



**THE  
NEW ISRAEL FUND:  
A NEW FUND FOR  
ISRAEL'S ENEMIES**

**Joseph Puder**

In today's Israel, an Arab terrorist seeking release from prison, a filmmaker whose works portray the "evils and exploits of capitalism," and a Sephardic radical devoted to battling the "pseudo-Western culture" of the "Ashkenazi elite" are all assured of ample financial support for their respective causes, thanks to the New Israel Fund, an American Jewish philanthropy that has embraced a startling variety of extremist crusades in its determination to transform Israel into a country that may satisfy members of the American Civil Liberties Union, but will bear scant resemblance to the Jewish State for which Jews longed for two thousand years.

The New Israel Fund was established in 1979 by Jonathan Cohen, a wealthy San Francisco businessman, and his wife, Eleanor Friedman, heiress to the Levi Strauss fortune. Cohen was formerly a staff member of the radical-left Vanguard Foundation (which, among other things, helped finance a prostitutes' union called "Call Off Your Tired Old Ethics"), and his friends on the left praised the New Israel Fund as a "radical Jewish fundraising effort."<sup>1</sup>

The literature that Cohen designed for his new Fund was considerably more circumspect, avoiding explosive terms like "radical" and instead stressing in vague terminology that the Fund would work "in such areas as Jewish-Arab peacemaking, legal aid, religious pluralism, the rights of women, and Ashkenazi-Sephardic relations." The Fund's brochures insisted that "We have no affiliations and make no grants to political parties or to organizations which are controlled by political parties."<sup>2</sup>

The Fund's vague promises about working for peace and pluralism helped it attract a great deal of money in a short time. Initially the Fund operated out of Cohen's home in northern California, but by 1983 its annual income had passed the \$500,000 mark, enabling a transfer of the NIF headquarters to plush offices in midtown Manhattan. Since then its annual income has multiplied many times over, totaling more than \$7 million in 1988-89.

Cohen, for his part, was busy enjoying the best of both worlds. By day, he was leader of the "non-partisan, non-political" New Israel Fund. By night, he was partisan and political, actively supporting Peace Now and helping to found a short-lived leftwing group called the Committee of Concerned American Jews. The Committee's brevity of existence was largely due to the fact that its initial fundraising letter turned into a public

relations fiasco when it emerged that an apparent statement of endorsement from Abba Eban that was featured in the letter was, in Eban's words, "fabricated."<sup>3</sup>

The sort of deceptive advertising in which Cohen's Committee of Concerned American Jews indulged has become the trademark of the New Israel Fund. Just as the Committee tried to fool the Jewish public into believing that it had the endorsement of Abba Eban, the Fund has tried to fool the Jewish public into believing that it has the endorsement of "the prophetic tradition," that its goals are "what Israel's founders aspired to." The only difference between Cohen's Committee and his New Israel Fund is that the Fund has been far more successful.

### **THE NEW ISRAEL FUND'S ROOTS: CONAME, BREIRA, NEW JEWISH AGENDA, PEACE NOW**

Most of those who occupy positions of leadership and influence in the New Israel Fund have long records of involvement in organizations that specialized in attacking Israel.

The earliest of these organizations was the Committee On New Alternatives in the Middle East, or CONAME, established in 1970. Its key founders included a number of anti-Zionists, most notably Noam Chomsky.<sup>4</sup> CONAME's most controversial public activity was in 1973, when it lobbied against U.S. arms shipments to Israel during the Yom Kippur war. The official CONAME position on the arms issue perfunctorily called for a halt to Soviet arms shipments to the Middle East as well, but since CONAME obviously had no means of influencing Soviet policy, the only operative aspect of its position was its attempt to influence American policy towards Israel.<sup>5</sup>

CONAME also adopted an ambivalent position with regard to Arab terrorism. In 1974, it reprinted and distributed an article authored by Paul Mayer, one of CONAME's "Sponsors" (the term used on CONAME stationery to describe its financial supporters), in which Yasser Arafat was praised for his "moderation and pragmatism," the idea that the various factions of the PLO are terrorists was labeled an "oversimplification," and the massacre of Israeli schoolchildren at Ma'alot was said to have been caused by the "not unfounded" fears of the PLO that "the future of the Palestinians was being bartered away by Kissinger."<sup>6</sup>

Luis Lainer, a Los Angeles attorney, was another one of

CONAME's "Sponsors." Today Lainer is the director of the Los Angeles branch of the New Israel Fund. (When Lainer's link to CONAME was first publicly revealed, he told reporters that he had left CONAME in 1972, long before the Yom Kippur War; but Alan Solomonow, who was executive director of CONAME, responded that Lainer "never resigned from CONAME. Only one person ever resigned from CONAME and asked his name to be removed from our stationery--and that was not Lainer."<sup>7</sup>) Albert Axelrad, the Hillel rabbi at Brandeis University, was a "Sponsor" of CONAME; today he is active in the Greater Boston Committee of the New Israel Fund. John Ruskay, who was on the CONAME steering committee, today sits on the New Israel Fund's Advisory Council.

CONAME's extreme position found little support in the American Jewish community, and by 1973 a number of its Jewish sympathizers began thinking about alternative means of political agitation. Carolyn Toll, a veteran of the Jewish left, recalls: "Some Jews sympathetic to CONAME felt that only an all-Jewish group could have significant impact on American Jews."<sup>8</sup> For that purpose they established Breira, a Jewish organization devoted to the idea that a Palestinian state must be established in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. Numerous Breira activists later "graduated" to the ranks of the New Israel Fund. John Ruskay and Albert Axelrad left CONAME to become leaders of Breira, before finally making their way to the NIF. Arthur Samuelson, editor of the Breira newsletter, *Interchange*, is today a member of the New Israel Fund's Board of Directors. In addition to his work with the New Israel Fund, Samuelson serves on the Advisory Council of the America-Israel Council For Israeli-Palestinian Peace, an extremist group that lobbies against Israel in Congress. Three members of the Breira board of directors currently have senior positions with the New Israel Fund: Mimi Alperin, who is on the Fund's board of directors, and Hillel Levine and Joseph Asher, who are on the Fund's Advisory Council. Lawrence Kushner, who was on the Breira Advisory Council, is today active in the Greater Boston Committee of the New Israel Fund.

In 1977, a series of exposes about the extremist background of the Breira leadership discredited the organization and led to its early demise.<sup>9</sup> Some Breira activists gravitated to the Shalom Network, an alliance of Jewish leftwing activists throughout the U.S. whose declared purpose was to promote the principle of "self-determination for the Palestinian people." The editor of the *Shalom Network Newsletter* was Jonathan Jacoby, who was soon to become a key figure in the New Israel Fund." While he was working for the Shalom Network in 1980, Jacoby was simultaneously involved in a short-lived leftist group called the

"Committee of Americans for Peace in the Middle East," whose only discernible activity was its sponsorship of a large advertisement in the New York Times demanding "Palestinian self-determination." The signatories included Jacoby, Rena Orenstein, who was the Office Coordinator for the New Israel Fund at its original headquarters in northern California, and at least six individuals who are today active in the Greater Boston Committee of the New Israel Fund.<sup>11</sup>

In 1982, the Shalom Network merged with the New Jewish Agenda, an organization that shares the Network's obsession with "Palestinian self-determination," but also believes that Jews should ally themselves with "progressives" on the entire range of American social issues. Agenda's leaders have repeatedly courted controversy by meeting with PLO officials, questioning the wisdom of U.S. aid to Israel, and downplaying the plight of Soviet Jewry.<sup>12</sup> With regard to the relationship between the New Israel Fund and the New Jewish Agenda, a senior official of the New Israel Fund has conceded that "there may be overlap in their constituencies."<sup>13</sup> The truth, however, is that there has been considerable overlap in their leaderships as well. Jonathan Jacoby, who after the demise of the Shalom Network was affiliated with Agenda,<sup>14</sup> became executive director of the New Israel Fund in 1982, a job he kept until 1989. Other Agenda activists likewise became important figures in the New Israel Fund. Don Perlstein, who was the New Jewish Agenda's representative in Boston, is today the Boston regional director of the New Israel Fund. Laura Geller, a Reform rabbi who is still active in Agenda's Los Angeles chapter, is simultaneously a member of the New Israel Fund's Advisory Council. Judith Wisch, who is currently active in the Philadelphia chapter of Agenda, simultaneously serves as leader of the New Israel Fund's branch in Philadelphia.<sup>15</sup> Albert Axelrad left Breira to become one of the founders of New Jewish Agenda. As noted earlier, he is currently active in the Greater Boston Committee of the New Israel Fund. Ross Neiuseler and Alan Epstein, both of whom were associated with Agenda, are likewise active in the NIF's Boston division.<sup>16</sup> Arnold Rachlis, who was affiliated with New Jewish Agenda in 1982, is today a member of the New Israel Fund's Board of Directors.<sup>17</sup> In addition, five members of the editorial board of the radical-left magazine Tikkun, which has had close ties to Agenda (for example, all Agenda members received a free one-year subscription to Tikkun when it began publication), also serve on the New Israel Fund's Advisory Council.<sup>18</sup>

Jewish leftists who were more interested in Israel than in the American social issues embraced by New Jewish Agenda found a home in Friends of Peace Now, which was established in

1979 as the North American support group for Israel's Peace Now movement. Although it has become a fixture on the Israeli political scene, Peace Now remains very much on the fringe. Public opinion polls have consistently shown that most Israelis reject Peace Now 's demand for negotiations with the PLO leading to a Palestinian state in most of the administered territories. Peace Now's ability to attract public support has been further undermined by the fact that PLO leaders have repeatedly praised it --Yasser Arafat, for example, called it "wonderful,"<sup>19</sup> a remark which served to reinforce the movement's image as a potential fifth column.

Six members of the Advisory Board of Friends of Peace Now simultaneously serve on the Advisory Council of the New Israel Fund, and three other members of the Peace Now board serve on the Fund's Board of Directors.<sup>20</sup> Peace Now advertisements or press statements have featured the signatures of the New Israel Fund's co-founder, Eleanor Friedman,<sup>21</sup> twelve other New Israel Fund Advisory Council members,<sup>22</sup> ten other members of the Fund's Board of Directors,<sup>23</sup> the Fund's former director of development,<sup>24</sup> its San Francisco regional director,<sup>25</sup> its Los Angeles representative,<sup>26</sup> its vice-president, Richard Gunther,<sup>27</sup> and even its new president, Mary Ann Stein.<sup>28</sup> (The Fund and the Friends of Peace Now seem to have a reciprocal relationship; Jonathan Jacoby resigned his post as executive director of the Fund in 1989 in order to assume the presidency of the Friends of Peace Now.)

