

# ISRAEL

## A Guide for Activists



A publication of the Anti-Defamation League

2008

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>TOOLS FOR ADVOCACY</b>	<b>3</b>
Advocating to Elected Officials	3
Advocating to the Media	6
Advocating on Campus	9
<b>GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS/EVENTS IN ISRAEL'S HISTORY</b>	<b>14</b>
Al Aqsa Martyr's Brigade	14
Annapolis Conference	14
Arab Economic Boycott	15
British Mandate	16
Camp David Accords/Israel-Egypt Peace	16
Camp David Summit 2000	17
Disengagement	18
Founding of State of Israel	20
Hamas	20
Hezbollah	22
Intifada 1987	24
Second Intifada 2000	24
Islamic Jihad	26
Jerusalem	27
Lebanon War 1982	28
Lebanon War 2006	29
Madrid Peace Conference	31
Oslo Accords	31
Palestine Liberation Organization	33
Palestinian Refugees	34
Roadmap	36
Security Barrier/Fence	37
Settlements	38
Six Day War	40
United Nations Partition Plan	40
United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242/338	41
War of Independence	41
West Bank and Gaza Strip	41
Yom Kippur War	43
Zionism	43

<b>RESPONSES TO COMMON INACCURACIES ABOUT ISRAEL</b>	<b>45</b>
Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process	45
Palestinian Violence and Terrorism	48
Israeli Responses to Palestinian Violence	50
2006 Lebanon War	52
Israeli Settlements	53
Palestinian Refugees	54
Israel/Zionism is Racist	55
Anti-Semitism and Criticism of Israel	59
U.S.-Israel Relations	60
Establishment of Israel	63
<b>KEY DATES IN ISRAEL'S HISTORY</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>SELECT ONLINE RESOURCES ON ISRAEL AND THE CONFLICT</b>	<b>74</b>

# INTRODUCTION

---

The Anti-Defamation League's **Israel: A Guide for Activists** is a one-stop resource for those who want to "do something" to support Israel.

It offers background about the key events in Israel's history. It lays out the essential points you need to know to challenge anti-Israel propaganda. It identifies common inaccuracies about Israel so you can refute them. It offers strategies for getting the facts to elected officials, to the media and on college campuses.

The most important thing supporters of Israel can do is **be educated** and **be active**. **Israel: A Guide for Activists** gives you the information and strategies on how to be knowledgeable and effective in support of Israel.

**Israel: A Guide for Activist** is regularly updated on ADL's Web site. For the most up-to-date version of this publication and for current information on Israel go to [www.adl.org](http://www.adl.org).





# TOOLS FOR ADVOCACY

---

## ADVOCATING TO ELECTED OFFICIALS

Establishing relationships with your elected officials is the most effective way to communicate the depth of support for Israel among their own constituents. As developments in the region pose new challenges, Members of Congress should hear how these developments are viewed by their own pro-Israel constituents.

**Lobby Members at Home.** There is no substitute for a Member of Congress hearing from constituents who embody local support for strong U.S.-Israel relations. Regular visits when Members are home in their Districts and ongoing contact make even a small number of supporters a more visible constituency. Prior to each Congressional recess, contact the District Scheduler of your Senators and Representatives to schedule meetings with the Members to discuss current developments.

**Write Letters.** While a face-to-face meeting is most effective, Congressional staff monitor the number of letters received in support of or in opposition to an issue. Letters on policy issues should be sent to the Member's Washington office, with a cc to the local District Office. Increased security procedures have caused delay in mail delivery to Capitol Hill so letters are not the best vehicle for fast-moving legislation.

- Address only one issue per letter so the letter is directed to a specific staffer.
- Be concise and to the point. State the purpose of the letter up front.

• To a Senator:	To a Representative:
The Honorable (first and last name)	The Honorable (first and last name)
United States Senate	United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20510	Washington, DC 20515
Dear Senator --- :	Dear Representative --- :

**Phone Calls.** Calls convey a heightened sense of urgency and are only warranted when legislative action is imminent. Congressional offices keep a tally of calls to gauge public sentiment in their district. Be prepared to supply your address to verify that you live in the district. Call the Capitol switchboard, (202) 225-3121, to connect to your Member's office.

**E-mail.** While more Congressional offices are processing and responding to constituent e-mail, the sheer volume of e-mail received makes it difficult and, in some offices, e-mail is still given less attention than faxes, letters, or calls. If you do

communicate by e-mail, be sure to include your home address and indicate that you live in the Member's district.

**Invite Members to speak.** Members of Congress welcome opportunities to speak at community meetings or other events. Host forums and voter education/ registration initiatives with candidates to educate them about your concerns.

**Reach out to Congressional staff.** Getting to know the Congressional staff in the district and in Washington is vital in facilitating ongoing communication with the Member of Congress and impacting policy. Congressional aides frequently meet with constituents while Members are called to vote or to attend committee hearings and meetings. Not only are they the Member's eyes and ears and help shape how a Member votes, but staffers often move on to leadership positions themselves. Staffers provide a vital link in facilitating ongoing communication with the Member of Congress. Take these meetings seriously and communicate your message clearly.

**Develop a Key Contact Network.** Though elected officials value the opinion of community leaders, nothing compares to an individual constituent who can place a personal call to key public officials to say "thank you" or raise concerns.

**Get to Know Local Elected Officials and Candidates.** The best relationships with officials are those which began in their early careers in state and local offices. Today's candidate for City Council may be tomorrow's Senator. Although these officials and candidates focus on local issues, they can be important voices in support of Israel in the community and beyond.

## LOBBYING TIPS

### Advance Preparation

- **Designate who will speak for the delegation.** One person should introduce the group, others may take the lead in discussing the separate issues, or taking notes.
- **Learn about what the Member has done** or said on your issues.
- **Prepare background material or articles of interest on the issue.** You may not have time for a full discussion and should leave behind additional resources.

### **At the Meeting**

- **Be brief.** Introduce the delegation quickly, underlining the connection with the Member's home district. Keep your presentation of issues to a minute or two.
- **Describe local support** the measure has received from other coalition allies.
- **Get to the point** and request a specific action of support.
- **Leave plenty of time to hear out the Member** about his/her reactions.

### **If the Member Disagrees. . .**

- **Disagree without being disagreeable.** With such a broad international and domestic agenda, there are always issues on which to find common ground.
- **Stay focused.** If the Member disagrees, they may try to divert the conversation onto another topic. Be sure to communicate concerns clearly.

### **If the Member Agrees . . .**

- **Thank him/her for support** and reiterate the importance of the issue(s) to constituents. Most letters, calls, and e-mails to Congressional offices are negative – which leaves Members with the impression that their positive actions go unnoticed.
- **Let them know you are available** as a resource and to provide support for the Member's work on the issues.

### **Keep Lines of Communication Open . . .**

- **Send a thank you note** to the Member and staffer with whom you met. Take the opportunity to reconfirm any commitments made. If he/she is undecided, restate your arguments and enclose additional information supporting your point.
- **Continue to correspond with your Member and invite staff to community events.**

# ADVOCATING TO THE MEDIA

Most Americans' perceptions of the Middle East conflict come from the mass media. The media – especially large-circulation daily newspapers, network television and wire services – have correspondents based in Israel and continue to devote considerable attention to the Mideast crisis. This is not surprising, considering the intensive U.S. involvement in the peace process, America's substantial interests in the region, the continuing strong ties between the U.S. and Israel, and the fact that Israel is the only democracy in the region with a free press.

The news media obviously plays a pivotal role in shaping public perceptions of the conflict, and it goes without saying that effective advocacy on behalf of Israel includes an assessment of the daily stream of news coverage from the region. There are some things that you can do to become an active participant in this process:

- Read your local newspaper every day
- Know the facts
- Pay attention to news coverage of the Middle East, and Israel in particular
- Get involved: Respond to coverage that is unfairly critical of Israel

## ASSESSING MEDIA COVERAGE

Newspapers and newsmagazines offer a variety of forums within their pages for news and analysis. **Breaking news** (or “straight news”) stories are usually written on the scene and describe events currently taking place in the region. News stories are quite different from **columns, editorials, and op-eds**, which generally express an opinion or offer a certain viewpoint. Understanding this difference is essential to effective Israel advocacy.

Generally, **news articles** aim to present the story from a balanced perspective, meaning that more than one point of view is represented. The professional journalists who report news stories strive to uphold their profession's standards of accuracy, fairness and balance. However, there are times when news reports may contain inaccuracies or overlook a critical piece of information that is necessary to put the story in context. While such oversights are often unintentional, they merit a response.

Often you will see **op-eds, editorials and columns** that are critical of Israel and Israeli leadership. The most effective and immediate response is a letter to the editor. Tips for submitting an effective letter to the editor are outlined below.

If you suspect a news story misrepresents facts or contains an error, it is important to review the item carefully and **check your facts** before drafting a letter to the editor in response.

National and local Jewish organizations can help you to assess the accuracy of a news story and determine the most appropriate course of action.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Letters to the editor offer an effective vehicle for responding to news articles, op-eds and editorials in newspapers and magazines. A few things to bear in mind:

- **Letters must be timely.** Allowing a week, or even a few days to pass before responding to an article will greatly diminish the likelihood of your letter seeing print.
- **Write in response to a particular news item, editorial or op-ed.** Newspapers and magazines are not interested in letters that do not address a story or issue discussed in their pages. In your letter, make specific reference to the story's headline and the date it appeared.
- **Be brief and address a specific issue.** Newspapers generally will not publish lengthy diatribes that go into the entire history or background of an issue. Many only accept letters of 250 words or less. Be succinct, brief and as "to the point" as possible. Review the publication's instructions for submitting a letter to the editor.
- **Be civil.** Do not personally attack the writer. Your salutation should be addressed "To the Editor." If responding to an opinion column or op-ed, you may refer in your letter to the writer by name, indicate that you disagree with his or her point of view, and explain why.
- **Be sure to include your name, address and a daytime telephone number.** Most newspapers will not accept anonymous letters; most will not publish a letter without first attempting to check the identity of the author.
- **Send your letter by e-mail or fax.** When using e-mail, direct the letter to the appropriate address for letters. Do not use multiple addresses, or copy others. This will diminish your chances of being published.

Many newspapers and some Internet news sites have a designated ombudsman or "reader's advocate" – a staff member whose job is to address specific grievances of readers. If you feel strongly that a certain writer or columnist continues to unfairly portray the issues or facts with regard to Israel, a letter to the ombudsman can be another effective route.

## RESPONDING TO TELEVISION AND RADIO NEWS

The television and radio networks have various outlets for news. Generally, there are two forms of news generated by major networks such as ABC, CBS, CNN, Fox News, NPR, MSNBC and NBC – traditional **news reports and commentary** reported on a television or radio broadcast, and **written news stories** posted on network Web sites. Some Internet news sites provide a forum for readers to respond to news articles. Several of the network-owned Internet news sites have recently assigned staff members to deal specifically with reader and viewer complaints.

If there is a **television or radio broadcast** that you feel is inaccurate or unfair, make a note of the report, including the date, time and channel of the broadcast. You should attempt to bring your concerns to the attention of the local news affiliate who aired the broadcast or, when appropriate, the network responsible for the inaccurate or unbalanced report. Writing a letter to the news manager or producer, then following up with a phone call, is a good approach. Keep in mind that local news affiliates often use footage from the Middle East distributed by their networks or other news services and may not be responsible for the content of the report.

# ADVOCATING ON CAMPUS

Universities are a breeding ground for ideas and change. From the Civil Rights movement, to the fight for Soviet Jewry, to the Save Darfur campaign, major political and social movements have originated on the college campus. Since the fall of 2000, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been debated on campuses across the country.

Pro-Israel advocacy is a particularly challenging task in today's college and university campus environment. Many high profile academics, charismatic speakers, and influential student leaders have presented the Israeli-Palestinian situation in a one-sided manner, blaming the conflict on Israel's "occupation" and largely ignoring Palestinian terrorism and violence.

However, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a complicated issue that cannot be easily explained through one-line talking points. Making the case for Israel requires historical knowledge, current information, and a nuanced perspective on the conflict as a whole. The great majority of students (including many Jews) are apathetic, feeling no personal connection to or stake in Israel's future. To many, the Middle East is another far-off, seemingly endless conflict similar to those found in Africa, South Asia, and elsewhere. In sum, **those who would make the case for and defend Israel on campus must contend with an activated hostile minority and a potentially friendly, but generally unengaged, majority.**

When developing an effective strategy to an anti-Israel campaign on campus, **always consult and coordinate with on-campus Jewish groups**, particularly Hillel.

## THE ANTI-ISRAEL CAMPAIGN ON CAMPUS

Anti-Israel activism was widespread on campuses throughout the 1970s and 1980s, especially during the first *Intifada*. With the dawn of Arab-Israeli negotiations at the 1991 Madrid Conference, and particularly with the 1993 Israeli-Palestinian Oslo agreement, anti-Israel campaigning on campus was much diminished, although it never entirely ceased. While there were periodic flare-ups of anti-Israel activity, such as those countering the celebration of Israel's 50th anniversary in 1998, themes of peace and reconciliation symbolized by the establishment of Jewish-Arab dialogue groups on some campuses received more attention.

The outbreak of the second *Intifada* in 2000 resulted in a resurgence of anti-Israel campus activity. On many campuses anti-Israel rallies were a daily occurrence. Some crossed the line into violence, anti-Semitism and hate, through vandalism,

physical assault, and extremist speakers. For example, in 2001 there was an arson attempt at the Hillel House at the University of California, Davis. In May 2002 Jewish students, faculty and campus visitors were verbally assaulted and threatened following a pro-Israel rally organized by Hillel members at San Francisco State University. A group of counter-demonstrators allegedly hurled epithets at a few dozen organizers, screaming slogans such as “Go back to Russia” and “Hitler did not finish the job.” In May 2006 the University of California, Irvine hosted the “Holocaust in the Holy Land” conference which featured a lecture called “Israel: The Fourth Reich.” Throughout the conference students distributed Holocaust denial literature.

Today, while daily protests are less common, Israel’s detractors continue to organize rallies, vigils, editorials in campus publications, lectures, “teach-ins” and other activities. “Anti-Israel” and “Israel Apartheid” weeks have become annual events on campuses across the country. Additionally, several unsuccessful campaigns were launched including an effort to pressure colleges and universities to divest from companies doing business with Israel. There have also been cases where anti-Israel bias has spread into the classroom where professors have reportedly penalized students based on their political perspective.

The most dramatic change to the campus environment is the presence of a more sophisticated type of criticism that has become popular within the academic community and among many extremist speakers. Based on former United States President Jimmy Carter’s 2006 book *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*, and respected academics John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt’s 2007 book, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, many focused on a so-called ‘Israel lobby’ as the source behind America’s foreign policy in the Middle East (which they believe to be contrary to U.S. interests) and a nefarious force stifling criticism of Israel. These arguments received wide play on campuses.

## **BEING POSITIVE: MAKING THE CASE FOR ISRAEL ON CAMPUS**

Pro-Israel students **must be proactive** rather than merely reactive on campus. It is most constructive to **make a positive case for Israel**, instead of focusing solely on refuting and counteracting anti-Israel agitation. The latter puts you in the position of always playing catch-up and acting within the parameters of an agenda that is set by others. When you move first, with positive pro-Israel programming, you get to define the issues of the debate and force the anti-Israel forces to respond to you.

Remember, the people you want to educate are not the anti-Israel activists, who may never come to agree with you. Rather, you need to focus on campus opinion leaders, minority groups, and the general campus population who are amenable to hearing the case for Israel. A number of your peers may become important public and private sector decision makers in the years to come after they graduate.

In making an affirmative case, you will need a long-term, though flexible, plan of action in which you specify your target audiences and come to know them well. Such a campaign requires that you develop a level of expertise on the complicated and vexing issues of the Middle East conflict. **You need to know your facts**, which can only come through a lot of reading and some hard work. Most of all, you will need to **communicate to others what Israel stands for and what it means to the Jewish people**.

Here are some specifics to consider:

- **Bring effective pro-Israel speakers and programs to campus**, at least once each semester. Consider bringing in non-political speakers and programs as well as speakers and programs focusing on current political events. Israeli academics on sabbatical in the United States are a major resource in this regard. When on campus, they should not only be used for evening, extracurricular events but should be employed as guest lecturers in appropriate courses as well. In these, they will have access to many more students than would come to the evening event. Set up an interview for them with a reporter from the campus newspaper and schedule an appearance on campus radio (and TV if available). Always reach out to the campus media and invite them to cover your events.
- Provide **concise, well-written and researched letters, op-ed**, and longer articles to the campus media. Do so on a regular basis, but do not overdo it. These submissions should not always come from the same person or small group. Encourage sympathetic faculty to participate in this enterprise. Make sure when referring to Israeli and other international policies that you are clear, accurate, and fair. Focus on current issues and concerns, rather than devolving into arguments about the rights of Jews to be in Israel in the first place; this kind of argumentation often will lead to counterproductive conversation and will only serve to offend religious individuals on both sides.
- Have a supply of **pro-Israel literature on hand** and seek to distribute it widely. Download and post such material on your group's Web site as well.
- Utilize web sites like MySpace™, YouTube™, Facebook, IvyGate, and other on-campus and college political blogs to distribute positive messages about Israel to your peers.
- Be in regular touch with Jewish organizations such as ADL, AIPAC, and the Israeli Embassy and Consulates that can be a source of timely information, literature, speakers, and programs.

## RESPONDING TO THE ANTI-ISRAEL CAMPAIGN

- Jewish groups on campus should **maintain routine contact with appropriate personnel in the university** administration (i.e. Student Affairs) and campus security. Keep them informed on a regular basis of national trends in anti-Israel activity (e.g. divestment campaigns, acts of violence, harassment, etc.) that should concern them. Such regular contact will provide easier access when and if an emergency situation emerges. Consider appointing one individual or a small group to serve as designated liaisons.
- While anti-Israel protests are protected by free speech rights, the protests cannot disrupt normal school functions, obstruct student access to school buildings, create pervasive, severe, or persistent harassment of students, or physically intimidate or threaten individual students. When the protests cross the line, **take action to alert the university** and assist in pursuing action against that conduct.
- **Respond with accurate information** in a succinct fashion to specific anti-Israel materials found in the campus media. It is most effective to do so in the form of op-eds or letters to the editor. Generally do so once, since continuing back and forth statements get tiresome to most readers and prove to be counterproductive.
- In some situations, pro-Israel counter-demonstrations may be an effective and appropriate tactic. Keep the counter-demonstrators apart from the anti-Israel demonstrators so as to minimize the possibility of physical confrontation. **Always be civil and come prepared** with written statements for the campus and local media. Have a supply of literature that refutes the standard anti-Israel propaganda available for the general public as well. Be sure to frequently cite unbiased sources in your arguments – using only overtly pro-Israel sources can be criticized and dismissed easily.
- When an on-campus panel discussion excludes knowledgeable pro-Israel speakers, make the case to the administration and to the general campus community that this event **violates the accepted standards of fairness and balance**. This point is especially vital when such events are sponsored/co-sponsored by academic departments or by the university itself. Our efforts in this regard will prove to be persuasive when we are able to affirm rather than to challenge the basic shared norms of the academic enterprise.
- When or if anti-Semitic materials and/or rhetoric should appear, you should publicly condemn it and seek to **educate the administration and the general campus community to the dangers of hate on campus**. Campus administrators and leaders should be urged to denounce strongly such manifestations of bigotry when they appear. Keep in mind that most anti-Israel material, however obnoxious, is not anti-Semitic. When in doubt, contact Jewish organizations for guidance.

