara Friedman and underscored by Congressman Nick Rahall as well. Therefore, although the Israel Lobby did not cause, or lead to, the Iraq war, it was able to establish acceptance that Iraq was a threat to Israel and the United States. This chapter underscores that the Israel Lobby during the 2003 Iraq war had already laid the ground work; the aim of the following chapters will be to understand how they had reached this powerful position by going back in history and studying the lobby and its role.
Chapter 4: The American Jewry During the Holocaust-Humble Beginnings

The aim of this chapter is to show that, although some American Jewish organizations attempted to help the European Jewry, these attempts focused on supporting their entry to Palestine through organizations like American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), and not on lobbying the United States government to take action or admit refugees. There was no evidence of a lobby or lobbying organizations as exists today. In this chapter, we will see the disconnection between American Jewry and European Jewry during the Holocaust, and the reason behind this existent rift. Generally, American Jews felt disinterest, but also fear of being singled out in the American society; therefore, there was the feeling of choosing assimilation, and wanting to hide from anti-Semitism. In addition to this, the chapter will also discuss the American government’s stance with regard to the Jewish refugees escaping the Nazis.

In 1939, an incident occurred which underscored that there was no pressure from the American Jewish Community on the U.S. president in any way. The SS St. Louis had “more than 900 Jews,” aboard (Lanchin, 2014, para 1). These European Jews were considered to be refugees who merely wanted to escape the Nazis in Germany (Lanchin, 2014, para 1) who destroyed synagogues and seized assets that were owned by Jews (Lanchin, 2014, para 6). However, this story’s happy ending for the refugees seemed to be very prolonged. Upon reaching the destination, Cuba, the officers did not allow these European Jews to leave the ship (Lanchin, 2014, para 23). Interestingly, “the Cubans had already decided to revoke all but a handful of the visas - probably out of fear of being inundated with more refugees fleeing Europe” (Lanchin, 2014, para 24). This statement actually shows that these Jewish refugees
had initially escaped Germany and legally had entry visas into Cuba. However, the Cubans disregarded these documents. When the ship’s captain found that there was no use in remaining in Cuba since the European Jews would not be allowed inside, he navigated the ship to Florida. However, the result was another disappointment since “US authorities also refused it the right to dock, despite direct appeals to President Franklin Roosevelt” (Lanchin, 2014, para 25).

The only remaining alternative for the ship’s captain was to return to Germany (Lanchin, 2014, para 26). Miraculously, four European countries decided to distribute the Jewish refugees amongst themselves: “Belgium, France, Holland and the UK” (Lanchin, 2014, para 29). All credit must be given to the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), which arranged with the governments of these four countries to accommodate all costs for the refugees (Lanchin, 2014, para 29). It is, however, important to emphasize that “two-hundred-and-fifty-four other passengers from the St Louis were not so fortunate and were killed as the Nazis swept across Western Europe” (Lanchin, 2014, para 33).

Why is the story of SS St. Louis important? How does it relate to the Israel Lobby’s evolution in power? Primarily, if the Israel Lobby was existent and powerful at the time of the St. Louis it may have been able to pressure the U.S. government to allow the European Jews to seek asylum in the U.S. However, there was obviously not enough pressure from the American Jewish community to bring about such a decision. Although the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) was able to help these European Jewry by splitting them between the four previously mentioned European countries, it did so outside of the realm of the U.S. It could only help them in Europe. Therefore, it is exactly as Freilich has stated previously, the Israel lobby was not always existent, and it had been established at a specific period
in history. The story of the SS St. Louis demonstrates that the American Jewish Community lacked the organization or clout to convince the U.S. president to accept this very minimal number of European Jews who were escaping to save their lives.

A. The American Government’s Stance

Firstly, it is necessary to establish the American government’s attitude towards refugees. It was actually very difficult for the European Jewish refugees to gain entry into America due to rules and regulations. Although Franklin Roosevelt is said to have made statements about aiming to decrease rules of entry for the European Jews, “those were only words, and ideas. Roosevelt and his administration never even tried to ease the immigration restrictions” (Druks, 2002, p 3). It was actually the exact opposite of this that happened since the American government caused the process to become even more tangled up, therefore making “it more difficult for them to enter the United States” (Druks, 2002, p 3). As early as 1924, there was an immigration act set in place which restricted the number of immigrants flowing into the U.S., therefore setting a “quota” (“The Immigration Act of 1924,” n.d., para 1) on the number that America could accept. By the time Hitler had become the ruler in Germany, Jews were escaping in “mass” (“Obstacles to Immigration,” 2016, para 1) numbers. However, one major problem that caused an impediment for the Jews was the occurrence of the Great Depression (“Obstacles to Immigration,” 2016, para 5); this caused Americans to worry about a rise in “competition” (“Obstacles to Immigration,” 2016, para 5) believing that potential job opportunities might be lost to the incoming immigrants (“Obstacles to Immigration,” 2016, para 5). In addition to this, the requirements for accepting European Jews escaping the Holocaust became excessively difficult. For example, the U.S. rejected:
“Jewish refugees trained in the professions and, potentially, anyone who did not have a guaranteed job upon arrival in the United States. Finally, the State Department established additional bureaucratic impediments, such as the need to provide certificates of good conduct from the German police” (Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 2016, para 7).

Thus, under Roosevelt, in simple terms, it is safe to state that “the flow of refugees slowed to a trickle between 1941 and 1945” (Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 2016, para 17), which are ironically the most critical years in which they should have been accepted in large numbers due to the events in Europe. In this specific case, as is with the case of the St. Louis, if the American Jewish community was powerful enough, it would have been able to put pressure on the American government to change its policies. The following section of this chapter aims to analyze exactly why this was not the case with regard to the American Jewish community.

B. The American Jewish Community during the Holocaust

To further understand the American Jewish community, it is essential to look at their attitudes taken toward the European Jews specifically during the time of the Holocaust. With regard to the American Jewish community, away from the American government, an article published by the Shoah Resource Center tackles two extremely significant issues with regard to the American Jewry during the Holocaust: they were apprehensive of voicing their opinions and they also had an absence of “[unity]…and lacked a central representative organization like those that existed in other countries” (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 1). The document further explains that it was due to these reasons, as well as lack of coordination between the American Jewry, that the American Jewish community was “ineffective at rescuing their Jewish brethren in Europe during the Holocaust” (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 1).
The document discusses clashes between different American Jewish organizations that occurred because they wanted to approach the Hitler and Nazi problem using different methods. For example, the Jewish Labor Committee was completely opposed to any and all links to Hitler’s government (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 2), but still promoted aiding the European Jews while the Holocaust took place by attempting to provide them “with all possible help” (Hertzberg, 1997, p 282). As for the American Jewish Committee (AJC), it preferred different methods such as “[diplomacy…and] behind-the-scenes negotiations” (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 2). As for the case of the American Jewish Congress, they seemed to follow a more out-spoken path of voicing their opinions through “protest rallies, demonstrations, and boycotts” (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 2). Therefore, these are three separate American Jewish organizations that chose very different mechanisms of reacting to Hitler, his Nazi government, and policies. As a result of this, “there was no single American Jewish voice to appeal to the American government for help” (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 3). In relation to this, Schoenbaum refers to several organizations in the U.S. such as the Zionist Organization of America, the American Zionist Emergency Council, the Jewish Agency, and the American Jewish Council. He explains that these organizations did play a part during the Holocaust; they wanted to “open the doors of Palestine” (Schoenbaum, 1993, p 29) to the European Jews, which is the epitome of Zionism; therefore, the organizations made the issue central to another region rather than their own country. However, he also states that there was “a war among the Jews and the implicit deadlock among the political authorities” (Schoenbaum, 1993, p 30), which clearly made initiatives by the key organizations ineffective. In addition to this, it is interesting to point out that the American Jewish
Conference’s important points regarding the safety of European Jews as well as their possessions was only formulated in 1947 ("Jews Ask Allies For Indemnity From Germany,” 1947, p 8), after the Holocaust had already taken place. Therefore, this specific organization’s initiative did not occur as the event happened, but only after the war had ended.

Interestingly, the article by the Shoah Resource Center also tackles another very important issue, that of assimilation and identity among American Jews. For example,

“Many of those American Jews working in the government were often more American than Jewish, and did not want to take on the responsibility of representing all of American Jewry, nor did they want to risk their jobs on a purely Jewish issue.” ("American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 4).

The article provides the name of Henry J. Morgenthau, who worked in the American government as “Roosevelt’s Secretary of the Treasury,” ("American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 3) as an exception to the rule whereby he pushed the American president to create the War Refugee Board (WRB) ("American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 3) which aimed at helping the European Jewish refugees. However, this entity was characterized as occurring after the event, and unfortunately much “too late” ("American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 3). If Morgenthau had not held such a high position in the American government, who would have rallied for the cause of helping the European Jews? By observing the nonexistent coordination and cooperation, it seems that no one would have had the ability to do so. The Shoah Resource Center emphasizes that what the American Jews were able to do was work together to collect money “for Jews in Europe and Palestine” ("American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 4); so, it was very much mostly financial help. The source names two such American Jewish organizations: the United Jewish Appeal and the previously mentioned American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.
The final issue that appears to have been very predominant in the U.S. during the Holocaust is that of anti-Semitism. This phenomenon caused the American Jews to refrain from speaking out against Hitler because they “fear[ed]… losing their jobs or being shunned by their neighbors” (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 4). This point regarding anti-Semitism apparent in the U.S. during the time of the Holocaust is emphasized in numerous other sources. For example, according to Matthew Baigell, Henry Ford’s name appears as having pushed forward “anti-Semitic campaigns through the late 1930s” (Baigell, 2002, p 4). By the 1940s, there were openly anti-Semitic “rallies” (Baigell, 2002, p 4). For example, the Christian Front targeted both synagogues as well as “Jewish businesses” (Baigell, 2002, p 4). Another example of anti-Semitism occurred by the German-American Bund rally “in 1939… [which] attracted between 19,000 and 22,000 people” (Baigell, 2002, p 4), which are undoubtedly very large numbers. In reaction to these acts of hostility and aggressiveness, the American Jewry were told to attempt to fit into the American society without “draw[ing]…attention to themselves as Jews” (Baigell, 2002, p 4). Therefore, they were being asked to keep their identity and religion discrete in order to remain safe.

Sidney Bolkosky’s case study reinforces Baigell’s statements. Bolkosky observes the relationship between the American Jews in Detroit and the German Jews who escaped Nazism (Bolkosky, 2000, p 309). Like Baigell, he also explains that there were supporters of Hitler and his regime that roved the American streets (Bolkosky, 2000, p 309) and denounced the Jews by claiming that it was the American Jews who were hurting the “German and American economies by boycotting German goods” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 309). These American supporters of Hitler made very anti-Semitic accusations against the American Jewry. Just as Baigell
described the American Jewish response to these hateful accusations, Bolkosky agrees by explaining that “both national and Detroit Jewish organizations discouraged public protests against German policies” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 310). In addition to this, “leaders of the American Jewish Committee…opposed the attempts by the American Jewish Congress to organize mass protest meetings” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 310), which shows an example of two American Jewish organizations that had very obviously clashing opinions as well as methods of functioning. Therefore, out of fear, the American Jews were silenced.

Thus, according to one author:

“In the thirties, even secular options of Jewish identity began to disintegrate…The mass of American Jews- immigrant and native-born-looked upon Jewishness and Judaism as disabilities, liabilities, and impediments to becoming full Americans” (Baigell, 2002, p 5).

Similarly to the previous quote, Biagell also includes an anecdote in which he states that “as a child growing up in New York in the early 1940s…[he was] being told to try to ‘pass’” (Baigell, 2002, p 5), meaning to attempt to fit into the American society without having anyone notice the fact that he was Jewish. Another important example is the fact that the American Jewish Committee attempted to limit all activities that drew attention and emphasized distinctions between “American Jews from other American citizens” (Druks, 2001, p 5).

This terror of anti-Semitism and fear of gaining attention is what led the American Jewish community to prefer assimilation. This is extremely evident in the primary sources collected from the Library of Congress. In the first primary source, which is an article that appeared in the Jewish Advocate, the author discusses the struggles faced by Jewish refugees escaping to America. He explains that “the immigrants need not only a place to sleep, or food to eat, but also the feeling of being
welcome and not being looked at as if they are unwanted invaders” (Carpey, 1939, p 1). Therefore, he is asking the American Jewish community to become more accepting, as well as create less of a distinction between the two Jewish communities. He also emphasizes that

“...The reaction of the American Jews towards the newcomers is very hesitant, sometimes really unfriendly. They are ready to spend money up to a certain amount, but only seldom ready to help the strangers in their attempts to acclimatization...the most truthful advice they give [to the European Jews]: ‘go to another place, to another town, to another state! This is not the right place for you’...” (Carpey, 1939, p 1).