More than two-thirds of the American members of the New Israel Fund's board of directors, and half of the members of the NIF's Advisory Council,<sup>29</sup> have been (and in many cases still are) involved with either CONAME, Breira, the New Jewish Agenda or Friends of Peace Now. The NIF's claim to be a "non-partisan" organization is therefore misleading at best. It is, in fact, an organization directed and staffed primarily by individuals with long histories of attacking Israel, who regard the New Israel Fund as a convenient vehicle for furthering their radical agenda. The only difference between the NIF and other groups on the Jewish left is that the NIF consciously strives to conceal its leftwing political orientation in order to gain respectability and attract donors.

### **CIVIL RIGHTS--FOR ARAB TERRORISTS**

The single largest beneficiary" of the NIF is the Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI), which was granted

\$350,000 in 1988-1989. The ACRI is also the most politically significant of the NW's grantees, for its relentless legal crusades have directly hampered Israel's battle against PLO terrorism. In contrast to many other NIF beneficiaries, whose activities are limited to propagandizing, the ACRI's efforts have had a direct impact on the ability of the Israeli Army to defend the Jewish State.

One of the ACRI's chief concerns is the question of what methods Israel should use in its fight against Arab terrorism. The leaders of the ACRI reject the idea that Israeli military experts are most qualified to determine Israel's security needs. They are convinced that in some cases "national security" is merely "a slogan to justify curtailing civil liberties," in the words of ACRI legal director Joshua Schoffman.<sup>31</sup> Thus when the Israeli Army shut down some Arab universities that were being used as riot centers, longtime ACRI leader Ruth Gavison insisted that "there was no plausible security reason that justifies the continued closure of educational institutions." According to Gavison, "there must be a balance between security and the need to maintain education," and the ACRI appears to believe that it has the right to determine what that "balance" should be.<sup>32</sup>

Counter-terror techniques that do not measure up to impossibly strict standards are the focus of protests, pressure and litigation by the ACRI. A Jew is murdered in an Arab town, and the Army imposes a brief curfew to aid in the search for the culprit; the ACRI sends a cable to the Defense Minister, denouncing the curfew as "collective punishment."<sup>33</sup> The government orders the expulsion from Israel of two Arab terrorists; the ACRI appeals to the High Court of Justice to intervene.<sup>34</sup> A fugitive terrorist is wounded by Army gunfire when he refused to surrender; the ACRI complains that the soldiers shot without justification.<sup>35</sup>

According to Haim Cohn, the longtime chairman of the ACRI, deportation is "the cruelest of punishments;"<sup>36</sup> Avigdor Feldman, the director of the ACRI's Legal Defense Center, has suggested that the Israeli deportation of Arab terrorists is comparable to the Nazis' deportation of Jews.<sup>37</sup> The Israeli High Court, however, has repeatedly rejected legal challenges to the use of deportation, and even some leading doves have defended its use in the battle against terrorism. Ezer Weizmann, for example, has said that "deportation is a terrible punishment, but it must serve as a threat as long as we are in this situation,"<sup>38</sup> and the liberal daily Ha'aretz has argued that "the experience of twenty years has shown that deportation has been an extremely effective method of prevention and deterrence."<sup>39</sup>

Another important target upon which the ACRI has focused its gunsights is the Israeli Army's policy of demolishing the homes of terrorists. The Defense Ministry contends that the policy has "proved (to be) an effective deterrent...there is no doubt that by the blowing up of a few dozen houses of proven terrorists, bent on indiscriminate murder...thousands of innocent lives...have been saved."<sup>40</sup> The Israeli High Court concurred with this view, ruling in 1986 that if the criticism of demolitions as 'collective punishment' were accepted, it would "leave only the possibility of punishing a terrorist who lives alone."

The regulation is designed as a deterrent, and by its very nature, the deterrent effect must also impinge on those surrounding the terrorist, particularly those members of his family living with him. He must realize that his abominable acts will not only bring hurt upon himself, but that they will also cause his family great suffering.

In this respect, the sanction of demolition is no different from imprisonment of the head of the family, the father of small children who are left without a breadwinner. Then too the family members are hurt.<sup>41</sup>

Years of pressure by the ACRI, including appeals to the High Court and threats of further legal action, eventually succeeded in forcing the Army, in 1988, to give terrorists and their families forty-eight hours' notice before a home is dismantled.<sup>42</sup> But the ACRI was not yet satisfied. It pursued the matter and, in July, 1989, obtained a High Court ruling that a home cannot be demolished until the terrorist's relatives have exhausted every possible appeal in civilian and military courts.<sup>43</sup> Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin subsequently complained that while the number of Arab firebombs had been reduced by the demolitions policy, the Army would be forced to curtail demolitions because of the ACRI's appeals to the High Court.<sup>44</sup>

## THE CRUSADE AGAINST ADMINISTRATIVE DETENTION

One area in which the ACRI has not yet triumphed is its ongoing campaign against the policy of administrative detention, which permits incarceration without trial for periods of up to one year. The practice is employed by the Israeli security forces in the cases of terrorists against whom the accumulated evidence is either technically inadmissible or could not be revealed without exposing the identities of undercover agents. The



administrative detention law does not give the Israeli authorities a carte blanche simply to jail individuals whom they dislike. Rather, the process is subject to a series of checks and balances: before issuing the detention order, the Army must consult its legal adviser, who rejects cases in which evidence is insufficient or in which a lesser restriction (such as confinement to home) would suffice; within ninety-six hours of arrest, the terrorist must be brought before a judge, who can shorten the detention period, or cancel the detention altogether, if the evidence presented to him is insufficient; within three months, another judge must review the case; and in, addition to all of the above, the Army must heed the standing High Court guideline to use administrative detention only in cases so serious that the imminent danger to national security renders any other means of restraining the defendant impractical."

The ACRI has persisted in its crusade to have administrative detention abolished despite all of these limitations, and despite the danger that loss of life might ensue from abolition of the detention policy. That danger was dramatized by the case of Ziad Abu Ein, who planted a bomb in a Tiberias marketplace in 1979, killing two civilians and injuring dozens of others. Abu Ein fled to the United States, only to be extradited back to Israel in 1983, convicted of murder, and sentenced to life imprisonment. He remained in jail only until 1985, when he was among the 1,150 Arab terrorists freed in Israel's prisoner exchange with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Barely a year after gaining his freedom, Abu Ein was arrested on suspicion of conspiring to hijack an Israeli bus. Since the information leading to his apprehension could not be presented in court without exposing agents of the security services, the Israeli authorities had no choice but to place Abu Ein in administrative detention for six months. During the period of his incarceration, the details of the hijacking conspiracy emerged, as Abu Ein's three accomplices all confessed to the crime and disclosed Abu Ein's central role in the plot.<sup>46</sup> Needless to say, if the ACRI had had its way and administrative detention was abolished, Abu Ein would probably have had the time he needed to implement his hijacking scheme.

#### ACRI AIDS SENIOR PLO ACTIVISTS

The possibility that civil rights crusading might have such bloody consequences does not seem to have fazed the ACRI. No organizational policy changes, or even expressions of regret, have been issued by the ACRI as a result of the numerous instances in which Arab militants who were facing deportation

denied any connections to the PLO, received legal aid from the ACRI, and then later were revealed to be senior PLO activists. One was Abu All Shahin, the PLO's chief of terrorist operations for the Hebron region during the late 1960s. Shahin was captured by the Israelis in 1967 and sentenced to fifteen years in prison. He could have been released in 1977, after serving two-thirds of his sentence, if he had signed the standard form letter requesting reduction of his sentence. Most imprisoned terrorists sign the letter, but not Shahin--he could not reconcile himself to the idea that he would be signing a letter that included an expression of implicit regret for his crimes. Upon his release in 1982, Shahin was ordered confined to his home during night hours, a routine preventive measure taken by Israeli security officials in order to curb potentially recidivist terrorists. That restriction proved insufficient, however, and as evidence mounted that Shahin was again involved with PLO elements, the Israeli authorities decided to expel him from the country. Shahin vehemently denied any links to the PLO, and his attorney, Avigdor Feldman of the ACRI, based his appeal against the deportation order on the "grounds that if Shahin were expelled to Lebanon, his life could be endangered by "anti-PLO elements." Ultimately Shahin was deported to Jordan, where he promptly joined the staff of PLO headquarters in Amman. Subsequently this "moderate" terrorist was promoted to the position of terrorist commander for the region of southern Lebanon, where it is his task to dispatch PLO squads to murder Israelis.<sup>47</sup>

A case which reflected equally poorly on the ACRI's judgment was that of Akram Haniyeh. Haniyeh, the editor of a pro-PLO East Jerusalem newspaper called **A-Sha'ab**, was ordered deported in 1986 after Israeli detectives discovered evidence linking him to PLO terror activities. Haniyeh denied any connection to the PLO, and his campaign to resist deportation was championed by the Israeli left as an issue of "freedom of the press." The ACRI's star attorney, Avigdor Feldman, challenged the deportation before the High Court. But when the Israeli security authorities presented the court with three hundred pages of documents linking Haniyeh to the PLO, the "innocent editor" suddenly reversed his position and agreed to be deported. Little was heard from Haniyeh after that--until February, 1989, when he showed up at a Cairo press conference as a senior aide to Yasser Arafat. Six months after that, Haniyeh turned up at the annual congress of Arafat's Fatah faction of the PLO, and was elected to its Revolutionary Council, no mean feat for a "persecuted journalist" who had previously claimed to have no ties to the PLO."

Deportation and administrative detention are not the only

counter-terror tactics that the ACRI abhors. The very imprisonment of an Arab terrorist is, under certain circumstances, regarded by the ACRI as unjustified. Take, for example, the case of Aisha al-Kurd, who was arrested in May, 1988, together with her husband, on suspicion of carrying out terrorist operations in the Israeli city of Rishon L'Tzion as well as in her native Gaza Strip. She became the first security prisoner ever to be released on bail, thanks to the intervention of the ACRI. The occasion? The birth, in jail, of her fifth child. The assumption that the mother of a newborn child would not continue to engage in terrorism might seem reasonable, until one recalls the fact that the existence of her four other toddlers, ages one to five, failed to deter Mrs. al-Kurd in the first place. The ACRI's appeal for her release was nevertheless successful, and the ACRI itself posted the bail--just to make sure that there would be no last minute hitches in its effort to set another suspected terrorist loose on Israel's streets.<sup>49</sup>

The ACRI has been equally persistent in its defense of Arab rock-throwers, despite the fact that stoning is an offense which might reasonably be regarded as attempted murder. (The Middle East is, after all, in the words of the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, "a region where stoning is a mode of execution."<sup>50</sup> The ACRI spearheaded a public pressure campaign to have an imprisoned rock-thrower, Akram Abu-Mansur, set free so that he could donate blood to a relative.<sup>51</sup> When the Israeli Army announced its intention to seal the homes of rock-throwers, the ACRI denounced the punishment as being "disproportionate to the offense of stone-throwing."<sup>52</sup> Evidently the leaders of the ACRI are not impressed by the fact that at least three Israelis have been murdered by Arab rock-throwers in recent years.<sup>53</sup>

For the unlucky terrorists who must serve out their prison sentences, there is always the hope that the ACRI can make it a cushier stay; ACRI attorneys have filed suit to obtain for them everything from bigger meals to roomier cells and wider windows.<sup>54</sup> An Arab terrorist need not even be imprisoned within Israel to qualify for aid from the ACRI; its officials have pressured the Israeli Army to be kinder to terrorists being held in southern Lebanon as well.<sup>55</sup>

Predictably, the ACRI has sounded the tocsin over the use of force by security officers during their interrogation of captured terrorists. The use of force in such circumstances, which had been the subject of rumors for many years, was confirmed in 1987 by an Israeli government-appointed commission on inquiry. Much to the consternation of extreme

liberals, the final report of the commission, while critical of some of the tactics employed by the security services, specifically endorsed the use of moderate force to elicit information about terrorist operations. David Kretzmer, one of the leaders of the ACRI, denounced the commission's conclusions as "far from democratic," and warned that "in another 16 years we will wake up to realize that methods which were only meant to be used on others are now being used on ourselves."<sup>56</sup> The clash between what the ACRI calls "democratic values" and the need to prevent terrorists from murdering innocent Jews is dramatically illustrated in this episode from the autobiography of Lesley Hazleton, a leftwing journalist:

One may take a stand, as I do, against any form of torture, and then be faced with a situation such as the following, which really happened.