- If you believe your professor is teaching about the Middle East in an unbalanced manner, you should follow established academic procedures and discuss the matter first with your instructor. Do so in a calm and non-polemical fashion. Try to suggest ways in which your concerns might be addressed (for instance, inviting in guest speakers and assigning supplementary readings which might balance the existing syllabus). If this does not lead to a satisfactory solution, you should next bring your concerns to the Chair of the Department. Subsequent levels of appeal would go to the Academic Dean, the Academic Provost and ultimately to the Vice Presidential and Presidential levels. If such appeals are mounted, be sure to have documentation of your claims: including statements from other students, detailed class notes, the course syllabus and assigned readings.
- **Be careful with the language and rhetoric you use.** It is easy to fall into arguments concerning “us” and “them” and to generalize about Palestinians when you are actually only referring to specific groups of Palestinian terrorists, political groups, or sympathizers.

## **SOME LONG-TERM CONSIDERATIONS**

- Work to build personal relationships and ongoing, **multi-issue coalitions** with other groups on campus. These include natural allies such as college young Democrats and Republicans and others such as African American, Asian American, LGBT, and Latino/a student groups. Often, when Jewish groups publicly support issues of concern to them, they will support Jewish issues (or at least remain neutral) in turn.
- Encourage engaged Jewish students to be **active in key areas of student life** like student government, public affairs forums, campus newspapers, other media, etc. One can be influential in campus decision-making bodies, which are always seeking volunteers, by simply showing up and becoming involved in their work.
- The pro-Israel burden should not fall on too few shoulders. Overextended students tend to burn out after a while. Get many involved and pay attention to the **development of new leadership who can continue the effort** when their older colleagues leave the campus.

**Encourage Jewish and non-Jewish students to travel to Israel to gain a first-hand perspective.**

# GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS AND EVENTS IN ISRAEL'S HISTORY

---

## **Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade**

The Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade was formed as the military arm of Yasir Arafat's political party, Fatah, shortly after the outbreak of the Palestinian violence in September 2000. Financed in part by the Palestinian Authority, it conducted some of the conflict's deadliest and most destructive attacks on Israeli civilians, and was designated a foreign terrorist organization by the U.S. in 2002. Israeli officials uncovered proof of financial payments made by high level Palestinian officials, including Yasir Arafat, to members of the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade who were carrying out suicide terrorist attacks.

Like Fatah, the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade is a secular organization whose ideology – although colored by Islam – is centered on Palestinian nationalism.

Several of its leaders were killed or arrested during the "Second Intifada." Its leader Marwan Barghouti is currently serving five consecutive life sentences in Israel. Its major operations include the January 2002 Jerusalem bombing by the first female suicide bomber, killing 1 and injuring 100 and twin suicide bombings in downtown Tel Aviv on January 5, 2003, killing 22 and injuring 100. The Brigade also claimed responsibility (along with Islamic Jihad) for the April 17, 2006 suicide bombing near Tel Aviv's old bus station, killing 9 and wounding 40. The Brigade has also been responsible for scores of rockets launched from the Gaza Strip targeting civilians in southern Israel.

## **The Annapolis Conference**

On November 27, 2007, representatives of 46 nations gathered at Annapolis, Maryland for a U.S.-hosted conference intended to renew Israeli Palestinian peace talks. Notably, the conference was attended by Arab states such as Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and Syria, none of whom have diplomatic relations with Israel.

At the opening of the one-day conference, President Bush read a Joint Agreement signed by Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas in which they stated their mutual desire for peace, declaring: "In furtherance of the goal of two states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security, we agree to immediately launch good-faith bilateral negotiations in order to conclude a peace treaty, resolving all outstanding issues, including all core issues without exception, as specified in previous agreements."

Israel and the Palestinian Authority pledged to renew negotiations – with the leaders meeting bi-weekly to negotiate – with the goal of a final status agreement by the end of 2008. The parties pledged to fulfill the obligations set out in the 2002 Roadmap, with the United States serving as monitor of implementation. (The Roadmap has the Quartet serving this purpose.)

### **Arab Economic Boycott**

The Arab Economic Boycott was initiated in 1946 by the newly formed League of Arab States. The boycott was aimed at preventing the continued growth of the Jewish community in Mandate-era Palestine by boycotting the goods and services produced by Jews in the region. After Israel's establishment in 1948, the Arab League expanded the boycott in an effort to undermine Israel's economic viability.

The Arab boycott operated on several levels, targeting not only Israel, but also governments, companies, organizations, and individuals around the world with ties to Israel. The boycott weakened through the 1980s due to the decline in Arab economic power. The 1979 Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty also served to further lessen the effects. The greatest change occurred after the signing of the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles in September 1993, the start of the so-called "Oslo Process" where there was significantly less adherence to the boycott by Arab countries.

The United States was the only nation in the world to adopt comprehensive anti-boycott legislation. U.S. legislation prohibits American citizens or businesses to refuse to do business with Israel at the request of a foreign government and prohibits furnishing information about business relations with Israel or blacklisted companies at the request of a foreign government.

Unlike the United States, response to the Arab boycott of Israel in Europe and the Far East was ambivalent at best. In the 1970s, the European Economic Community (EEC) included anti-boycott provisions in the EEC constitution and anti-discrimination clauses in economic agreements with Arab states but did not enforce these clauses.

In the Far East, the impact of the Arab boycott on Israeli relations with Japan and Korea was severe. Until June 1998, no Japanese government minister had ever visited Israel – although today Japanese products are ubiquitous throughout Israel. Likewise, South Korea's strong compliance with the Arab boycott of Israel made contact non-existent.

From its initiation, the Arab boycott undoubtedly impaired Israel's economic growth, but it has never been able to thwart that growth altogether. While the actual cost is impossible to quantify, the Federation of Israeli Chambers of Commerce estimates that due to the boycott, Israel's annual exports were 10 percent smaller than might otherwise be expected. Despite the restrictions placed upon it, Israel has grown into a technological power, with strong economic ties to many countries.

While the scope and power of the official Arab boycott has lessened in the past decade, organized campaigns by pro-Palestinian groups in Europe and the United States promoting grassroots economic sanctions against Israel have gained momentum. Among these efforts are calls for the boycotting of Israeli goods, campaigns to prevent the participation of Israeli professionals and academics in international conferences and projects, and initiatives to “divest” university, church and city investment portfolios from Israeli companies and companies that do business with Israel. Most of these initiatives, particularly divestment campaigns on campuses and city councils, have failed. However, the campaigns have been somewhat effective among several mainline Protestant church groups in the United States and a number of British trade unions. In 2005, the Presbyterian Church USA, for example, passed a resolution calling for divestment which has since been overturned. In 2007, the British National Union of Journalists and the University and College Union, voted in favor of resolutions supporting boycotts of Israel. (The UCU later determined that any discussion of a boycott violates British anti-discrimination law and announced they would not implement the resolution.) These votes are unlikely to have a serious practical impact on Israeli academics, universities and companies doing business with Israel, however they serve the public-relations goals of anti-Israel activists by publicly demonizing and singling out Israel. Such boycott initiatives are not covered by American anti-boycott legislation.

### **The British Mandate**

After World War I the League of Nations was charged with dividing the territories previously controlled by the German and Ottoman Empires. The League of Nations established the mandate system in which they allocated the territories which were considered to be more advanced. Under this rubric and as part of the Treaty of Sevres which divided the Ottoman Empire, the British were granted control over Transjordan (modern day Jordan) and Palestine (modern-day Israel, with the West Bank and Gaza Strip) in 1923. The British took little interest in achieving self-governance and exerted absolute control over all of the governmental affairs in Palestine.

In 1946, however, Transjordan declared its independence, ending British rule in the area. Growing Jewish-Palestinian violence and attacks on British personnel by some Jewish extremists led Britain to announce that it sought to cede control of the area, and the issue of sovereignty over Palestine was referred to the United Nations.

### **Camp David Accords/Israel-Egypt Peace Agreement 1978/1979**

The Israel-Egypt peace agreement was a watershed event and marked the first such agreement between the Jewish state and an Arab state. The breakthrough came in November 1977 when Egyptian President Anwar Sadat made a bold and unprecedented visit to Israel and in a speech at the Israeli Knesset (parliament) addressed the Israeli people with words of reconciliation and peace.

Formal negotiations ensued the following September when Sadat and Israeli Prime

Minister Menachem Begin joined U.S. President Jimmy Carter at the Camp David presidential retreat in Maryland. The so-called “Camp David Accords” of September 17, 1978 were based on U.N. resolutions 242 and 338, and were meant to constitute a basis for peace not only between Egypt and Israel, but also to reach “a just, comprehensive, and durable settlement of the Middle East conflict” for all neighbors willing to negotiate with Israel. Israel agreed to withdraw from all of the Sinai within three years and to dismantle its air bases near the Gulf of Aqaba and the town of Yamit; Egypt promised full diplomatic relations with Israel, and to allow Israel passage through the Suez Canal, the Straits of Tiran, and the Gulf of Aqaba. The accords also stipulated a framework for solving the problem of the West Bank and Gaza.

On March 26, 1979, the two countries signed a peace treaty on the White House lawn. Sadat, having gone out on a limb for the peace treaty, was vilified in the Arab world, and was assassinated in 1981.

The groundbreaking Israel-Egypt peace paved the way for subsequent Israeli negotiations and treaties with Jordan and the Palestinians. Relations between Cairo and Jerusalem have not been warm, and the two nations share what is commonly referred to as a “cold peace.” However, in recent years, Egypt has played a key behind-the-scenes role in facilitating Israeli-Palestinian negotiations and helping prepare the Palestinian Authority for the Israeli disengagement from Gaza. In December 2004, Israel, Egypt and the U.S. signed a joint free trade agreement.

### **Camp David Summit 2000**

The Camp David Summit was convened by U.S. President Bill Clinton on July 11, 2000, to bring together Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Chairman Arafat at Camp David for intensive negotiations for a final status agreement. By July 25, President Clinton announced that the Summit had failed and that no agreement had been reached. President Clinton publicly acknowledged that Prime Minister Barak had shown “particular courage and vision and an understanding of the historical importance of the moment.”

Barak entered the summit convinced that a final agreement with the Palestinians was reachable. According to first-hand accounts, he offered Palestinians an ambitious peace package which included far-reaching concessions on Jerusalem, borders, settlements, refugees and other issues. Barak’s offer reportedly included: an Israeli redeployment from as much as ninety-five percent of the West Bank and one hundred percent of the Gaza Strip and the creation of a Palestinian state in that area; the uprooting of isolated Jewish settlements in the areas to be transferred to Palestinian control; Palestinian control over parts of Jerusalem; and “religious sovereignty” over the Temple Mount. In return, Barak wanted the final status agreement to include an “end of conflict” clause under which the parties would pledge that all issues between them were now resolved and further claims would not be made at a future date. According to the accounts of the participants, Chairman Arafat refused Israel’s offer and clung to maximalist positions, particularly on

Jerusalem and refugees. The Palestinian delegation did not offer any counter-proposals.

On his return to Israel, Barak said: "Today I return from Camp David, and can look into the millions of eyes and say with regret: We have not yet succeeded. We did not succeed because we did not find a partner prepared to make decisions on all issues. We did not succeed because our Palestinian neighbors have not yet internalized the fact that in order to achieve peace, each side has to give up some of their dreams; to give, not only to demand." Barak later said that at Camp David, Yasir Arafat, and his true intentions, were "unmasked."

Faced with criticism after abandoning the negotiations at Camp David and the turn to violence barely two months later, Palestinians publicly declared that the failure of Camp David was due to lack of preparation by the Americans, personality differences between Barak and Arafat, and by Barak's "take-it-or-leave-it" negotiating posture. Many Israeli and American high-level officials who were at Camp David dismiss these excuses. Instead, Camp David demonstrated that Arafat and the Palestinian leadership had unrealistic expectations that they could force Israel to concede to their maximalist demands without making important compromises of their own. While there were additional negotiating sessions in October and December at the Egyptian resort of Taba, they were conducted in the midst of persistent Palestinian violence, and no agreement was reached.

### **Disengagement**

In December 2003, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, a long-time advocate for settlements, announced plans for Israel to unilaterally disengage from the entire Gaza Strip and from four settlements in the northern West Bank.

In a policy address to the annual Herzlyia Conference, Sharon argued that in the absence of a serious Palestinian peace partner and amidst ongoing Palestinian terrorism, Israel needed to take unilateral steps to ensure its own security and improve conditions on the ground. Sharon stated: "...it is a step Israel will take in the absence of any other option, in order to improve its security." "The purpose of the disengagement plan is to reduce terrorism as much as possible, and grant Israeli citizens the maximum level of security. The process of disengagement will lead to an improvement in the quality of life, and will help strengthen the Israeli economy." The plan was approved by Israel's cabinet in June 2004 and by the Israeli Knesset in October 2004 and mechanisms were put in place to implement the pull-out, including the establishment of a "disengagement authority."

The disengagement plan required the uprooting and resettlement of 25 Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip and northern West Bank. Many of these settlers had lived in the area for decades and built lives, families and businesses there.

Public opinion polls showed that the majority of Israelis supported the disengagement. Supporters of the plan argued that this painful move was necessary

to protect Israel in the long term. They argued that that the cost of protecting 8,000-plus Israelis living in the midst of one million-plus Palestinians was hurting Israel economically and socially. The disengagement would also allow Israel's security apparatus to better protect those West Bank settlements which are more heavily populated, of clearer strategic or historical importance to the State, and likely to be annexed to Israel in a final status agreement with the Palestinians. Finally, they argued that an Israeli presence in the Gaza Strip was always intended to be temporary, and that it was tacitly understood that Israel would give up control of Gaza and uproot its settlements as part of any negotiated final agreement with the Palestinians.

Opponents of the plan argued that Israel was retreating from Gaza "under fire" – that the decision to disengage was a capitulation to Palestinian terrorism, and not in the context of mutually agreed concessions. They argued that this move would be perceived as a show of weakness by the Palestinians and the Arab world, and rather than strengthening Israel's security, would lead to increased threats and attacks in the future. Some opponents rejected the plan because it called for the ceding of the area given its role in Jewish history. Others were opposed in principle to the very idea of uprooting Jews from their homes.

Opponents of the plan organized large demonstrations in the period leading up to and during the disengagement, and groups traveled to the Gaza settlements where they staged (primarily) non-violent protests against the evacuations.

While initial plans called for an evacuation of all settlements by September 15, the army's operation was much quicker. Moreover, despite predictions of widespread "civil war" and amidst protests and acts of civil disobedience by some settlers and other opponents, the evacuations went remarkably smoothly and civilly. The disengagement officially began on August 17 and by August 22, all settlers had been evacuated from the Gaza Strip. The evacuation of residents of the four settlements in the West Bank was completed by August 23. The Israel Defense Forces officially left Gaza on September 12.

It was hoped that the Palestinian Authority would ensure a smooth transition of this area to full Palestinian control, and that many structures in the former settlements – including the extensive greenhouses – would be used to benefit Palestinian housing and industry. Indeed, James Wolfensohn, the U.S. special envoy to the Middle East and former president of the World Bank, raised \$14 million in private donations to purchase the greenhouses from their Israeli owners so that Palestinians could take over these profitable enterprises. However, in the immediate aftermath of the Israeli withdrawal, Palestinians entered the former Israeli settlements and burned buildings – including synagogues – and materials from buildings and greenhouses were looted. The greenhouses are now operational under Palestinian administration, and there is some building in the settlements for Palestinian industry, educational institutions, and for private housing.

The evacuated settlers were compensated for the loss of their homes and businesses. However, many have yet to find permanent housing or employment, and among these former Gaza settlers there is much dissatisfaction regarding the Government's assistance and responsiveness to their situation.

While the Israeli military fully withdrew from the Gaza Strip, there are ongoing security concerns, particularly following the Hamas take-over of Gaza in June 2007. Most serious is the continual launching of Kassam rockets by Palestinian terrorist organizations from Gaza locations. Since August 2005, Palestinian terrorist groups have launched thousands of rocket attacks at vulnerable southern Israeli cities such as Sderot and nearby environs, landing in or near private homes, schools and day care and recreation centers. Gaza has also served as a base for other Palestinian attacks against Israel, such as the Hamas attack of a military installation inside Israel in June 2006, during which two Israeli soldiers were killed, and Israeli Cpl. Gilad Shalit was kidnapped.

### **Founding of the State of Israel 1948**

Israel's independence was officially declared in Tel-Aviv on Friday May 14, 1948 by Zionist leader David Ben-Gurion, the day the British Mandate over Palestine was officially terminated. Ben-Gurion proclaimed:

...the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine, to be called Israel...The State of Israel will be open to the immigration of Jews from all countries of their dispersion; will promote development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; will be based on the precepts of liberty, justice and peace taught by the Hebrew Prophets; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of race, creed, or sex; will guarantee full freedom of conscience, worship, education and culture; will safeguard the sanctity and inviolability of the shrines and Holy Places of all religions; and will dedicate itself to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations...We offer peace and unity to all the neighboring states and their peoples, and invite them to cooperate with the independent Jewish nation for the common good of all.

The political, social and economic institutions which governed Jewish life in the pre-state period served as the infrastructure of the new state. Despite the euphoria of the moment, Israel faced imminent disaster with an expected invasion by Arab nations who rejected the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Outnumbered in men and arms, the new Israeli army was attacked from all directions. In addition, the fledgling state had to deal with the huge challenge of absorbing shiploads of immigrants who arrived daily – many penniless Holocaust survivors and refugees from Arab states.

### **Hamas**

Hamas is an Islamic extremist terrorist organization based in the West Bank and Gaza strip that calls for the eradication of the State of Israel. Both the United States and the European Union have designated Hamas as a terrorist organization.

Following internecine fighting between Hamas and Fatah in June 2007, Hamas now controls the Gaza Strip.