Therefore, what this author is trying to underscore is that the European Jews felt very unwelcomed by the assimilated American Jews. Building on this point, another author whose article was also published in the Jewish Advocate states that

“We sometimes like to indulge in wishful thinking about the strength of the American Jewish community and to think...of the mantle of world Jewish leadership as having fallen upon our communities. The truth is, as every observed [Sic.] of the American Jewish scene knows, that American Jewry is neither able nor willing to accept the responsibility of building for the future” (Mordecai, 1940, p 4).

This quote is significant because it shows that the American Jewry, during the Holocaust, wanted to remain disconnected both from the events as well as from the European Jewish refugees escaping from these events to America. To emphasize the need for assimilation that American Jews felt, the author states: “the great masses of American Jews are indifferent to the fate of their people or the preservation of a posterity” (Mordecai, 1940, p 4). Therefore, the American Jews, as has been explained earlier, felt the need to assimilate into the American society. They did not want to be looked at as “Jews, they wanted to be looked at as “Americans”. Thus, these two primary sources from American newspaper articles published during the Holocaust definitely underscore this fact. These two primary sources are very similar
to Bolkosky’s finding in which he observed that one American Jewish leader actually stated that “new settlements of Jews in the United States would not be encouraged beyond the country’s ‘absorptive capacity’…new Jewish refugees must not displace native Americans” (Bolkosky, 2000, p 310). Therefore, in making such a statement, the American Jewish community was clearly distinguishing itself from the European Jewry; they did not see themselves as “Jews” collectively; they were not “one people”, but two different groups, the outsiders, which were the Jewish refugees, and the assimilated, the American Jews.

Therefore, now it is important to ask the key and critical questions: how do you go from being afraid of anti-Semitism, having no leadership, unity, or power, not only in the case of organizations but also in the case of the American Jewish community as a whole, and not being able to take action because the Jews in the U.S. government were not very concerned or active in taking up the case of the European Jewish refugees (“American Jewry and the Holocaust,” para 3) as has been previously mentioned, to having a voice, power, confidence, and strength to influence US foreign policy with Israel? What happened for this change to occur and how did the Israel Lobby get to where it is now?
Chapter 5: 1948- The Lobby Had Clark Clifford to Thank

“Nearly a decade after leaving office, Truman was asked...if he had any regrets in extending recognition to the new state of Israel. He replied: Not the slightest for this reason. I’m going to brag a little if you’ll allow me. I know the history of that section of the world fairly well. When it came time to make the decision and there was a chance to create the State of Israel, as had been promised, I just carried out the agreements that had already been made on the subject, and I’ve never been sorry for it because I think it’s necessary that there be a State of Israel” (Benson, 1997, p 54).

The aim of this chapter is to present the events leading up to Truman’s recognition of the state of Israel in 1948. The chapter will do so by specifically exploring a very important article written by Clack Clifford, who was present in the U.S. government (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008) during the creation of the state. From this first hand account, five major points regarding the inchoate lobby and its influence can be discerned; the first three points relate to the American government: 1) the existence of anti-Israel sentiments within the U.S. government, 2) the fact that George Marshall, who was the Secretary of State at the time (“Biographies of the Secretaries of State,” n.d.), and Truman were not in agreement on the Israel issue, 3) trusteeship and state recognition were both options on the table; as for the last two points, they do not relate to the American government: 4) Clifford’s discussion of the events leading up to Israel’s creation and 5) Clifford’s mention of the American Zionists. These points are not just a summary of this critical article, they are also an analysis of the events leading up to Truman’s decision to reject the State Department’s recommendation, and accept the new state, and they enable us to contextualize such a critical time period that is central to this thesis. The chapter will also discuss the existence of the Israel Lobby, referred to as the Zionist Lobby at the time, its role, and how Truman saw it. It is essential to note that the lobby discussed in
this chapter appears in a different form from today’s Israel Lobby. One of the key players during this time period was the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), which was established in the late 1800s, specifically “in 1897” (“What is the ZOA?”, 2016, para 1), and characterizes itself as “the oldest pro-Israel organization in the United States” (“What is the ZOA?”, 2016, para 1). The ZOA is important because it was the first attempt at a formal lobbying effort by supporters of a Jewish state, and appears to be a “proto lobby”. The ZOA will be mentioned further towards the end of this chapter.

A. Resistance to Zionist Objectives in the American Government

The first point that is very clear in Clifford’s article is that the people around Truman were not at all supportive of Zionist objectives. “From the beginning, I [Clifford] had also supported the creation of the Jewish state, even though this put me in opposition to an entire generation of senior foreign policy makers” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008), including George Marshall, the Secretary of State (“Biographies of the Secretaries of State,” n.d.). This statement is critical because it shows that Clifford was actually swimming against the tide when he believed it was necessary to stand with Israel, and that the common opinion was not to support this state at the point of its establishment, and this was the main conflict within the White House. Clifford goes on to say, “I knew Marshall and Lovett would argue that we should continue to support trusteeship, and delay in recognizing the new state – but by ‘delay’ I was convinced that State in fact meant ‘deny’ (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008),” which is further support for the point regarding the U.S. government’s, specifically the State Department’s, anti-Zionist stance. Finally, Clifford explains that “[his] fears about the State Department had crystallized after a bitter incident in March, when, without informing the President, it had permitted the American delegation to the UN to
reverse its support for partition and switch to trusteeship for Palestine” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Clifford explains that this change went directly against “a personal commitment the President had given the previous day to Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader who would later become the first President of Israel” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). When Truman found out what had happened at the UN, Clifford states that he was upset, but at the same time he refrained from instructing Marshall “to reendorse partition” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008) because he did not want to create a problem with him (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008).

What is very interesting about the above statements is that they show that Truman actually did want to recognize Israel, but almost everyone around him did not want to do so; therefore, he did not know how to go about the process without the support of the rest of the American government. Clifford describes the meeting that took place at the White House only two days before the state of Israel was created. Clifford was obviously being very pro-Israel, against everyone else, such as George Marshall “and his deputy, Robert Lovett” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008); after he had finished discussing his points, this was the reaction:

“Marshall, scarcely concealing his ire, shot back, ‘These considerations have nothing to do with the issue. I fear that the only reason Clifford is here is that he is pressing a political consideration with regard to this issue. I don’t think politics should play any part in this’” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Marshall’s quote leads directly to the second point: Marshall was not on the same page with Truman, and believed Truman was doing this, as in wanted to support Israel, for internal political reasons; this means that they were simply accusing Truman of not caring for the Zionist cause, and for having personal interests to accept this new state. Lovett took the floor claiming that if the U.S. acknowledged Israel, “such a move would be
injurious to the prestige of the President. It is obviously designed to win the Jewish vote, but in my opinion, it would lose more votes than it would gain” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Secretary of State Marshall strongly believed that the idea Clifford was promoting of supporting Israel “was dictated by domestic political considerations, specifically a quest for Jewish votes” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Marshall then stated, “If you [Truman] follow Clifford’s advice and if I were to vote in the election, I would vote against you” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Marshall had just menaced the President of the United States in order to get him not to acknowledge the state that was on the verge of creation. This is the reason why the meeting is referred to as the “‘White House Confrontation on Recognition’ on 12 May” (Fetter, 2008, p 503).

In his article, Clifford emphasizes that Marshall and Lovett were incorrect in assuming that he wanted the U.S. to recognize the new state so that Truman could attain more votes. Clifford underscores that

“since at the time [in 1948] a significant number of Jewish Americans opposed Zionism, neither the President nor I believed that Palestine was the key to the Jewish vote. As I had written in 1947, the key to the Jewish vote in 1948 would not be the Palestine issue, but a continued commitment to liberal political and economic policies” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008).

Therefore, this quote is very significant because it shows the continued rift discussed in the previous chapter between the American Jewish community, and outside issues relevant to the rest of world Jewry.

B. American Zionists in the Picture

The American Zionists during 1948 need to be examined in detail as it is central to understanding the role they played as well as their existence as the predecessors of the Israel Lobby. The best method to determine this role is by looking
at primary sources from the time period. In an article published in *The New York Times* in the first week of 1947, there are very critical statements that actually present the American Zionists as united for one cause:

"The program for the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state and the proposal to boycott the forthcoming London conference "under the present circumstances" were reaffirmed last night by leading members of the American Zionist delegation to the recent World Zionist Congress at Basle, Switzerland.

The "militant" position of the Congress on the larger Palestine issues was defended at a public rally and reception to the delegates in Manhattan Center, 311 West Thirty-fourth Street, under the auspices of the Zionist Organization of America.

("Zionists Here Hail Decisions at Basle," 1947, p 13)

This section from the article clearly demonstrates that these groups were collaborating together for a new state to be created, and were openly denouncing anyone who seemed to be an obstacle to their goal. What can be understood from this excerpt is that at the World Zionist Congress, those who attended were in line with the idea of the creation of Israel and that the Zionist Organization of America brought this stance to the U.S. during a demonstration.

Towards the end of January, in another article also published in *The New York Times*, the author quotes “Dr. Emanuel Neumann, [who was the] vice president of the Zionist Organizations of America” (Egan, 1947, p 8) as having stated “United States Zionists are ready to pour ‘millions’ of dollars into the financing of ‘illegal’ immigration of Jews to Palestine” (Egan, 1947, p 8), underscoring that they had the financial capacity to do so. In the same newspaper on the 17th of February 1947, another article states the following:
WASHINGTON, Feb. 17—Charging British "faithlessness" to the mandate of Palestine, the American Zionist Conference, in an emergency session today, called on the United Nations to repudiate imperial restrictions on Jewish immigration and settlement in the country as violations of the organic grant.

It accused the British Government of "insincerity" in its negotiations with Arab and Zionist leaders in London recently and of trying through the United Nations to perpetuate military rule in Palestine. It demanded a voice for the Jewish Agency for Palestine in any United Nations discussion of the subject, and it asked this Government to continue its efforts at getting 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine.

(Belair, 1947, p 14)

The conference delegates were cheered by a telegram from Dean Alfare, chairman of the American Christian Palestine Committee of Greater New York, who urged the organization to "pursue a militant and unswerving course in the battle for the survival of Jewry that is now being waged in the settlements and cities of Jewish Palestine."

(Belair, 1947, p 14)
The excerpt from the first article indicates how the American Zionists were organizing and rallying for the cause of Palestine, and had not given up. However, the second excerpt is even more significant because this idea of the “survival of Jewry” (Belair, 1947, p 14) had not been existent in the previous chapter regarding the Holocaust, nor was it tied to statehood either. Therefore, it represents a shift in behavior, whereby the issue of Palestine was being discussed openly, and even aggressively. Although the Zionists had taken up a more aggressive tone and activity appears to be taking place, they still had no influence because as was seen in the previous section, the American government was leaning towards trusteeship and not a new state. In another article, also published in The New York Times, the author presents voices of several leaders of American Jewish organizations. These leaders are openly denouncing Britain and claiming that it is not doing enough to promote “a Zionist State” (“American Zionists Denounce Bevin,” 1947, 4). Therefore, this demonstrates the first example, since the Holocaust time period, in which we are able to see groups that are openly voicing their opinions and pushing for a cause.

Then, by the first week of March in 1947, the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), passed “a resolution pledging ‘support of the maximum resources of American Jewry’ for continuance of ‘the stream of Jewish immigration into Palestine in defiance of the British blockade” (“Entry Aid Pledged by Zionists of U.S.,” 1947, p 2). In addition to this, “the Council [part of the ZOA] adopted a mobilization call to increase membership in the Zionist Organization of America” (“Entry Aid Pledged by Zionists of U.S.,” 1947, p 2), which underscores the American Zionists’ rallying and activity. One year later on the 10th of May, 1948, only four days before the new Israeli state was to be created, the Zionist Organization of America was still trying to gain more members in what they referred to as “ ‘Liberation Week’...[which was taking
place] in support of the Jewish state in Palestine” (‘‘Liberation Week’ Begun by Zionists,’’ 1948, p 16) that was on the brink of creation.

In calling for a large registration, Dr. Neumann asserted that “all of Palestine is a battlefield, all Palestine Jewry is the army; the Jews of America must be their bulwarks to supply the morale and financial aid necessary to carry on the battle for freedom.”

(‘‘Liberation Week’ Begun by Zionists,’’ 1948, p 16)

The significance of the above quote is that it presents not only the determination of the American Zionists to see Israel created, but also the method of appealing to the American Jewish community in order to rally for this cause as well. Thus, the excerpts from the presented articles show that as far back as 1947, meaning one year before the state was created, these Zionists were fighting for the birth of Israel to take place; they were attempting to become organized for this one cause. In response to Israel finally becoming a state, Bertram Hulen published an article in The New York Times on the 15th of May 1948 quoting Truman: “The United States recognizes the provisional government as the de facto authority of the new State of Israel” (Hulen, 1948, p 1). Thus, it is important to question if Truman’s decision was in fact influenced by the Zionists’ activities, or by other factors.