A bomb exploded in a Jerusalem marketplace, killing and wounding civilians (mainly Jews, but also Arabs). The police and army moved in quickly and rounded up all Arabs in the area as suspects. One man had what could have been explosive powder beneath his fingernails, but there was no time to send it for analysis. A common terrorist tactic is to place a second bomb timed to go off five or ten minutes after the first so that the crowd gathered around the damage of the first bomb would be injured by the second. The urgent question was whether there was another bomb, and if so, where. The officer in charge took the suspect into a paddy wagon and beat him. The suspect told him the whereabouts of a second bomb. The Israeli police sapper defused it one minute before it was due to explode.<sup>57</sup>

### **RIGHTS FOR RIOTERS**

The Arab "intifada" has provided the ACRI with a bonanza of opportunities to promote the rights of Arab rioters at the expense of Israeli security. The ACRI denounced the use of live ammunition by soldiers under attack from firebomb-throwers.<sup>58</sup> It filed suit to prohibit the Army from withholding the identity cards of Arabs who refused to pay taxes as a symbol of solidarity with the rioters.<sup>59</sup> It appealed to the High Court to prevent the Army from using nightly curfews as a means of calming centers of violence.<sup>60</sup> It even established a special office in an Arab neighborhood of Jerusalem to handle complaints from "victims of violence" --that is, Arab victims of alleged Israeli violence; there

is no room on the ACRI's agenda for Israeli victims of Arab violence.<sup>61</sup> Some of the ACRI's attempts to solicit Arab complaints against Israelis have been less than successful. Its attempt to place an Arabic-language advertisement in a pro-PLO newspaper, *Al Fajr*, was rejected because it included the word "Israel" in its text (in the ACRI's name)!<sup>62</sup> The ironic import of this incident was, needless to say, lost on the leaders of the ACRI and the NIF.

In early 1989, senior officials of the ACRI joined hands with several leftwing Members of Knesset and professors to establish the "Israeli Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories," for the ostensible purpose of collecting data about the "intifada." The project quickly qualified for a \$55,000 grant from the New Israel Fund. The Center is known in Hebrew as "B'Tselem," which is derived from the Biblical verse (Genesis 1:27), "God created man in His own image." The Center's publications leave the impression that it regards Arab rioters alone as having been created in the Divine image, for its voluminous reports on casualties related to the "intifada" are conspicuously reticent on the subject of Jewish victims of Arab violence. Each of B'Tselem's monthly reports contains exactly one sentence mentioning the number of Israeli casualties, followed by twelve pages of statistical analysis and affidavits regarding Arab casualties.<sup>63</sup>

In a further gesture of sympathy for the rioters, the ACRI announced that it would strengthen its relationship with an East Jerusalem Arab organization called "Al Haq - Law in the Service of Man," a group which frequently supplies attorneys for violent Arabs.<sup>64</sup> Such ties carry the potential for some embarrassment, as for example in January, 1988, when Al Haq sponsored a seminar on whether or not Israeli administration of Judea, Samaria, Gaza and East Jerusalem conforms to international law. The handful of American and British professors of law brought together by Al Haq predictably concluded that the Jewish presence in those lands violates the Fourth Geneva Convention. The ACRI representative at the gathering, Eli Natan, concurred.<sup>65</sup> A few weeks later, Al Haq activists lobbied the European Economic Community to impose sanctions on Israel, as punishment for Israel's supposed violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention.<sup>66</sup>

If the ACRI had expected that its assistance to Al Haq would influence Al Haq's leaders to tone down their anti-Israel rhetoric, they were sorely mistaken. Al Haq chairman Raja Shehadeh, who regularly rants to journalists about alleged Israeli oppression of Arabs, set his sights not long ago on the Israeli military order that forbids picking wild thyme in the administered territories. As Shehadeh explained to an interviewer, "Perhaps it is meant to

deprive the Palestinian population of access to a herb which, through the many allusions to it in Palestinian literature, has come to symbolize the attachment of Palestinians to the land."<sup>67</sup> Not quite; the order was actually issued at the behest of the Israel Nature Reserves Authority, which was concerned that local Arabs might harvest the thyme for export to Jordan, stripping the land of a distinctive plant.

Asked by a sympathetic journalist to detail his charge that Israel "humiliates" Arabs, Shehadeh cited the fact that in Israeli offices, "you greet the person and the person does not want to greet you...you want something from him and he says, 'I am busy.' You feel that you are not wanted...And then you try to phone him and he is never there."<sup>68</sup> By such a definition, of course, most residents of Israel, Jewish or Arab, could certainly claim to be victims of "humiliation" at the hands of Israel's notorious bureaucracy. Shehadeh's deputy, Mona Rishmawi, has an equally vivid imagination. She too cites as fact the palpable fiction that the picking of wild thyme is forbidden because Israel desires to deprive Arabs of this "national food" so that "Palestinians might simply forget their identity and culture."<sup>69</sup> Among the reasons Rishmawi blames for the outbreak of Arab rioting is the "very depressing" fact that "our people are cheap labour in Israel." It does not seem to have dawned on Ms. Rishmawi that Arabs who work within Israel are "cheap" to hire because they offer to work at lower rates in order to undercut Israelis competing for the same jobs. This is the law of supply and demand, not an example of "Israeli oppression."

The "intifada" has also provided plenty of new casework for the ACRI's Avigdor Feldman. He has represented Mahmoud Abu Din, who is charged with setting twelve fires in the Jaffa area (not exactly the "occupied West Bank"); the Society for Family Rehabilitation, a group that aids families of imprisoned PLO terrorists, which had its offices shut down after the Israeli police found evidence that staff members were encouraging neighborhood children to engage in violence; Faisal Hussein, formerly an explosives instructor for the Palestine Liberation Army (a PLO faction), who was placed in administrative detention because of his role in the rioting; and Mahmoud Masrawa, accused of stealing confidential Israeli Army documents as well as of more conventional offense such as hurling firebombs.

In between all of this, Feldman has found time to lecture abroad, including appearances at the recent annual conventions of two PLO support groups in the U.S., the Palestine Human Rights Campaign and the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. (Although when he was later asked by a reporter about those

speeches, he at first claimed that he "could not remember" them, and then finally admitted, "Probably I did. I think so.") Meanwhile, Feldman somehow manages to continue representing a number of pre-"intifada" cases involving the radical left, which no doubt evoke nostalgic feelings for him since he was once active in Moked (a Communist Party splinter group) and Yesh Gvul, the movement which urges soldiers to refuse to serve beyond Israel's pre-1967 borders.<sup>71</sup> Feldman's clients include Mordechai Vanunu, convicted of stealing Israeli nuclear secrets; Reuven Kaminer and Eliezer Feiler, convicted of meeting with PLO terrorists; and Michael Warshawski, whose Trotskyite "Alternative Information Center" was found to be assisting the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

### **FORMER ALLIES CRITICIZE THE ACRI'S BIAS**

The ACRI's aid to Arab terrorists, its opposition to every major anti-terrorist measure employed by the security forces, and its willingness to openly associate with Arab extremist groups like Al Haq has drawn criticism from the ACRI's own former allies. Eli Kulas, who until recently served as chairman of the Knesset Law Committee, had routinely consulted the ACRI on every piece of civil rights-related legislation; in 1987, he announced that because of the ACRI's demonstrated "political bias," he had stripped it of its automatic advisory status.<sup>72</sup> Another stinging slap came from Professor Alan Dershowitz of Harvard University, one of the world's foremost experts on civil rights law. Commenting on the ACRI's behavior during the "intifada," Dershowitz told an Israeli interviewer:

When I wrote my very first article about Israel, I called for the establishment of a civil rights group. When I visited Israel during that same period, there was no group of that nature. Hence the establishment of the Association for Civil Rights was a considerable improvement. But the Association has political leanings. The majority of its people come from the left, not from the right and the center . . . The Association has not been sufficiently sensitive to Israel's security problem in the territories. They inject their political philosophy into their civil rights activity . . . If the Association does not move in a more non-political direction, then I will call for a new organization to be created in Israel, one that is completely non-political . . .<sup>73</sup>

Although the ACRI's most notorious activity is that which relates to Arab terrorists, it would be incorrect to imply that terrorism is its exclusive concern. It has, for example, been lobbying for years to abolish government-subsidized housing mortgages for Army veterans, on the grounds that such mortgages are "racist" because most Arabs do not serve in the Army and therefore do not qualify for the housing privileges. The ACRI thus seeks to deny any kind of 'veteran's bonus' to young Israeli men who defend their country, thereby leaving them on the same economic footing as Israeli Arabs (and those few Israeli Jews) who refuse to defend their country--except, of course, that the Arabs actually have a substantial economic advantage because they have three years to pursue higher education or earn money while their Jewish peers are patrolling Israel's borders. Yet while the New Israel Fund is financing the ACRI's battle against the veteran's bonus, the longtime president of the NIF, David Arnow, has been presenting the issue to American Jews in an entirely different manner. Writing in the **Jewish Week** in 1989, Arnow proposed that Israeli Arabs be permitted to perform some sort of civilian national service so that they can qualify for the housing mortgages. The ACRI, however, has never suggested that the Arabs should have to do anything to qualify. Arnow's proposal helps to obscure the unpleasant fact that his New Israel Fund is financing those who want the Arabs to receive special privileges whether or not they perform national service. With one hand, Arnow proposes "civilian national service," which sounds pleasing to American ears, while, with the other hand, his Fund finances those who are trying to undermine Israel's perfectly legitimate veteran's bonus policy.<sup>74</sup>