Hamas (the Arabic acronym for Harakat Al-Muqawama Islamiya fi Filistin, or the Islamic Resistance Movement in Palestine) was established in 1988 by Sheikh Ahmad Yassin, then a preacher with the Muslim Brotherhood in Gaza. Its ultimate goal is the establishment of an Islamic Palestinian state ruled by Islamic theocratic law in place of the State of Israel.

The Hamas covenant, issued in 1988, is replete with anti-Semitism, and echoes the notorious *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and charges Jews with an international conspiracy to gain control of the world. In Hamas' world-view, Islamic precepts forbid a Jewish state in the area known as Palestine, and the Jewish people have no legitimate connection to the land of Israel. As its covenant proclaims, "The land of Palestine is an Islamic trust... It is forbidden to anyone to yield or concede any part of it... Israel will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it..." To this end, the leaders of Hamas have denounced compromise with Israel as a betrayal of the Palestinian cause.

Funding for the group has traditionally come from Iran, Muslim charities around the world and sympathetic sources in the Gulf and Saudi Arabia. Syria also offers support by Hamas, and its top political leader, Khaled Mashaal, is based in Damascus. Hamas is both a terrorist organization and a mass social, political and religious movement. It operates schools, medical clinics and youth groups. The division of Hamas into military and political/social wings has led many observers to erroneously assume that the social wing of Hamas is completely separate from its military wing. However, funds raised for the social programs of Hamas free up other funds for the military wing. Moreover, Hamas' military wing utilizes the organization's social wing for indoctrination and recruitment. The social, cultural, religious and educational institutions of Hamas are well-known venues for anti-Israel and anti-Jewish hatred and serve as recruitment centers for suicide bombers.

Since 1994, Hamas has been the main organization perpetrating terrorist attacks in major Israeli cities with targets including shopping malls, cafes, buses and hotels. Its most deadly attacks include the March 2002 suicide bombing of the Park Hotel in Netanya, killing 30 and injuring 140 during their Passover seder; the August 2001 suicide bombing of the Sbarro pizzeria in Jerusalem killing 15 and injuring 130; and the June 2001 suicide bombing at the Dolphinarium nightclub in Tel Aviv, killing 21 and injuring 120, most of them youths. Following the Israeli disengagement from the Gaza Strip, Hamas has been behind the rocket attacks against southern Israel.

Hamas entered the Palestinian political arena and secured nearly half of the municipal seats up for grabs in the January 2005 Palestinian elections. In the January 2006 parliamentary elections, Hamas had tremendous success and won 74 seats in the 132-seat legislature, with Fatah earning a disappointing 45 seats.

Following the 2006 election, Hamas leader Ismail Haniyeh became Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority while Mahmoud Abbas remained President, creating a so-called “unity government.” The international community established a policy of isolating Hamas, and suspended financial aid to the Hamas-led Palestinian Authority until it met three conditions: recognize Israel’s right to exist, renounce the use of violence and terrorism and accept previously negotiated Israeli-Palestinian agreements. Hamas refused to comply with the conditions.

In June 2006, Palestinian terrorists, including members of the military wing of Hamas, tunneled under the border fence in the southern Gaza Strip and attacked an Israeli military installation inside Israeli borders, killing 2 Israel soldiers, and kidnapped Cpl. Gilad Shalit, age 19. Shalit continues to be held captive.

In June 2007, tensions between Hamas and Fatah reached a boiling point and Palestinian-on-Palestinian violence broke out in Gaza. Within a few days, Hamas prevailed. Palestinian Authority President Abbas dissolved the Hamas-led government and declared he would govern based on emergency powers. As a result, Gaza is administered by Hamas, and continues to be isolated by the international community. The West Bank is under the sole administration of the Fatah-led Palestinian Authority, which enjoys international support.

### **Hezbollah**

Hezbollah (“Party of G-d”) is a terrorist organization, based in Lebanon, whose goal is the destruction of Israel. In that pursuit it has attacked Israeli and Jewish targets worldwide. It is also responsible for infamous attacks against American military installations in Lebanon in the early 1980s.

Hezbollah, a Shi’ite Muslim group, is financed and armed by Iran and enjoys full backing from Syria. Hezbollah was founded with the help of Iranian Revolutionary Guards who traveled to the Bekaa Valley in Lebanon in 1982 to fight Israel following the Israeli incursion into south Lebanon. According to its 1985 platform, Hezbollah advocates the establishment of an “Islamic Republic” in Lebanon. It also states: “The conflict with Israel is viewed as a central concern. This is not only limited to the IDF presence in Lebanon. Rather, the complete destruction of the State of Israel and the establishment of Islamic rule over Jerusalem is an expressed goal.”

In recent years, Hezbollah has attempted to reinvent itself as a political party. The party enjoys solid support from the country’s Shi’ite community (which comprises 40 percent of Lebanon's population). The party secured a substantial bloc of seats in the Spring 2005 “Syria-free” parliamentary elections in Lebanon. Hezbollah and its Shi’ite ally Amal won 35 seats in the 128-seat Parliament (of which 64 are allocated to Muslims).

In the early and mid 1980s Hezbollah was responsible for numerous attacks against U.S. installations in Lebanon, most infamously the 1983 attack on the U.S. Marines barracks in Beirut, which killed 241 servicemen. Hezbollah is responsible for scores of attacks against Israeli forces in south Lebanon and civilians in northern Israel.

The Syrians, who effectively controlled Lebanon from 1976 on, allowed Hezbollah to operate along the Israeli border with impunity. Analysts argue that Syria has long preferred a proxy battle with Israel via the Lebanese border (using Hezbollah) to escalation on its own border with Israel.

In September 2004, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1559, calling on Syria to remove its troops from Lebanese territory and for Hezbollah to disarm. In April 2005, under massive international pressure, Syria withdrew its forces from the country, ending a 29-year military occupation of Lebanon. But the withdrawal of Syria's forces did not stop its support for Hezbollah, which continued to amass a huge stockpile of weapons, including longer range rockets capable of striking farther into Israeli territory, with direct assistance from Syria and Iran.

Since Israel's unilateral withdrawal from Lebanon in May 2000, Hezbollah has continued its unprovoked attacks on Israel. On July 12, 2006, Hezbollah terrorists attacked Israel in a cross-border raid, killing eight Israeli soldiers and kidnapping two others – Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev. The assault sparked a month-long conflict, known as the Second Lebanon War, with Hezbollah launching thousands of Katyusha rockets at Israel's northern cities and Israel targeting Hezbollah positions throughout Lebanon with air strikes and, eventually, ground forces. A cessation of hostilities was declared after the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 1701, which called for a phased withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon and the deployment of an expanded international UNIFIL force working alongside Lebanese troops to re-assert security control of south Lebanon. The resolution required Hezbollah to completely disarm and called for Lebanon to assert its sovereignty over the entire nation.

Hezbollah's continuing operations in Lebanese civilian centers violate international humanitarian law and previous U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Hezbollah, with Iranian support, is also believed to be responsible for a number of terrorist incidents in the wider Middle East, Western Europe, Asia, and Latin America, including two bombings in Buenos Aires – the 1993 bombing of the Israeli embassy and the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish community building.

Hezbollah also runs a satellite television network, Al-Manar ("The Beacon"), which broadcasts Hezbollah's messages of hate and violence worldwide. Hezbollah owns and operates the station, staffing it with members of Hezbollah and directing its programming and communications. Al-Manar is more than Hezbollah's mouthpiece – it is its tool for incitement to terror against Americans and Israelis. It broadcasts images of Iraqi devastation attributed to the U.S.-led action with voiceovers calling

for “death to America,” glorifies suicide bombings and calls for the recruitment of Palestinian “martyrs” to kill Jews. Al-Manar appears to be the source of the conspiracy theory that claimed that 4,000 Israelis (or Jews) were absent from their jobs at the World Trade Center on September 11, thereby implying that Israel was in some way behind the attack. The story was posted on its Web site on September 17, 2001 and picked up by extremists around the world. Al-Manar’s messages of hate and violence are also often accompanied by anti-Semitic themes, such as the medieval blood libel. Al-Manar is also a conduit to channel money to Hezbollah – openly and actively soliciting funds on the air and on its Web site. Since 2004, the European Union, France and other countries have taken steps to ban Al-Manar from transmitting within their borders. Hezbollah was declared a terrorist entity by the United States in 2004.

### **The Intifada 1987-1990**

In December 1987, collective Palestinian frustration erupted in the popular uprising against Israeli rule known as the Intifada, or “shaking off.” At first a spontaneous outburst, the Intifada developed into a well-organized rebellion. Masses of civilians attacked Israeli troops with stones, axes, Molotov cocktails, hand grenades, and firearms supplied by Fatah, killing and wounding soldiers and civilians. Israeli troops, trained for combat, were not prepared to fight this kind of war. Amid confusing directives, abuses occurred.

The Intifada petered out by 1990, with most of its leadership arrested. Nonetheless, it had a tremendous impact on Israeli public opinion and policymaking throughout the ensuing decade. While many Israelis were outraged by the Palestinian violence and angered by the danger their family members in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) encountered in the territories, the Intifada intensified the Israeli longing for normalcy and an end to the conflict, creating consensus for the peace negotiations of the 1990s.

For the Palestinians, the Intifada created a new cadre of leadership based in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. These youths were supporters of the PLO leadership in Tunis, but did not consider themselves accountable to it. Many of the youths most active in the Intifada later became officials in the Palestinian Authority.

### **The Second Intifada/Outbreak of Palestinian Violence September 2000**

Widespread Palestinian violence erupted on Friday, September 29, 2000 in the Old City of Jerusalem and in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The grassroots protests and violence soon turned to a campaign of deadly terrorism targeting Israeli civilians on buses, restaurants and on city streets. Over 1,000 Israelis were killed, and thousands severely injured in these attacks.

Palestinians claimed the outbreak of violence was “provoked” by the visit of then-Likud Party Chairman Ariel Sharon to the Temple Mount the previous day. Israeli leaders maintain that the violence was orchestrated by the Palestinian leadership pointing to other incidents of violence against Israeli targets in the Gaza Strip days

before the Sharon visit. Well before the Sharon visit there were incendiary calls for action in the Palestinian media and in sermons by religious leaders. Furthermore, on September 29, the PA closed the schools under its jurisdiction and coordinated the busing of demonstrators to the Temple Mount. Palestinian leaders have been quoted boasting that the violence was planned as early as July 2000.

The outbreak of Palestinian violence and terrorism was particularly disheartening for Israelis, especially those who were supportive of negotiations with the Palestinians, because it erupted just as the most serious negotiations for a final status agreement between Israel and the Palestinians were being pursued. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak had offered the Palestinians far greater concessions on Jerusalem, settlements, and territory than ever anticipated. Yet, the Palestinians refused the Israeli offer and turned to a campaign of violence.

In the initial weeks, there was a popular element to the violence (commonly referred to by Palestinians as the Al-Aqsa Intifada or the Second Intifada), with large demonstrations in some Palestinian cities. Intermingled with the civilians at these demonstrations were armed Palestinian gunmen, who often used the cover of the crowd to shoot at Israeli installations. During this period, a Palestinian mob in Ramallah attacked two off-duty Israeli reservists, lynched them, and celebrated their deaths. In a short time, grassroots participation in the violence ended, and the Palestinians turned to directly attacking Israeli civilian centers, military installations, vehicles, and civilians through suicide bombings, drive-by shootings, and rocket launchings.

The Palestinian Authority was involved in the violence against Israel through PA-affiliated militia groups such as Fatah's Tanzim and the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade. The PA authorized the members of the Tanzim to conduct armed warfare against Israeli soldiers and civilians and encouraged Palestinian children and teenagers to participate in the early demonstrations to provide cover for Palestinian militia shooting at Israelis. Israeli officials also maintain that the PA encouraged terrorist attacks against Israelis, and released Hamas and Islamic Jihad terrorists held in PA prisons. Israeli officials also uncovered proof of financial payments made by high level Palestinian officials, including Yasir Arafat, to members of the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade who were carrying out suicide terrorist attacks. The PA leadership, including Yasir Arafat, was also fully involved in numerous arms shipments that were intercepted by Israel en route to the Gaza coast, most notably a large cache found in January 2002 aboard the Karine A ship which was on its way from Iran to the Palestinian Authority.

Israel attempted to counter Palestinian violence in a variety of ways. Most directly, it engaged in military operations in the West Bank and Gaza Strip to destroy the terrorist infrastructure. A major incursion was in March-April 2002, following the March 22 Hamas suicide bombing of a Passover seder at a Netanya hotel which killed 29 and wounded 140 people. In 2003, the Government of Israel approved the building of a security fence or barrier, intended to prevent Palestinian terrorists from

reaching their civilian targets inside Israel.

Numerous international efforts were undertaken to end the crisis, including plans presented by a commission headed by former Senator George Mitchell (known as the Mitchell Plan, calling for an end to violence, Israeli confidence-building measures, followed by final status negotiations) as well as a timetable set out by CIA chief George Tenet (known as the Tenet Plan, calling for an end to Palestinian violence and terror, Israeli confidence building measures, followed by negotiations for a final status agreement). In September 2002, the United States, the European Union, the Russian Federation, and the United Nations (collectively dubbed The Quartet) announced its sponsorship of "A Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." The Roadmap, a phased peace plan, is still officially the working document for negotiations.

The "second Intifada" petered out slowly, due in part to Palestinian malaise as well as the effectiveness of Israeli military defense and the protective security fence which served to stymie many terrorist attempts.

### **Islamic Jihad**

Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) is a radical Islamic extremist organization inspired by the Iranian revolution of 1979. It was established by Palestinian students in Egypt who were admirers of the Iranian Revolution and the Muslim Brotherhood. Like Hamas, its expressed goal is the violent destruction of the State of Israel, which Islamic Jihad believes will then bring about the unification of the Arab and Islamic world, "purified of modern Western elements."

The PIJ carried out its first terror attacks against Israeli civilians and soldiers in mid-1986, half a year prior to the outbreak of the Intifada. It regards itself as part of the larger Islamic Jihad movement, which originated in Lebanon with the backing of Iran.

Unlike the larger and better-funded Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad does not manage social welfare programs; it concentrates instead on spectacular attacks against Israeli civilians and military forces, sometimes using women and children as suicide bombers. Its most deadly attacks include the October 2003 suicide bombing at the Maxim restaurant in Haifa, killing 22 and wounding 60; the June 2002 suicide bombing at Meggido junction, killing 18 and wounding 50; and the March 1996 suicide bombing of the Dizengoff shopping mall in Tel Aviv, killing 13 and injuring 75. Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility for the July 12, 2005 suicide attack on a Netanya shopping mall, killing 5 and wounding 90 and at the Netanya mall on December 5, 2005, killing 5 and wounding 50. The group claimed responsibility (along with the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade) for the April 17, 2006 bombing of the old central bus station in Tel Aviv, killing 11 and wounding 70 and the January 29, 2007 attack on a bakery in Eilat, which killed three.

Since the Israeli disengagement from Gaza in 2005, PIJ has been one of the main perpetrator of rocket attacks against civilian targets in southern Israel.

## **Jerusalem**

Jerusalem is Judaism's holiest city, and is also holy to Christianity and Islam.

The Jewish people are inextricably bound to the city of Jerusalem. No other city has played such a dominant role in the history, politics, culture, religion, national life and consciousness of a people as has Jerusalem in the life of Jewry and Judaism. From the time King David established the city as the capital of the Jewish state circa 1000 BCE, it has served as the symbol and most profound expression of the Jewish people's identity as a nation.

Since the exile, Jerusalem has embodied the Jewish yearning for the return to Zion. In their daily prayers, Jews worship in the direction of Jerusalem, and prayers for Jerusalem are incorporated throughout. Passover Seder tables have resonated with the refrain "Next Year in Jerusalem." With the brief exception of the Crusader period, no other people or state has made Jerusalem its capital.

Since King David's time, Jews have maintained a continuous presence in Jerusalem, except for a few periods when they were forcibly barred from living in the city by foreign rulers. Jews have constituted a majority of the city's inhabitants since 1880, and today, Jews represent over two-thirds of the city's population. Jerusalem is an important spiritual and historic center for Christianity. Jerusalem is central to the events of the New Testament. According to tradition, many events in Jesus' childhood and adulthood took place in Jerusalem, and it was in Jerusalem that he was tried, crucified and resurrected. Jerusalem took on added significance for Christianity when Queen Helena, the mother of Constantine (the Roman Emperor who adopted Christianity), designated the holy sites in Jerusalem associated with the last days of Jesus' life. The great churches built on these spots continue to attract streams of pilgrims, and are surrounded by Christians monasteries, convents, hospices, churches, and chapels.

Jerusalem is also a holy city for Muslims, who refer to it as "al-Quds" (the holy one). According to Islamic tradition, the Prophet Muhammad traveled to heaven via the rock which the Dome of the Rock currently envelops. The Prophet Muhammad and his followers initially turned to Jerusalem in prayer and although the direction was later changed towards Mecca, the sanctity of Jerusalem continued to be stressed in Islamic tradition. Jerusalem is considered Islam's third holiest city after Mecca and Medina. The 20th century saw a renewed emphasis on the sanctity of Jerusalem in Islamic religious tradition.

The only time Jerusalem was divided was between 1948-1967 when armistice lines drawn between the army of the newly declared State of Israel and invading Arab armies divided Jerusalem into two sectors, with Jordan occupying and annexing the eastern sector, including the Old City, and Israel retaining the western and southern parts of the city. Barbed wire divided the sides. In violation of the Armistice Agreement, Jordanians denied Jews access to and the right to worship at their holy sites, including the Western Wall. The 58 synagogues in the Jewish Quarter were

systematically destroyed and vandalized and Jewish cemeteries were desecrated.

Jerusalem was reunited under Israeli sovereignty as a result of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. Israel immediately passed the "Protection of Holy Places Law," which guarantees the sanctity of all holy sites and makes it a punishable offense to desecrate or deny freedom of access to them. Under Israeli rule, Christians and Muslims have always administered their own holy places and institutions and have had access to Israel's democratic court system in order to present any claim of violation of these rights.

Israel maintains that Jerusalem is the undivided and eternal capital of Israel. Palestinian leaders insist that all of East Jerusalem, including the Temple Mount, be the capital of an independent Palestinian state. During periods of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, Israeli officials floated creative solutions that might satisfy some Palestinian aspirations, including sovereignty over some Palestinian neighborhoods both inside and outside municipal Jerusalem.

### **Lebanon War 1982**

The Lebanon War was Israel's longest and most controversial war. In the mid-1970s, the PLO broadened its presence in Lebanon, establishing military training centers and escalating artillery and cross-border attacks on civilians in northern Israel. Following the attempted assassination of the Israeli ambassador in London, Israel attacked PLO targets in Lebanon on June 4, 1982. The PLO responded with rocket and artillery barrages, and Israel retaliated by sending ground troops into Lebanon, in a mission titled "Operation Peace for the Galilee."

