

Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy
Institute for Policy and Strategy

**Soft Powerlessness: Arab Propaganda and the
Erosion of Israel's International Standing**

Working Paper

Submitted for the Herzliya Conference,
January 21-24, 2006

Emmanuel Navon

This paper reflects the opinions of its author only

“On résiste à l’invasion des armées, on ne résiste pas à l’invasion des idées.”

Victor Hugo

“A lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is putting on its shoes.”

Mark Twain

Table of Contents

Abstract	p. 3
Introduction	p. 4
<hr/>	
Part I: Defining and Understanding the War of Ideas	p. 7
<hr/>	
1. A New Type of Warfare	p. 7
2. The War of Ideas Against Israel	p. 15
3. Israel's Achilles' Heel	p. 30
Part II: The War of Ideas in the International Arena	p. 37
<hr/>	
1. The United States as a Target	p. 37
2. The Role of the United Nations	p. 40
3. The Role of NGOs	p. 46
Part III: The Problem with Europe	p. 58
<hr/>	
1. Europe's Ideological and Cultural Surrender	p. 58
2. European Hostility Toward Israel Since September 2000	p. 64
3. The Economic Boycott of Israel in Europe	p. 72
Conclusion	p.79
<hr/>	
Appendix: Selected List of Pro-Israel Organizations	p. 86
<hr/>	
Bibliography	p. 94
<hr/>	

Abstract

The present study explains why Israel is widely perceived as an international villain, argues that this negative image is detrimental to Israel's security and economic interests, and provides practical solutions to Israel's PR deficiencies.

In the 1970s, the PLO adopted the "propaganda strategy" of the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists. This strategy consists of defeating a militarily superior enemy through psychological and media warfare. Mass media enable propaganda to be turned into an efficient tool by convincing world public opinion that the victim of terrorism is actually responsible for that very terrorism, and that terrorists are using the only tool available to defend universal values such as freedom and national liberation. Indeed, propaganda warfare is also known today as Fourth Generation War (4GW), i.e. a war in which the target is not military but psychological. The strategy of 4GW consists of scaring the enemy through terrorism, and of convincing international public opinion, through the use of propaganda, that terrorism is justified.

The PLO's strategy enabled this organization to gain international legitimacy and to progressively turn Israel into a pariah state. With the explosion of Arafat's war in the fall of 2000, the PLO intensified this strategy, which culminated in the Durban Conference a year later. Even though it made a generous peace proposal that was rejected by Arafat, and even though Arafat triggered a terror war against Israeli civilians, Israel was blamed for the violence and became increasingly vilified at the UN, in Western media and on campuses. The UN and international NGOs play an important role in promoting the PLO's propaganda, and Europe has become increasingly hostile to Israel. As a result, Israel's very legitimacy and economic interests are increasingly being challenged in Europe.

In order to counter this dangerous tendency, Israel should entrust its National Security Council with the task of developing a 4GW strategy, and implement this strategy through the centralized control of the Prime Minister and in coordination with all the pro-Israel organizations in Israel and overseas. In addition, Israel's PR budget should be boosted through a special fund financed by Israeli business leaders.

Introduction

In July 2000, the Prime Minister of Israel made a peace proposal at the Camp David Summit, a proposal that constituted the maximum Israel could offer: a Palestinian state in nearly all of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip with its capital in East Jerusalem, including the Old City. The Palestinian leadership rejected the offer, did not make a counter-offer, and initiated a war of terror in gross violation of the basic tenet of the Oslo Agreements, in which the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had committed itself to abandon terror and to resolve any future disagreement through negotiations.

To Israel's astonishment, Arafat was not condemned by world public opinion for rejecting the peace offer at Camp David and for turning to violence. On the contrary: Israel was blamed for the violence and was pressured to make more concessions to the Palestinians.

This psychological shock was followed by another a year later. September 2000 marked the renewal of Arafat's *military* war against Israeli civilians. September 2001 marked the renewal of Arafat's *ideological* war against the Jewish State at the Durban Conference. Israel was caught off guard by the reactivation of the ideological war against the Jewish State by the PLO. During the Oslo process, it was widely believed that the PLO had chosen the path of peace and that its media war against Israel was over.

Arafat's strategy was, by his own account, twofold: a) to bring Israeli society to its knees through terror, b) to convince world public opinion that the Jewish state is an apartheid regime responsible for the worst human rights violations and for the Arab-Israeli conflict. This double strategy was meant to bring about the end of Israel through internal implosion and external pressure. The first part of this dual strategy failed. The second worked.

At the United Nations, in Europe and on American campuses, Israel is now widely perceived as the world's worst violator of human rights, as a state based on a racist ideology, as a powerful and ruthless country solely responsible for the Arab-Israeli conflict, as the obstacle to peace, and as the cruel and even sadistic oppressor of the Palestinians. As a result of these truncated yet deeply rooted beliefs, Israel is being *de-legitimized* in the media, in academia in and in international organizations. Governments are increasingly pressured to act for the replacement of the Jewish state by a bi-national Jewish-Arab state and to boycott Israel.

The lethal effects of the media war against Israel are no less dangerous than those of the military war. Israel is not only threatened by Palestinian terror, Hizballah's missiles and Iran's nuclear program. It is also threatened by words, images and ideas that are convincing more and more people around the world that the very existence of the State of Israel is something that can no longer and should no longer be tolerated.

The global war of ideas, or media war, is also known as the "Fourth Generation War" (4GW). Unlike previous generations of warfare, 4GW does not attempt to win by defeating the enemy's military forces, but to directly attack the minds of enemy decision makers and constituencies to destroy their political will.