The ACRI has championed other politically tainted causes. It has protested against the closure of Arab newspapers that have ties to the PLO, on the grounds that "freedom of expression has no bounds" (to quote Ruth Gavison, who seems to be unfamiliar with the concept of yelling "fire" in a crowded theater).<sup>75</sup> It has pressured an insurance agency to make a loan to two Arabs whose application had been rejected because they failed to provide the required guarantors.<sup>76</sup> It has defended the right of soldiers to refuse to serve in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, on the grounds that (in the words of Ruth Gavison) "service there necessarily involves the soldier in immoral acts."<sup>77</sup> It has filed suit to force the Ministry of Interior to register a child born to a Jewish mother and an Arab father as an Arab.<sup>78</sup> It has even called for the abolition of Israeli laws which prevent intermarriage between Jews and Arabs.<sup>79</sup>



What accounts for the eagerness of the ACRI to defend Arab enemies of Israel? It is due in part to the influence of Haim Cohn, the former Supreme Court Justice who was chairman of the ACRI for many years until illness forced him to relinquish the post in 1988. Cohn has always contended that Israeli policy should conform to the lofty standards of Western liberal thought. He regards capital punishment as "premeditated murder by the State,"<sup>80</sup> (adding that he would have refused to sign the death warrant for Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichmann, on the grounds that his signature would have made him into "a murderer"<sup>81</sup>) and considers the concept of imprisonment to be inherently "immoral."<sup>82</sup>

In addition to Cohn's influence, one must consider the fact that many senior ACRI activists have spent one or more years at universities in the United States or Great Britain, studying laws written for nations not faced by constant terrorism and periodic invasions. Many of the key ACRI staff members are graduates of the New Israel Fund's "Israel-U.S. Civil Liberties Law Program," in which young Israeli attorneys are sent to the American University, in Washington, D.C., to study civil liberties law and serve as interns in local civil liberties organizations. Upon their return to Israel, they are expected to put into practice what they learned abroad.

Joshua Schoffman, who today serves as legal director of the ACRI, and Netta Goldman, an ACRI staff attorney, are both graduates of the program. They spent half of their internship year with the American Civil Liberties Union,<sup>83</sup> where they imbibed the ACLU's zealous commitment to defending the civil rights of extremist groups (neo-Nazis, the Ku Klux Klan) bent on using those rights to hasten the violent overthrow of the United States government. Given the political marginality of such groups in American society, it could be argued that tolerance of their activities is an affordable luxury. But the transposition of ACLU-style theories to the Middle East is a much more serious matter, given the daily peril Israel faces from the Arab terrorists whose civil rights the ACRI defends. While the ACLU is defending the rights of violent extremists who have virtually no impact on American society, the ACRI's Arab terrorist clients have a consistently bloody impact on Israeli society.

The controversial Center for National Security Studies has also had a hand in the training of the ACRI's future leaders. Both Schoffman<sup>84</sup> and Avigdor Feldman (another graduate of the New Israel Fund's U.S.-Israel program)<sup>85</sup> interned at the Center, which is a leftwing lobby that aims to emasculate the Central Intelligence Agency in a manner similar to the ACRI's efforts to

hamstringing the Israeli security authorities.<sup>86</sup>

### **THE SEARCH FOR RADICAL SEPHARDIM**

Over the years, the New Israel Fund has bestowed its largesse on several tiny Sephardic protest movements. The leaders of these movements began their political careers in the early 1970s, in the ranks of the Black Panthers, a group that blended anti-Ashkenazi chauvinism with extreme leftwing politics, pseudo-Marxist rhetoric and cynical exploitation of Sephardic poverty. Although they currently operate under the auspices of other organizations, their ideology remains unchanged.

One of the NIF's earliest Sephardic beneficiaries was the Ohalim organization, led by former Panther Yamin Suissa,<sup>87</sup> a convicted drug dealer.<sup>88</sup> Suissa's favorite tactic is to exploit the plight of Soviet Jewry as a platform from which to make his demands for poor Sephardim. The first headline-making demonstration that he and his fellow Black Panthers staged, back in 1971, involved an attempt to change the name of "Silent Jewry Square" (a square in Jerusalem named in solidarity with Soviet Jewry) to "Square of the Real Jews of Silence" (as they dubbed the residents of the Sephardic neighborhoods).<sup>89</sup> When Suissa headed Ohalim's unsuccessful campaign for the Knesset in 1981, he coined the slogan "Prisoners of the Neighborhoods," a deliberate manipulation of the Hebrew phrase for Soviet Jewish "Prisoners of Zion."<sup>90</sup> When large numbers of Soviet Jews began arriving in Israel in 1989, Suissa sent a telegram to the Kremlin, demanding that Jews be prevented from leaving the USSR because they might compete for jobs with Sephardic Jews in Israel.<sup>91</sup>

The NIF has also funded the Moreshet Social Theater (\$7,000 in 1985), which was established by Black Panther leader Saadia Marciano. Marciano served in the Knesset from 1977 until 1981, first as a representative of the extreme leftwing Sheli Party and then as the leader of his own Black Panthers faction. It seems, however, that it was easier to take the rowdy out of the back alleys than it was to take the back alleys out of the rowdy. In 1980 --while he was serving as chairman of an "action committee" to assist the fugitive Yamin Suissa<sup>92</sup> Marciano and another of his Black Panther comrades, Knesset Member Charlie Biton (elected to parliament with a faction of the Communist Party) were reported to have assaulted a Jerusalem social worker. The incident prompted Mayor Teddy Kollek to complain that "just because the two were elected to the Knesset and have immunity doesn't mean that they can behave violently and force their will on a whole neighborhood."<sup>93</sup> That same year, Marciano and two

of his friends attacked a building guard who had refused to admit them to a Jewish Agency gathering without tickets; Marciano was later convicted of assault and fined forty thousand shekels.<sup>94</sup> Since leaving the Knesset, Marciano has divided his time among a bewildering variety of radical causes: "Ma'avak", an organization that he established together with Biton (who is still in the Knesset, as head of the one-man Black Panthers faction) for the purpose of opposing settlements in Judea and Samaria; the campaign to reopen the Alternative Information Center, a Trotskyite news agency shut down after the authorities discovered that it was linked to an Arab terrorist group;<sup>95</sup> and the New Israel Fund's favorite, his Moreshet Social Theater.

Moreshet claims to "use theater as a vehicle for expression of ethnic and cultural identity," but it is, of course, subject to Marciano's narrow conception of Sephardic 'cultural identity', and the result is that it churns out "socialist-oriented plays" and films that portray "the evils and exploits of capitalism" (in the words of a sympathetic reviewer).<sup>96</sup> Typical of Moreshet's productions is "The Flag Factory," a play in which the sadistic capitalist "boss" exploits his workers, forcing them to toil in miserable conditions at low pay in order to fill his quota of flags for Israeli Independence Day. One of the main characters is an Arab worker at the factory who is savagely beaten by Israeli policemen for no apparent reason.<sup>97</sup> The fact that the Moreshet Theater churns out such crude pro-Arab propaganda comes as no surprise when one considers the remarks of Moreshet's administrative director, Reuven Ben-Arush: "We identify more with the oppressed Arabs than with the Ashkenazi oppressors. We Sephardim speak the same language, enjoy the same music and eat the same foods."<sup>98</sup>

The Sephardic extremists who have benefited most from the NIF (\$19,000 in 1988) are the leaders of the East For Peace group, a handful of leftwing intellectuals of Moroccan background who bill themselves as the Sephardic counterpart to Peace Now. East For Peace, which shares office space in Jerusalem with "The Twenty-First Year" (a radical group devoted to returning Israel to its pre-1967 boundaries)<sup>99</sup> engages primarily in propaganda activity aimed at "furthering the political consciousness of the Sephardic masses,"<sup>100</sup> that is, weaning Sephardim away from their nationalist orientation.

That might seem to be an overwhelming task, but the leaders of East For Peace have nevertheless found plenty of time to indulge in related pursuits. The East For Peace spokesman, Manny Barzilai, is also active in the pro-PLO "Committee for Confronting the Iron Fist," the extremist Progressive List for Peace, and the committee to free nuclear spy Mordechai

Vanunu .<sup>(101)</sup> Another East For Peace leader, David Ish-Shalom, who is currently on trial for meeting with PLO terrorists, is also active in the campaign for unilateral Israeli nuclear disarmament.<sup>(102)</sup> The head of East For Peace's Ashkelon branch, Rafi Zagori, was recently a candidate for the Knesset with the extreme leftwing Citizens Rights Movement.<sup>103</sup> The chairman of East For Peace, Shlomo Elbaz, spends much of his time managing an East For Peace spinoff, the "Committee for Israeli-Palestinian Dialogue," and lobbying for the release of suspected terrorists like Akram Haniyeh (the newspaper editor who was defended by the ACRI and later became an adviser to Arafat).<sup>104</sup> As for the East For Peace agenda, Elbaz has said that he wants East For Peace to devote more time "fighting the pseudo-Western culture the Ashkenazi elite is trying to impose on this country."<sup>105</sup>

### ARAB-JEWISH MEETINGS

The New Israel Fund helps finance more than one dozen organizations and projects devoted to the theme of Arab-Jewish coexistence. Most of them focus on arranging personal meetings with Arab and Jewish teenagers for the ostensible purpose of breaking down barriers between the two ethnic groups. Such activity is quite appealing to the New Israel Fund leadership, since it is very much an expression of what the historian David M. Potter calls "the unlimited American faith in the efficacy of discussion as a means of finding solutions for controversies."<sup>106</sup>

Are American methods of problem-solving applicable in the Arab-Israeli context, or do they merely serve as frameworks in which to reiterate the familiar leftwing themes of Israeli guilt and Arab suffering? The question must be considered in light of the experience of a team of American sociologists who visited Israel some years ago for the purpose of researching the possibility of improving Jewish-Arab relations through face-to-face meetings between Jews and Arabs. Two groups of young men were selected to live together (the Jerusalem group for seven days, their Haifa counterparts for three) and participate in lengthy, carefully-monitored discussions about issues of mutual concern. Summing up the results of the experiment, the researchers were forced to conclude that the Arab and Jewish participants evinced strikingly different motives.

"(T)he fundamental differences in intent of the two groups were consistently apparent," the sociologists concluded. "The Arabs wanted to air grievances and to use this exchange of views as a means of achieving redress or improvement through giving information--through 'telling'." Whereas the Jews "had an

abstract faith in the value of coming to know the Arabs and in reducing tensions through mutual understanding," the Arabs "were mainly gratified by having had the opportunity to voice their complaints." In the final evaluations offered by the participants, the Arabs described the experience as essentially a welcome opportunity to propagandize.