C. Trusteeship or State?

The previous section presented the American Zionists’ position with regard to Israel. What were the American government’s possible decisions that it had laid out on the table? This is the third major point regarding the issue of recognizing and
accepting this Jewish state; there were two options that the U.S. could have chosen between. Truman’s preferred course was recognition, which was at odds with Marshall. According to Clifford: “with the May 14 deadline fast approaching, the U.S. was in the awkward position of having its UN delegation still rounding up votes for trusteeship while the President favored partition and prompt recognition of the soon to be proclaimed Jewish state” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). The fact that these American delegates were focusing on the subject of the trusteeship means that Israel would not, and could not, be an independent state, while at the same time, Truman and Clifford wanted to acknowledge the new state of Israel when it was established. Logically speaking, a newly independent state could not be a trusteeship, and these two very different objectives cannot be reconciled, and this can be seen through Clifford’s re-telling of the incident:

“But one last, suitably bizarre scene was still to be played out. At 5:45 p.m. I [Clifford] called Dean Rusk to ask him to inform Ambassador Warren Austin, the head of our UN delegation, that the White House would announce recognition of Israel right after 6 p.m.. I realized as I talked to Rusk that Lovett had not yet told him that the decision had been made. He reacted as if he had been stung: ‘This cuts directly across what our delegation had been trying to accomplish in the General Assembly – and we have a large majority for it,’ he responded testily” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008).

Therefore, not only was there a lack of communication in the White House, but there was also a lack of unity because there were people working in different directions with different aims. However, it must be noted that the final decision was obviously made by the President; he was the one who held the authority in this situation and this is also made clear in Clifford’s previous statement in which the American ambassador to the UN was told which decision to follow through with from above.
D. The Outcome

The fourth major point that must be mentioned is Clifford’s description of the events of the establishment of “the new state” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). He claims that he called the “Jewish Agency representative [Epstein]” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008) himself and told him: “we would like you to send an official letter to President Truman before twelve o’clock today formally requesting the United States to recognize the new Jewish state. I would also request that you send a copy of the letter directly to Secretary Marshall” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Clifford’s description of the events presents forth two very important facts: 1) he openly states that Truman did not know how to act when the time came and the state was created, in only a few hours (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008) and 2) the Jewish Agency did not even know or have the capacity to write this letter, and it was Clifford who helped them compose the message. Therefore, it was Clifford who had reached out to them, informed them of the steps, and guided them through the process. This underscores that there was no leadership or organization, and they had to rely on him for help. However, even more importantly than this, they had no knowledge of the potential “name of the new state” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008) was to be. This shows that it was not only the American government that was underprepared, it was also the case with the future government members of Israel; this presents forth obvious major weaknesses which are considered a very dramatic shift when looking at Israel today. Clifford includes part of the message that was to be sent to Truman as well as Marshall:
Clifford includes small, but very significant telling details. For example, he notes that because Epstein had no knowledge of the potential name, he merely denoted it as “the Jewish State” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). However, when the message was on its way to delivery, Epstein finally “got word on his shortwave radio that the new state would be called ‘Israel’” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). The result was that, before the message could be delivered, “two blocks from the White House, Zinder, sitting in the car Epstein had provided, crossed out with a pen the words ‘Jewish State’ and inserted the word ‘Israel’” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). There was clearly no plan by the Jewish Agency, and matters were happening very haphazardly. If the Jewish Agency had a prescribed plan, Epstein would not have resorted to Clifford in the first place. On the contrary, he would have already constructed the message and delivered it before Clifford would have asked him to do so. More importantly, this man would have been aware of the name of this new state that was only a few hours away from being established. There was absolutely no direction by the Jewish Agency, and clearly no leadership as well. This point is interesting because it enables us to draw parallels between the Jewish Agency as well as the American Jewish Community mentioned in the previous chapter.

There is another telling incident that Clifford mentions that leads to the fifth and final point, and that is the issue of the American Zionists. In response to Clifford
going to Lovett and telling him that Truman had made up his mind, later that day this happens:

“Around 4 p.m. [of the same day that Israel was to be created], Lovett made the telephone call I had waited so long to receive: ‘Clark, I think we have something we can work with. I have talked to the General [Marshall]. He cannot support the President’s position, but he has agreed that he will not oppose it’” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008).

This quote is important for two reasons: first, to have a secretary of state who was openly in complete rejection of a presidential decision would have weakened the government. However, it still says nothing of the power of the American Zionists, if anything, this entire story represents the weakness of the Jewish Agency. At the end of this article, Clifford mentions the American Zionists only once when he states that “President Truman was often annoyed by the tone and fierceness of the pressure exerted on him by American Zionists” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). Therefore, even before the creation of Israel, there were Americans, which are characterized as Zionists by Clark Clifford in his article, who were fighting relentlessly for the sake of this state to exist, and these are the same American Zionists that the previous primary sources have discussed. Michael Benson names one central character in this story: Abba Hillel Silver (Benson, 1997, p 96). “In May 1947… [Truman stated]: ‘We could have settled this Palestine thing if U.S. politics had been kept out of it. Terror and [Rabbi] Silver are the contributing causes of some, if not all, of our troubles’” (Benson, 1997, p 96). Verifying this idea, Eddie Jacobson told Chaim Weizmann “that one of the hardest things to combat outside the State Department and the British Foreign Office, was the conduct of some American Zionists” (Benson, 1997, p 96). Michael Cohen delves into more detail than Benson and states that the “Zionist Lobby came into its own during the Truman presidency, in the diplomatic struggle that preceded the establishment in May 1948 of the State of Israel” (Cohen, 1990, p 59).
Cohen underscores that the main player at the time was the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) “and its proxies” (Cohen, 1990, p 59); however, he does not delve into any further details about which organizations those were. Regardless of this fact, he explains that the ZOA attempted to rally the “American Jewish community” (Cohen, 1990, p 59) for the cause of Israel. Thus, one author talks about people taking the lead, while another author underscores the existence of a “lobby” at the time. What must be noted is that this Zionist Lobby definitely did not look like the Israel Lobby of today. What does become clearer, however, is that these “Zionist leaders” (Benson, 1997, p 95) were able to rally the people.

Truman claimed that he was not only facing “incessant Zionist lobbying efforts aimed at Truman personally, the White House was deluged with letters, telegrams, and phone calls from citizens throughout the United States…From 1947 to 1948, Truman received 48,600 telegrams, 790, 575 cards, and 81,200 pieces of other mail…In 1948, during one three-month period alone, Truman received 301,900 postcards” (Benson, 1997, p 93). Although Benson does not discuss who these “citizens” (Benson, 1997, p 93) were, they were obviously sympathizers of the cause for a Jewish state. In that same year, Truman openly discussed feeling confused, because of the extent of the lobbying for the sake of Israel, with “the president of the St. Louis Council of the American Jewish Congress” (Benson, 1997, p 95). He claimed that he “appreciated the ‘emotional feelings’ of the Jewish people, he once again deferred final judgment on the matter to the United Nations” (Benson, 1997, p 95). Therefore, we can say that there was no lobby that existed in the same way or form as it does today, but that there were organizations, as well as individuals such as the previously mentioned Silver, who fought aggressively (Benson, 1997, p 96) to sway presidential thinking and attempt to rally support. This underscores that the
decision change was more the result of efforts of a few individuals and not the cohesion of the lobby of today. We can also see from Truman’s quote that, in contrast to the Holocaust time period discussed in the previous chapter, many American Jews were starting to speak up openly about their preferences and demands of government. Interestingly, as active as these groups and individuals were, Truman emphasized “that his Palestine policy would not be influenced by the Zionist lobby” (Cohen, 1990, p 67). From the literature, it must also be noted that generally, these Zionists tended to focus on the executive, and by pushing the people to write so many letters and express how they felt, they were also encouraging them to bombard the executive as well in order to convince the president. One incident that underscores this further occurred between Truman and a congressman who went to discuss the issue of European Jewish refugees being allowed to move to Palestine (Benson, 1997, p 93). Truman stated “that he was tired of having Jews and Irishmen and Poles and Armenians come to him representing their own ethnic interests. He said he wanted to hear requests from some ‘Americans’” (Benson, 1997, p 93).

1. Concluding Remarks: Where was the Influence?

The events leading up to Israel’s recognition are very telling. Even before the decision was to be made, as the primary sources have shown, the American Zionists were working together for the cause of Israel and they were very active in propagandizing as well as fighting for Israel’s cause; however, they were not doing so as the fully functional lobby that we see today, but as a “proto lobby”, a predecessor to the one that currently exists and this explains why their role was diminished in the following years, as will be seen through chapter on the 1956 war. This means that as the American Zionists were fighting for the cause of Israel, they seemed to be ineffective because there were still anti-Zionist feelings within the American
government. In addition to this, the secretary of state was directly against Truman, and this shows that there was no broad consensus on the issue of the new state. More importantly, it was Clark Clifford who took it upon himself to be the Jewish Agency’s guide in order to help them create their state, underscoring the fact that they could not do so themselves. Therefore, placing this within the context of lobby literature, “access is central to stimulating agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803), and it is the exact opposite of this statement that takes place with regard to the Jewish Agency because it was Clifford who had decided to take them by the hand and help, not the Zionist Lobby’s efforts. Thus, the Jewish Agency had not reached out to him. This means that Clark Clifford appears as one of the most important factors, and not the American Zionists. Another important factor that also needs to be recognized is the Cold War politics since according to Clifford himself, he had advised Truman that “such a move should be taken quickly, before the Soviet Union or any other nation recognizes the Jewish state” (Clifford and Holbrooke, 2008). In the next four chapters, we will see if this proto lobby evolved into a more organized entity, or was diminished with time.
Chapter 6: About The Israel Lobby and its Establishment-History and Origins

The aim of this chapter is to provide background information about the Israel Lobby. The chapter will mention a central figure in the lobby’s creation named Isaiah Kenen and discuss why he is significant. Finally, the chapter will look at the organizations that compose the lobby. Thus, this chapter is strictly informative.

According to Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer, the Israel Lobby “is a loose coalition of individuals and organizations that actively works to move U.S. foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 5). In addition to this, they explain that what the Israel Lobby is doing is actually what typical lobbies aim to do, and it is “not a cabal or conspiracy that “controls”” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 5) U.S. foreign policy. It is simply a powerful interest group…” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 5). Therefore, the Israel Lobby has a cause: to support Israel, and it constantly fights for this cause in order to endorse it in American policy. Even though there are different subdivisions and organizations in the lobby, “they share the desire to promote a special relationship between the United States and Israel” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 5).

A. The Creation

When researching the origins of the Israel Lobby, it is clear that at the starting point of the Holocaust there was no lobby at all; what is very noticeable is that there were a number of different American Jewish organizations, but not more than this. The degree of interconnectedness between these different organizations is also not clear, and this is demonstrated through the example of Isaiah L. Kenen.

A main player that needs to be mentioned when discussing the Israel Lobby is Isaiah Kenen. Although originally not an American citizen, he gained the U.S.
citizenship and began conducting activities to support Israel (“U.S. Department of Justice,” 2009). Originally, he was born in Canada, but he had been attached to the cause because of his parents; he characterizes his “father… [as] a life-long Zionist” (Kenen, 1981, p 4) and explains that his father had suffered for being a Jew at every stage of his life:

“My father’s life story epitomized the tragic history of his generation. He fled from Czarist pogroms; he was a prisoner of the Communists; his settlement in Palestine was barred by Anglo-Arab policy and, residing in Europe, he perished soon after Nazis conquered the Warsaw ghetto” (Kenen, 1981, p 5).

Hence, hearing these stories must have fueled Kenen’s passion for the cause since he explains that he started his activism as early as the age of 12 by establishing “The Young Judea Club” (Kenen, 1981, p 5). In 1926, Kenen moved to the U.S. and “became the City Hall reporter, political writer, and State House correspondent for The Cleveland News” (Kenen, 1981, p 5). By 1941, Kenen states that he had “become president of the Cleveland Zionist District” (Kenen, 1981, p 6). According to official U.S. Department of Justice documents, Kenen was part of several different Jewish organizations. Among these Jewish organizations, the most important are: “member” (“U.S. Department of Justice,” 2009) of the Zionist Organization of America, and he explicitly notes that “it was [for] many years since 1947” (“U.S. Department of Justice,” 2009). Next, he became an “executive secretary” (“U.S. Department of Justice,” 2009) at the American Jewish Conference “from…1943…to 1948” (“U.S. Department of Justice,” 2009), at the same time between 1947 and 1948 he was the “New York Information Director” (“U.S. Department of Justice,” 2009) at the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Therefore, he was clearly very active in numerous American Jewish organizations, and often at the same time. At the time the document was written, he states that he is

Therefore, Kenen’s job mentioned in the previous excerpt shows that he was to promote Israeli interests in American policies, and he was being paid by Israel to do so in the case of being a member for their mission at the U.N. (“FBI files,” 2008). The position that Kenen next took is what paved the way from the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). Kenen had become the “Washington representative and registered lobbyist of the American Zionist Council (AZC)” (Schoolman, 1997) in 1951, and had therefore broken away from the government of Israel (Smith, 2007, para 2). AZC’s focus was to promote Israel’s interests of “financial…and military… aid” (Schoolman, 1997) as well as American policy modifications that center on Israel (Schoolman, 1997). In 1954, the AZC transformed “into a separate entity….: the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs (AZCPA)” (Schoolman, 1997). This organization was then renamed into the American Israel Public Affairs Committee in 1959 (Schoolman, 1997). Thus, Kenen is referred to as the “founder” (“Isaiah L Kenen, 2016, para 6) of AIPAC. Kenen explains that:

"The lobby for Israel, known as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) since 1959, came into existence in 1951. It was established at that time because Israel needed American economic assistance to enable her to absorb the huge influx of refugees who poured into the country soon after statehood." (“Isaiah L Kenen, 2016, para 6).