While the original plan called for Israeli troops to undertake a 25-mile incursion to wipe out PLO positions in Southern Lebanon, Israeli troops on the ground quickly overran PLO positions in the south of Lebanon, destroyed Syrian installations in the Bekaa Valley, and reached Beirut by June 9. After battles in West Beirut, the PLO surrendered and agreed to evacuate to Tunisia in September.

On September 16, Defense Minister Ariel Sharon and Chief of Staff Rafael Eitan permitted Israel's Lebanese allies, the Christian Phalangist forces, to enter the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatilla with the purpose of rooting out remaining PLO forces who had evaded evacuation. The Phalangists, however, brutally massacred Palestinian civilians in the camp. Many Israelis were horrified by the incident, and on September 24, 400,000 gathered at the first of many demonstrations to protest the Lebanon War. The Government-appointed Kahane Commission released its report in February 1983 finding Sharon "indirectly responsible" and concluding that given the well-known Phalangist hatred of the Palestinians, he should have anticipated that they "were liable to commit atrocities." Sharon resigned as Defense Minister.

In 1983, Israel signed an agreement with Lebanon terminating the state of war between the neighbors. While the PLO state-within-a-state had been dismantled,

Syrian troops remained in Lebanon and the Christian-dominated Lebanese Government was too weak to control rival factions from attacking each other and Israel. A year later, under pressure from the Syrian government, Lebanon reneged on its agreement and the country remained volatile. Israeli troops completed a phased withdrawal from Lebanon in June 1985 and created a 9-mile-wide security zone in southern Lebanon along the border. The zone was intended to shield Israeli civilian settlements in the Galilee from cross-border attacks, and facilitated the capture of many terrorists. However, many Israeli soldiers continued to be killed in the security zone by terrorist groups supported by Iran and Syria, particularly Hezbollah.

The high number of casualties incurred in the South Lebanon security zone sparked widespread debate within Israel. In March 2000, the Israeli cabinet voted unanimously for a full troop withdrawal from Lebanon by July. The expectation was that such a withdrawal would be part of an agreement with Syria and Lebanon. However, after Syrian President Hafez al-Assad refused to continue talks with Israel, such coordination was not possible, and Prime Minister Ehud Barak authorized a unilateral withdrawal from Lebanon on May 24, 2000. Israel remained in the Sheba Farms/Har Dov region, which it has held since the 1967 Six Day War. The area is recognized by the United Nations as Syrian, not Lebanese territory, and thus should be the subject of Syrian-Israeli negotiations. Hezbollah insists that it is Lebanese territory and frequently attacks Israeli troops in the area, as well as along the border, and occasionally launches rocket attacks against northern Israeli cities.

### **Lebanon War of 2006**

On July 12, 2006, Hezbollah terrorists crossed the border from Lebanon into Israel and attacked a group of Israeli soldiers patrolling the border, killing eight soldiers and kidnapping two others – Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev. Israel responded with precision air strikes specifically aimed at Hezbollah positions and operational assets inside Lebanon; Hezbollah immediately unleashed a barrage of Katyusha rockets targeting civilian population centers in Israel's northern cities including Kiryat Shemona, Haifa and Safed. The rocket fire continued at an unprecedented pace of more than 100 per day, totaling nearly 4,000 rockets over the duration of the conflict which lasted close to five weeks.

Israel's air strikes targeted known Hezbollah positions including the offices of its leadership, weapons storage sites, bunkers and rocket launch sites. Israel sought to disable infrastructure used by Hezbollah including Beirut's airport and certain roads and bridges through which Iran and Syria supplied weaponry to Hezbollah. Air strikes were supported by limited ground incursions to specific villages in southern Lebanon near Israel's border followed by a broader ground offensive with the goal of expelling as many Hezbollah terrorists as possible from southern Lebanon.

Hezbollah – a U.S.-designated terrorist organization – has occupied the region south of the Litani River since shortly after Israel’s U.N.-certified withdrawal from Lebanon in 2000. Following that withdrawal, Hezbollah moved into the vacated area and established themselves in bunkers throughout civilian areas, despite the presence of UNIFIL observer troops stationed there under the terms of Security Council Resolution 1559. Since Israel’s withdrawal in 2000, Hezbollah has attacked Israel more than 20 times with cross-border raids and Katyusha rockets. Hezbollah terrorists live among civilians, store their weapons and hold meetings in civilian houses, and fire their rockets into Israel from civilian neighborhoods, in direct violation of international humanitarian law.

During the conflict, Hezbollah indiscriminately fired Katyusha rockets at Israeli population centers with the intent of harming innocent civilians. At least 157 Israelis were killed during the conflict and countless more injured. The rockets also drove nearly 400,000 Israelis from their homes in the north, while those remaining had to spend long periods in bomb shelters for the duration of the month-long conflict. Damage to northern Israel surpassed \$1.5 billion.

Israel responded with air strikes that were intended to hit only legitimate military targets and took extra steps to ensure minimal civilian casualties. In advance of strikes in civilian areas, Israel gave up a certain degree of surprise by dropping fliers and sending radio messages warning civilians to leave specific areas. Israel also employed precise ordnance rather than larger, more effective ordnance to avoid collateral damage. Despite Israel’s best efforts, the situation created on the ground by Hezbollah led to the temporary displacement of 800,000 Lebanese civilians and the death of an estimated 1,000 Lebanese. Hezbollah does not report its casualty figures, and many non-uniformed Hezbollah terrorists are suspected of being among the dead.

The conflict subsided with the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701, passed unanimously on August 11, 2006 and adopted by Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert’s Cabinet – also unanimously – on August 13, 2006. The resolution called for an immediate cessation of hostilities to be followed by a withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon during a simultaneous takeover of the territory by a 15,000-troop contingent of the Lebanese army and a 15,000-troop beefed-up UNIFIL force comprised of international troops. The resolution required that Lebanon assert its sovereignty over the entire country and forbade the rearming of terrorist militias in Lebanon. Nearly identical to Resolution 1559, which was passed in 2004 but never fully implemented, these stipulations require that Hezbollah be disarmed and not rearmed by any foreign powers, including most notably Iran and Syria.

Resolution 1701 mandated the “unconditional release” of the two Israeli soldiers kidnapped by Hezbollah. As of this writing, Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev have not been released and there has been no word as to their fate.

Following the cessation of the war, there was much criticism within Israel that while the country had no choice but to act against Hezbollah following its attack on Israeli soil, the military and country had been ill-prepared for the conflict and its soldiers ill-equipped. Prime Minister Olmert ordered a government commission of inquiry into the war. The resulting Winograd Commission issued its findings in April 2007 and January 2008 on the decision-making before and during the war by the Prime Minister, the Defense Minister, the Chief of Staff and others, concluding “we determine that there are very serious failings in these decisions and the way they were made.”

### **Madrid Peace Conference 1991**

In October/November 1991, just after the Gulf War, the United States and Russia convened an Arab-Israeli peace conference in Madrid. The historic conference marked the first time that Israel, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, and a Palestinian delegation (which was officially part of the Jordanian delegation) sat at the same table to negotiate. The participants agreed to establish two tracks for negotiations: a bilateral track for direct negotiations between Israel and Syria, Israel and Lebanon, and Israel and the Jordanian/Palestinian delegation; and a multilateral track for region-wide negotiations on issues such as water, environment, refugees, arms control and economic development.

A series of bilateral negotiation sessions were held in Washington over the next 18 months. The negotiations were significant on a symbolic level, but yielded very few practical results. A number of multilateral working groups were also convened, laying the groundwork for cooperative regional projects on issues such as the environment, water, arms control, economic development and refugees. The bilateral track was essentially halted by the surprise announcement of an Israeli-Palestinian agreement in August 1993.

### **The Oslo Accords/Oslo Process**

The “Oslo Process” refers to the Israeli-Palestinian negotiating process begun in September 1993 which established a framework for resolving the conflict.

In August 1993 the world was astonished to learn that secret negotiations in Oslo, Norway, between high-level Israelis and Palestinians, had led to the first Israeli-Palestinian agreement. The talks, initiated months earlier under the auspices of the Norwegian Foreign Ministry, had begun informally with low level Israeli and Palestinian diplomats and academics. But with growing success in the drafting of an agreement, the talks were upgraded and soon were conducted by high-level Israeli and Palestinian officials. On August 20 a draft of a “Declaration of Principles” (DOP) was initialed.

On September 9, Israel and the PLO exchanged letters of mutual recognition to precede the official signing of an agreement. In his letter to Prime Minister Rabin, Chairman Yasir Arafat recognized Israel's right to exist "in peace and security." Arafat renounced "the use of terrorism and other acts of violence." Arafat also pledged to revoke articles in the Palestinian National Covenant which deny Israel's right to exist. In a response to Arafat's letter, Rabin confirmed that "in light of the PLO commitments included in your letter, the Government of Israel has decided to recognize the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people and commence negotiations with the PLO within the Middle East peace process."

On September 13, 1993, the Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles (DOP) was signed by Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat in the presence of U.S. President Bill Clinton on the White House lawn amidst tremendous fanfare.

The DOP, the first in a series of what are known as the Oslo Accords, consisted of a carefully constructed two-phased timetable. The first phase, or the "interim period," was to last five years, during which time Israel would incrementally withdraw from Palestinian population centers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, while transferring administrative power to a soon-to-be-elected Palestinian Authority. The Palestinian Authority would be responsible for combating terrorism and coordinating security with Israel. The second phase was the "permanent status" or "final status" negotiations, to resolve "remaining issues, including: Jerusalem, refugees, settlements, security arrangements, borders, relations and cooperation with other neighbors, and other issues of common interest." A final status agreement would mark the official peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

The rationale behind the two-phased plan was to save the most difficult issues for last. While the drafters of the DOP did not believe these issues would be easy resolved, it was hoped that after building confidence and cooperation through the interim period, Israel and the Palestinians would be better able to tackle the most complex and divisive issues in the conflict.

Over the next six years a series of further interim agreements were signed, most significantly the September 1995 Oslo II Agreement and the October 1998 Wye River Accord. Following the implementation of these agreements, as of September 2000, over eighty-five percent of the Gaza Strip and 39.7 percent of the West Bank were under the control of the Palestinian Authority. Ninety-nine percent of the Palestinian population resided under the Palestinian Authority's jurisdiction.

The negotiations were supported by the majority of the Israeli population who believed that Israel needed to make difficult territorial concessions in the pursuit of peace. A very vocal minority, however, stood vehemently opposed to the agreements and the Government's policies. In November 1994, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by an Israeli anti-Oslo activist.

Throughout the interim period Palestinian terrorist groups conducted scores of terrorist attacks against Israeli civilian targets. Over the years, Israelis grew increasingly disenchanted with the Palestinian Authority who did little-to-nothing to control terrorist organizations, and continued to spread anti-Israel and anti-Semitic propaganda.

### **Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)**

The PLO was founded in 1964 during the first Arab summit in Cairo, where leaders of 13 Arab nations pledged to take a more active role for the “liberation of Palestine.” Since that time it has declared itself the representative of the Palestinian people and their nationalist aspirations. The PLO has operated primarily as an umbrella organization for six Palestinian groups, most prominently, Yasir Arafat’s Fatah group. In 1969, Arafat was elected PLO Chairman, and Fatah became the dominant party in the PLO.

The guiding ideology of the PLO was outlined in the Palestine National Charter or Covenant which was adopted at its founding in 1964 and amended in 1968. The Charter functioned as the PLO’s constitution, and contained 33 articles calling for the destruction of the State of Israel. In June 1974 the PLO adopted its “Phased Program” which declared “Any liberation step that is achieved constitutes a step for continuing to achieve the PLO strategy for the establishment of the Palestinian democratic state...to pave the way for completing the liberation of all Palestinian soil.”

The PLO was responsible for scores of acts of terrorism from its creation, resulting in the deaths of thousands of civilians. Among the infamous attacks conducted by the PLO are: the murder of 11 Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Olympic Games; the killing of 21 schoolchildren at Ma’alot in 1974; the death of 35 people and wounding of 85 in an attack on Israeli tourist buses along the Haifa-Tel Aviv coastal highway in 1978; the hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship in 1985 and the murder of disabled American Jewish passenger Leon Klinghoffer. The PLO also launched terrorist and guerrilla attacks against Israel from Jordan – until they were ousted by King Hussein in September 1972 – and from Lebanon – until they were ousted by Israel in 1982.

In 1988 in Geneva, Yasir Arafat announced that he would accept the existence of the State of Israel, renounce terrorism, and accept U.N. resolutions 242 and 338. Despite this declaration, the PLO continued terrorist attacks against Israelis.

Following secret negotiations with Israel in Oslo, on September 9, 1993, Arafat sent a letter to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin recognizing Israel’s right to exist, renouncing terrorism, and pledging to remove clauses in the Palestine National Charter calling for the destruction of Israel. In return, Israel recognized the PLO as the “official representative” of the Palestinian people and began formal negotiations with the PLO. The Charter was revised in a vote by the Palestinian Authority Parliament in the presence of U.S. President Bill Clinton in December 1998.

However, the original Charter is still featured on some Palestinian Authority Web sites.

Today, the PLO continues to exist; however, most of its leaders have now become top Fatah officials in the Palestinian Authority. Fatah-related militia groups, such as the Tanzim, Force 17 and the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade have played a leading role in Palestinian violence since 2000, including suicide terrorist attacks, ambushes, and shootings of Israeli vehicles and facilities.

With the death of Arafat in November 2004, Mahmoud Abbas, a long-time secretary general of the PLO, became the new Chairman of the PLO and was subsequently elected President of the Palestinian Authority.

### **Palestinian Refugees**

The Palestinian refugee problem originated as a result of the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, when five Arab armies invaded the State of Israel just hours after it was established. During the ensuing war as many as 700,000 Palestinians fled their homes in the newly created state. Many of the Palestinians who fled did so voluntarily to avoid the ongoing war or at the urging of Arab leaders who promised that all who left would return after a quick Arab victory over the new Jewish state. Other Palestinians were forced to flee by individuals or groups fighting for Israel.

Of the Palestinians who left, one-third went to the West Bank, one-third to the Gaza Strip, and the remainder to Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. The Arab nations refused to absorb these Palestinians into their population and they were instead settled into refugee camps. Only Jordan's King Abdullah agreed to confer citizenship on the 200,000 Palestinian living in Jordan and the Jordan-controlled West Bank and East Jerusalem. In 1949, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) was created to oversee the economic integration of the refugees into these Arab countries. The Arab governments refused to consider integration, insisting that it would undermine the refugees' "right" to return to their homes in Palestine. UNRWA continues to operate, providing relief, health care, education and vocational training to the refugee populations in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

During the 1967 Six Day War, another estimated 250,000 Palestinians fled the West Bank and Gaza Strip with the arrival of Israeli forces. Some of these were people who had left their homes in Israel in 1948. These individuals are considered by the international community to be displaced persons, not refugees.

A Jewish refugee problem was also created with the establishment of the State of Israel. From 1948-1951 as many as 800,000 Jews were expelled from their native Arab nations or forced to flee as a result of state-sponsored anti-Zionist violence. They left behind their property and the lives they had built in these lands over hundreds of years. As many as 500,000 of these refugees fled from Iraq, Tunisia, Syria, Egypt, Yemen, Algeria, Libya and Morocco and were absorbed into the new

State of Israel. Others fled to Europe and North and South America where they were forced to rebuild their lives.

Tallying the number of individuals considered Palestinian refugees today is a matter of debate. UNRWA, which registers Palestinian refugees, claims that refugees and their descendants number about 4.4 million (as of December 2006), including those who left Israel in 1948, those who left the West Bank and Gaza Strip in 1967, those who were abroad but were subsequently not allowed to return to Israel, and all of their descendants. UNRWA's statistics include those residing in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the West Bank and Gaza Strip. (UNRWA's policy of including the children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who left in 1948 and 1967 into the refugee population for demographic and aid purposes is not done for any other refugee group.) Israel believes the UNRWA statistics are exaggerated. Israel also strictly distinguishes "refugees" from "displaced persons" and from "expired permit Palestinians" who were abroad at the time the conflicts ensued and were not allowed to return.

Palestinian insistence that refugees must have a "right of return" to their former homes inside Israel, and that this "right" is founded in international law, is rejected by Israel. Israel denies that there is any foundation in international law for a Palestinian "right of return," and that the non-binding international resolutions on the issue call not for a "return" to Israel, but for a just resolution of the refugee problem. Israel also argues that a "return" is not viable for such a small state, given that the influx of millions of Palestinians into Israel would pose a threat to its national security and upset the country's demographic makeup. In the decades that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) did not recognize Israel's right to exist and actively sought to bring about Israel's downfall and replace it with a Palestinian state, the "right of return" of Palestinian refugees was a rallying cry. In 1993, the PLO recognized Israel's right to exist and committed to a negotiating process to establish an independent Palestinian state alongside the State of Israel. Given this situation, world leaders, including President Bill Clinton and President George W. Bush, publicly stated that Palestinian refugees should rightly be resettled in a future Palestinian state.

Israel maintains that it is not responsible for the Palestinian refugee problem since it is the result of a war forced on Israel by invading Arab armies. However, Israel has stated that on humanitarian grounds it would participate in an international effort to resolve the situation. Such an effort would likely involve Palestinian refugees settling in a newly established state of Palestine, an international compensation fund, and individual cases of family reunification. Any international effort would also need to consider the situation of the 800,000 Jews who were expelled from their native Arab nations or forced to flee as a result of as a result of state-sponsored anti-Jewish violence following the founding of the State of Israel.

## **The Roadmap**

The Roadmap is a three-phased, performance-based peace plan based on reciprocal steps by both the Israelis and the Palestinians. It was introduced in September 2002, amidst continuing Palestinian terrorism, by the United States, the European Union, the Russian Federation, and the United Nations (collectively dubbed The Quartet). On April 30, 2003 the Quartet released the "Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict" which outlined the three phases of the plan with the eventual goal of settling the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by 2005. The plan called upon the Quartet to facilitate and monitor the completion of each phase of the plan.

As initially drafted, the first phase of the plan required that the Palestinians undertake the necessary measures to ensure an unconditional cessation of violence, terrorism and incitement, restructure the security forces, enact political reforms and engage in democratic institution building. The Israelis were required to facilitate the Palestinian's security measures and to withdraw its military forces from areas it entered in September 2000. Israel was also called on to dismantle settlement outposts and to freeze settlement activity.

In the second phase the Quartet was to assess whether the new Palestinian government had met the requirements necessary to lead an independent Palestinian state. If the Palestinians were to meet the Quartet's approval, a provisional Palestinian state would be established in the territory that was under P.A. jurisdiction on September 28, 2000.