Amin was pleased that "we really talked about all the things" --which he named as "problems of the Arab minority, the problems (of Arabs) in the University, the occupied areas and so on." Amin said he had agreed to take part because "I realized I would have the opportunity to explain what this problem is all about." Rashid recalled how "the other side really wants information so I had to give it...they grabbed every word I said. They believed me, which gave me a good feeling." Saoud concurred: "I have found the Jews ready to listen to us if we will tell them what we have to say in the right way..." For Hemdi, the crucial point was that "This meeting was a step to understand the actual problems in the Arab sector...We told them about our problems." Finally, there was Omar, who was delighted by the liberalism of one of his Jewish dialogue partners in particular: "I was encouraged at seeing an Israeli who would go beyond his Jewishness..." The Jewish participants, for their part, did not approach the dialogue as a chance to air **their** grievances (about, for example, Arab terrorism, anti-Semitism in Arab school curricula, or the persecution of Jews in Arab countries). Instead, their experience seems to have consisted primarily of absorbing guilt feelings over the Arabs' alleged plight. "(M)y understanding of how Arabs feel was quite enriched," said Amiram. "(I)t is hard for Arabs to change and really if this problem is going to be solved, it's got to be initiated from a Jewish point of view." Moshe declared that "I have gotten much information about the situation of the Arab in Israel," and Yaron expressed his surprise at discovering "that there is a serious problem of Israeli Arabs." Aharon said frankly, "My own views changed."<sup>107</sup>

The New Israel Fund's favorite project in Arab-Jewish coexistence is the small Arab-Jewish village of Neve Shalom, which it awarded \$200,000 in 1989. There a handful of Jews and Arabs live side by side and operate a "School for Peace" that hosts meetings between Israeli and Arab highschoolers. For the Arab residents of Neve Shalom, holding Israeli citizenship and living together with Jews does not necessarily mean having to forsake any of the traditional positions of militant Arab nationalism. "It is difficult for me to see that people who I like defend acts of terrorism or express understanding for such acts," Neve Shalom

resident Daniella Kitain says of her Arab neighbors.<sup>108</sup> When a notice was posted on the Neve Shalom community billboard, inviting residents to a celebration at a nearby kibbutz, one of the Arab residents responded by posting a notice charging that the kibbutz had been established on "stolen Arab land."<sup>109</sup> Israeli Independence Day, commemorating the creation of the Jewish State, is the toughest morsel for the Arabs of Neve Shalom to swallow. Elias Eady, one of Neve Shalom's most prominent Arab residents, refuses to call Israel's War of Independence by its name--for him, it is merely "the war of 1948," which he described as "the symbol of the tragedy of the Palestinian people."<sup>110</sup> After a heated debate over whether or not Independence Day celebrations should be permitted on Neve Shalom's territory, it was finally decided that "Jewish members who so desired went to Jerusalem or Tel Aviv to partake in the nationwide celebration," and upon their return to Neve Shalom "they made a campfire--out where they couldn't be heard," recalls Arab resident Rayek Rizek, who is a public spokesman for the village.<sup>111</sup>

But even on ordinary occasions, the Jews of Neve Shalom must suppress their identity lest their Arab neighbors take offense: "If I organize an evening of song," says teacher Etti Edlund, "I am careful not to choose nationalistic songs."<sup>112</sup> In such an atmosphere, the Zionist convictions of the Jewish residents are inevitably eroded. Perhaps it is no surprise to hear such outbursts of moral confusion as that of Daniella Kitain: "I have come to realize that terror is difficult to define," she says, citing Israeli strikes at the PLO in Lebanon and the behavior of Israeli soldiers in Judea and Samaria as examples of "the way of terror."<sup>113</sup> Ariela Bailey of Neve Shalom's School for Peace has suggested hopefully that the Arab "intifada" rioting could force Israelis to realize the need for territorial surrender, while Neve Shalom treasurer Eitan Kramer has ventured that "(i)t will be difficult for Israelis in Tel Aviv to recognize that Palestinians have rights if they [the Israelis] don't feel the pain and pay a heavy price."<sup>114</sup>

The activities of the small village help reinforce such thinking. A public poetry reading on the subject of "Homeland" finds an Arab poet reciting verse about Israeli oppression of Arabs in "the wounded homeland"; his Jewish counterpart responds, not by setting forth the Jewish people's right to its homeland, but by declaring that "it is dangerous to allow love of land to get in the way of love of people."<sup>115</sup> A delegation of visiting psychologists from abroad is subjected to two hours of "one-sided Palestinian political propaganda," in the words of one of the listeners; the speaker, Neve Shalom secretary Elias Eady, is

said to have spent most of the time declaiming on "why it was necessary for a Palestinian state to be established before any dialogue between Jews and Arabs could take place, and why all Israeli schoolchildren should be educated about the Green Line (the pre-1967 border), so it would not be forgotten."<sup>116</sup> A Jewish-Arab political rally at Neve Shalom features speeches praising PLO leader Yasser Arafat, denouncing Israel, and recommending that Israeli youngsters emigrate rather than serve in the Israeli Army.<sup>117</sup>

A reporter sitting in on a Neve Shalom encounter between Jewish and Arab ninth-graders found the Arabs challenging their counterparts about Arab deaths in Lebanon, about alleged anti-Arab racism among kibbutz members, and about the question of what the Jewish youngsters would do, as soldiers, "if they were given an order to fire on an Arab family." The Jews, for their part, asked if, and where, the Arabs would like a Palestinian state, and "what it felt like to be a minority."<sup>118</sup>

A reporter who witnessed a Neve Shalom meeting between Jewish and Arab students from the eleventh and twelfth grades recorded similar exchanges. A counselor asked the group, "Is Zionism a racist movement?" The Jewish youths were confused. "I don't think anyone here knows exactly what Zionism is," says one. A second ventured, "In first grade, you learn about the first immigration, the second immigration, but you don't know what Zionism is." A third Jewish youngster had a startling comment: "I feel that Zionism today doesn't leave a place for the Arabs." That suited the Arab youths just fine. One of them declared --without any of the others dissenting-- that "the Zionist movement doesn't want a single Arab person to be in its country." One of the Jewish youths asked his Arab counterpart: "If the head of this state were Arab, and in Argentina they were killing Jews, would you agree that they all come to this country?" The Arab's reply was blunt: "I'll explain why we have to bring Palestinians here: Because we brought enough Jews already." He then explained his sympathy for PLO terrorists, whom he described proudly as "the Palestinian fighters outside Palestine." "I'm with them in my heart and body," the youth declared. "My first obligation is to feel close to them." At the final meeting of the weekend encounter session, the counselors guided their charges in role playing. It was, however, a certain kind of role playing: the Arabs played the part of anti-Arab Israelis, while the Israelis played "Arab victims of prejudice."<sup>119</sup> In this grotesque inversion of Middle East reality, all of the characters were either Jews who persecute Arabs or Arabs who are persecuted by Jews. Jewish victims of Arab violence were nowhere to be found.

No wonder, then, that supporters of the PLO have enthusiastically embraced the idea of Arab-Jewish meetings. A pro-PLO Arab professor who met with Israelis called the experience "a success in the sphere of political maneuvering...the PLO has now become a legitimate factor, with which it is possible to conduct negotiations,"<sup>120</sup> and a member of the PLO's Executive Committee has said that meetings with Israelis are worthwhile because they "make people realize, both in Israel and abroad, that we are not the anti-Semitic thugs we are often portrayed to be."<sup>121</sup> This helps explain why Professor John Woods of the University of Chicago, who is active in the Palestine Human Rights Campaign (a pro-PLO lobbying organization in the U.S.) is simultaneously a member of the board of the American Friends of Neve Shalom.<sup>122</sup>

### **THE SEARCH FOR LEFTWING ORTHODOX JEWS**

As part of its effort to appear non-partisan, the New Israel Fund has gone out of its way to locate groups that can be defined as Orthodox yet meet the NIF's ideological criteria. There are not many, but the one that best suits the NIF's purposes is Oz VeShalom, which it awarded \$13,000 in 1988. Oz VeShalom adheres to the political formula subscribed to by all leftwing Israeli groups, namely, the need for Israeli territorial concessions and the establishment of a Palestinian state in the evacuated territories. Its leaders differ from others on the left by virtue of the fact that they observe Orthodox ritual and insist that their political position derives from their traditional Jewish sources.

It is true that Orthodox rabbinical opinion is divided on the question of whether or not portions of the Land of Israel may be surrendered to Arab rule in return for a bona fide Arab commitment to peace. But Oz VeShalom goes further than merely suggesting that such concessions are hypothetically permissible. Rather, Oz VeShalom contends that the Torah's ideal of "justice" necessitates the establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the Land of Israel. Oz VeShalom leader Uriel Simon claims that Torah values require Israelis to find "a way of implementing the (Arabs') national rights so that there will be some kind of symmetry between the two peoples,"<sup>123</sup> because, he claims, the Jews' "right over the Land will actualize to the degree that we relate to the natural right of our Arab neighbors in this land."<sup>124</sup> Oz VeShalom's Information Secretary, Yehezkel Landau, concurs, arguing that Israelis are obligated to "develop a Jewish vision of the Holy Land, Eretz Yisrael, that allows room for an independent Palestinian entity within that shared homeland."<sup>125</sup> That



"entity" would comprise Judea, Samaria and Gaza, and Landau has even hinted that he and his comrades are willing to surrender part of Jerusalem to the Arabs as well.<sup>126</sup> As first steps toward the establishment of the Palestinian "entity," Oz VeShalom wants Israel to "issue a Balfour Declaration for Palestinian Arabs,"<sup>127</sup> and to compensate Arab refugees from the 1948 war, an issue it regards as "more important" than Jewish prayer rights in Hebron's Cave of the Patriarchs.<sup>128</sup>

Oz VeShalom does not seem particularly concerned by the possibility that a Palestinian "entity" might serve as the springboard for future terrorist attacks against Israel. Indeed, Landau sees Israeli fears of Arab terrorism as being part of a collective "need to be able to say 'They're the bad guys' to be secure that our bombing of their camps is justified."<sup>129</sup> He regards Israeli security officials who killed two Arab terrorists as "murderers."<sup>130</sup> His wife, Dalia, has written that although some Arabs may be terrorists, "some of Israel's political leaders were (also) terrorists in the past and have never repented."<sup>131</sup> Another Oz VeShalom leader, Aviezer Ravitzky, believes that "Arabs who commit terrorism have more justification" than Israelis who retaliate against terrorism, "since they (the Arabs) have no political power, and they might feel in real distress."<sup>132</sup>

The Oz VeShalom view of Jewish history is consumed by a desire to cast today's Palestinian Arabs in the role of yesterday's Jewish victims. At an Arab-Jewish Passover gathering, Oz VeShalom activists discussed the question, "Are we Pharaoh?"<sup>133</sup> Arab aggressors and Jewish victims are viewed as equal partners in "a century-long conflict in which two oppressed peoples have been fighting over the same homeland."<sup>134</sup> Jews who live in Judea and Samaria are denounced for "treating Arab Christians and Muslims in ways that resemble the persecution to which Jews were subjected for centuries."<sup>135</sup> If the Palestinian Arabs are not treated more humanely, declares Ravitzky, "all the tears of my grandparents who were persecuted and murdered and expelled from their countries will become crocodile tears."<sup>136</sup>

Oz VeShalom has gone out of its way to lend a helping hand to Arab militants. It has sponsored a number of Arab speakers, including Jonathan Kuttab of the anti-Israel propaganda agency "Al Haq,"<sup>137</sup> and Father Elias Chacour, who has justified terrorist behavior by young Arabs on the grounds that "they do not know which Jew has not killed a Palestinian." It appealed to the Israeli authorities to cancel the deportation order against Mubarak Awad, the Arab advocate of "non-violence" who has said that his goal is to "crack the Zionist set-up."<sup>138</sup> And it even demanded that a PLO official who died abroad be permitted to be buried in

## A POTPOURRI OF EXTREMIST CAUSES

There is virtually no limit to the imagination of Israeli leftists when it comes to conjuring up new ways to promote their agenda, and the NIF is usually ready to pick up the tab.