In the chapter concerning his autobiography, he states that, altogether, his different positions “equipped me [Kenen] for my Washington service: the struggle to close a dark chapter in Jewish history and to turn a page illuminated by redemption
Bahnassy,

and regeneration” (Kenen, 1981, p 6). Thus, his devotion to this cause seems to have been due to very personal reasons; his act of participating in pro-Israel activities was in no way coincidental or random. From what can be understood from his autobiographical chapter, he grew up not only hearing of his father’s struggle, but also watching him simply be “a life-long Zionist” (Kenen, 1981, p 5).

1. Members

As the previously mentioned excerpt by Kenen concerning the Israel Lobby reveals, he only mentions AIPAC, his own organization, when he speaks of the lobby. However, there are currently numerous other organizations that fall under the umbrella of the lobby. Alison Weir, from the Council for the National Interest (Weir, 2014), has provided the name of 55 organizations that are considered to be part of the Israel Lobby, while claiming that this is only “a partial list” (Weir, 2014). Among the most well-known organizations that Weir mentions are: the first on the list being the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) which Weir characterizes as “the most prominent governmental lobbying organization on behalf of Israel” (Weir, 2014), The Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (CoP), The Emergency Committee for Israel (ECI), and the American Israel Education Foundation (AIEF) (Weir, 2014). In addition to this, Weir also mentions the American Jewish Committee (AJC), the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), and The Jewish Agency, which are the American Jewish organizations that were mentioned in the previous section that had operated during the Holocaust. Thus, they have clearly become part of the Israel Lobby.

Therefore, the third chapter on Iraq underscores the existence of a strong Israel Lobby today. The fourth chapter on the Holocaust presents the idea that these American Jewish organizations existed separately during the Holocaust and
attempted, with difficulty and disunity, to help the European Jews; however, there was no “Israel Lobby” at the time, obviously because the state itself did not exist, and even more so, the American Jewish community was very much uninvolved. The fifth chapter on 1948 underscored the idea of an inchoate, “proto” lobby that rallied for the cause of a state, but disappeared after the goal had been achieved. Now, on the contrary, we see that the Israel Lobby contains more than 55 organizations. According to Cheryl Rubenberg, this shift became evident “in the years after 1967” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 15), whereby “the objective power of the pro-Israeli groups grew… [after 1967]… and assured Israel that its interests became American policy” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 15); Walt and Mearsheimer are also in support of this statement, explaining that “the lobby’s size, wealth, and influence” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 118) expanded drastically following the dramatic war of 1967 (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 118).

Thus, as can now be fully understood, the Israel Lobby exists to propagate and push forward Israel’s interests. According to Mitchell Bard, the Israel Lobby “consists of at least seventy-five different organizations, which in one way or another support Israel” (Bard, 2012, para 30). The Israel Lobby, specifically AIPAC, is viewed to be very effectual in achieving its goals. For example, one congressman characterized AIPAC by stating that it was “without question the most effective lobby in Congress” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 117). Another extremely critical quote states that “it is argued in respect of the influence of pro-Israel Lobby that – if the pro-Israel Lobby were to sponsor a resolution on Capitol Hill calling for the abolition of the Ten Commandments, both Houses of Congress would adopt it overwhelmingly” (Milton-Edwards, 2009, p 171). However, this was obviously not always the case, as
the last two chapters have shown. The following chapter seeks to explore how this change took place, and the way in which the evolution occurred.

Chapter 7: 1956 War- The Seemingly Weak, and Almost Invisible, Lobby

In this chapter, we will observe the role of the Israel Lobby during the 1956 war. The chapter aims to show that the lobby had played an extremely minimal part, specifically since it could not get the American president to change his stance with regard to Israel because he obligated it to return to Egypt the land it had taken over due to the war. This underscores that the Israel Lobby represented no form of pressure to the president, denoting no strength on its part. Therefore, the lobby appears to have been largely ineffective in this particular situation.

A. Leading Up to the War

Egypt went to the World Bank where both Britain and the United States both agreed to help the country through an “approved…loan package” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 310) towards the end of 1955. However, to move forward with the “loan package” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 310) Britain and the U.S. had specific “conditions” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 310) for Egypt. Gamal Abdel Nasser did not accept these specific “conditions” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 310) instantly; on the contrary, he thought it best to think about “whether or not to accept the arrangement” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 310). Britain and the U.S. did not wait for an answer; they cancelled the entire plan. As a direct reaction to this, “on July 26, 1956, Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 311). Nasser explained to the people that the money from the Suez Canal would be utilized to build the dam (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 311).
Therefore, the 1956 war occurred when Britain, France, and Israel attacked Egypt. The war started “on October 29, 1956, with an Israeli strike into Sinai” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 312). Interestingly, the war ended on “November 6th” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 312) after both “Britain and France [had] agreed to a UN-sponsored cease-fire” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 312); this left only Israel occupying Egyptian territory. Thus, the dialogue that took place in the American government after the war had ended revolved around the issue of Israel. The issue in 1956 was that the U.S. could either support Israel and support its decision of continuing to occupy Egypt’s territory, or it could be directly opposed to Israel’s occupation and order its withdrawal.

**B. The Israel Lobby’s Stance**

Isaiah Kenen, mentioned in the previous chapter, stated that during the Suez war,

> “We were dismayed by our government’s stand [of being pro-Arab]. We joined the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations in appeals to the Administration to work for a negotiated settlement and guarantees for agreed boundaries” (Kenen, 1981, p 132).

According to Weir, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations is in fact currently a member of the Israel Lobby (Weir, 2014). The Conference of Presidents was established in 1951 in order to embody the American Jewry’s opinions on matters concerning Israel (“Encyclopedia Judaica,” 2008, para 1). However, by “1966, the Conference became a body of constituent organizations, rather than of presidents of organizations” (“Encyclopedia Judaica,” 2008, para 6). The role of the Conference is to be a voice of the American Jewry’s needs, beliefs, and wants, and although it does not aim to shift “strategy on public-policy issues facing Israel” (“Encyclopedia Judaica,” 2008, para 8), it still does attempt to voice Israel’s opinion to the U.S. government (“Encyclopedia Judaica,” 2008, para 8). The
Conference’s website currently provides the names of 55 organizations that fall under its umbrella (“Member Organizations, 2014), and several of them are also members of the Israel Lobby, such as AIPAC (Weir, 2014). Therefore, the significance of this mass-organization at this point in history is that it demonstrates the first stages, after 1948, where American Jewish organizations were attempting to mobilize under the umbrella of an actual entity: the Conference of Presidents.

What could be understood from Isaiah Kenen’s previous statement is that he did not agree with the U.S. government’s position towards Egypt, and that the existent American Jewish organizations at the time had tried to take action with regard to the issue. In addition to this, Kenen underscores that “we had strong public support” (Kenen, 1981, p 132), whereby he attempts to indicate that the American public did not agree with the government’s position of taking Egypt’s side.

What is very interesting about the role of the American Jewish community, described by Kenen, is that it is extremely different from the way in which they act in the contemporary time period. For example, he states,

“Meanwhile, there were long and feverish negotiations between the Israelis and Dulles, and the Secretary of State tried to divide American Jews, most of whom were strongly backing the Israelis. He invited a group of major Jewish philanthropists, including leading non-Zionists, to use their influence to persuade Israel to accept the U.S. position, but they held fast and refused to qualify their support” (Kenen, 1981, p 134).

On the issue of Israeli withdrawal from Egyptian territory, according to Findley, the Israel lobby was able to gain “support from Eleanor Roosevelt, former President Truman, and leaders of both parties in the Senate, Democrat Lyndon Johnson…and Republican William Knowland” (Findley, 1985, 119). The tactic the Lobby followed in this case was to gain support from famous individuals who were influential in the American political scene. In addition to this, according to one
source, the proposed sanctions by Eisenhower caused him to be “thwarted by the pro-Israel lobby in Congress” (Bastaki, 2014, para 6).

To add to that, the “Democratic Policy Committee” (Kenen, 1981, p 134) tried to convince Eisenhower to refuse “any proposal to punish Israel for her rejection of unconditional withdrawal” (Kenen, 1981, p 135). The conclusion of this meeting was that the “Democratic Policy Committee” (Kenen, 1981, p 134) asked Eisenhower to take “his case to the public” (Kenen, 1981, p 135) even though “the congressional leaders declined to support Eisenhower’s position” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 81). When Eisenhower did so, he did not mention the sanctions; however, “he did call for pressure to force Israel’s withdrawal” (Kenen, 1981, p 135). In response to Eisenhower’s speech, Kenen states that “20,000 people poured into Madison Square Garden in a demonstration of protest” (Kenen, 1981, p 135). Kenen, who at the time was working at the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs (AZCPA), which is AIPAC’s predecessor (Schoolman, 1997), appears to have organized, or been linked to, this protest because he states that “we had asked Senator Douglas and Bishop James to speak” (Kenen, 1981, p 135).

Finally at the end of his chapter, in a very disappointed tone, Kenen explains that the press had shifted its position. At the beginning of the conflict, it was very openly pro-Israel. However, in time, it started to criticize Israel and its actions. For example, “The New York Times, on February 22, called on Israel to ‘put itself on the side of the angels and set itself aright with both the U.N. and the great body of world opinion’” (Kenen, 1981, p 136). This point underscores that Israel was losing its support, and that the Israel Lobby was not doing enough to rally the media for the cause.
C. U.S. Government’s Stance

The U.S. government was inclined to take Egypt’s side rather than Israel’s. It wanted Israel to return Egyptian territory. According to Kenen, “Instead of blaming Egypt for the war, the Administration joined the Soviets in competition for Arab favor – an unprincipled exercise in appeasement” (Kenen, 1981, p 132)

“In response to the Israeli invasion, the administration immediately brought the matter before the Security Council. On October 30 the American Ambassador to the United Nations...asked the council to find a breach of the people, to order a cease-fire, and to instruct the Israeli forces to withdraw behind the frontiers as established in the armistice agreements” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 69).

The previous quote presents the U.S. government as prepared to place pressure on Israel. During the Suez Crisis, Dulles appears to have attempted to use the American Jewry in order to affect Israel’s actions; he wanted the American Jewish organizations, in theory, to act as the mediators in order to have Israel change its position into one that was more in line with the U.S. Kenen also underscores that both Democrats and Republicans in congress were united against Dulles and Eisenhower (Kenen, 1981, p 134). He also speaks of the “American Jewish Committee’s Washington representative” (Kenen, 1981, p 134) as well as other members of the American Jewish community (Kenen, 1981, p 135) who attempted to contact Lyndon Johnson, “the Democratic leader” (Kenen, 1981, p 134) at the time in order to prevent the U.S. government from sanctioning Israel (Kenen, 1981, p 135). “Other senators joined their party leaders” (Kenen, 1981, p 135) to prevent the sanctions against Israel as well. These events underscore that, in this case, the decision came from the executive; it was the US president who had the authority to take action since all efforts were targeted at him in order to change his mind.
D. The Outcome

The major relevant point in the Suez crisis is the fact that neither the American Jewish organizations, nor Israel, could change the U.S. government’s stance; “under continuing pressure to withdraw, Israel finally gave her reluctant consent” (Kenen, 1981, p 136). This point is important for numerous reasons: primarily, it underscores that the American Jewish community was not powerful enough to influence the government’s decision. Secondly, it leads to the question of: where was the Israel Lobby? The Conference of Presidents as well as the American Jewish Committee are both mentioned in Kenen’s chapter on the 1956 war; however, he does not mention the lobby as a whole standing united and attempting to pressure the U.S. government. In fact, what is very ironic is the fact that he mentions the American Jewish community actually being used as a tool to get Israel to concede. This is the reason why Dulles’ statement about the American Jewish Community is ironic since he states: “I am aware how almost impossible it is in this country to carry out a foreign policy [in the Middle East] not approved by the Jews” (Neff, 1996, para 5). This is also the reason why it is very odd that Neff mentions that the “lawmakers” (Neff, 1996, para 5) around Eisenhower feared “the influence of the Israeli lobby” (Neff, 1996, para 5). These two statements by Dulles and Neff are in direct contradiction of what actually happened. Adam Garfinkle supports this point by explaining that “U.S. policy had forced Israel to withdraw from the Sinai after the 1956 Suez War, a matter over which the pro-Israel lobby was completely powerless. It is not clear at all what Dulles was talking about” (Garfinkle, 2009, p 207). This is actually the reason why Michael Hoffman states that Eisenhower’s greatest moment in history “was the Suez Canal crisis, when he faced down Britain, the Israelis and their lobby in the U.S.” (Hoffman, 2011, para 4). It is also worth noting that Rubenberg’s chapter dedicated to
the 1956 war and the tension between the U.S. and Israel does not mention the Israel Lobby once. If the Lobby had played an important part, this part would have been acknowledged.