The third and final phase called for the stabilization of the new Palestinian government and security infrastructures which, if the Quartet found that all the prerequisites have been met, would result in negotiations for a final status peace agreement and the establishment of a permanent Palestinian state by the end of 2005.

The Israeli government, under the leadership of Ariel Sharon, accepted the general framework of the Roadmap, however, they cited 14 reservations which they had to the text. These objections included ensuring that the Palestinians make substantial effort to reform their security forces and to stop terrorism before the second phase would be implemented, and calling for American supervision of the implementation of the Roadmap's obligations.

However, because of the failure of the PA to clamp down on terrorism, as required by the first phase of the plan, little practical progress was made in the implementation of the Roadmap. Additionally, the election of Hamas stymied any progress forward since Hamas does not recognize the Roadmap or other proposals for Israeli-Palestinian coexistence.

On November 27, 2007, the Roadmap was revived at the U.S.-hosted Annapolis Conference. At the conference President Olmert and President Abbas issued a joint statement in which both parties agreed to begin implementing their obligations under the Roadmap, working towards a permanent two-state solution and an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The statement, however, stated that the U.S., and not, as stipulated in 2002, the Quartet, will monitor the execution and fulfillment of the obligations for both sides.

### **The Security Barrier/Fence**

In 2002, the Government of Israel formally approved plans to build a security barrier or fence as a defensive measure to prevent Palestinian terrorists from reaching their civilian targets inside Israel. The decision to build the fence was reached following over two years of relentless terrorism by Palestinians suicide bombers who targeted Israeli buses, cafes, shopping centers and other gathering points for Israeli civilians. Over 1,000 Israelis were killed, and thousands severely injured in these attacks. Israel felt it had no choice but to take strong action to stop these terrorists from entering Israel from their operation centers in the West Bank. Throughout this period, the Palestinian Authority did little to prevent these attacks or to abolish the terrorist infrastructure despite its commitment to do so in agreements with Israel.

The Government of Israel has stated that the security fence is a temporary and reversible measure that has been created in reaction to the reality of ongoing Palestinian terrorism. Israeli leaders have said that should the threat of Palestinian terrorism end, there will be no need for this protective barrier and it can be dismantled.

The 480-mile security barrier, being constructed in phases, is comprised 94 percent of chain-link fence and 6 percent of a concrete barrier. The entire barrier is a multi-fence system which incorporates ditches, barbed wire, patrol roads and observation systems. Contrary to anti-Israel propaganda, a very small section of the is concrete, or can be described as “a wall.” The concrete sections are primarily in the area of the Palestinian cities of Qualqilya and Tulkarim, the locus of many terrorist operations, where snipers often shoot at Israeli civilians, and the outskirts of municipal Jerusalem.

The security fence is helping to prevent terrorist bombings. According to the Israeli government, since it has been operational, there has been a dramatic decrease in Palestinian terrorism – not because there have been no attempted attacks, but because the security barrier has impeded terrorists from reaching Israeli cities, or has forced them to take more circuitous routes, leading to their capture.

The fence has caused hardship for a number of Palestinians located on or near its route; however, recent alterations to the route help it to affect a minimal number of people, especially given the population density and demographic complications that define the area. The Israeli Supreme Court has issued rulings on the barrier's route,

ordering it changed in areas where it would lead to unnecessary hardship for Palestinians. More challenges and route changes are anticipated.

In July 2004, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued a decision on the Israeli security fence. The Court announced that Israel violated international law in the routing of the security fence and called on Israel to dismantle sections built in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. In its decision, the Court completely dismissed the arguments of Israel, along with those of 22 other nations who submitted written briefs, while accepting without reservation the arguments of the Palestinians and their supporters. The issue of the fence was brought before the ICJ by a Palestinian-initiated resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2003. The resolution sent the issue to the ICJ for an advisory opinion on the question: "What are the legal consequences arising from the construction of the wall being built by Israel, the occupying Power, in the Occupied Palestinian Territory." The Palestinian Authority and supporters had attempted to have the Security Council pass such a resolution, but when these efforts were unsuccessful, they turned instead to the General Assembly, where anti-Israel resolutions are routinely supported by the majority of member nations. The resolution passed 90-8, with 74 countries abstaining. There was extensive controversy regarding the ICJ's involvement in this issue and their non-binding advisory opinion. Israel and its supporters argued that issues related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, including the security fence, should be settled through bilateral negotiations, and not be predetermined or imposed by the ICJ or other international bodies. Furthermore, they argued, the countries who lobbied for the UN resolution to send the issue of the fence to the ICJ were more interested in scoring public relations points against Israel than in seeking constructive opportunities to promote reconciliation between Israel and the Palestinians.

### **Settlements**

Settlements are Jewish communities that were established in the West Bank and Gaza Strip after these territories came under Israeli military control at the end of the 1967 War. In 2005, all Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip were uprooted as part of the Israeli Disengagement from Gaza. Today, there are 121 settlements in the West Bank with approximately 260,000 inhabitants.

Historically, Judea and Samaria (the West Bank) are the cradle of Jewish civilization, containing the birthplaces and burial sites of key personalities in the Bible. Jews lived in the area until 1948, when the West Bank was occupied by Jordan in the Arab-Israeli war. Indeed, several of the current settlement communities in the West Bank and Gaza Strip existed prior to 1948 when they were overrun by invading Arab armies. Kfar Etzion and other villages in the Jerusalem-Bethlehem corridor, for example, fell to Arab forces in May 1948 and those captured were massacred. Sons and daughters of those who lived there until 1948 were the first to return after the 1967 war. The Gaza Strip has archeological remains of centuries of Jewish communal life.

In the 1970s, successive Israeli governments believed that settlements in certain sections of the West Bank, particularly in the Jordan Valley and eastern slopes of Samaria, as well as in areas of the Gaza Strip would provide Israel with an important military buffer zone.

While often characterized as “ideological, right-wing, nationalist and religious,” the settler population is actually more diverse and includes secular Israelis and new immigrants as well as those who chose their homes based on affordability and convenience rather than on religion or politics. However, many settlers and supporters of the movement believe that there is a religious obligation to settle and hold on to this territory. In addition, the vast majority of settlers and their supporters believe that they play an essential role in providing security for the State of Israel, by providing a first line of defense against Palestinian or other Arab attack.

Indeed, Israeli settlements have suffered greatly from Palestinian terrorism. Since 2000, Israeli settlers in the West Bank have been directly targeted by snipers and bombers. Settlements in the Gaza Strip were the favored target of Palestinian rocket attacks.

Since 1967, Israeli governments have maintained a willingness to withdraw from areas of the West Bank and Gaza Strip in a peace agreement with the Arabs. In the event of such an agreement, it has always been expected that at least some of the settlements, particularly those of the Gaza Strip, would have to be uprooted, just as the Israeli town of Yamit in the Sinai was dismantled following Israel’s peace agreement with Egypt.

In the Oslo Accords, settlements were to be negotiated as a final status issue, and were not to be discussed during the interim period. At Camp David, in July 2000, Prime Minister Ehud Barak reportedly offered to uproot all Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip and the isolated settlements in up to 95 percent of the territory of the West Bank. The remaining settlements in five percent of the territory of the West Bank – which contain the vast majority of the settler population – were to be gathered into settlement “blocs” which would be annexed to Israel. Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasir Arafat rejected the plan and offered no alternative.

In 2003, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, a long-time advocate for settlements, announced plans for Israel to unilaterally disengage from the Gaza Strip, uproot its settlements and relocate its 8,000 residents along with four settlements in the northern West Bank. Sharon argued that in the absence of a serious Palestinian peace partner and ongoing Palestinian terrorism, Israel needed to take unilateral steps to ensure its own security and improve conditions on the ground. The dismantlement of the Gaza and four West Bank settlements was concluded in August 2005, and the Israeli army completed its full disengagement from Gaza in

September 2005. Public opinion polls showed that the majority of Israelis supported the disengagement; however, a large and vocal minority of Israelis, particularly the settler community and their supporters, opposed the move and protested and resisted the army's evacuation of the settlements.

### **Six Day War**

In May 1967, events in the region led Israel to believe that an Arab attack was imminent. Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser had ordered a withdrawal of the U.N. forces on the border and announced a blockade of Israeli goods through the Straits of Tiran. At the same time, Syria increased border clashes along the Golan Heights and mobilized its troops. Israel held back on military action due to a request by the United States, but international diplomatic efforts to stop the blockade failed. The Arab states began to mobilize their troops, and Arab leaders called for a war of total destruction against Israel.

Arab mobilization compelled Israel to mobilize its own troops, 80 percent of which were reserve civilians. Israel launched a pre-emptive strike against Egypt on June 5. Israel captured the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip from Egypt, and when Jordan and Syria entered the conflict Israel also gained control of the West Bank and the eastern sector of Jerusalem from Jordan and the Golan Heights from Syria. In a catastrophic military defeat – which shook the Arab world for many years to come – the Arab nations ceased their fight six days after the war began.

This new territory brought great changes to Israeli daily life and created new challenges for policymakers. With the reunification of Jerusalem, Jews, who had been prevented by Jordan from entering the eastern part of the city, flocked to pray at the Western Wall for the first time in 19 years. In the West Bank and Gaza Strip, Israel had to grapple with the implications and challenges of having one million Palestinian Arabs now under its administration.

Soon after the end of the fighting, the United Nations passed Security Council Resolution 242, calling for an Israeli withdrawal from territories recently occupied and an acknowledgment by the Arab nations of Israel's right to live in peace within secure borders.

### **United Nations Partition Plan 1947 (U.N. Resolution 181)**

The General Assembly of the United Nations voted on November 29, 1947 to divide the British Mandate-controlled area of Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish. According to the plan, the two states, roughly equal in size and natural resources, would cooperate on major economic issues, sharing their currency, roads, and government services. The Jews reluctantly accepted the partition plan, as it offered at least two of their requirements – sovereignty and control over immigration. The Palestinian Arabs and the surrounding Arab nations rejected it outright, refusing to accept the establishment of a Jewish state in the region.

### **United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242/338**

United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 were passed (respectively) in the aftermaths of the 1967 and 1973 Arab-Israeli wars. Resolution 242 (reaffirmed in 338), was designed to provide the framework for peace negotiations based on a “land-for-peace” formula and has become the foundation of all subsequent peace treaties in the region. The resolutions called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces “from territories of recent conflict,” an Arab “termination of all claims or states of belligerency,” and a recognition of the State of Israel and its “right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.” The resolution also called for “achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.”

As 242 and 338 call for Israel’s “withdrawal from territories” and not “*the*” territories as part of a peace agreement, it is understood by the drafters of the resolution and by Israel and the United States that Israel may withdraw from areas of the West Bank and Gaza Strip consistent with its security needs, but not from all the territories.

### **War of Independence 1948-1949**

On May 15, the day after the creation of the State of Israel, the Arab armies of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon invaded the new state. The Arab forces were significantly larger and better equipped than Israel’s. Yet coordination and organization within the Arab armies was lacking, and political squabbles over conquered territories strained relations among the Arab allies. Despite its small number, the Israeli army was well-organized, well-disciplined and well-trained.

Months of fighting interspersed with temporary cease-fires officially ended in January 1949, followed by a series of armistice agreements between Israel and Egypt (February), Lebanon (March), Jordan (April) and Syria (July). Israel held the 5,600 square miles allotted to it by the UN partition plan plus an additional 2,500 square miles. Jordan held the eastern sector of Jerusalem and the West Bank, and Egypt held the Gaza Strip. Borders were finalized based on the frontlines.

Though Israel hoped the agreements would lead to official peace treaties, the Arab states refused to recognize Israel’s existence. A total economic, political, and social boycott of Israel was maintained.

### **West Bank and Gaza Strip**

The territory now known as the West Bank formed the heart of ancient Israel and was the site of many significant events in Jewish history. Since ancient times, the area has been known as Judea and Samaria and was identified as such through the British Mandate period. In the 9th Century BCE, Samaria (in the northern West Bank) was the capital of the Israelite Kingdom. Much of the Old Testament takes place in Judea and Samaria. While Gaza has less of a presence in the Bible, it does

appear in the books of Joshua and Judges. From that time until 1948, the West Bank and Gaza Strip were occupied by the Romans, the Ottomans and the British. The Gaza Strip, and particularly the West Bank, are rich in archeological remains of centuries of Jewish communal life.

The 1947 U.N. Partition Plan proposing an independent Arab state in Palestine alongside a Jewish state was rejected by the Arab states, which instead proceeded to invade the State of Israel hours after its establishment. In the ensuing war, Jordan occupied the West Bank (which it annexed in 1950) and Egypt occupied the Gaza Strip. For the next 19 years neither Egypt nor Jordan made any attempt to establish an independent Palestinian state in these territories. Indeed, these areas were relatively neglected in terms of economic and agricultural development.

In 1967 Israel gained control of the West Bank and Gaza Strip (and its population of at least one million Arabs) in the Six Day War. Israel immediately made clear that it would be ready to redeploy from territories in return for a peace agreement with its Arab neighbors. Israel's offer was rebuffed.

In 1993, as part of the Oslo Accords, Israel agreed to redeploy from Palestinian population centers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Beginning with the West Bank city of Jericho and a large portion of the Gaza Strip in May 1994, there were a series of Israeli redeployments totaling 40 percent of the West Bank and over 85 percent of the Gaza Strip, leaving 99 percent of the Palestinian population living under the jurisdiction of the Palestinian Authority. At Camp David in July 2000, Prime Minister Ehud Barak reportedly offered an Israeli withdrawal from as much as 95 percent of the West Bank, 100 percent of the Gaza Strip, and parts of Jerusalem. Chairman Arafat rejected this offer, arguing that only a full withdrawal to the pre-1967 lines would be acceptable, but made no serious counter-offer.

In 2003, then-Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon announced a plan for Israel to unilaterally disengage from the Gaza Strip and some small settlements in the northern West Bank in order to further Israel's political, security and demographic interests. The disengagement was approved by the Cabinet and Knesset and began on August 15, 2005. By September 15 all Israeli civilians had left the Gaza settlements, and on October 1 the last Israeli soldier left the strip, completing the disengagement.

While there are obvious social, political, religious and family ties between the Palestinian communities in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, there have long been differences between the two populations. The Palestinians of the West Bank are considered more cosmopolitan and educated. The Palestinians of Gaza are more economically disadvantaged, tend to be more religious and more supportive of extremist ideology. Hamas and Islamic Jihad are based in Gaza, and Gaza is the primary center for terrorist and militant activity – including the launching of rockets at Israeli population centers, raids on Israeli military installations, and the smuggling of weapons from Egypt or by sea. A number of West Bank cities are also known to

harbor terrorist cells – including Jenin, Qualqilya, and others, and have been the center of terrorist operations by Fatah-affiliated groups such as the Al Aqsa Martyrs Brigade.

Following internecine Palestinian clashes in June 2007, Palestinians in the West Bank continue to be governed by the Fatah-led Palestinian Authority under the leadership of President Mahmoud Abbas. Gaza is now governed exclusively by Hamas.

### **The Yom Kippur War 1973**

On the holiest day of the Jewish calendar, Yom Kippur, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel in an effort to force Israel to surrender the land gained in 1967. Caught by surprise, in the war's initial days, Israel suffered severe losses of life, military equipment, and territory, abruptly shattering the euphoria the country had experienced since its show of strength in the Six Day War. Following an Egyptian refusal to accept a cease-fire and a Soviet airlift of military equipment to bolster Egyptian forces, the United States sent an airlift to Israel enabling her to recover from the first blow and inflict damage on Egypt and Syria. In response, Saudi Arabia led the Arab world in an oil embargo directed against the United States and other western nations. The war officially ended with a U.N.-declared cease-fire, but fighting continued.

When hostilities stopped later in the month, the Israeli army held an additional 165 square miles of territory from Syria and had encircled the Egyptian Third Army by the Suez Canal. Efforts for peace treaties at that point failed, and only a year later following U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy" were disengagement treaties signed by the parties. As per these limited agreements, Israel withdrew from all areas it had acquired from Syria during the 1973 war, and some territory from the 1967 war. Israel also withdrew from parts of the Sinai. Prisoners of war were exchanged, and the Arab world ended its oil embargo. Despite the victory, Israel's near-defeat by the Arab nations highlighted her continued vulnerability.

### **Zionism**

Zionism is the Jewish national movement of rebirth and renewal in the land of Israel – the historical birthplace of the Jewish people. The yearning to return to Zion, the biblical term for both the Land of Israel and Jerusalem, has been the cornerstone of Jewish religious life since the Jewish exile from the land two thousand years ago, and is embedded in Jewish prayer, ritual, literature and culture.

Modern Zionism emerged in the late 19th century in response to the violent persecution of Jews in Eastern Europe and anti-Semitism in Western Europe. Modern Zionism fused the ancient Jewish biblical and historical ties to the ancestral homeland with the modern concept of nationalism into a vision of establishing a modern Jewish state in the land of Israel.

The “father” of modern Zionism, Austrian journalist Theodor Herzl, consolidated various strands of Zionist thought into an organized political movement, advocating for international recognition of a “Jewish state” and encouraging Jewish immigration to build the land.

Today, decades after the actual founding of a Jewish state, Zionism continues to be the guiding nationalist movement of the majority of Jews around the world who believe in, support and identify with the State of Israel.

# RESPONSES TO COMMON INACCURACIES ABOUT ISRAEL

---

## ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS

**Inaccuracy: Israel is not interested in or prepared to make meaningful compromises to achieve peace with the Palestinians.**

**Response:** Israel is fully committed to pursuing a negotiated peace agreement with the Palestinians so that it may finally live in peace and security. Peace has proven difficult because there has not been a Palestinian peace partner willing to recognize Israel's right to exist and able to uphold peace commitments. Israel was able to reach historic peace agreements with Egypt (1979) and Jordan (1994) in which both sides made serious compromises for the sake of normalized relations. In 2005, in the absence of a serious Palestinian negotiating partner but still interested in taking steps for improving conditions on the ground, the Israeli government unilaterally disengaged from the Gaza Strip, proving its willingness to make painful sacrifices even at a time when mutual cooperation was not an option.

Public opinion polls in Israel since the start of the Oslo process in 1993 consistently show that the vast majority of Israelis are supportive of negotiations with the Palestinians and are willing to make extremely difficult compromises on borders, settlements, Jerusalem and other contentious issues. This support has been relatively constant despite Palestinian terrorism, the rise of Hamas, and widespread skepticism of the Palestinian commitment to negotiations leading to an end of the conflict and a resolution of all claims. Recognizing this great support for peace, every candidate for Prime Minister of Israel since 1993 has pledged to continue the pursuit of peace – albeit with different approaches.