There is Lapid, the Movement for Teaching the Lessons of the Holocaust, which seeks to persuade the public that the primary lesson to be derived from the Holocaust is that Israelis may be tempted to mimic Nazi methods in their treatment of Arabs. In this vein, Lapid recently called on the Israeli Army to use less force in responding to Arab rioters.<sup>140</sup>

There is the Association for the Defense of Bedouin Rights (\$30,000 in 1989), which has staged violent rock-throwing demonstrations against the Israeli police and accused Israel of treating the Bedouins in a manner "reminiscent of South Africa."<sup>141</sup> Ironically, an article that has been reprinted as a brochure by the New Israel Fund itself reports that the chairman of the Association, Nuri El Ukbi, has "lost credibility with much of the Israeli press. Several journalists told me that he had misled or misinformed them so many times that they simply won't have anything to do with him. I got a taste of that when I visited the Bedouin Rights Organization headquarters . . . instances that al Ukbi cited in which the (Israeli) Green Patrols allegedly clubbed (Bedouin) women and children simply didn't check out."<sup>142</sup> Nevertheless, the NIF has been steadily increasing its grants to the Association, from \$7,750 in 1984-85 to \$14,000 in 1987-88 to \$30,000 last year.

There is the National Council for the Well-Being of the Child, which has taken out time from its campaign against child abuse to denounce the Israeli Army for detaining Arab rioters under twelve years of age.<sup>143</sup> Instead of calling attention to the Arab riot leaders who cruelly send children to the front lines to stone and firebomb innocent Israelis, the Council seems to be exclusively interested in preventing Israeli soldiers from defending themselves against deadly attacks by anyone less than twelve. Ignoring the unique battlefield conditions experienced by Israeli soldiers who are attacked by rioters, the Council is demanding the application of abstract Western principles that would in effect grant immunity from prosecution to every eleven year-old firebomb-thrower from Gaza to Nablus. Coincidentally, the Council's annual grant from the NIF has increased dramatically since it turned its attention to the "intifada," rising

from just \$7,000 in 1986-87 to \$18,000 in 1987-88 and \$34,000 last year.

### THE SHORT END OF THE STICK

Some beneficiaries of the New Israel Fund can legitimately claim to be nonpolitical, such as rape crisis centers and shelters for battered women. NIF literature places considerable emphasis on such grantees, no doubt to give the impression that they are as important a concern to the NIF as are its politically-oriented beneficiaries. Yet the amount of funding set aside for rape victims and battered women is paltry compared to that given to leftwing political causes. The *NIF's combined* grants to rape crisis centers in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Haifa and Eilat totaled just \$44,950 in 1988.<sup>144</sup> Compare that to, for example, the \$350,000 given to the ACRI, the \$200,000 given to Neve Shalom, and the \$121,000 given to other groups devoted to "Arab-Jewish coexistence."<sup>145</sup> In other words, what the four rape crisis centers receive is less than 13% of what is allotted to those who assist Arab terrorists, and barely 14% of what is given to fostering social intercourse between Arabs and Jews.

An analysis of the overall NIF grant list reveals a similar pattern. Organizations that promote the political agenda of the Israeli left receive far more than do the non-political causes. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1988, sixty-two Israeli organizations received NIF grants, totaling \$1,143,164. Thirty three of the recipients were groups that lobby for Israeli territorial concessions, defend Arab terrorists, promote Arab rights, sponsor Arab-Jewish meetings, or favor the complete secularization of Israeli public life. They received a total of \$748,750, that is, 65% of the grant money. The non-political grantees, those that assist rape victims, battered women, abused children, new immigrants, or disadvantaged neighborhoods, received a total of \$393,393, or 34% of the grant money. (The remaining 1% consisted of two allocations for NIF prize money, totaling \$1,021.)

### REVOLVING-DOOR RADICALISM

Yet even many of those involved with ostensibly non-political beneficiaries of the New Israel Fund are simultaneously active in other, blatantly political causes. The extent to which members of the NIF "family" flit from cause to cause is remarkable, and it is a phenomenon which in effect transforms the NIF from a financier of assorted, separate leftwing crusades

into the financial backbone of an entire network of revolving-door radicals.

Alice Shalvi, the director of the NIF-funded Israel Women's Network, has repeatedly dabbled in leftwing politics. She has complained that Israel's victory in the 1967 war "was very bad for us" because "being conquerors had a debilitating effect on our moral integrity."<sup>146</sup> In 1987, she signed a petition urging the release from prison of an Arab charged with membership in the terrorist Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine.<sup>147</sup> More recently, Shalvi permitted a Norwegian television crew to stage an anti-Israel "news filming" at the high school of which she is principal, pitting an articulate Palestinian girl against Shalvi's unprepared students.<sup>148</sup>

Shalvi is not the only NIF activist with a multiple agenda. Ruth Rasnik, the founder of a New Israel Fund-financed rape crisis center, was a candidate for the fifth place on the 1988 Knesset list of the Citizens Rights Movement.<sup>149</sup> Nur El Ukbi, director of the NIF-funded Association for the Defense of Bedouin Rights, was a candidate for the Knesset with the Citizens Rights Movement in 1977, and is today a member of the central committee of the ultra-leftwing Progressive List for Peace.<sup>15</sup> The social action committee of Mevakshei Derech, a non-traditional Jerusalem congregation which the NIF assisted in a court action seeking municipal funding, holds regular vigils outside the Prime Minister's office to denounce Israeli treatment of Arab rioters.<sup>151</sup> Both Yamin Suissa, of the Ohalim movement, and Rayek Rizek, the public spokesman for Neve Shalom, joined the campaign on behalf of nuclear spy Mordechai Vanunu.<sup>1 2</sup>

Members of the NIF's own staff also keep busy in related causes. The Fund's director in Israel, Gila Svirsky, is one of the leaders of the "Women in Black," a far-left group that holds vigils mourning the deaths of Arab rioters.<sup>153</sup> Naomi Kies, one of the founders of the NIF's branch in Israel, was (until her recent death) active in a variety of ultra-left movements, including the Black Panthers and the Sheli Party.<sup>154</sup> Simkha Weintraub, the NIF's director of public relations, has continued to work with extreme leftwing groups despite the embarrassment that such links might cause to his employers; he signed a newspaper advertisement sponsored by Tikkun magazine last year,<sup>155</sup> and he was affiliated with the 1989 "Passover Peace Coalition," which declared that the suffering of the Jews in ancient Egypt necessitates the creation of a PLO state in Judea and Samaria today.<sup>156</sup> A similarly bizarre inversion of the meaning of Passover has been offered by Esther Leah Ritz of the NIF, who was one of the stars at a conference of PLO officials and Jewish

radicals in New York in March, 1989, and boasted to reporters that "I wept at the Seder last year, because everywhere the word 'Hebrew' comes we could substitute the word 'Palestinian.'"<sup>157</sup>

The tendency of those affiliated with the NIF or its beneficiaries to associate with other leftwing causes raises a thorny conflict-of-interest issue. Is it appropriate for someone who has an official position with the Fund simultaneously to serve as the leader of an organization that is applying for the Fund's assistance? Will such an individual refrain from using his position in the NIF to encourage a favorable response to the application of his pet charity? Numerous NIF officials in the U.S., as well as one of the Israeli members of its Board of Directors, Itzhak Galnoor, have links to Peace Now;<sup>158</sup> and the NIF has provided various forms of assistance to Friends of Peace Now, including office space, computer time, and the loan of its tax-exempt status for U.S. fundraising efforts.<sup>159</sup> Jesse Zel Lurie, the chairman of the American Friends of Neve Shalom, which received \$200,000 from the NIF last year, is a member of the NIF's Advisory Council. Alice Shalvi, the head of the Israel Women's Network (\$115,000 from the NIF last year), is a member of the NW Advisory Council as well as a member of the NIF's Leadership Fellows Program Steering Committee. Leorit Daniel and Adam Fish, who are officials of the Association for Civil Rights in Israel (\$350,000 from the NIF last year), are members of the NIF's U.S.-Israel Civil Liberties Law Program Steering Committee and its Shatil Steering Committee, respectively. Jonathan Perlman, who until recently served on the NIF's Board of Directors, has been active in the Association for Defense of Bedouin Rights (\$30,000 from the NIF last year).<sup>160</sup>

#### AWARDS FOR ISRAEL-BASHERS

Finally, no survey of the New Israel Fund's activities would be complete without mention of its Ted Lurie Memorial Award for Outstanding Reporting, which is given each year to a journalist for "the best coverage of issues in Israel in the North American print media," meaning the coverage that most closely mirrors the NIF's political perspective. The awardees have included:

\* Thomas Friedman of the **New York Times**, who in 1974 was one of the leaders of the Breira-affiliated "Middle East Peace Group" at Brandeis University.<sup>161</sup> Friedman was honored by the NIF for an article in which, disguising polemics as "news analysis," he blamed Israel for being just as responsible as the PLO for the absence of peace in the Middle East, and outlined his own plan for a "functional" surrender of Judea and Samaria to a

Jordanian-Palestinian administration.<sup>1 62</sup>

\* Amos Elon, who received a Special Honorary Citation from the NIF for an article in which he compared Menachem Begin to Shabtai Zvi, the 17th-century false messiah.<sup>163</sup>

\* Lance Morrow, who received the NIF's award for a Time cover story- about Israel's fortieth anniversary, in which he described the various Arab-Israeli wars without mentioning the Arab aggression that started them; equated Israel's "ferocity" with the PLO's slaughter of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics; called Israel's leaders "craven" and "cowardly" while saying almost nothing critical about Yasser Arafat; and resurrected a Medieval anti-Semitic image by claiming that Israel's response to Arab rioters has "undermine(d) the moral edifice of the Chosen."<sup>164</sup>