1. **No Sign of Strong Influence**

Before the Suez War had actually taken place, Paul Findley explains that Israel, Britain, and France had already decided on their plan to “attack...Egypt” (Findley, 1985, p 118). Interestingly, this happened at a very critical point because it came hand in hand with Eisenhower’s “re-election” (Findley, 1985, p 118). Therefore, in Israel’s mind, this would prevent Eisenhower from trying to get involved in the issue; “with the U.S. presidential election just days away, [Israel] counted on partisan pressures from its American lobby to keep candidate Eisenhower on the sidelines. All miscalculated” (Findley, 1985, p 118). This statement shows that the Israel Lobby had not devised and used its tactics correctly, or even processed the issue clearly; they had not only misunderstood, but also underestimated Eisenhower. What is even more ironic than this is the fact that “more American Jews voted for Eisenhower in 1956 (40 percent) than those who had supported him in 1952 (36 percent)” (Findley, 1985, p 118). This shows that the American Jews had actually voted against the Israel Lobby’s efforts, underscoring that the Israel Lobby was not powerful enough to have influenced the election result. This example is in direct contrast of the previously discussed Iraq case presented earlier in which the American Jewish community was not siding with the lobby, but the lobby’s preference still prevailed. Therefore, this shows that there was no influence by the Israel Lobby during 1956.

The case of the 1956 war reveals that the Israel Lobby had no influence or capacity to change Eisenhower’s decision, and although they appear to have played a
minimal role, it is still essential to discuss their methods with regard to lobbying techniques. The purpose of this will be to present the stark contrast in their influence as they start to gain more power in the American political scene during future conflicts.

2. **Lobbying Techniques**

   It is essential to discuss the methods used by members of the Israel Lobby to attempt to change the U.S. government’s stance. Those lobbying for the cause, in this cause it is the Israel Lobby, expect the following reaction from its supporters: “the ideal response they seek is not simply ‘I’ll support you on this’ but ‘what can I do to help?’” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803). Therefore, when Findley states that the Israel lobby had gained “support from Eleanor Roosevelt, former President Truman, and leaders of both parties in the Senate, Democrat Lyndon Johnson…and Republican William Knowland” (Findley, 1985, 119) this shows that these individuals of influence were “sympathetic” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) to the Israel Lobby’s cause and had decided “to help” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) by openly voicing their opinions, ones which were considered very weighted in American politics, in order to affect the president’s decision. According to Hojnacki and Kimball, “legislators have the upper hand in relationships with interest groups… granting access primarily to people who share their predispositions and to groups with whom they have established relationships” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 776) and this directly applies to Johnson and Knowland openly supporting the Israel Lobby since they were both “leaders of… [their] parties” (Findley, 1985, 119). The method used by the Israel Lobby in this case is also discussed by Cumberlege, whereby they were clearly using their “connections” (Cumberlege, 2004, p.30); this is also mentioned by Janice Terry since she states that lobbying for a specific cause may be enhanced by “a
close personal relationship with just one powerful senator or representative” (Terry, 2005, p 30). Regardless of all of these attempts, Eisenhower was still able to stand by his decision and follow through with it.

As for the large protest that Isaiah Kenen discusses in his chapter, this method is in line with the point that Grossman and Helpman discuss. Grossman and Helpman explain that “sometimes they [interest groups] undertake disruptive activities, which are intended to coerce rather than persuade” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1). In this case, however, they neither “coerced” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1) nor “persuaded” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1) Eisenhower to change his stance. Therefore, the reason why the Suez Crisis is critical to discuss is because it shows that even with these commonly used lobbying techniques, the Israel Lobby was unable to affect Eisenhower’s decision. This example demonstrates the weakness of the Israel Lobby, and their ineffectiveness to change Eisenhower’s policy. Hence, in accordance to Hojnacki and Kimball’s, who “define lobbying as providing information directly to members of Congress…to further the two goals described above: [to influence bills and legislation]. We believe that this definition characterizes what groups do and what they hope to achieve by applying their resources to advocacy” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778), underscoring that they had not successfully reached their goal when they had “advocated” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778) for their cause. The historical examples that will follow demonstrate a rise in the Israel Lobby’s power; the evolution will become very clear as time passes.

In conclusion, even a few months after the conflict had ended, “Eisenhower wrote of the American position after January 13: ‘if Israel did not desire to defy the United Nations it was first necessary that her forces withdraw unconditionally behind the borders fixed by the truce of 1948. Only then could the nation expect the support
of the rest of the free world in securing by peaceful means her legal rights” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 75). The fact that Eisenhower continued to be adamant and unmoved about his position reveals that the Israel Lobby neither represented a threat, nor had influence to impact or change his decision.

Chapter 8: 1967- The Six-Day-War

This chapter aims to show that, as with the case of the 1956 war, the Israel Lobby was also generally inactive, with some exceptions, during the 1967 war. However, it is only after the 1967 war that we see an obvious change in the American Jewish community’s behavior, and more activity within the Israel Lobby. Thus, it is Israel’s winning of the 1967 war that strengthened its relationship with the U.S., and not the Israel Lobby itself; the 1967 war was a defining moment for both the Israel Lobby and the American Jewish Community because it gave birth to a clear new attitude, one that brought them to become more active. Therefore, this new identity was reactionary to the war.

A. Background to the war

“In May 1967 Soviet and Syrian intelligence reported that Israel was preparing a large-scale military operation against Syria for its sponsorship of Palestinian guerrilla activities” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338), and although this information was wrong, Nasser decided to take action. The first step he took was by sending Egyptian “troops” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338) to Sinai. Next, Nasser asked “all UN forces be withdrawn from Sinai” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338). These UN troops were considered to be a buffer zone amid the two hostile states (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338). The final move Nasser made was “reoccupying the UN positions at Sharm al-Shaykh and announcing a blockade on
Israeli shipping passing through the Straits of Tiran” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 38).

In Israel’s eyes, what Nasser had done was “a *casus belli*” (Quandt, 1977, p 41), which translates into an act of war. In an article published one week after the war had taken place, the author relays the fear that Israelis had felt: “Levi Eshkol [Israeli Prime Minister] and his people found themselves besieged and threatened as few nations have ever been in their history” (Dunetz, 2011, para 1).

Israel responded to Nasser’s move by conducting war which took place on “June 5, 1967” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338). Israel was able to “destroy most of the Egyptian air force while it was still on the ground. Later that same day, after Syria and Jordan had entered the conflict, Israeli pilots effectively destroyed the air forces of those countries as well” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338). The war with Egypt ended four days later as a result of “a cease-fire” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 339). The result of the war was a crushing loss for the Arab countries that had participated; Israel had now gained an overwhelming amount of land: “East Jerusalem, the West Bank, Gaza Strip, Sinai, and the Golan Heights” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 338). Egypt had instigated a war it could not win, and Jordan and Syria, attempting to help, had also lost significantly. By “November…1967” (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 342) the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 242 (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 342) whereby Israel was to return the land it had taken during the war (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 342). However, this resolution was not successful because not all of the parties to the conflict agreed with it (Cleveland and Bunton, 2009, p 342).

Walt and Mearsheimer underscore that “since the Six-Day War of 1967, a salient feature- and arguably the central focus- of America’s Middle East policy has
been its relationship with Israel” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 7). They also explain that The U.S.-Israeli relations were strengthened from “1967 to 1989” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 51) for one very obvious reason: the Soviet Union. Israel had crushed the Soviet Union’s allies in two wars during that time period which “enhanced U.S. prestige” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 52). The issue in 1967, with the case of the war, the U.S. had two choices: it could either support the state of Israel, or act as it had done in the previous conflict and side with the opposing state.

A. Change: U.S. Government Sides with Israel

After Nasser had sent his military to Sinai, Israel wrote to the U.S. president Lyndon Johnson and asked him to “reaffirm its commitment to Israeli security and inform the Soviet Union in particular of this commitment” (Quandt, 1977, p 40). Unlike in the previous conflict in which the U.S. had openly denounced Israeli actions and forced it to leave Egyptian territory, the U.S. followed Israel’s instructions and conveyed the message to the Soviet Union (Quandt, 1977, p 40), but also went further by “suggesting…a ‘joint initiative of the two powers to prevent the dispute between Israel and the U.A.R. and Syria from drifting into war” (Quandt, 1977, p 40 - 41), underscoring that the U.S. was inclined to support Israel during this conflict.

What is interesting to note is that Johnson seemed hesitant throughout this particular situation. On the 18th of May when Nasser had requested complete “UNEF…withdrawal” (Quandt, 1977, p 41), Johnson did not react, even though he had promised Israel he was on its side. When Johnson finally decided to take action by delivering a message to Nasser asking him to avoid incidents “that might lead to war” (Quandt, 1977, p 42) it was too late because Nasser “had already…closed” (Quandt, 1977, p 42) the Straits of Tiran. Therefore, in this specific crisis, we are able
to see that the U.S. sides more with Israel than it did in 1956, but at the same time we can also see very obvious hesitation on its part as well. However, according to William Quandt, America’s hesitation is discontinued after the war begins. He states:

“There was Johnson prepared to support Israel so strongly once the war had begun, especially in view of his firm expression, before June 5, of his opposition to war? Was he responding to pressures from pro-Israeli opinion in the United States, or to his own sympathy for the Jewish state?” (Quandt, 1977, p 60)

B. The Lobby: Not in Sight

The previous quote by William Quandt is extremely significant because it leads to specific and central questions: what was the role of the lobby in this conflict? Is the Israel Lobby what caused Johnson to strengthen his stance and stand by Israel more firmly? According to Quandt, during this time period, “the…pro-Israel interest groups” (Quandt, 1977, p 70) did exist, and he characterizes them as “allegedly powerful” (Quandt, 1977, p 70). However, he states that their role was that of “unimportance during the crisis” (Quandt, 1977, p 70). He further explains that “lobbying…was not a significant factor” (Quandt, 1977, p 70) because Lyndon Johnson was “already” (Quandt, 1977, p 70) very much pro-Israel, and he had not focused any of his attention on “the pro-Israel lobby during the prewar crisis” (Quandt, 1977, p 70). These statements clearly show that the lobby existed as an entity at the time, much different from the Holocaust time-period, but had no major role because the U.S. president’s initial stance was to side with Israel.

Although Tom Segev does not mention the lobby in specific, he does explain that the Israeli government did play a part in rallying the American population as the conflict took place by “create[ing] a public atmosphere that will constitute pressure on
This happened through “‘getting sympathetic Americans to write letters, editorials, telegrams, and public statements’...whose purpose...was ‘to create a public atmosphere...that will strengthen our friends within the administration’” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 122). Therefore, “the White House” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 122) had been bombarded “with letters” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 122) asking Johnson to remain by Israel’s side (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 122). This method used by the people is similar to the previously mentioned protest by Isaiah Kenen which occurred in 1956; in this case, however, the people were voicing their opinion by openly writing to the president, as well as writing about the issue. In lobby literature, as mentioned earlier, “[interest groups] undertake disruptive activities, which are intended to coerce rather than persuade” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1) and they can also involve the people as an attempt “to win voter sympathy” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1), and this is one such example. Although the method of writing letter to the American government, as well as “public statements” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 122) is not exactly “disruptive” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1), its aim was still to place pressure on the government.

C. The Outcome

Quandt explains that what enabled “Johnson to maintain a policy of support for Israel” (Quandt, 1977, p 70) was “the extremely pro-Israeli tone of American public opinion, coupled with Nasser’s hostility” (Quandt, 1977, p 70), but it was not the Israel Lobby (Quandt, 1977, p 70). An example that directly reinforces Quandt’s analysis is that of the “rally” (“A Near-Riot Erupts at Rally for Israel,” 1967, p 9) that took place on the second day of the 1967 war, which was discussed in an article published in The New York Times. The article states that this event was “sponsored by
the New York City Labor Council” (“A Near-Riot Erupts at Rally for Israel,” 1967, p 9), underscoring that it was not the Israel Lobby that had organized it, but at the same time showing that there were pro-Israel feelings in the American society.