**Inaccuracy: Hamas must be part of any Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. Israel's refusal to deal with Hamas doesn't make sense. After all, Israel eventually negotiated with the Palestinian Liberation Organization after decades of enduring its terrorist attacks against Israelis and Jews.**

**Response:** Hamas is committed to the elimination of Israel's existence by whatever means necessary. This commitment is articulated in the Hamas Covenant, and is regularly reiterated by its leadership. No country, including Israel, should be expected to negotiate with an entity that seeks its destruction and uses terrorism and rocket attacks to further that goal.

Israel and the international community have been clear, Hamas must recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce the use of violence and terrorism, and accept previously negotiated Israeli-Palestinian agreements. Until it meets these requirements, neither Israel nor the international community will engage with Hamas.

Israel does deal with the the Palestinian Authority and its leaders who were former PLO officials. However, this only came about once the PLO met similar requirements. In 1993, PLO Chairman Yasir Arafat sent a letter to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin recognizing Israel's right to exist, renouncing terrorism, and pledging to remove clauses in the Palestine National Charter that called for the destruction of the state of Israel. The PLO/Palestinian Authority and Israel's other Arab peace partners – including Egypt and Jordan – have done what Hamas adamantly refuses to do: accept the reality of Israel's existence and reject efforts to eradicate Israel.

Hamas is well aware of the steps it must take if it is interested in negotiating with Israel.

**Inaccuracy: The Palestinians had no choice but to reject the Israeli proposals at Camp David.**

**Response:** At the Camp David Summit in July 2000, Palestinians had the opportunity to negotiate a final peace agreement with Israel that would have provided them with a Palestinian state in the entire Gaza Strip and most of the West Bank.

Prime Minister Ehud Barak offered the Palestinians a final status agreement with concessions that went far beyond what most Israelis ever expected. Nonetheless, in response, Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasir Arafat refused the Barak proposal, made no counteroffer and failed to demonstrate any flexibility or willingness to compromise on the contentious issues under negotiation. After rejecting the Israeli offer – which included extensive concessions on sharing Jerusalem, including the Temple Mount, establishing an independent Palestinian state in 100 percent of the Gaza Strip and as much as 95 percent of the West Bank, uprooting isolated settlements – the Palestinians walked away from negotiations.

After the Summit, President Clinton openly acknowledged Israel's tremendous concessions and stated that Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak "showed particular courage and vision and an understanding of the historical importance of the moment." On his return to Israel, Prime Minister Barak declared: "Today I return from Camp David, and can look into the millions of eyes and say with regret: We have not yet succeeded. We did not succeed because we did not find a partner prepared to make decisions on all issues. We did not succeed because our Palestinian neighbors have not yet internalized the fact that in order to achieve peace, each side has to give up some of their dreams; to give, not only to demand."

In the aftermath of Camp David, Palestinians publicly excused their behavior by declaring that the failure of Camp David was due to lack of preparation by the Americans, personality differences between Barak and Arafat, and by Barak's "take-it-or-leave-it" negotiating posture. These excuses cannot explain or justify the Palestinian refusal to discuss the Barak proposal or to present a counteroffer. The issues under discussion were no secret – final status negotiations had been anticipated for the seven years since the 1993 Oslo Agreement. Instead, Camp David demonstrated that Arafat and the Palestinian leadership were not seriously interested in negotiating peace with Israel. Ehud Barak said that at Camp David, Yasir Arafat and the Palestinian leadership were "unmasked."

**Inaccuracy: The concept of a two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is not feasible and is outdated. Instead, there should be one state, a "bi-national" state that would be comprised of Israel and the West Bank and Gaza Strip that would protect the respective Jewish/Israeli and Palestinian identities and interests of its citizens.**

**Response:** The proposal of a bi-national state is nothing less than an indirect attempt to bring about an end to the State of Israel as a national homeland of the Jewish people.

The State of Israel was established as a Jewish state out of the nationalist aspiration of the Jewish people and an international recognition of the rights of Jews to a homeland following millennia of persecution. It is unrealistic and unacceptable to expect Israel to voluntarily subvert its own sovereign existence and nationalist identity. Israel is a self-declared Jewish state, with founding principles that guarantee the equal treatment and protection of all its citizens – regardless of religion, ethnicity or color.

Bi-nationalism requires Israel to forsake its Jewish nationalism and identity, along with its status as a refuge for Jews fleeing persecution. Furthermore, bi-nationalism is unworkable given current realities and historic animosities. With the high birth rate among the Palestinians, Jews would very soon be a minority within a bi-national state, thus likely ending any semblance of equal representation and protections. Additionally, given the degree of hostility to Jews by many Palestinians, what is euphemistically called "bi-nationalism" would mean risk of persecution and oppression for those Jews allowed to remain on the territory of their former state. Finally, as Israeli journalist Yossi Klein-Halevi has argued, "the notion that Palestinians and Jews, who can't even negotiate a two-state solution, could coexist in one happy state is so ludicrous that only the naive or the malicious would fall for it."

Within certain intellectual circles the call for a bi-national Israeli-Palestinian state has gained traction. While couching their arguments in terms of egalitarianism and justice, proponents of a bi-national state are predominantly harsh critics of Israel,

and use this proposal as a vehicle to question the legitimacy of the Jewish state.

Any just solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should be based on two states, living side by side in peace and security.

## **PALESTINIAN VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM**

**Inaccuracy: Hamas members are resistance fighters whose only goal is to end the unjust Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands.**

**Response:** Hamas is a terrorist organization and is very clear in describing its mission. Its Covenant calls on followers “to raise the banner of Allah over every inch of Palestine.” Hamas considers all of Israel to be on Palestinian territory, and consequently denies that Israel has any right to exist. Hamas does not just want Israel out of Gaza and the West Bank – it wants Israel to disappear and for a Palestinian Islamic state to be established in its place.

Furthermore, Hamas’ version of “resistance fighting” is through suicide bombing attacks deliberately targeting children on city buses on their way to school, families eating in a local pizzeria, and through rockets landing in people’s living rooms.

Finally, while Israel has committed to a peace process with the Palestinians and to a negotiated two-state solution to the conflict, Hamas leaders flatly reject any compromise with Israel.

**Inaccuracy: Palestinian terrorism is understandable since they have no other weapon to fight Israeli occupation.**

**Response:** Terrorism is the premeditated use of violence deliberately directed against random civilians, with the aim of killing as many as possible and sowing psychological fear and despair. The use of such tactics is never justified.

Moreover, it is simply untrue that Palestinians have no option besides terrorism. Direct negotiations with Israel offer the way to a more stable and secure future for Israelis and Palestinians. Indeed, in 2000, a Palestinian campaign of terrorism erupted just after Israel had made its most ambitious offer for a final status agreement that would have created a Palestinian state in 95 percent of the West Bank and 100 percent of the Gaza Strip. Negotiations were bringing the Palestinian state closer to reality.

While there is genuine frustration and suffering among Palestinians, the unconditional end to Palestinian violence and terrorism, a true acceptance of Israel’s right to exist and a commitment to bilateral negotiations are the real “weapons” to resolve the conflict.

**Inaccuracy: The Palestinian use of terrorism is a legitimate tool in the Palestinian national struggle for liberation.**

**Response:** As many Palestinian leaders, including Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, have publicly acknowledged, violence and terrorism do nothing to hasten the realization of Palestinian nationalist aspirations.

Terror attacks bring fear to everyday life for Israelis, who live with the understanding that a suicide terrorist attack can happen anywhere to anybody – to children on the way to school on a city bus, to teens gathering at a nightclub or shopping mall, or to people socializing at a cafe. Following such attacks, grief and fear are often joined by anger towards the terrorists and the Palestinians who condone, celebrate or incite terrorism. A terror attack merely reinforces Israeli concerns that the Palestinian people do not seek reconciliation.

Direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations are the way to properly address the genuine frustration among Palestinians and offer the only way to achieve a more stable and secure future for all Israelis and Palestinians. However, the willingness of the Israeli public to accept substantial concessions depends on their belief that the Palestinians are truly interested in peace and reconciliation, are capable of carrying out agreements, and have resolutely rejected terrorism and violence.

**Inaccuracy: The Palestinian people are waging a war of independence against a colonial, hegemonic power.**

**Response:** In no way can the State of Israel be considered a colonial or hegemonic power. Israel is not a foreign invader. The State of Israel is built on the foundation of thousands of years of Jewish connection to and a presence in this land. Moreover, Israel has no desire to empire-build, gain financial benefit, or rule over the lives of millions of Arab Palestinians in the West Bank or Gaza Strip, as is evident from their efforts to seek a negotiated settlement to the conflict with the Palestinians and Israel's unilateral disengagement from Gaza.

Israel has already withdrawn from parts of this territory in the pursuit of peace. Israel willingly withdrew from the oil-rich Sinai Peninsula in exchange for a comprehensive peace agreement with Egypt in 1979. Israel's presence in the West Bank and Gaza Strip was the result of a defensive war and the decades-long refusal of surrounding Arab states to negotiate peace with Israel. As a result of the Oslo process, by September 2000, Israel had redeployed from Palestinian population centers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, resulting in 99 percent of the Palestinian public living under the jurisdiction of the Palestinian Authority. When the Palestinians began

using these areas as a base for a campaign of violence and terror against Israeli civilians, Israel had no choice but to re-enter some of these towns. In August 2005, Israel unilaterally disengaged from the Gaza Strip, removing its military presence and evacuating 25 settlements.

## **ISRAELI RESPONSES TO PALESTINIAN VIOLENCE**

**Inaccuracy: Israel is building a “wall” on the West Bank in order to encircle the Palestinian population and to seize more land for Israeli control.**

**Response:** Israel’s security barrier is a defensive measure undertaken by Israel to prevent Palestinian terrorists from reaching their civilian targets inside Israel.

The decision to build the barrier was made by the Government of Israel in 2002 following two years of unabated terrorism by Palestinians suicide bombers, who targeted Israeli buses, cafes, shopping centers and other gathering points for Israeli civilians. Over 1,000 Israelis were killed, and thousands severely injured in these attacks. Throughout this period, the Palestinian Authority did little-to-nothing to prevent these attacks or to abolish the terrorist infrastructure despite its commitment to do so in agreements with Israel. Israel had no choice but to take strong action to stop these terrorists from entering Israel from their operation centers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

The Government of Israel has stated that the security fence is a temporary and reversible measure that was created in reaction to the reality of ongoing Palestinian terrorism. Israeli leaders have said that should Palestinian terrorism end, there will be no need for this protective barrier and it can be dismantled.

Moreover, this barrier is not a “wall.” The 480-mile security barrier, being constructed in phases, is comprised 94 percent of chain-link fence and 6 percent of a concrete barrier. The entire barrier is a multi-fence system which incorporates ditches, barbed wire, patrol roads and observation systems. Contrary to anti-Israel propaganda, only a very small section of the barrier is concrete, or can be described as “a wall.” The concrete sections are primarily in the area of the Palestinian cities of Qualqilya and Tulkarim, the locus of many terrorist operations, where snipers often shoot at Israeli civilians, and in the outskirts of municipal Jerusalem.

Most importantly, the security fence is helping to prevent terrorist bombings. Israeli security officials say that scores of attacks have been thwarted since 2003 as terrorists have been unable to reach Israeli cities, or have been forced to take more circuitous routes, leading to their capture.

The fence has caused hardship for the small number of Palestinians located on or near its route. This is primarily due to the population density and demographic complications that define the area. The Israeli Supreme Court has issued a number of rulings on the barrier's route, ordering it changed in areas where it would lead to undue hardship for Palestinians. It is anticipated that further modifications to the route will continue to be made.

**Inaccuracy: The Israeli army uses excessive force against unarmed Palestinians.**

**Response:** Israel has shown the greatest possible restraint and makes a determined effort to limit Palestinian casualties. Whenever possible, the Israel Defense Forces respond to Palestinian violence in a very directed manner, at carefully specified targets.

These operations to root out terrorists and their infrastructure are consistent with the Israeli Government's right and responsibility to defend Israel and its population from attack. The Israeli military seeks to prevent civilian casualties, in stark contrast to the Palestinian terrorist organizations' goal of killing as many civilians as possible.

Israel has had no option but to go into Palestinian centers, since Palestinian terrorists and militia often deliberately position themselves in densely populated areas. Terrorist organizations set up their operation and training centers in the middle of heavily populated centers, such as West Bank and Gaza refugee camps. Snipers shoot guns or launch mortar shells and rockets at Israeli targets from residential areas. Tunnels smuggling weapons from Egypt are deliberately situated in private homes in Gaza. In the early days of the Second Intifada, Palestinian Tanzim shot at Israeli forces from behind groups of demonstrating children and young men. During these demonstrations, stones, firebombs, and Molotov cocktails were thrown by adults and children alike, and protestors were often seen carrying rifles and machine-guns.

Most Palestinian casualties are individuals who are directly engaged in anti-Israel violence and terrorism and who aim to kill and maim as many civilians as possible in their attacks. Tragically, innocent Palestinians have been caught in the crossfire. This is in contrast to Palestinian terrorist operations, which deliberately aim to kill as many civilians as possible. In many cases of Palestinian casualties, the Israeli military conducts internal investigations to determine whether errors were made by its soldiers.

**Inaccuracy: The purpose of Israel’s policy of “closure” and its system of checkpoints is designed to collectively punish the entire Palestinian population for the acts of certain individuals and to deliberately cause economic hardship to the Palestinians.**

**Response:** The closures and checkpoints are instituted by the Israeli government to protect its citizens. Border closures and checkpoints have been among the only mechanisms at Israel’s disposal to prevent would-be suicide bombers from entering Israeli cities. Indeed, checkpoints have allowed Israel to thwart numerous terrorists attempting to enter Israeli population centers in this manner. Israel understands the economic hardship the closures impose upon Palestinian civilians who cannot go to their jobs in Israel or receive and send shipments. Israel eases the closures and passage through checkpoints when the threat of terrorism is reduced. However, the checkpoints themselves have been terrorist targets. For example, in January 2004, a 22-year-old mother of two detonated a bomb strapped to her body at the Erez checkpoint in Gaza, killing four soldiers.

Because of the checkpoint system, would-be terrorists have attempted to enter Israel through uninhabited and unmanned areas. The building of Israel’s security fence also aims to prevent such infiltrations.

## **2006 LEBANON WAR**

**Inaccuracy: The 2006 Lebanon War was a premeditated attack by Israel on Lebanon and during the conflict, Israel violated humanitarian law by targeting civilians.**

**Response:** Hezbollah’s attack on sovereign Israeli territory led to the conflict in Lebanon. On July 12, 2006, Hezbollah launched rockets into Israeli territory as a diversion while guerillas crossed the Israeli-Lebanese border into Israeli territory and attacked a group of IDF soldiers. The terrorists killed three soldiers and abducted two others (who remain in Hezbollah custody). Another five soldiers were killed by Hezbollah on Lebanese territory while on a mission to rescue the kidnapped soldiers.

There is no doubt that Hezbollah’s operation was premeditated. Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah called the operation in which the Israeli soldiers were kidnapped “Operation Truthful Promise,” as he had long pledged to attack and kidnap soldiers in hopes of a prisoner exchange that would free Lebanese prisoners held in Israel.

Hezbollah, not Israel, systematically violated international humanitarian law during the conflict. Hezbollah embedded itself within a civilian population, housing its office buildings, military positions, and weapons caches among civilians. Hezbollah also fired its rockets from within civilian villages and cities making it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between civilian and Hezbollah areas. Hezbollah indiscriminately fired rockets at Israeli population centers. Their aim was to cause as much civilian suffering as possible.

Israel, on the other hand, went to great lengths to avoid civilian casualties and collateral damage in Lebanon. Israeli air strikes utilized precision ordnances that targeted only Hezbollah positions. Israel dropped leaflets and broadcast radio messages warning civilians to leave certain areas often giving up the element of surprise.

## **ISRAELI SETTLEMENTS**

**Inaccuracy: Settlements are a violation of international law.**

**Response:** Settlements, Jewish communities that were established in the West Bank and Gaza Strip after the territories were gained in the 1967 War, do not violate international law.

Israel's administration of the territories in 1967 replaced Jordan's control of the West Bank and Egypt's of the Gaza Strip. Neither Jordan nor Egypt had legal sovereignty over these areas, but took them over during the 1948 war with the newly established State of Israel. (According to the U.N. Partition Plan, the West Bank and Gaza Strip were to be part of an independent Arab state to be established alongside an independent Jewish state – a plan rejected by Arab nations and Palestinian leadership.)

Israel maintains that these areas can thus not be considered “occupied territories” under international law, since Israel did not “occupy” it from another sovereign nation. Rather, they are “disputed territories” over which there are competing claims requiring that their future must be determined through negotiations. Since 1967, Israeli governments have maintained a willingness to withdraw from areas of the West Bank and Gaza Strip as part of a peace agreement with the Arabs. Israel uprooted all of the settlements in the Gaza Strip in August 2005 as part of its unilateral disengagement from Gaza.

Critics of Israel frequently cite Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits the forcible transfer of segments of a population of a state to the territory of another state which it has occupied through the use of armed force, as proof of the illegality of settlements. However, Israel maintains that the Geneva Convention, drafted after World War II, was intended to protect local populations from displacement, such as the forced population transfers experienced before and

during the war in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary. The situation in today's West Bank is clearly different. Israel has not forcibly transferred Israelis to these settlements. Rather, Israeli settlers voluntarily moved to the areas where Jews have historically dwelled. Jews have lived in the West Bank throughout recorded history, until 1948, but they were forced to flee the invading Arab armies. Indeed, several of the current settlement communities existed prior to 1948 when they were overrun by invading Arab armies. For example, Kfar Etzion and other villages in the Jerusalem-Bethlehem corridor fell to Arab forces in May 1948 and those captured were massacred. Sons and daughters of those who lived there until 1948 were the first to return after the 1967 war.

## **PALESTINIAN REFUGEES**

**Inaccuracy: Palestinian refugees have a “right of return” under international law – the right to reclaim and return to their former homes inside Israel.**

**Response:** International law and international statute do not call for a Palestinian “right of return” to Israel, but rather for a resolution of the long-standing Palestinian refugee problem which was caused by the Arab attack on Israel in 1948. On humanitarian grounds, Israel has committed to participating in an international effort to resettle and compensate Palestinian refugees.

United Nations Resolutions 242 and 338 refer not to a “right of return,” but of the need to resolve the Palestinian refugee issue. The international resolutions which Palestinians often base their claim of a “right” on, such as the December 1948 United Nations General Assembly Resolution 194 and Article 12 of the December 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, are non-binding. Moreover, these non-binding resolutions are inconsistent with current conditions and realities. For example, Resolution 194 calls for a return of refugees to “live at peace with their neighbors,” hardly realistic given the refugees’ long-standing refusal to recognize Israel’s right to exist. Article 12 is similarly inapplicable. It refers to individuals, not a group of people, who left the country as a result of war and infers a relationship, even citizenship, between the individual and the country.