### THEIR MOTIVES: FEAR AND LIBERALISM

What motivates someone to become active in the New Israel Fund? There are several possible explanations. For Jews who have climbed the ladder of socioeconomic success and become supremely comfortable in the physical and spiritual fleshpots, there is a fear that a cantankerous Israel will cause anti-Jewish resentment in the United States. Jonathan Cohen, the well-to-do businessman who established the New Israel Fund, asserted in 1982 that Israel's policies in Lebanon constituted "an absolutely critical turning point" in "the life of Western Jews" because "Israeli policy under Begin has allowed a nascent anti-Semitism to be legitimized." Therefore, Cohen concluded, "We must create the foundations for a new Israel."<sup>165</sup> (This attitude was also evident in the pronouncements of some leaders of Breira. Its chairman, Arnold Jacob Wolf, complained in 1980 that political candidates who assure Jewish voters of their support for Israel "place us in the position of less-than-loyal Americans" and make Jews "look like bad citizens, ethnocentric partisans."<sup>166</sup>)

Other New Israel Fund activists are dogmatic liberals who can only tolerate an Israel that mirrors their political and cultural tastes. After all, many of the NIF top brass had their formative political experiences in the struggles of the New Left or the civil rights movement. Founder Jonathan Cohen is a veteran of the anti-apartheid movement; former president Ruth Abram had been a staff member of the American Civil Liberties Union; current president Mary Ann Stein spent the 1960s helping blacks register to vote in South Carolina (and to this day sends her children to a private school that she picked because "it

has a substantial portion of minority children"<sup>167</sup>); longtime vice-president Richard Laster was one of Nader's raiders;<sup>168</sup> the new executive director, Norman Rosenberg, was hired because of his "strong background in civil rights and civil liberties."<sup>169</sup> Men and women with such backgrounds gravitate toward the New Israel Fund because it offers them an opportunity to help transform Israel into a state that will (in the words the Israeli writer Ze'ev Chafets) "meet the approval of the ACLU, T h e Nation magazine, and the Sierra Club."<sup>170</sup>

The New Israel Fund is neither new, nor does it aid Israel. It merely reflects the same dissatisfaction with the Jewish State that has been articulated by radical Jews for the past two decades, first by CONAME, then by Breira, and today by New Jewish Agenda and Friends of Peace Now. Although it poses as a fund to assist Israel, the New Israel Fund in fact serves to provide financial muscle to a handful of Israeli extremists who, lacking the electoral mandate to radically transform the Jewish State, seek a constituency in New York and Berkeley that they cannot muster in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> Mother Jones, May 1980.

<sup>2</sup> Brochure of the New Israel Fund.

<sup>3</sup> The initial pamphlet of the Committee of Concerned American Jews described Cohen as "a leading supporter of American Friends of Shalom Achshay." His signature also appeared on a Peace Now advertisement in the New York Times (hereafter NYT), September 24, 1982. For Eban's statement, see Jerusalem Post (hereafter JP), May 6, 1983.

<sup>4</sup> Shortly before the founding of CONAME, Chomsky had written in Liberation magazine (November 1969) of the need to replace Israel with "a democratic, socialist Palestine."

<sup>5</sup> The Peacemaker, Vol.26, No.13 (October 20, 1973).

<sup>6</sup> The article was entitled "Peace, Justice and the Palestinians." It originally appeared in WIN Magazine, July 4, 1974, and was then reprinted by CONAME. A copy of the reprint, bearing CONAME's name and address, is in the possession of the author.

<sup>7</sup> Lainer's statement appeared in the Los Angeles Jewish Journal, February 9-15, 1990. Solomonow's response appeared in the Cleveland Jewish Times, March 14, 1990.

<sup>8</sup> Carolyn Toll, "American Jews and the Middle East Dilemma," T h e Progressive, August 1979. Toll (today known by her married name, Oppenheim) was a member of the Breira national board.

<sup>9</sup> The key expose was the booklet "Breira: Counsel for Judaism?," by Rael Jean Isaac, published by Americans For a Safe Israel. A series of articles based on the booklet appeared in the New York Jewish Week during the

spring of 1977, generating a lively public debate about Breira.

<sup>10</sup> See **Shalom Network**, Vol.1, No.9 (November 1980).

<sup>11</sup> See NYT advertisement, June 22, 1980. The six are Herman Blumberg, Betsy Cohen, Lawrence Kushner, Michael Luckens, Sharon Schumack and Daniel Shevitz.

<sup>12</sup> For details, see Robert A. Seltzer, "New Jewish Agenda: Dissent or Disloyalty," published by the American Jewish Committee, Middle Atlantic Region, 1989 and Rael Jean Isaac, *The New (Anti) Jewish Agenda*, published by Americans For a Safe Israel, 1989.

<sup>13</sup> JP, August 3, 1987.

<sup>14</sup> Jacoby signed a New Jewish Agenda advertisement in NYT, June 30, 1982.

<sup>15</sup> Perlstein was listed as such in **Agenda**, October-November 1980. Geller's continuing connection to New Jewish Agenda is mentioned in the internal New Jewish Agenda newsletter, **Agenda in Brief**, August 1988. Wisch was listed as a "contributor" on a New Jewish Agenda-Philadelphia advertisement that appeared in the Philadelphia-area magazine **Shalom**, March 1990.

<sup>16</sup> Axelrad, Neiuseler and Epstein are listed as such in "What's right with this picture?," a flyer distributed by the New Israel Fund Greater Boston Committee. (Copy in the possession of the author.) Neiuseler and Epstein signed a New Jewish Agenda advertisement in NYT, June 30, 1982.

<sup>17</sup> He signed a New Jewish Agenda advertisement in NYT, June 30, 1982.

<sup>18</sup> The five are Laura Geller, Hillel Levine, John Ruskay, Letty Cottin Pogrebin and Arnold Vorspan.

<sup>19</sup> JP International Edition, April 19-26, 1981.

<sup>20</sup> The six are Steven M. Cohen, Rabbi Laura Geller, Rabbi Steven B. Jacobs, Seymour Martin Lipset, Letty Cottin Pogrebin, John Ruskay; the other three are Franklin Fisher and Henry Voremborg and Gerald Bubis.

<sup>21</sup> NYT advertisement, July 4, 1982.

<sup>22</sup> The twelve are William Brinner (see NYT advertisement, June 8, 1980), Albert Vorspan (see NYT advertisement, June 8, 1980), David Polish (see **Los Angeles Times**, July 2, 1980), Jesse Zel Lurie (see NYT, April 22, 1978), Joseph Asher (see NYT advertisement, January 3, 1988), Jo Levinson (see NYT advertisement, January 3, 1988), Charles Silberman (see NYT advertisement, September 24, 1982), Harold Schulweis (see NYT advertisement, September 24, 1982), Geoffrey Cowan (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988), Hal Lieberman (see NYT advertisement, September 26, 1982), Edward Asner (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988) and Morris Levinson (see **Los Angeles Times**, July 2, 1980).

<sup>23</sup> The ten are Leonard Fein (founder of Friends of Peace Now), Lois Gunther (see NYT advertisement, September 24, 1982), Richard Giesberg (see JP advertisement, May 11, 1987), Mimi Alperin (see NYT advertisement, January 3, 1988), Arnold Rachlis (see NYT advertisement,



January 3, 1988), Ann Lenway (see NYT advertisement, January 3, 1988), Ruth Abram (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988), Elizabeth Melamid (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988), William Goodman (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988) and Sharon Silverstein (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988).

<sup>24</sup> Irving L. Cramer (see JP advertisement, May 11, 1987).

<sup>25</sup> Miriam Goodman (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988).

<sup>26</sup> Susan Laemelle (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988).

<sup>27</sup> Richard Gunther (see NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988).

<sup>28</sup> See NYT advertisement, January 26, 1988.

<sup>29</sup> This calculation excludes the four American politicians who are members of the Advisory Council, who it may be presumed have been added to the Council merely in order to increase its prestige, and not because they have any role in NIF policymaking.

<sup>30</sup> Excluding "Shatil," which is a creation of the NIF. Shatil, which was granted \$436,000 by the NIF in 1989, serves as a support group for NIF grantees, providing them with practical assistance in fundraising, public relations and the like. Shatil also has a placement service to channel student volunteers to leftwing groups, including East For Peace, Fellowship of Reconciliation (the Israeli branch of the U.S. pacifist movement by that name), and the Progressive Zionist Caucus, which regards Arab rioters as "Palestinian kids" and endorses "Palestinians' right to self-determination." A Shatil press release (copy in the possession of the author) listed these and other groups as approved to receive volunteers. The platform of the Progressive Zionist Caucus is described in a leaflet distributed by the Caucus in 1988, entitled "Enough is Enough!!!" (copy in the possession of the author).

<sup>31</sup> NYT, January 4, 1985.

<sup>32</sup> Al Fajr English Weekly, May 8, 1989.

<sup>33</sup> JP, April 4, 1985.

<sup>34</sup> JP, November 29, 1985.

<sup>35</sup> JP, February 16, 1990.

<sup>36</sup> JP, April 20, 1988.

<sup>37</sup> Counterpoint, November 1987. Invoking the memory of Nazism in order to denigrate policies of which they disapprove is a favorite polemical device of Israeli leftists. Haim Cohn, for example, has compared the traditional Jewish view of matriarchal descent as the basis for Jewish identity to Nazi legislation. See JP, June 18, 1963 and JP, April 20, 1988.

<sup>38</sup> Ha'aretz, February 10, 1985.

<sup>39</sup> Ha'aretz, December 30, 1987.

40 "The Israeli administration in Judea, Samaria and Gaza--a record of progress," Ministry of Defense, Tel Aviv, 1968, p.7.

41 JP, December 30, 1987.

- 42 JP, April 12, 1988 and June 21, 1988; Ma'ariv, June 10, 1988.
- 43 NYT, July 31, 1989.
- 44 Israel Radio, August 14, 1988.
- 45 JP, April 8, 1986.
- 46 JP, April 8, 1986
- 47 JP, July 21, 1983; JP, March 15, 1984; JP, March 25, 1984; JP, February 18, 1985; JP, January 5, 1987; Al Awdah, January 25, 1987; Ha'aretz, February 22, 1985; Ha'aretz, April 19, 1988.
- 48 Davar, December 29, 1986; Hadashot, December 25, 1986; JP, January 1, 1987; Los Angeles Jewish Journal, March 3-9, 1989; Al Fajr English Weekly, August 14, 1989.
- 49 JP, June 20, 1988.
- 50 Miami Herald, January 17, 1988
- 51 JP, February 10, 1989
- 52 JP, February 7, 1990.
- 53 Esther Ohana, stoned to death near Dahariya in February, 1983; Benny Meisner, killed when he was struck in the head by a chunk of concrete in Nablus in May, 1989; and Haim Sharabani, hit in the head by rocks in Gaza in August 1989, and died of his wounds two weeks later.
- 54 Al Fajr English Weekly, January 2, 1988; Chicago Jewish Sentinel, June 29, 1989; JP, April 7, 1989
- 55 Al Fajr English Weekly, September 19, 1986.
- 56 JP, November 6, 1987
- 57 Harper's, October 1980.
- 58 JP, December 23, 1987.
- 59 JP, August 12, 1988; Chicago Jewish Sentinel, May 18, 1989.
- 60 JP, March 12, 1990.
- 61 Miami Herald, September 18, 1988; JP, March 29, 1989.
- 62 Koteret Raishit, March 16, 1988.
- 63 See, for example, the monthly B'Tselem "Information Sheets," from May 1, 1989 (which was the first issue) through January 1, 1990. On the establishment of B'Tselem, see JP, March 29, 1989.
- 64 Kol Hatir, October 16, 1987.
- 65 Al Awdah English Weekly, February 8, 1988.
- 66 Al Awdah English Weekly, March 14, 1988.
- 67 JP, January 2, 1981.
- 68 JP, January 15, 1988.
- 69 The Nation, March 19, 1988.
- 70 JP, January 3, 1988.
- 71 Counterpoint, September 1988.
- 72 Letter, G.Cohen to E.Kulas, May 25, 1987; letter, E.Kulas to G.Cohen, May