1. **Where was the influence?**

The fact that the Israel Lobby does not appear to have been a major player during the conflict underscores that Johnson’s decision was not influenced by it. On the contrary, like in 1948, members of his administration were instrumental in shaping U.S. response, and the perfect example of this is Eugene Rostow as well as his brother. “The Rostow brothers were also firmly pro-Israel. Both were in positions of considerable influence at the White House. Eugene Rostow was Under Secretary of State in June 1967 and his brother, Walt, was National Security Adviser” (Mutawi, 2002, p 99). Thus, again we are able to see that government officials in high positions as having the influence, rather than the lobby itself. Eugene Rostow himself was active in the composition of Resolution 242 (“Resolution 242,” 2007). In addition to this, the Israeli government’s interference to rally the American population for its cause also underscores that the lobby appears to have been inactive; if the lobby was actively participating, there would not have been a need for the Israeli government to interfere.

In the case of Johnson, it is because he was originally pro-Israel (Quandt, 1977, p 70) that he openly sided with the state. In addition to this, the general American population appears to have supported Israel (Quandt, 1977, p 70), enabling Johnson, the key character with authority in this situation, to make the decision to take Israel’s side and “maintain a policy of support” (Quandt, 1977, p 70). Therefore, we can make the conclusion that the lobby’s role was again minimal in this particular conflict as well.
2. Impact of the War: Post-War Power

J.J. Goldberg mentions the rise in power of the lobby. He explains that the Six Day War resulted in the:

“prominence [of] a group of ‘New Jews’ drawn disproportionately from hard-line Zionist, Orthodox, and neoconservatives circles. ‘Their defiance was so strident, and their anger so intense […] that the rest of the Jewish community respectfully stood back and let the New Jews take the lead. The minority was permitted to speak for the mass and become the dominant voice of Jewish politics’” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 126).

Similar to this previous statements, Stuart Eizenstat explains that the Israel Lobby’s rise in power became extremely obvious in “the mid-1960s” (Eizenstat, 1991, p 92). He further explains that:

“two events sparked this new political consciousness. First, the dramatic Six-Day War in 1967 galvanized the American Jewish public like no event since Israel’s War of Independence. In less than a week, Israel’s remarkable victory over the military forces of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and the Iraqi air force wiped away centuries-old Jewish selfimage as helpless supplicants unable to fight their oppressors. The sense of pride in “new Jews,” proud, strong, and capable of defending themselves, had an incalculable effect on American Jewry” (Eizenstat ,1991, p 92).

What is very critical about this statement is that it highlights that even though the Israel Lobby was existent in “the mid-1960s” (Eizenstat ,1991, p 92), its dominance became extremely obvious after the 1967 Six-Day War had taken place, and not during the actual event of the war. As has been consistent with the general literature, the shift “in U.S.-Israeli relations” (Verbeeten, 2006) took place following the Six-Day War, and according to Verbeeten, ironically, “it was the Israeli military that achieved what AIPAC had not: a general acceptance among U.S. policymakers that close relations with Israel was an asset to U.S. national security and regional
interests” (Verbeeten, 2006) because they had won the 1967 war as well as stood by the Jordanians “during and after the 1970 Black September crisis” (Verbeeten, 2006).

Collectively, from the four previous statements that discuss the change in American Jewry as well as shift in American-Israeli “relations” (Verbeeten, 2006) due to the 1967 war, a very sharp contrast can be seen between the American Jewish community during the Holocaust, in which they preferred to remain disconnected and uninvolved with the European Jews, while during and after the 1967 war the American Jewish Community’s attitude had differed completely and taken an opposite turn. According to Jack Wertheimer, “American Jews” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 32) took action by organizing “mass” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 32) protests at “the United Nations, in Washington, and in local communities” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 32). Wertheimer characterizes this movement as “a new style, drawn from the confrontational politics of the 1960s, converted thousands of Jews- particularly young people- into activists fighting to ensure the survival of Jews abroad” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 32). These protests are the second example, after sending letters to the president, of “[interest groups] acting out through disruptive activities, which are intended to coerce rather than persuade” (Grossman and Helpman, 1994, p 1), which have been mentioned previously. Lowery agrees with this and states that “public opinion” (Lowery, 2007, p 44) actually provides significant weight when lobbying (Lowery, 2007, p 44).

How is this point relevant to the Israel Lobby? Primarily, it can now be understood that American Jewish organizations had failed the European Jewry during the Holocaust, as did the American Jewry since they had chosen to stay disconnected. By 1948, the inchoate lobby had fought for the cause of a state, but its momentum had decreased as has been seen through the 1956 war. However, in the 1960s, we see a
shift in attitude in both American Jewry as well as the Israel Lobby whereby they have both started to mobilize. According to Wertheimer, the 1967 War led to “the organized Jewish community…[to undergo] profound changes. For one thing, American Jewry fully identified with Israel, an identification that galvanized the community to unprecedented amounts of philanthropic giving and volunteering” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 32). In an article published in *The New York Times* towards the end of the 1967 war, the reporter captures the sense of surprise among members of the United Jewish Appeal by the amount of money the American Jewish community was giving away to Israel. “At a luncheon meeting…after word had arrived of the start of hostilities, about 200 community leaders in the course of 15 minutes pledged $15-million to the newly announced Israel Emergency Fund” (Fowle, 1967, p 10). The article goes on to state, that in comparison to such previous events, this “would mean a doubling or tripling of the normal annual contributions reaching Israel from American Jews” (Fowle, 1967, p 10). Hence, this specific example underscores, not only money, but the ability of the American Jewish community at the time to gather such money for Israel. Therefore, in reference to Hojnacki and Kimball, in this case, this massive amount of money is regarded as the “resource” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 776) that will eventually provide this community with the “access” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 776). After this step, “agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) becomes apparent, and this will be seen more clearly in the next chapter regarding the 1973 war.

Even religious figures sided with this idea that a change in the American Jewry had taken place as a result of 1967. For example, in Rabbi Abraham Besdin’s sermon, he states: “it took the shock of the Holocaust to remind many Jews of their identity. It was the terror of a possible second Auschwitz in the Six Day War which aroused
dormant Jews throughout the world to a new sense of their independence” (Singer, 1971, p 82). Relating this to lobby literature, the American Jewry’s newly-found identity shows that they were beginning to realize their “organized interest” (Lowery, 2007, p 29). They had created what Cumberlege refers to as “an aligned community” (Cumberlege, 2004, p 20).

Therefore, the chapter discussing the Holocaust underscored the non-existence of a concrete Israel Lobby during the time period even though there were few American Jewish organizations that attempted to help the European Jewry. Next, we looked at 1948 whereby there were several American Zionists and American Zionist organizations pushing aggressively for the cause of Israel, specifically the Zionist Organization of American (ZOA), revealing that there was significant activity for the cause. “With the founding of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948, the ZOA’s role diminished and shifted to fund raising and public relations on behalf of Israel” (“Zionist Organization of America,” 2013, para 2). Following 1948, we looked at the 1956 war in which the Israel Lobby was barely active. In reference to the previous information about the fall of the ZOA after 1948, in the year directly after the 1956 war, a large number of influential American Zionists broke away, leaving the ZOA and establishing their own entity (“Zionist Organization of America,” 2013, para 2). Following 1956, by observing the 1967 war we see that there was also very minimal activity. It can be concluded that in 1948, there was obviously no adequate institutional basis or foundation because after Israel had been established, their role was diminished seeing as how in the following conflicts they were barely active. However, specifically after the 1967 war had taken place, the American Jewry had started mobilizing, and attained a voice. We see the American Jewry slowly gaining their voice in the American political scene, and the Israel Lobby plays a part in this.
The aim of the following section is to discuss this continued evolution of the Israel Lobby by observing the Yom Kippur War of 1973.

Chapter 9: The Change Becomes Evident

The aim of this chapter is to show that by the 1973 war, the Israel Lobby’s attitude had differed completely from the other previous two conflicts in 1956 and 1967; the lobby had become more organized and by this specific time period it was now strong since it had both influence as well as “agency” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779). The most compelling example is evident though Kissinger’s incident of sending weapons to Israel during the 1973 war. The chapter will also underscore that the decade of the 1970s was a very critical time period for the lobby for three main reasons: the lobby saw increased reward, functional changes, and more cooperation between the different organizations. The 1970s represents a time period in which the Israel Lobby saw increased organizational strength, flourished, and built on the post-1967 period, and focused on Israel and US-Israel relations.

The case of the 1973 war is very interesting. From the primary sources, we are able to point out that the U.S. had strayed from Israel, in terms of weapons; Walt and Mearsheimer mention the fact that the U.S. “responded slowly to Israel’s initial requests for help” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 43). One possible reason for this stance was because Israel always presented itself as more powerful than the Arabs; for example, when discussing the 1973 war “Major General Ariel Sharon recalled: ‘These were soldiers who had been brought up on victories….It was a generation that had never lost. Now they were in a state of shock….How was it that [the Egyptians] were moving forward and we were defeated?’ (Browne, 2015, para 32). The fact that the
Arabs were fighting in this method shocked the Israelis, and they felt that they were under major threat. However, there is a major recalculation in the American attitude, specifically after the Israeli Ambassador meets with Henry Kissinger. America’s stance had changed “when Israel encountered unexpected difficulties and began running short of critical military supplies” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 43). The result was what the official governmental documents have relayed, and will be discussed further below.

A. The Change

“The heightened concern with Israel’s well-being within Jewish organizations continued during the War of Attrition (1969-1970) and the October War (1973)…these conflicts also raised fears about Israel’s security, thereby reinforcing the Israelcentric focus of many Jewish community-relations groups” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 118-119).

Thus, this evolution, as well as connection, is described

“by Albert Chernin, the longtime executive of NJCRAC [National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council], who declared in 1978 that, in the field of communal relations, ‘[o]ur first priority is Israel, of course, reflecting the complete identity of views of the American Jewish leadership with the concerns of the rank and file of the American Jewish community’ – a stunning admission that political efforts to shore up Israel superseded all other concerns of Jewish community relations organizations in the United States” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 32-33).

Therefore, what can be understood from these quotes is that the strong connection that the American Jews had felt with Israel after the 1967 war became even stronger in 1973, and Israel had become an issue of primacy for them. The American Jews also became very united. There are three different ways in which the Israel Lobby evolved in the 1970s, and they will be discussed further below. Two of these changes will be centered specifically on AIPAC.
According to Wertheimer, the American Jewish community is currently able to gather massive “funds” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54) as well as have “political mechanisms to lobby in behalf of Israel” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54). This feeling of necessity to lobby occurred “first…after the 1973 Yom Kippur War as a result of a development that significantly reshaped relations between Israeli and American Jews: U.S. government financial aid to Israel increased astronomically” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54). Wertheimer underscores that aid went from “between $25 and $50 million to approximately $2 billion annually as part of the disengagement treaties arranged by Henry Kissinger in the wake of the Yom Kippur War” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54). Therefore, the donations by American Jews to Israel, very briefly mentioned in the previous chapter, were regarded as extremely minimal in contrast to what the American government was paying (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54). “The greatest contribution American Jewry could make to Israel was to ensure that high levels of U.S. aid continued” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54), and this happened through “lobbying” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54). Wertheimer provides examples of how exactly Jewish organizations attempted to succeed at lobbying for this cause:

“In the 1970s, then, sectors of the organized community that previously had paid scant attention to Israel-related matters now threw their energies and resources into such lobbying. The Council of Jewish Federations formed an Israel Task Force, and the community relations field shifted much of its personnel and budget to the task of explaining Israel’s needs to the American public. In the early 1970s, for example, NJCRAC [National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council] estimated that 65 percent of its budget was spent on activities for Israel and Soviet Jewry. The American Jewish Committee spent between 25 and 50 percent of its budgets on Israel-related programs, while the ADL [Anti-Defamation League] allocated 30 percent to Israel programming, and the American Jewish Congress, though less involved with Israel then, assigned it 14 percent of its budget” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 54-55).

Therefore, Wertheimer’s previous quote demonstrates that these American Jewish organizations, two of which are currently members of the Israel Lobby (Weir,
found it necessary to create new branches that target just the issue of Israel, and in doing so they were better preparing themselves, distributing tasks, and becoming more organized. These characteristics were very lacking in all of the previously discussed sections. In direct relevance to this point, the table below presents the idea that during this time period, the Israel Lobby was in the forefront.

“Rank Order Listing of Most Active Interest Groups, 1966 – 1974” (Trice, 1976, p 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Opinion Group Classification</th>
<th>Total N Events</th>
<th>% Total Activity</th>
<th>Date Founded</th>
<th>Still in Existence?</th>
<th>If ceased to exist, when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Action Committee on Arab American Relations</td>
<td>Pro-Arab</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In late 1980s renamed: American-Arab Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Curtiss, 1998, para 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Curtiss, 1998, para 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(“About,” 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(“Encyclopedia Judaica,” 2008, para 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>American Jewish Committee</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(American Jewish Committee, n.d., para 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>(“American Jewish Congress,” para 1, 2016)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>(“What is the ZOA?”, 2016, para 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jewish Defense League</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>(“Backgrounder,” 2013, para 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B’nai B’rith</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>(“About Us,” 2016, para 2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rabbi Board (of New York)</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>(“Guide,” 2011, para 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Association of American-Arab University Graduates</td>
<td>Pro-Arab</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(“Summary,” n.d.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(“Summary,” n.d.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>American Israel Public Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>(Schoolman, 1997)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>American Council for Judaism</td>
<td>Anti-Zionist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>(“About Us,” 2010, para 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Synagogue Council of American</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>(“Synagogue Council of America,” 2008, para 1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(“Synagogue Council of America,” 2008, para 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** This table has been copied from (Trice, 1976, 38), with the exception of the last three columns.