A “right of return” is also not viable on practical grounds. An influx of millions of Palestinians into Israel would pose a threat to its national security and upset the country’s demographic makeup. Moreover, the “right of return” of Palestinian refugees was a rallying cry in the decades that the PLO and Arab nations did not recognize Israel’s right to exist and actively sought to bring about Israel’s downfall and replace it with a Palestinian state to which Palestinians would return. (Indeed, Arab states with Palestinian refugee populations used this “right” as an excuse not to provide Palestinians with citizenship, or educational and professional opportunities.) In 1993, the PLO officially recognized Israel’s right to exist and engaged in a negotiating process that was expected to ultimately establish an independent Palestinian state alongside the State of Israel. Palestinian refugees should rightly be

resettled in a mutually negotiated Palestinian state, not in the State of Israel. Indeed, U.S. President George W. Bush declared in April 2004: “It seems clear that an agreed, just, fair and realistic framework for a solution to the Palestinian refugee issue, as part of any final status agreement, will need to be found through the establishment of a Palestinian state and the settling of Palestinian refugees there, rather than Israel.”

Israel maintains that it is not responsible for the Palestinian refugee problem since it is the result of a war forced on Israel by invading Arab armies. However, Israel has stated that on humanitarian grounds it would participate in an international effort to resolve the situation. Such an effort would likely involve Palestinian refugees settling in a newly established state of Palestine, an international compensation fund, and individual cases of family reunification. Any international effort would also need to consider the situation of the 800,000 Jews who were either expelled from their native Arab nations or forced to flee as a result of state-sponsored anti-Jewish violence following the founding of the State of Israel.

**Inaccuracy: Palestinians were systematically expelled from their land by Israel in 1948.**

**Response:** There was no official, deliberate or systemic Israeli policy of expelling Palestinians from the newly established State of Israel. As many as 700,000 Palestinians abandoned their homes when five Arab armies invaded the newly declared state on May 15, 1948. During the chaotic and volatile war, many of the Palestinians who left did so voluntarily to avoid the war. Others left at the urging of Arab leaders who promised a quick return to their homes after an anticipated Arab victory over the new Jewish state. Recent historical studies have revealed that some Palestinians were forced to flee by individuals or groups fighting for Israel. Palestinians who stayed were made full citizens of the new State of Israel.

## **ISRAEL/ZIONISM IS RACIST**

**Inaccuracy: Zionism is a racist ideology.**

**Response:** Rooted in the liberal principles of freedom, democracy, equality, and social justice, Zionism is fundamentally incompatible with racism. Zionism is the Jewish national movement of rebirth and renewal in the land of Israel – the historical birthplace of the Jewish people. The yearning to return to Zion, the biblical term for both the Land of Israel and Jerusalem, has been the cornerstone of Jewish religious life since the Jewish exile from the land two thousand years ago, and is embedded in Jewish prayer, ritual, literature and culture. Zionism is an ideology that celebrates the Jewish connection to Israel. It does not discriminate against or judge other religions or nationalities.

Israel's Law of Return, which some critics of Israel accuse of being "racist," is for Jews a potent testimonial to the safe and free haven they will always have in the State of Israel after centuries of persecution and isolation. Israel's uniqueness as a country which grants automatic citizenship to Jews (as well as their non-Jewish immediate family members) who seek to settle there is not racist. Individuals ineligible for automatic citizenship under the Law of Return are eligible for Israeli citizenship under regular procedures equivalent to such requirements in other countries. Indeed, the State of Israel is a multi-ethnic and multi-religious society, comprised of Jews and non-Jews from at least 100 different countries from diverse ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds.

The false equation of "Zionism equals racism" has its origins in the passage of the Arab and Soviet-sponsored United Nations resolution of November 10, 1975 which declared Zionism a "form of racism and racial discrimination." The highly politicized resolution was aimed at denying Israel its political legitimacy by attacking its moral basis for existence. The resolution, which former-UN Secretary General Kofi Annan described as a "low point" in the history of the UN, was finally repealed on December 16, 1991. Unfortunately, there have been numerous efforts by Arab representatives at international conferences and forums to reintroduce this heinous equation.

**Inaccuracy: As a self-described "Jewish State," Israel is by nature an undemocratic and discriminatory country.**

**Response:** Democracy is the cornerstone of the State of Israel. As stated in its Declaration of Independence, Israel's government will be "for the benefit of all its inhabitants; it will be based on freedom, justice, peace as envisaged by the Prophets of Israel, it will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture; it will safeguard the Holy Places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations." Israel's two official languages are Hebrew and Arabic, and all its citizens regardless of religion, ethnicity or color are accorded full civil and political rights, and equal participation in all aspects of Israeli social, political, and civic life.

As in every country, much more needs to be done to promote greater educational and employment opportunities for minorities, particularly Israeli Arabs and new immigrants. Much of this disparity is due to scarce resources. The Israeli government has been committed to investing in the necessary infrastructure and assistance for these communities and there are numerous non-government organizations in Israel and abroad who monitor government policies and treatment of minorities.

**Inaccuracy: Israel treats Arabs as second-class citizens.**

**Response:** Israeli law makes no distinction between its Arab and Jewish citizens. Israeli Arab citizens enjoy the same rights as their Jewish neighbors. They are free to practice their religion without discrimination, in accordance with Israel's commitment to democracy and freedom. There are a number of Israeli Arab parties represented in the Israeli Knesset (parliament), and Arab members of Knesset are extremely vocal in promoting their issues and opinions. In 2007, Raleb Majadele, was named Minister of Science, Culture and Sports, becoming the first Israeli Arab member of the cabinet. In 2004, an Israeli Arab, Salim Jubran, was appointed to the Israeli Supreme Court.

As in every country, much more needs to be done to promote greater educational and employment opportunities for minorities, particularly for Israeli Arabs. The Israeli government has committed to investing in the necessary infrastructure and assistance for these communities. As in the United States, non-governmental organizations publicly advocate for increased investment in Israeli Arab communities.

It is important to note that Palestinian Arabs living in the West Bank and Gaza Strip are not citizens of Israel. After gaining territory in the 1967 War, Israel found itself with a million Palestinian Arabs under its administration. Israel hoped its authority over the Palestinians in these areas would be short-lived and that it would be able to exchange the land for peace with its Arab neighbors. As a result, Israel did not annex or incorporate the West Bank and Gaza Strip into Israel proper, and thus did not apply the same laws that govern Israeli civilian life.

**Inaccuracy: Israeli treatment of the Palestinians today is comparable to the Nazis' treatment of the Jews, and policies of "ethnic cleansing" or "genocide."**

**Response:** Absolutely no comparison can be made between the complex Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the atrocities committed by the Nazis against the Jews. Nor can Israeli actions or policies be characterized as acts of ethnic cleansing or genocide.

In contrast to Holocaust and more recent examples of genocide and ethnic cleansing in Darfur, Rwanda and Kosovo, there is no Israeli ideology, policy or plan to persecute, exterminate or expel the Palestinian population – nor has there ever been. Israeli policies toward the Palestinians are based on its need to defend its population and combat threats to Israel's security, while promoting a negotiated resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

In direct contrast, the Nazis' "final solution" to the "Jewish problem" was the deliberate, systematic and mechanized extermination of European Jewry. Hitler's final solution led to the calculated, premeditated murder of six million Jews and the destruction of thriving Jewish communities across Europe.

Those that make the comparison between the Jewish state and the Nazis and Hitler – who perpetrated the greatest and largest act of anti-Semitism in world history – have not chosen this comparison innocently or dispassionately. It is a charge that is purposefully directed at Jews in an effort to associate the victims of Nazi crimes with the Nazi perpetrators, and serves to diminish the significance and uniqueness of the Holocaust. To make such a comparison constitutes blatant hostility toward Jews, Jewish history and the legitimacy of the Jewish State of Israel.

**Inaccuracy: Israel is an apartheid state and should be fought in the same manner that apartheid in South Africa was fought – through divestment, boycott and other punitive economic measures.**

**Response:** The treatment of Arabs by the State of Israel cannot be compared in any way to the treatment of the black majority in South Africa under apartheid. There is no Israeli ideology, policy or plan to segregate, persecute or mistreat the Arab population.

Apartheid was a uniquely repressive system, through which South Africa's white minority enforced its domination over the black and other non-white racial groups who made up more than 90 percent of the population. Apartheid – which means "separate development" in the Afrikaans language – was enabled through a host of laws such as the Group Areas Act, which banned blacks from "white areas," the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, which prevented blacks and whites from marrying or even having sexual relations with each other, and the Bantu Education Act, which regulated the education of black children in accordance with their subservient social position. The regime imposed "Bantustans," impoverished autonomous homelands whose borders were designed to exclude economically viable land, upon 12 million black South Africans.

No such laws exist in Israel, which pledged itself to safeguard the equal rights of all citizens in its Declaration of Independence. Arab citizens of Israel have the full range of civil and political rights, including the right to organize politically, the right to vote and the right to speak and publish freely. Moreover, Israel has declared its acceptance, in principle, of a sovereign Palestinian state in most of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, to be established as the result of bilateral Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. As Benjamin Pogrund, the prominent South African Jewish journalist who was imprisoned by the apartheid regime, has written: "Palestinians are not oppressed on racial grounds as Arabs but are, rather, the competitors in a national/religious conflict for land."

Divestment and boycott campaigns singularly demonize Israel and designate Israel for pariah status, while ignoring other states, including many in the Middle East, which systematically abuse human rights. If anti-Israel divestment and boycott activists were truly interested in aiding Palestinians and promoting Israeli-Palestinian reconciliation, they would advocate constructive initiatives between Israelis, Palestinians and others. Unfortunately, most of these activists ignore such initiatives, and focus solely on bashing Israel and promoting punitive actions against the state.

## **ANTI-SEMITISM AND CRITICISM OF ISRAEL**

**Inaccuracy: Jews unfairly label anyone who criticizes Israel an anti-Semite.**

**Response:** Certainly the sovereign State of Israel and its government can be legitimately criticized just like any other country or government in the world. Criticism of particular Israeli actions or policies in and of itself does not constitute anti-Semitism. However, it is undeniable that there are those whose criticism of Israel or of Zionism crosses the line into anti-Semitism. It is also undeniable that criticism of Israel and Zionism are considered socially acceptable, thereby providing a pretext for some whose criticism masks deeper anti-Semitic attitudes.

How can one distinguish between criticism of Israel that is within the bounds of legitimate political discourse, and that which crosses the line into anti-Semitism? One way is to recognize when those that criticize Israel invoke traditional anti-Jewish references, accusations and conspiracy theories. For example, when Israelis are depicted using *Der Stürmer*-like stereotypes: i.e., hooked noses; bent over, dark, ugly, demonic figures. Or when Israelis are accused of crimes that are reminiscent of age-old anti-Jewish conspiracy theories – i.e. alleged Israeli/ Jewish plans for world domination; that a Jewish cabal (elders of Zion) is behind Israel's strength or behind foreign policy that is favorable to Israel, or allegations of Israeli actions that are eerily similar to medieval blood libels.

Another common theme is when Israelis are compared to Nazis and Hitler. This comparison between the Jewish state and those who perpetrated the greatest and largest act of anti-Semitism in world history is not an impartial or dispassionate accusation. It is a charge that is purposefully directed at Jews in an effort to associate the victims of the Nazi crimes with the Nazi perpetrators, and serves to diminish the significance and uniqueness of the Holocaust. To make such a comparison is an act of blatant hostility toward Jews and Jewish history.

Finally, deeper bias against Israel and Jews may be evident when Israel is held to a different standard than any other country in the world. Such an example is when critics of Israel question or deny Israel's right to exist. No one questions France's right to exist or Egypt's, simply because there is disagreement with their policies. Why is it only the Jewish state's legitimacy that is a subject for discussion? Similarly,

questions of motivation arise when Israel is singled out for criticism for actions or policies that nations around the world engage in with impunity.

**Inaccuracy: Arabs who hate Jews cannot be labeled as anti-Semitic because they themselves are Semites.**

**Response:** The term anti-Semitism was formulated to refer specifically to the hatred of Jews. The term has never been used to refer to hatred against Arabs. Claims to the contrary are an effort to diminish the potency of the term, or to seize ownership of this resonant term.

The historical roots of the term “anti-Semitism” go back to the 19th century when it was invented and popularized by anti-Jewish German writers and intellectuals in the closing decades of the 19th century. The anthropology of that era gave the name “Semitic” – from the Hebrew “Shem,” one of Noah’s sons – to a family of languages that included Hebrew, Arabic, Assyrian and Phoenician; and labeled members of groups that spoke these languages were “Semites.” Through the ministrations of late-century racial “science,” Semitic was increasingly used to designate Jews as a “race” with inborn biological attributes. The use of the term “anti-Semitism” to specifically denote opposition and antagonism to Jews was first suggested by the German journalist Wilhelm Marr in his 1879 work *The Victory of Judaism over Germanism*, a best-seller that helped push “the Jewish question” to the center of German politics. Quite simply, anti-Semitism refers to the hatred of Jews, whatever the nationality, race, color or creed of the perpetrator. Attempting to dismiss the term anti-Semitism because of semantics does not erase the fact of its existence or its history.

## **U.S.-ISRAEL RELATIONS**

**Inaccuracy: The only reason the United States supports Israel is because of the powerful Jewish lobby.**

**Response:** U.S. foreign policy on Israel involves many complex issues, actors and considerations and cannot be simply ascribed to a “powerful Jewish lobby.”

The United States is a longstanding strong ally of Israel based on shared democratic values and strategic interests including the rejection of terrorism and violence. The United States has a great interest in the stability of the Middle East, a region that is afflicted by extremists who violently oppose the U.S., Israel and democracy, by rogue states with large military arsenals which include non-conventional weaponry, and other authoritarian regimes. Bolstering and supporting peace, stability and democracy in the region through relations with Israel is in America’s strategic interest.

Indeed, public opinion polls taken over decades have consistently demonstrated that Americans of all backgrounds support strong U.S.-Israeli relations and view Israel as a key ally of the United States.

As citizens of the United States, American Jewish advocacy is an appropriate exercise of American democracy and reflective of the Jewish community's commitment to American democratic ideals. The American Jewish community's active engagement in the political process is mirrored in the activism of other minority constituencies, such as Chinese Americans, Arab Americans, Irish Americans, Indian Americans and others.

Indeed, there is no shortage of voices who are critical of U.S. policy towards Israel. There are strong lobbyists for Arabs and Palestinian interests, there is lively debate on U.S. policy daily on op-ed pages, radio and television talk shows, and by speakers on college campuses, where the viewpoint is at times harshly critical of Israel and of U.S. policy. Even within the Jewish community there is a diversity of opinion on U.S. policy towards Israel.

The exaggeration of the power of the "Jewish lobby," the disregard for the consistently broad-based American public support for Israel, the omission of the very many interests that the U.S. has in a strong and safe Israel, and the overriding theme that policymakers are controlled by this so-called "lobby," adds up to an effort to delegitimize pro-Israel activists and has elements of classical anti-Jewish conspiracy theories.

**Inaccuracy: The U.S. relationship with Israel threatens our national interests as it alienates important Arab allies the U.S. needs for access to oil and for support against Middle East-based extremists such as Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda.**

**Response:** U.S.-Israel relations do not jeopardize relations with others in the region. The U.S. enjoys a mutually beneficial relationship with its Arab allies, who have overriding national interests in maintaining their close relations with the U.S. They are an important source of oil for Americans, while the U.S. provides them with crucial military and political support.

For U.S. allies such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia, internal pressures dictate how much those nations can show support for any U.S.-led coalition against extremists – regardless of Israeli policies or involvement. Because of internal threats from Islamic

extremists in their own populace, these nations generally do not provide too much public assistance – for example, using their countries as takeoff points for U.S. military actions – lest they antagonize these anti-American extremists. At the same time, given the threat Islamic extremist terrorist organizations pose to both the Egyptian and Saudi regimes, they are supportive of the U.S. effort against Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda.

America's Arab and Muslim allies recognize that support for U.S. efforts against Middle East-based extremists is in their interest. U.S. policies towards Israel, and Israel's policies and actions have little bearing on these overriding interests.

**Inaccuracy: Islamic terrorists such as Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network target the United States because of its relationship with Israel and its favoring of Israel in the conflict with the Palestinians. If the U.S. ended its close relations with Israel, these terrorists would no longer have a reason to attack the U.S.**

**Response:** The hatred of the United States and the West by Islamic extremist terrorists such as Osama bin Laden has little to do with U.S. policy towards Israel and the Palestinians. Indeed, their key “grievances” against the U.S. and the West would remain even were there no Israeli-Palestinian conflict or were the U.S. to sever its ties with Israel.

These extremists are ideologically opposed to everything the U.S. and the West stand for: democracy, modernism, freedom, globalism and diversity. In Al Qaeda's public pronouncements the U.S. is blamed for its presence on Muslim soil (the war in Iraq, stationing U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan), and for its support of “moderate Arab regimes” such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt and others that they consider corrupt and anti-Muslim. Bin Laden and his supporters recognize that the U.S. and its allies in the region (including Israel, Saudi Arabia and Egypt) stand in the way of his ultimate goal: the establishment of a theocratic, unified Muslim state spanning the region.

Until the U.S. launched military action against Al Qaeda in response to the 9/11 attacks, bin Laden said hardly a word about the Palestinians or Israel. His periodic championing of the Palestinian cause is clearly calculated to woo support from the “Arab street.”

**Inaccuracy: The United States gives Israel too much foreign aid making it difficult to meet critical needs at home.**

**Response:** Foreign aid, which represents less than one percent of the federal budget, is a crucial tool in promoting American interests around the world. Foreign affairs spending in general is vital to advance our country's security, economic and humanitarian interests and preserve America's leadership worldwide. It is a tool for spreading liberty and democracy. That is why such a broad array of faith, business and humanitarian organizations continue to advocate for a strong foreign affairs budget. Foreign aid also creates jobs in the United States. Indeed, by law, nearly all U.S. assistance must be spent on American-produced goods.

Aid to Israel promotes stability and democracy in the Middle East. The United States has an ongoing strategic interest in supporting Israel – a stalwart democratic ally with whom it shares many core values, including a commitment to democracy and a rejection of extremism and terrorism in a vital region of the world. Moreover, history has shown that American aid, particularly military assistance, which keeps Israel strong, is the primary ingredient in bringing Israel's neighbors to the peace table.