- 25, 1987. Copies in the possession of the author.
- <sup>73</sup> **Yerushalayim**, May 13, 1988.
- 74 **Jewish Week**, May 19, 1989.
- <sup>75</sup> JP, December 11, 1983; JP, September 29, 1985.
- 76 JP, July 31, 1987.
- 77 JP, June 3, 1988.
- 78 Association for Civil Rights Annual Report June 1985-May 1986, p.21.
- 79 See **New Israel Fund Bulletin**, October 1982.
- 80 **Now**, November 5, 1984.
- 81 JP, April 20, 1988.
- 8 2 JP, April 20, 1988.
- <sup>83</sup> NYT, January 4, 1985.
- 84 **Ibid.**
- <sup>85</sup> **New Israel Fund Bulletin**, April May 1986.
- 86 For details on the CNSS, see Rael Jean Isaac and Erich Isaac, **The Coercive Utopians** (Chicago: 1985), pp.119-121.
- <sup>87</sup> Suissa refers to his Panther days in JP, June 25, 1981. Ohalim is listed as a beneficiary of the NIF in **New Israel Fund Bulletin**, May 1985.
- <sup>88</sup> JP, October 17, 1980.
- 89 "Anatomy of A Riot," **Lillit**, No.5 July 1971.
- 90 JP, June 25, 1981.
- <sup>91</sup> JP December 8, 1989; JP, December 14, 1989; JP, December 21, 1989.
- 92 JP, October 17, 1980.
- <sup>93</sup> JP, November 19, 1980.
- <sup>94</sup> JP, December 4, 1983.
- <sup>95</sup> **Ha'aretz** ad, March 5, 1987.
- <sup>96</sup> JP, September 13, 1985.
- <sup>97</sup> JP, January 9, 1987.
- <sup>98</sup> JP, September 13, 1985.
- <sup>99</sup> **Kol Ha'ir**, July 1, 1988.
- 100 JP, July 8, 1983.
- 101 Barzilai's involvement in the Vanunu case is noted in JP, March 5, 1987. His position as the East For Peace spokesman is noted in **Kol Ha'ir**, June 12, 1987 and in JP, February 26, 1987. His roles in the Committee for Confronting the Iron Fist and the Progressive List for Peace are described in **Al Fajr**, September 19, 1986.
- 102 **Kol Ha'ir**, April 24, 1987.
- <sup>103</sup> **Kol Hair**, July 1, 1988. Zagori, the ninth candidate on the list, was not elected.
- 104 For an interview with Elbaz about the Committee, see **Al Awdah**, February 23, 1986. Elbaz's participation in the campaign to free Haniyeh

is noted in *Al Fair*, November 21, 1986.

<sup>105</sup> *Moment*, May 1984.

<sup>106</sup> David M. Potter, "The Quest for National Character," in John Higham, ed. *The Reconstruction of American History* (New York, 1962), p.217.

<sup>107</sup> Martin Lakin, with Jack Lomranz and Morton A. Lieberman, "Arab and Jew in Israel: Case Study in Human Relations Training Approach to Conflict," *American Academic Association for Peace in the Middle East*, June 1969, pp.112-125.

<sup>108</sup> *Kol Ha'ir*, April 3, 1987.

<sup>109</sup> *Kol Ha'ir*, April 3, 1987.

<sup>110</sup> *Kol u Ha'ir*, April 3, 1987.

<sup>111</sup> *Jewish Floridian*, December 18, 1987.

<sup>112</sup> *Haolam Hazeh*, April 3, 1987.

<sup>113</sup> *Kol Ha'ir*, April 3, 1987.

<sup>114</sup> *JP*, December 21, 1987.

<sup>115</sup> *JP*, August 19, 1977.

<sup>116</sup> *JP*, September 4, 1986.

<sup>117</sup> *Al Fajr English Weekly*, December 6, 1987; *Chicago Jewish Sentinel*, December 31, 1987.

<sup>118</sup> *JP*, December 17, 1982.

<sup>119</sup> *NYT*, August 10, 1986.

<sup>120</sup> *Ha'aretz*, October 1, 1987

<sup>121</sup> *Al Awdah*, February 1, 1987.

<sup>122</sup> *JP*, July 17, 1987.

<sup>123</sup> *Moment*, October 1986.

<sup>124</sup> *Tradition*, Volume 18, p.90.

<sup>1 25</sup> *Religious Zionism: Challenges and Choices*, published by Oz VeShalom, p.2.

<sup>126</sup> *Al Awdah*, February 22, 1987. Landau has also suggested that he would not be opposed to Arab control of the Temple Mount, since with a Moslem presence there "the name of God is also glorified and sanctified there, even though He's called Allah and not HaKadosh Baruch Hu." (*Moment*, October 1986).

<sup>127</sup> *Long Island Jewish World*, February 8-14, 1985.

<sup>128</sup> *JP*, August 20, 1975; also see "Clarifications," a passage added to the official Oz VeShalom reprint of the article from *Moment*, October 1986.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>130</sup> *JP*, December 10, 1986.

<sup>131</sup> *JP* January 14, 1988.

<sup>132</sup> Ravitzky is quoted in David Shipler, *Arab and Jew; Wounded Spirits in the Promised Land* (New York: 1985), p.157.

- <sup>133</sup> JP, April 28, 1989.
- <sup>134</sup> Maryknoll, September 1989.
- <sup>135</sup> Yehezkel Landau, "Introduction," in **Religious Zionism: Challenges and Choices**, Oz VeShalom Publications, English-Language Series, #1.
- <sup>136</sup> Moment, October 1986.
- <sup>137</sup> JP, January 6, 1989.
- <sup>138</sup> Al Fajr, February 28, 1986; JP International Edition, November 1, 1986.
- <sup>139</sup> JP, December 31, 1984.
- <sup>140</sup> Long Island Jewish World, September 8-14, 1989; N.I.F.Report, March 1988.
- <sup>141</sup> JP, July 4, 1985; JP, November 7, 1979.
- <sup>142</sup> Moment, May 1984.
- <sup>143</sup> NIF Report, June 1989.
- <sup>144</sup> According to the New Israel Fund Annual Report, November 1989, the "General Grant Authorizations" (as opposed to Donor-Advised Grants) for the year ended June 30, 1988 were: \$16,950 for the Rape Crisis Center-Haifa, \$10,000 for the Rape Crisis Center-Tel Aviv, \$5,000 for the Rape Crisis Center-Eilat. The Jerusalem Rape Crisis Center received Donor-Advised Grants of \$2,044 in 1986-87 and \$11,075 in 1987-88, but did not receive any NIF General Grants in either year.
- <sup>145</sup> The groups listed under the heading "Jewish Arab Relations" in the New Israel Fund Annual Report - November 1989 are Writ B'nei Shem (\$5,000), Interns for Peace (\$6,500), Yandav (\$7,500), Center for Jewish-Arab Economic Development (\$16,000), Partnership (\$30,000), Netivei Ahva (\$28,000), Youth Who Sing a Different Song (\$12,000) and Re'ut (\$16,000).
- <sup>146</sup> Israel Scene, March 1987.
- <sup>147</sup> JP, March 24, 1987.
- <sup>148</sup> JP, October 12, 1989.
- <sup>149</sup> JP, June 7, 1988.
- <sup>150</sup> Al Awdah English Weekly, June 29, 1986.
- <sup>151</sup> JP, February 26, 1988.
- <sup>152</sup> Suissa and Raizek were two of the seventy-five individuals who signed an undated broadside entitled "For Vanunu's Civil Rights! Against the Israeli Nuclear Threat!," which was distributed in 1987 by Michael Warshawski of the Alternative Information Center. Copy in the possession of the author.
- <sup>153</sup> Present Tense, May-June 1989.
- <sup>154</sup> New Israel Fund Bulletin, May 1985; JP, September 2, 1983; JP, May 7, 1985; JP, June 10, 1985.

<sup>155</sup> NYT, April 5, 1989.

<sup>156</sup> **New York Jewish Week**, April 14, 1989. Jo Levinson, a member of the NIF's Board of Directors, and Laura Geller, a member of the NIF's Advisory Council, joined Weintraub in the Passover Peace Coalition.

<sup>157</sup> **Present Tense**, September-October 1989.

<sup>158</sup> Galnoor is described as one of the founders of Peace Now in **Chicago Jewish Sentinel**, February 8, 1990, as a Peace Now spokesman in **JP**, February 13, 1980, has been a speaker at Peace Now functions (see **JP** advertisement, July 27, 1988), and has written for the magazine **Peace Now**, published by the Washington, D.C. office of Friends of Peace Now.

<sup>159</sup> **Moment**, May 1984.

<sup>160</sup> Perlman's activities are described in "Unlimited Partnership," *op.cit.*, and in "Bridges to Democracy: 1988-89 Calendar of Events," a New Israel Fund brochure.

<sup>161</sup> Friedman and nine other self-described members of the Steering Committee of the Middle East Peace Group affixed their signatures to an open letter entitled "Another Bad Omen," published in **The Brandeis Justice** on November 12, 1974, which endorsed a Breira statement regarding Yasser Arafat's appearance at the United Nations.

<sup>162</sup> Thomas Friedman, "No Illusions: Israel Reassesses Its Chances for Peace," **NYT**, January 26, 1986.

<sup>163</sup> Amos Elon, "Letter From Israel," **New York**, July 29, 1985.

<sup>164</sup> Lance Morrow, "Israel: At 40, the Dream Confronts Palestinian Fury and a Crisis of Identity," **Time**, April 4, 1988.

<sup>165</sup> **Mother Jones**, December 1982.

<sup>166</sup> **Interchange**, November 1976.

<sup>167</sup> **Jewish Week**, July 7, 1989.

<sup>168</sup> **Moment**, May 1984.

<sup>169</sup> **N.I.F.Report**, Winter 1989-90.

<sup>170</sup> Ze'ev Chafets, **Members of the Tribe** (New York: 1989), p.75. Chafets' characterization is strikingly similar to a remark made by the NIF's longtime executive director, Jonathan Jacoby (in **Moment**, May 1984): "America is a well-established democracy, yet it still needs an American Civil Liberties Union, a Sierra Club to lobby for environmental protection, and so on. Can Israel, which is still so young, need such citizen action groups any less?"