Therefore, this table is significant because it underscores the findings in chapter four, with regard to the 1967 war, as well as chapter five, concerning the 1973 war and the lobby’s consecutive strength. The table shows that out of the 17 “most active interest groups” (Trice, 1976, 38) between the specified years of “1966 – 1974” (Trice, 1976, 38), 12 of them are labeled as “pro-Israel” (Trice, 1976, 38), which means approximately 71 percent of these organizations. To add to that, of these 12 organizations (Trice, 1976, p 37), five of them are currently official members of the Israel Lobby today: Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, American Jewish Committee, Zionist Organization of America, and American Israel Public Affairs Committee (Weir, 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rabbinical Council of America</td>
<td>Pro-Israel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1935 (“About Us [RCA],” 2016, para 1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>609</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**
Wertheimer further emphasizes that there were two organizations leading the “lobbying [process] for Israel” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55): the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations as well as AIPAC (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55). These two organizations are part of the Israel Lobby (Weir, 2014), and Wertheimer notes that they had a very limited role in the past, which is a point that coincides with the previous chapter (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55). Their rise in power took place “in the 1970s and 1980s” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55); The Conference of Presidents and AIPAC worked together and divided tasks (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55) whereby “The Conference of Presidents took responsibility for speaking to the executive branch of the American government on matters pertaining to Israel, and AIPAC dealt mainly with the legislative branch” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55), underscoring that it is after these re-organizational changes and cooperation initiatives in the “1970s and 1980s” (Wertheimer, 1995, p 55)-that AIPAC’s focus centered on Congress. Therefore, the change is now obvious as we begin to see a very clear starting point with regard to organization, mobility, cooperation, and power.

In a document issued by AIPAC in 2008, the organization openly states the role it played to assist Israel during the war in 1973:

(AIPAC, 2008, p 3)

It is Isaiah Kenen who, as the head of AIPAC at the time, played a defining role in this case. He explains that at the very beginning of the war, he worked with “30 Washington Jewish leaders” (Kenen, 1981, p 300) to work on a resolution that
would “urge Congress to adopt a resolution promising Israel support in negotiation for peace. We drafted the text along with a telegram urging senators to vote for it” (Kenen, 1981, p 300). On the next day, Kenen took it upon himself to visit the Republican “Senate leader [Scott]” ”(Kenen, 1981, p 300) and took his “draft” (Kenen, 1981, p 300) to him. He explains that his “draft was side-tracked, and neither Scott nor Kissinger could tell me who was responsible when I questioned them later” (Kenen, 1981, p 300). Kenen goes on to say that “although the Senate did not consider my draft resolution, many members expressed support for Israel” (Kenen, 1981, p 301). Through Kenen’s telling of the events, he provides one significant detail that shows that the Israel Lobby had power during the war:

“CBS interviewer…jolted Fulbright: ‘It is a fairly serious charge to say that your colleagues in the Senate- some 70 of them are controlled by a power group rather than by their own vision of what they think are proper principles of freedom and right.’ Fulbright retreated just a little: ‘They have been persuaded that this is in our interest. I don’t know these niceties of semantics, perhaps I could withdraw it and rephrase it. It still comes out with the fact that influence is dominant.’ ” (Kenen, 1981, p 301).

Kenen explains that when the United States was starting to send weapons to Israel, “Israel’s friends circulated the congressional resolutions which had been held back…they served a significant purpose – to encourage the Administration to continue to strengthen Israel, and, in effect, to ask for the $2.2 billion arms authorization which Nixon proposed on October 14” (Kenen, 1981, p 305). Thus, he is speaking of the resolution he had taken to Scott at the very beginning of the war; it was now moving forward and being put to use. Kenen states:

“Our office began calling constituents to encourage their congressmen to co-sponsor, and when the resolutions were introduced (on October 18 in the Senate, and October 23 in the House), the sponsors included 68 senators and 260 representatives. Others added their names, bringing the total to 71 senators and 269 representatives” ”(Kenen, 1981, p 305).
Thus, from Kenen’s chapter, it can be understood that there were two choices to be made: primarily the U.S. could send weapons to Israel and proceed with the $2 billion to Israel, or it could choose to abstain from undergoing these actions.

B. The Outcome

Kenen’s description of events is in line with what AIPAC says it had accomplished 35 years earlier. Kenen went even further when he states that he had “testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations to describe the disastrous effects of the war and worldwide inflation of Israel” (Kenen, 1981, p 307). He explains that he was not just the voice of AIPAC, but the voice of “all the organizations in the Presidents Conference” (Kenen, 1981, p 307), the organization which has been mentioned numerous times. This signifies unity between these organizations, and underscores that they were working for this one cause together. This resolution did go through since Rubenberg states that “on October 19 the American Congress passed emergency legislation providing Israel $2.2 billion to pay for the new weapons. This financial aid was indeed a watershed in U.S. support for Israel, both quantitatively and qualitatively” (Rubenberg, 1986, p 164). Hence, AIPAC did play an important role during the 1973 war, and their position signifies a very weighted one in American politics.

Official White House documents have been published recently and they present forth the conversations that took place between the key political figures such as the Jordanian King, Anwar El Sadat, Henry Kissinger, and the Israeli Ambassador in the U.S. throughout the span of the war. There are specific conversations that need to be highlighted because they are very telling with regard to the Israel Lobby and its power.

In the late hours of October 12th and the early hours of October 13th, Henry
Kissinger and the Israeli Ambassador Simcha Dinitz had a very intense conversation. What can be understood from the conversation is that the United States was simply not supporting Israel enough throughout the war, and it was not fulfilling its promises (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 459 - 460). The U.S. was supposed to send warplanes to Israel in order to aid with the fight; however, this plan was not materializing, even to Kissinger’s surprise who repeatedly claimed they were “authorized” (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 461) to do so. The more critical part of the conversation occurs in the following section:

“Dinitz: The Prime Minister asked me to tell you we have based our operations on this basis, and as well as what we . . .

Kissinger: Can I tell this to Schlesinger now?

[Picks up phone]: Get me Schlesinger.

Dinitz: Yes.

To save a little of the situation—I’m not talking about an initiative, but about saving the situation—the planes must fly directly to Israel.

Kissinger: There will be a mutiny here. That’s impossible.

Dinitz: So help me, I must tell you, there will be a mutiny here if there are no planes. The Jewish community, and many friends, and the labor movement and the press. I’ve been making no comment. I can’t do it. I have no right, no historical right; we are dealing with the destiny of people” (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 461).

The last two underlined statements by Kissinger and Dinitz are the most important parts of the conversation because they show how much Kissinger took the Israel Lobby and Jewish community into account; Kissinger, previously, was obviously not rushing to help Israel. However, once he was threatened, he actually worried about the way in which the lobby would react to the American government being unable to aid Israel enough during the war, and the example of the role AIPAC was playing at the same time as the conversation was taking place represents that Kenen, as well as AIPAC, had accessibility and a voice that was heard within the
Congress. This is made even more obvious when Kissinger reacts by calling Schlesinger, the secretary of defense at the time:

“**Kissinger:** [talks to Schlesinger on phone] Hello Jim.

**Schlesinger:** Hi Henry.

**Kissinger:** I’ve just been meeting on an urgent basis with Dinitz, who says they are running out substantially of ammunition. They based their strategy on the assumption that they would get the ammunition replaced this week, as the President had promised them on Tuesday, and that they are stopping their offensive in Syria because they can’t move because of lack of supplies. And the Egyptians have transferred artillery over and now they are saying there is a problem of a major thrust into the Sinai. And it is true we gave them our assurances.

**Schlesinger:** Well, what do you want to do?

**Kissinger:** Well, I don’t know what I want to do. I just feel that we did make some undertaking—you know it would help us. I was raising hell with them for not keeping their offensive going for a day while we were setting up the scenario on diplomacy. And now they have got to stop it.”

*(Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 461- 462)*

After Kissinger had a long conversation with Schlesinger, the conclusion was as follows: “**Kissinger:** [hangs up, turns to Dinitz]: They’ll give you ten C–130’s immediately, and will load them with ammunition. And probably fly them with American pilots” *(Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 461- 464)*. This quote is extremely significant because it shows what Kissinger did out of fear of the lobby; he responded immediately to the Israeli ambassador’s request. The second very important conversation that took place, which also involves the Israel Lobby, occurred two days later while the war was still taking place:

“**Mr. Clements:** Is anyone thinking about quote foreign military sales unquote? What are we going to do about this volume.

**Mr. Rush:** We have a serious problem.

**Mr. Clements:** We will need a supplemental.

**Secretary Kissinger:** Let’s get the Jewish lobby to get us the money. And let’s wrap some other things in it too. Go see (Senator) Ribicoff.
Mr. Sisco: Let’s get a Congressional package and get it moving in the next 24 hours.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, and don’t be modest. They have been screaming for it—let (Senator) Jackson put it through. And get Cambodia taken care of in the package. It’s an absurdity that we have to lose our war. If we had put one F–4 into Cambodia they would have screamed bloody murder.

Mr. Sisco: (to Clements) Curtis Tarr and Sy Weiss will work with you on this.

Secretary Kissinger: Let’s get it today” (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 534).

Therefore, this segment of the conversation is critical because it indicates that it was the Israel Lobby, which they refer to as the “Jewish Lobby” (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 534) obviously had influence with the Congress. So, Kissinger was using them because he wanted to get votes for this “money” (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 534) he mentions, and he finds that the only way to do so was through the lobby. This shows that Kissinger actually needed them to go to Congress, and this underscores that the Israel Lobby had the ability to act, as well as had the “access” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) in Congress. This point is also significant because it can be directly contrasted with 1956 whereby the American Jews were used as a tool to get to Israel, now they were being used to get to Congress. This demonstrates more internal influence.

1. Lobbying Techniques and Influence

According to Hojnacki and Kimball, lobbies “can work directly to build coalitions in Congress in addition to relying on legislative friends” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 775). Goldberg emphasizes that AIPAC followed this exact same method, and that is why it was able to “achieve its goals during the war” (Goldberg, 1990, p 48).
“For interest groups to affect policy, they must not only gain access to governmental actors who are sympathetic to their policy preferences, but they must get support from governmental actors who can, themselves, make a meaningful input into the decision that finally emerges” (Trice, 1976, p 55).

This quote by Trice is in direct alignment with the varying lobbying theories discussed by Hojnacki and Kimball, as they explain that interest groups pick exactly who they lobby, they claim that “a group will target committee members based on the likelihood of those legislators acting on the group’s behalf in committee as well as later in the legislative process” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778). Therefore, with regard to this aspect of lobbying, AIPAC underwent an ingenious endeavor after the 1973 war by actually choosing to inform the new “young congressmen and….senators” (Tivnan, 1987, 83) who were not aware of the issue. By doing so, AIPAC was molding these insiders for its cause, and ensuring, as Hojnacki and Kimball have explained, that they would vote for its cause. In addition to this, this supports Hojnacki and Kimball’s point that AIPAC was widening its reach (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778) by targeting fresh members of Congress and attempting to convince these individuals “to support the group’s interests” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778). By doing so, they were establishing the “connections” (Cumberlege, 2004, p.30) that Cumberlege underscored.

Trice continues explaining that the Israel Lobby specifically between the years of “1966 – 1974” (Trice, 1976, p 58) chose to lobby people who were already siding with Israel and were “predisposed to support their policy positions” (Trice, 1976, p 58). Trice emphasizes that the Israel Lobby tended to focus on Congress rather than the State Department as “they believed that support was much easier to extract from Congress, even though on most diplomatic issues Congress was not a primary governmental actor” (Trice, 1976, p 58). When cases did occur and they had to lobby
the State Department, they tended to divert their attention to people who were recognized for sympathizing with Israel (Trice, 1976, p 58). This lobbying technique is very much in alignment with Hojnacki and Kimball as they discuss the essentiality of having “legislative allies” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778) because they will be the ones who drive forward “favorable amendments and repel unfavorable amendments in committee to strengthen the content of a bill” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778). In addition to this, they may also be able to convince other congressmen to support their cause and result in the creation of a “proposal that emerges from committee [that] has the best chance of survival on the floor” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 778).