In recent years, aid to Israel has decreased and its proportion of the overall foreign aid budget has been cut in half. Israel is in the final stages of phasing out economic assistance from the United States, maintaining only military assistance to promote its security.

## **ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL**

**Inaccuracy: Jews are interlopers in the Middle East. The Jews that came to Israel have no connection with the land which was populated solely by indigenous Palestinians.**

**Response:** The Land of Israel – the historical birthplace of the Jewish people, the land promised to Abraham, the site of the holy Temple and David's Kingdom – has been the cornerstone of Jewish religious life since the Jewish exile from the land two thousand years ago, and is embedded in Jewish prayer, ritual, literature and culture.

A small number of Jews lived continuously in the Land of Israel after their exile in the year 70, through Byzantine, Muslim and Crusader rule. At the time of the Ottoman conquest in 1517, Jews lived in Jerusalem, Nablus, Hebron, Safad and in Galilean villages. Hundreds of Hasidic Jews immigrated in 1770 from Eastern Europe. Many pious Jews left Eastern Europe in the late 18th and early 19th centuries in order to pray and die in the four sacred cities of the Holy Land: Jerusalem, Safed, Tiberias and Hebron.

There has been a continuous presence of Jewish residents in Jerusalem from King David's time (except for periods when Jews were barred from living in the city), and by 1844, Jews were the largest single religious community in Jerusalem. By 1856, the Jewish population in Palestine was over 17,000. Organized Jewish immigration began in 1880 with the emergence of the modern Zionist movement. The number of Palestinian Arabs living in the area when Jews began arriving en masse in the late 19th century remains the subject of dispute among historians.

The early Zionist pioneers saw the Arab population as small, apolitical, and without a nationalist element and they therefore believed that there would not be friction between the two communities. They also thought that development of the country would benefit both peoples and they would thus secure Arab support and cooperation. Indeed, many Arabs attracted by new employment opportunities, higher wages and better living conditions migrated to Palestine from other countries in the wake of economic growth stimulated by Jewish immigration.

**Inaccuracy: The Palestinians were justified in rejecting the 1947 U.N. Partition Plan.**

**Response:** The rejection of the partition plan in 1947 by the Arab nations demonstrated an unwillingness to accept the existence of a Jewish state in the region. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs were fully satisfied with the plan calling for a division of British-mandated Palestine into two states, with Jerusalem as an international city, and there was much internal opposition. Giving the Jews only 12 percent of the land promised to them in the Balfour declaration, and drawing borders for the new state which were virtually indefensible, the plan was a difficult compromise for many of the Jews of Palestine. On the other side, the Arab nations desired full control over the land of Palestine and the Arab people in the region. Yet, the Zionist leaders accepted the partition plan despite its less-than-ideal solution, understanding the need to compromise. It was the Arab nations who refused the plan and gathered their armies to wage battle against Israel. Had the Arabs accepted the plan in 1947 there would have been an Arab state alongside the Jewish State of Israel and the heartache and bloodshed that have characterized the Arab-Israeli conflict might have been avoided.

# KEY DATES IN ISRAEL'S HISTORY

---

February 14, 1896	Publication of Theodor Herzl's treatise "The Jewish State"
August 29, 1897	Opening of the First Zionist Congress at Basel, Switzerland
November 2, 1917	Issuing of Balfour Declaration: British support for a "Jewish Homeland"
April 24, 1920	Britain assigned mandatory power over Palestine at the San Remo Conference
August 23, 1929	Arab attack on Jewish community of Hebron
April 15, 1936	Arab revolt begins
May 17, 1939	British White Paper limiting Jewish immigration to Palestine
December 1945	Initiation of Arab League Boycott (on the Jewish community of Palestine)
July 22, 1946	Irgun bombs King David Hotel
February 14, 1947	Britain gives UN responsibility for Palestine
November 29, 1947	UN Partition Plan approved (Resolution 181)
May 14, 1948	Declaration of the State of Israel
May 15, 1948	Outbreak of War of Independence. Ends January 1949
January 25, 1949	Israel's first national election takes place; David Ben-Gurion elected Prime Minister
May 1950	Operation Ali Baba; brings 113,000 Iraqi Jews to Israel
September 1950	Operation Magic Carpet; 47,000 Yemeni Jews to Israel
Oct. 29-Nov. 6, 1950	Suez Campaign
October 10, 1959	Creation of Fatah

January 1964	Creation of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)
January 1, 1965	Fatah attack on Israeli water system
May 15-22, 1967	Egyptian Mobilization in the Sinai/Closure of the Tiran Straits
June 5-10, 1967	Six Day War
November 22, 1967	Adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 242
April 4, 1968	Establishment of Jewish settlement in Hebron
July 18, 1968	Hijacking of El Al airliner by PLO
February 1-4, 1969	Arafat becomes PLO Chairman
March 8, 1969	War of Attrition begins, lasts to August 1970
September 5, 1973	Massacre of 11 Israeli athletes at Munich Olympics
October 6-24, 1973	Yom Kippur War
October 17, 1973	Arab Oil Embargo
October 19, 1973	U.S. sends \$2.2 billion in military aid to Israel to counter Soviet arms shipments to Egypt
October 22, 1973	Adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 338
November 5, 1973	Kissinger begins shuttle diplomacy
May 15, 1974	Terrorist Attack on school in northern Israeli town of Ma'alot
November 10, 1975	"Zionism is Racism" resolution passed by the UN
May 17, 1977	Likud victory in Israeli elections/Menachem Begin becomes PM
November 19, 1977	Egyptian President Anwar Sadat visits Jerusalem
September 17, 1978	Camp David accords signed
March 26, 1979	Egypt-Israel peace treaty signed
June 7, 1981	Israel attacks Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor

October 6, 1981	Assassination of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat
April 25, 1982	Final Israeli withdrawal from Sinai
June 6, 1982	Operation "Peace for the Galilee" launched; start of Lebanon War
August 21, 1982	PLO evacuation from Lebanon
September 16-17, 1982	Attack on Sabra and Shatila by Christian Phalangists
September 15, 1983	Begin resignation
October 23, 1983	Bombing of U.S. Marine barrack in Beirut
November 1984	Operation Moses airlifts 7000 Ethiopian Jews to Israel
June 10, 1985	Withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon; Israel retains buffer zone in southern Lebanon
October 7, 1986	Hijacking of Achille Lauro
December 8, 1987	Start of the Intifada
January 16	Gulf War; Iraq launches SCUD missiles at Israel
May 24, 1991	Operation Solomon brings 14000 Ethiopian Jews to Israel
October 30, 1991	Madrid Peace Conference
December 16, 1991	UN repeals "Zionism is Racism" resolution
June 23, 1992	Labor victory in Israeli elections; Yitzhak Rabin elected Prime Minister
January 19, 1993	Israel repeals ban on contacts with the PLO
August 30, 1993	Secret agreement between Israel and the PLO in Oslo announced
September 9, 1993	Israel-PLO letters of mutual recognition exchanged
September 13, 1993	Israel-Palestinian Declaration of Principles announced
February 25, 1994	Jewish gunman kills 29 Palestinian worshippers in Hebron

April 6, 1994	Afula suicide bombing, kills 8
May 4, 1994	Agreement on the Gaza Strip and Jericho reached
May 13, 1994	Israel withdraws from Jericho
May 18, 1994	Israeli withdrawal from Gaza
July 1, 1994	Arafat enters Gaza
October 9, 1994	Hamas kidnaps and kills an Israeli soldier
October 14, 1994	Rabin, Peres, and Arafat awarded Nobel Peace Prize
October 19, 1994	Tel Aviv bus bombing, kills 13
October 26, 1994	Israel-Jordan Peace Treaty
December 1, 1994	Transfer of West Bank administrative control to Palestinians
December 11, 1994	Jordan and Israel open embassies
January 22, 1995	Beit Lid suicide bombing, kills 21
April 9, 1995	Gaza suicide bombings, kills 8
September 28, 1995	Signing of Oslo II agreement
November 4, 1995	Assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin
November 13, 1995	Israel redeploys from Palestinian population centers
December 27, 1995	Israel-Syria negotiations at Wye Plantation begin
January 20, 1996	First Palestinian elections
February 25, 1996	Jerusalem/Ashkelon suicide bombings, kill 27
March 3, 1996	Bombing of bus in downtown Jerusalem kills 19
March 4, 1996	Bombing outside main Tel Aviv mall, kills 13
March 13, 1996	Sharm-el-Sheikh "Summit of Peacemakers"
May 29, 1996	Benjamin Netanyahu elected Prime Minister

September 24, 1996	Palestinian "Tunnel Riots" erupt
January 17, 1997	Israel withdraws from Hebron
March 13, 1997	Jordanian soldier kills 7 Israeli schoolgirls
June 10, 1997	U.S. Congress recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's "United Capital"
July 30, 1997	Hamas suicide bomber explodes in a Jerusalem market, killing 16
September 4, 1997	Three bombs on Jerusalem pedestrian mall, kill 5, injure 181
October 23, 1998	Israel-Palestinian "Wye Memorandum" signed
December 10, 1998	Palestinians vote to change PLO charter in presence of President Clinton
May 17, 1999	Ehud Barak elected Prime Minister
May 24, 2000	Israel withdraws from southern Lebanon
July 11-25, 2000	Camp David Summit
September 28, 2000	Ariel Sharon visits Temple Mount
September 29, 2000	Outbreak of widespread Palestinian violence, "Second Intifada" begins
October 7, 2000	Hezbollah kidnaps 3 Israeli soldiers from Lebanon border
October 12, 2000	Two Israeli soldiers lynched by Palestinian mob in Ramallah
October 16-17, 2000	Sharm el-Sheikh Summit
November 22, 2000	Suicide bomb in Hadera, kills 2
February 6, 2001	Ariel Sharon elected Prime Minister
May 18, 2001	Suicide attack at Netanya shopping mall, kills 5
May 20, 2001	Mitchell Report published

June 1, 2001	Suicide bombing of Tel Aviv night club, kills 21 youths
August 9, 2001	Suicide bombing at pizzeria in Jerusalem, kills 15
November 29, 2001	Bombing of inter-city bus, kills 3
December 1, 2001	Suicide bombing in pedestrian mall in central Jerusalem, kills 11 youths
December 2, 2001	A suicide bomber of a bus in Haifa, kills 15
January 4, 2002	Israel intercepts massive Palestinian arms shipment on Karine A
March 2, 2002	Suicide bombing outside a bar mitzvah party in Jerusalem, kills 11
March 5, 2002	Gunman opens fire at a Tel-Aviv restaurant, kills 3
March 9, 2002	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem cafe, kills 11
March 12, 2002	Hezbollah operatives open fire on Israeli vehicles in Kibbutz Metzuba, kill 6
March 21, 2002	Suicide bombing in downtown Jerusalem, kills 5
March 27, 2002	Suicide bomber kills 30 at Passover seder at Netanya hotel
March 29, 2002	Female suicide bomber attacks Jerusalem supermarket
March 29, 2002	IDF begins Operation Defensive Shield to uproot terrorist infrastructure in West Bank
March 31, 2002	Suicide bombing in Haifa restaurant, kills 15
April 10, 2002	Suicide bombing of bus traveling from Haifa to Jerusalem, kills 8
April 12, 2002	Female suicide bomber attacks Jerusalem market, kills 6
May 7, 2002	Suicide bombing at Rishon Le-Zion billiards hall, kills 15
June 5, 2002	Suicide bombing of bus in Meggiddo Junction, kills 17
June 18, 2002	Suicide bus bombing in Jerusalem, kills 18

June 19, 2002	Suicide bombing at bus stop in Jerusalem, kills 7
June 24, 2002	U.S. President George W. Bush's speech calls for replacement of Palestinian Authority leadership to crack down on terrorism, to be followed by interim Palestinian state (basis of future Roadmap)
July 17, 2002	Suicide bombing of Tel-Aviv market, kills 5
July 31, 2002	Suicide bombing of cafeteria at Hebrew University, kills 9
August 4, 2002	Suicide bombing of bus in Meron Junction, kills 9
September 19, 2002	Suicide bus bombing in Tel Aviv, kills 6
October 21, 2002	Car bomb kills 14 people on a bus at Karkur Junction
November 10, 2002	An Al-Aqsa gunman kills 5 at Kibbutz Metzger
November 21, 2002	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem bus, kills 11
November 28, 2002	Gunman attacks Likud Party headquarters in Beit Shean, kills 6
January 5, 2003	Two simultaneous suicide bombings in Tel Aviv, kill 23
March 5, 2003	Suicide bombing of Haifa bus, kills 17
April 20, 2003	Suicide bombing at Mike's Place, a Tel-Aviv blues club, kills 3
April 30, 2003	The "Road Map for Peace" is presented by the Quartet to the Israelis and Palestinians
May 18, 2003	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem bus, kills 7
June 11, 2003	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem bus, kills 17
August 19, 2003	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem bus, kills 24
September 8, 2003	Suicide bombing on Jerusalem bus, kills 9
September 8, 2003	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem cafe, kills 8
October 4, 2003	Suicide bombing at Haifa cafe, kills 21

December 18, 2003	Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon first makes reference to a unilateral disengagement from Gaza at Herzliya conference
January 29, 2004	Suicide bombing on Jerusalem bus, kills 11
January 29, 2004	Israel swaps prisoners with the terrorist group Hezbollah; releases 435 Arab prisoners in return for the remains of murdered soldiers and a kidnapped Israeli businessman
February 22, 2004	Suicide bombing of Jerusalem bus kills 8
March 14, 2004	Double suicide bombing at an Ashdod port, kills 8
August 31, 2004	Two simultaneous suicide bombings in Beersheba kill 16
November 11, 2004	Yasir Arafat dies in a Paris hospital
December 14, 2004	Israel, Egypt, and U.S. sign a partial free trade deal
December 23, 2004	The first phase of PA municipal elections are held; Hamas secures nearly half the seats
January 2005	Sharon forms a National Unity Government with the Labor Party; Shimon Peres is "Vice-Premier"
January 9, 2005	Mahmoud Abbas is elected PA president
February 8, 2005	Abbas and Sharon meet at Sharm-el-Sheikh, Egypt, and declare an "end to the fighting"
February 25, 2005	Suicide bombing at Tel Aviv nightclub, kills 5
February 26, 2005	The Knesset gives final approval to the Disengagement Plan, rejects calls for a national referendum
July 12, 2005	Suicide bombing of Netanya mall kills 3
August 17-22, 2005	Evacuation of settlers from the Gaza Strip
August 23, 2005	Evacuation of four settlements in the northern West Bank completed.
September 12, 2005	Israeli military completes withdrawal from the Gaza

December 5, 2005	Suicide bombing of a shopping mall in Netanya kills 5
January 4, 2006	Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon incapacitated by massive stroke; Deputy Prime Minister Ehud Olmert appointed Acting Prime Minister
January 26, 2006	Palestinian parliamentary elections; Hamas wins 74 seats in the 132-seat legislature
March 28, 2006	Israeli elections; Kadima wins 29 of Knesset's 120 seats
March 30, 2006	Suicide bombing in Kedumim kills 4
April 13, 2006	Ehud Olmert officially assumes post of Prime Minister
April 17, 2006	Suicide bombing near the old central bus station in Tel Aviv kills 9
June 25, 2006	IDF Corporal Gilad Shalit is kidnapped by Hamas from IDF army post; Israel responds with military operation
July 12, 2006	Hezbollah sparks the second Lebanon War when they cross the border into Israel and attack an Israeli military patrol, killing eight soldiers and kidnapping two others
August 11, 2006	The U.N. Security Council unanimously adopts Resolution 1701 for cease fire in the Lebanon War
April 30, 2007	Winograd Committee investigating Israeli decision making in Second Lebanon war releases preliminary report; final report issued in January 2008
June 15, 2007	Hamas takes over Gaza
November 27, 2007	Forty-six nations gather at Annapolis, Maryland for a U.S.-hosted conference intended to renew Israeli Palestinian peace talks
March 6, 2008	A Palestinian gunman attacked a Jerusalem yeshiva, killing 8.



# **SELECT ONLINE RESOURCES FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT ISRAEL AND THE CONFLICT**

---

## **ISRAELI GOVERNMENT RESOURCES**

Israel Defense Forces: <http://dover.idf.il/IDF/English/>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs: [www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/home.asp](http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/home.asp)

## **ISRAELI NEWS SOURCES**

Ha'aretz: [www.haaretz.com](http://www.haaretz.com)

Jerusalem Post: [www.jpost.com](http://www.jpost.com)

Kol-Israel Radio: [www.kol-israel.com](http://www.kol-israel.com)

Yedioth Ahronot: [www.ynetnews.com](http://www.ynetnews.com)

## **MIDDLE EASTERN NEWS SOURCES**

Al-Ahram (Egypt): [www.ahram.org.eg/weekly/](http://www.ahram.org.eg/weekly/)

Arab News (Saudi Arabia): [www.arabnews.com](http://www.arabnews.com)

Islamic Republic News Agency (Iran): [www.irna.ir/en/](http://www.irna.ir/en/)

Jordan Times: [www.jordantimes.com](http://www.jordantimes.com)

Daily Star (Lebanon): [www.dailystar.com.lb](http://www.dailystar.com.lb)

Wafa News Agency (Palestinian Authority): <http://english.wafa.ps>

Tehran Times: [www.tehrantimes.com](http://www.tehrantimes.com)

Syria Times: <http://syriatimes.tishreen.info/>

## **THINK TANKS/ RESEARCH INSTITUTES**

BESA Center for Strategic Studies: [www.biu.ac.il/SOC/besa/](http://www.biu.ac.il/SOC/besa/)

Harry S. Truman Institute for Peace: <http://truman.huji.ac.il>

The Institute for National Security Studies: <http://www.inss.org.il/>

Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs: [www.jcpa.org](http://www.jcpa.org)

Saban Center for Middle East Policy/Brookings Institution:

[www.brookings.edu/fp/saban/sabancenter\\_hp.htm](http://www.brookings.edu/fp/saban/sabancenter_hp.htm)

Washington Institute for Near East Policy: [www.washingtoninstitute.org](http://www.washingtoninstitute.org)

# Anti-Defamation League



**GLEN S. LEWY**, National Chair

**ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN**, National Director

**KENNETH JACOBSON**, Deputy National Director

**MICHAEL SALBERG**, Associate National Director  
Director, International Affairs

**CHARLES F. KRISER**, Chair, International Affairs  
**LYNNE BORSUK**, Vice Chair, International Affairs

**SUSAN HELLER PINTO**, Director  
Middle Eastern Affairs and International Analysis  
Assistant Director, International Affairs

**JUDITH HEISTEIN**  
International Affairs Analyst





© 2008 Anti-Defamation League

Printed in the United States of America  
All Rights Reserved