In addition to this, it is necessary to discuss the subject of money. According to Hojnacki and Kimball, money plays a defining role in lobbying: “organizations with fewer resources will be more likely to concentrate solely on their allies in committee” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779), while those who do have a large monetary capacity and “a comparative advantage in resources” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779) will go one step further by lobbying individuals that do not necessarily agree with their cause, as well as others who have not yet formulated an opinion on the matter (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779). This issue of “resources” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779) can be directly connected to the previously relayed conversation between Kissinger, Clements, and Sisco whereby Kissinger openly suggests that they turn to the Israel Lobby for monetary help in order to push forward a “package” (Howland and Daigle, 2011, p 534) for Israel; therefore, they turned to the Israel Lobby for its comparative advantage in resources” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779) since it had the ability to reach within Congress and get the money from them. With regard to lobbying techniques, this newly revealed moment
in history is essential for several critical reasons. Primarily, it does not only present forward the previously mentioned fact that the Israel Lobby had accessibility with the Congress, it also supports Isaacs’ point that as the war took place, the Israel Lobby was able to gather an extremely large sum of money. Isaacs characterizes this moment in history as:

“the most spectacular Jewish giving of all came during and after the Yom Kippur War of 1973, when more than $100 million was raised for Israel in several days. The war pushed the 1974 fund-raising goals to the vicinity of one billion dollars” (Isaacs, 1974, 119).

To add to that, this money feeds into the idea of “agency” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779) put forward by Hall and Wayman’s survey of varying lobbying theories. They explain that money works in a cycle because it leads to “access” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) which in return leads to “agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803). Thus, by going to Congress and taking this large sum of money to the White House, the Israel Lobby must have been able to gain “access” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) as well as “agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803). These factors can also be linked to the previously mentioned conversation between Kissinger and the Israeli ambassador; Goldberg emphasizes that AIPAC was distressed due to the issue of the “delaying of the airlift” (Goldberg, 50, 1990). Therefore, now that these private conversations have been revealed, it is clear why the Israeli ambassador had threatened unrest of the Israel Lobby if these planes did not go through to Israel; the lobby had “agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) to act. In addition to this, Goldberg cites the “$2.2 billion” (Goldberg, 1990, p 49) of aid money provided to Israel by the US during the war, and underscores that this money had been “swift[ly]” (Goldberg, 1990, p 49) approved, denoting AIPAC’s “access” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) and “agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803) because he emphasizes that they were the ones who “focused…attention” (Goldberg, 1990, p
on this specific cause, a point that has been underscored through Kenan’s retelling of the events.

2. Post-1973

AIPAC continued to evolve after 1973 when it dramatically shifted its methodology. Isaiah Kenen was still the person in charge during the war in 1973. According to Edward Tivnan, “after Vietnam and Watergate, the House and Senate began to change; there were younger and more activist politicians… Kenen’s pals were either retiring or dying. No longer would a few strong arms be able to keep everyone in the pro-Israel line” (Tivnan, 1987, p 83). At the same time, AIPAC believed that the most significant entity was “Congress-AIPAC’s traditional turf” (Tivnan, 1987, p 83). Therefore, the issue no longer relied on connections, and AIPAC needed to adapt to this “change” (Tivnan, 1987, p 83) because it felt that it was no longer connected to the people within this entity that they believed was so critical. By 1975, Morris Amitay took Kenen’s place (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 119). What Amitay did differently from Kenen was magnify AIPAC’s reach (Tivnan, 1987, p 83). He aimed “to extend its network and concentrate on influencing – and educating – scores of young congressmen and an increasing number of senators ignorant of Middle East history and diplomacy” (Tivnan, 1987, p 83). Thus, he did not just depend on existent connections, as Kenen had done, but he took it upon AIPAC to establish new allies within the entity they saw to be most significant. According to Hojnacki and Kimball, “only those organizations with strong resource base…will have the capacity to move beyond their allies and lobby…undecided legislators” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779); they also underscore that such “groups with a comparative advantage in resources” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 779) do so. Thus, it is clear that the lobby had such means and capabilities from the
amount of money donated in 1967.

Therefore, with regard to this point, we can see a significant shift between 1948 and, specifically 1975, whereby in 1948 the Zionists had targeted the executive; however, by 1975 Amitay aimed at targeting the legislative branch, Congress, in order to have them in line with his organization’s interests. In 2004, “CNN reported that AIPAC… holds 2000 meetings a year with US Senators and Congressmen, leading to the passage of an average of 100 pro-Israel pieces of legislation every year” (Cole, 2004, para 5), which underscores that the organization had continued in this path almost 30 years later. If this method had not been effective, it would have changed its route.

Therefore, as mentioned earlier the Israel Lobby underwent three significant changes; one has already been mentioned with regard to the functional changes that took place within the entities. The two other changes are directly related to AIPAC. The first major change in AIPAC had to do with the leaders’ attitudes. Kenen and Amitay were polar opposites, and therefore led AIPAC in two different directions. Kenen was viewed as “diplomatic and chummy” (Tivnan, 1987, 83) with those in Congress. Amitay, on the other hand, was characterized as “aggressive” (Tivnan, 1987, p 83), and according to Tivnan, “Capitol Hill did not appreciate the head of a lobby threatening to shut off Jewish campaign funds if they didn’t vote AIPAC’s way” (Tivnan, 1987, p 83). Therefore, Amitay made AIPAC project “its power” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 119) “instead of shunning the limelight” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 119), as Kenen had proceeded to do in the past. Tom Dine, who later took Amitay’s place, also followed Amitay’s footsteps, and these two men were able to “transform [AIPAC] from an intimate, low-budget operation into an
annual budget (derived solely from private contributions that went from some $300,000 in 1973 to an estimated $40-60 million today” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 119).

The second major change that took place in AIPAC, as well as other members of the Israel Lobby, was a shift in their mentality; they attempted to achieve their goals by shifting the way in which they framed their interests, and this can be seen very clearly through the following quote:

“AIPAC and other groups in the lobby did not define their public agenda as humanitarian support for Jews in Israel. Rather, the evolution of the lobby increasingly involved the formulation and promotion of sophisticated arguments about the alignment of America’s and Israel’s strategic interests and moral values” (Walt and Mearsheimer, 2007, p 119).

This quote signifies that the Israel Lobby found that if it could link American-Israeli interests directly together, it could get U.S. support for Israel, which is also a tactic that we begin to see is mentioned for the first time.

In conclusion, through the examination of the 1973 war, we are able to see the Israel Lobby’s mobility, and the different organizations working together for the sake of Israel. In addition to this, the lobby was able to revolutionize its functional duties, interests, and specifically with the case of AIPAC, its entire attitude. These innovative changes enabled the lobby to gain influence in the American political scene.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

In one article, the Israel Lobby was listed as number nine out of the “10 biggest lobbies in Washington” (Hastley, 2011, para 18). What is crucial about this point is that it is the only lobby on the list that attempts to change American “foreign policy” (Hastley, 2011, para 18), which underscores that the Israel lobby is in fact the strongest lobby within this category.
To conclude this project, I initially started with the 2003 war in Iraq because it shows that by this specific time period, the Israel Lobby had become extremely powerful, and this serves to contrast their non-existence during the Holocaust time period, as well as the fact that it took them years of hard work to be in the position that they were in then. I then explored the Holocaust time period which revealed the anti-Semitism that caused American Jews to hide their identities. The chapter also presents the different American Jewish organizations that attempted to help European Jewry, but these attempts were usually linked to the issue of Palestine. By 1948, American Zionists were rallying for the cause of a Jewish state; in this cause, they were united. However, after the goal had been achieved, their momentum had decreased because there was no “Israel Lobby” as an actual functioning entity, it appeared to have been merely a proto-lobby. Next, the 1956 war chapter revealed that the Israel Lobby did not have enough influence to get the American president to change his stance with regard to Israel, and in this case, he forced Israel to do what he wanted and not what it preferred. By the 1967 war, the chapter reveals that the Israel Lobby also did not play a major role during this event either because the general atmosphere was pro-Israel; even the American president himself appeared to be in support of the state. It is only after the 1967 war that we see a major change in the American Jewish community whereby they begin to gain their voice. This activeness is strengthened in the 1970s, and specifically after the Yom Kippur War as the Israel Lobby begins to develop functional changes and cooperate within itself. The fact that Kissinger used the Israel Lobby to get money from Congress during the Yom Kippur war reveals their influence, as well as how far they had come along since the Holocaust time period. After the war, the new leader of AIPAC brought with him a different attitude, a far more aggressive one that Kenen’s.
Therefore, this significance of this thesis is that it provides a historical perspective to the Israel Lobby, and discusses the subject from a completely different lens than is usually used to observe the lobby. This ties back to the previously mentioned quote in the introduction, in which AIPAC was characterized as a “magnificent creation” (Freilich, 2015), and how this “creation” (Freilich, 2015) came to be. As the literature review chapter has underscored, the discourse tends to ignore the importance of this historical perspective. This project also presents that the Israel Lobby, even though it has been able to gain influence in American politics, did not always achieve its goals. This is especially true in the case of 1956. As for the Iran Nuclear Deal mentioned in the introduction, the outcome depends on perception. It had fought for the review, and attained it, but the deal still went through. Therefore, it can be concluded that it achieved its short-term goal, and not its long-term one. Therefore, this leads to the idea that the Israel Lobby’s strength may be exaggerated or presented as extreme. Lara Friedman sides with this view when she stated that

“For people who want to say there is a hidden hand, or maybe not so hidden, behind U.S. Middle East policy and it is the Israel Lobby, I think that that does not hold up. It does not hold up to even fairly superficial analysis. For people who want to say how dare you suggest that there is an Israel Lobby that plays a role, that is anti-Semitic, I think that doesn’t hold up either. There are clearly organizations, including my own and many that are more powerful than mine, who work very hard, who have very very good access within various government circles- you’re talking Congress or given administration- and within a democracy that’s what they’re supposed to do....this is part of a healthy democracy” (L. Friedman, personal communication, March 14, 2016).

This project is significant because, through the study of the lobby’s evolution, we are able to counter the ideas that the lobby constantly has an impact on U.S. foreign policy, as well as tie back to Barari’s idea that Arabs have incorrect
assumptions and “ideas” (Barari, 2009, p 4). Therefore, this project is the first step in correcting them.

A. Recommendations

This evolution of the Israel Lobby is essential to explore because it enables other lobbies to learn for its experience. In this specific case, it is the Arab Lobby that I am concerned with. “Given its weakness when compared to its pro-Israel counterpart, the pro-Arab Lobby has had a spotty history in the United States. Its very existence is often contested even from within its own ranks” (Marrar, 2009, p 84). The fact that people doubt its presence underscores the weakness and lack of visibility in the picture. Therefore, the Arab Lobby, according to Marrar’s description, appears to be in its early stages and can be resembled to the Zionist Lobby, or proto-lobby, described in the 1948 chapter.

“Former President of the NAAA [National Association of Arab-Americans] Joseph Baroody once remarked, we can’t represent the Arabs the way the Jewish Lobby can represent Israel. The Israeli government has one policy to state, whereas we couldn’t represent the ‘the Arabs’ if we wanted to. They’re as different as the Libyans and Saudis are different, or as divided as the Christian and Moslem Lebanese” (Marrar, 2009, p 88).

The significance of this quote is that it exemplifies the Arab problem (Marrar, 2009, p 88). Therefore, one recommendation in this case that we have learned from the Israel lobby, and should be applied by the Arab lobby, is cooperation; just as the organizations within the Israel lobby began cooperating together in the 1970s, the organizations within the Arab Lobby should find it in their best interest to do so as well; this will strengthen their cause. According to Blankfort, the Israel Lobby’s opposition is extremely weak; “the Arab-American organizations in Washington, the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) and the Arab-American Institute (AAI), being both too small and too timid to challenge even their shadow”
(Blankfort, 2006, para 24). This is another reason why cooperation is key. If there is no strong opposition to the Israel lobby from the Arab lobby, then the Israel lobby will continue to be the only voice that is heard. However, if the Arab lobby cooperates together to strengthen and unify its voice, this will show the American government that there are other voices that also need to be heard. Thus, it is necessary for them to find mutual interests that they should work together to promote.

There appears to be another problem with the Arab Lobby, one of money. “From 1990 until 2002, pro-Israel political action committees (PACs) gave a total of $48,985,897 to political candidates compared to only $296,830 contributed by all Arab and Muslim pressure groups combined” (Marrar, 2009, p 88). Therefore, the first recommendation of working together is directly linked to being able to gather such massive funds. It is only when they have such “resources” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 776) will they be able to have “access” (Hojnacki and Kimball, 1998, p 776) and “agency” (Hall and Wayman, 1990, p 803), and this has been an obvious lesson learned from observing the Israel lobby’s evolution. This has been exemplified through the example of 1973 in which Kissinger made the Israel Lobby get money from Congress, underscoring their access.

Finally Marrar highlights an essential point of change that the Arab Lobby has undergone and needs to continue to follow: support the two-state solution (Marrar, 2009, p 110). What Marrar is advising here is directly relevant to what we learned in the 1973 chapter whereby, after the war, the Israel Lobby learned to align its interest to the US government’s interests in order to achieve its goals. Therefore, the last recommendation is for the Arab Lobby to do so as well.
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