Propaganda warfare can have lethal effects on the enemy's ability to fight and survive. This is because propaganda actually works, and because public opinion and leaders form their opinions (and, hence, their policies) based on how they *perceive* reality. As explained by propaganda expert Oliver Thomson, it is thanks to propaganda that over the centuries "we have been lulled into idolizing conquerors, applauding genocide, upholding persecution and condoning exploitation ... We have been willing to believe the silliest myths, we have let our senses be ruled by martial music, poetic slogans, absurd prophecies and exotic images. We may now claim to be more sophisticated and less easily manipulated than our ancestors, but there is little evidence of this."¹

¹ Oliver Thomson, *Easily Led. A History of Propaganda* (Sutton Publishing, 1999), from the Preface.

The war of ideas is not a mere PR contest. Its outcome is eroding Israel's international stance and is likely to affect Israel's national security. It is therefore critical to fully understand the motivations, aims and strategy of this type of warfare in order to design and implement a counter-strategy. This paper offers a comprehensive description and analysis of the war of ideas. Part One shows the centrality of propaganda in modern terrorism, the *modus operandi* of anti-Israel propaganda, and Israel's weaknesses and disadvantages in the propaganda war. Part Two looks into the international ramifications of the war of ideas, by showing that Israel is not the only target, and that the United Nations and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are actively involved in the promotion of Palestinian propaganda. Part Three argues that Europe is ideologically tilting toward the Arab world and against the United States and Israel, and that this phenomenon is threatening both Israel's economic interests and the unity of the West vis-à-vis Islamism. The Conclusion presents practical recommendations to improve Israel's stance in the arena of international public opinion.

Part I: Defining and Understanding the War of Ideas

1. A New Type of Warfare

The great wars of the twentieth century were fought on two levels: physical and ideological. The two World Wars and the Cold War erupted as a result of both conflicting interests and ideologies. These wars involved combat aircraft, tanks and rifles, but also images, words and ideas. The reason for this dual nature of modern warfare is obvious: Wilhelm, Hitler and Stalin wanted to impose both their power *and* ideology. These tyrants knew that in order to succeed they needed to militarily vanquish the democracies and convince public opinion in these democracies that the “right” ideology was the one against which the West was fighting.

Totalitarian ideologies did achieve some of their goals during the “Three World Wars”²: Prussian Hegelianism, Nazism and Marxism gained many believers and admirers in the West. This ideological penetration was patent altogether in academia, in the media and among voters. Hitler was able to occupy France for four years not only because of his military victory but also because of his ideological gains: “*Plutôt Hitler que Léon Blum*” (“Rather Hitler than Léon Blum”) had become an idiom in pre-war France partly as a result of Nazi propaganda. When the Soviet Union deployed its SS-20 missiles in Eastern Europe in the early 1980s, it could (and did) rely on the support of millions of sympathizers in the West. Many Western academics became the blind apostles of the new Savior. The list is endless, but the name of Edward Hallett Carr comes naturally to mind: during the Second World War, this respected Cambridge historian proclaimed the ideological superiority and imminent victory of both Hitler and Stalin.

With the demise of Soviet power and Communist ideology in the last two decades of the twentieth century, the United States could rightly pride itself on winning the Cold War. However, the values for which the United States had fought during the Second

² The “Cold War” was an expression forged by Soviet propagandists, but was in fact a World War as much as the First and Second World Wars. See: Norman Podhoretz, “World War IV: How It Started, What It Means, and Why We Have to Win.” *Commentary*, September 2004 (Vo. 118, No. 2), pp. 17-54.

World War and the Cold War were far from being unchallenged –notwithstanding some optimistic proclamations about the “End of History.” American economic and military predominance aroused the ire of neo-Marxists and Islamic fundamentalists alike. “Globalization” became the catchword for an ideological crusade against the worldwide expansion of economic liberalism, and “imperialism” the motto used by Islamic fundamentalists to justify their *jihad* against the United States. True, the physical harm caused by neo-Marxists was minimal compared to the one triggered by Islamic fundamentalists: José Bové trashed his tractor into a Mc Donald’s restaurant in rural France, while Bin-Laden crashed three airplanes into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon – the most lethal and barbaric terrorist attack in History. But both neo-Marxists and Islamic fundamentalists are actively waging a war of ideas in the post-Cold War world. Their common hatred for the United States and Israel creates strange bedfellows in the West: radical leftist secularists now commonly demonstrate together with Islamic conservatives against “globalization” and “Israeli occupation.” The moral relativism that has become the bon ton and politically correct discourse in Western media and academia undoubtedly offers fertile ground for the new and bizarre alliance between neo-Marxists and Islamic fundamentalists. Back in October 1975, communist terrorist Ramírez Sánchez (“Carlos”) converted to Islam and declared that there was no contradiction between being Muslim and communist.

There is little neo-Marxists can do to stop the spread of economic liberalism. Thus, their struggle is concentrated on the *ideological* level to win the hearts and minds of Western public opinion. Similarly, the warfare of Islamic fundamentalists is primarily *psychological*. As Bin-Laden has explained in his recorded appearances, the United States’ decisions to withdraw from Lebanon in 1983 and from Somalia in 1993 convinced him that, when threatened by death, America will capitulate. Which is why his strategy consists of causing as many American casualties as possible until Islam wins out against “Infidels.” This strategy is based on the use of propaganda.

The word *propaganda* is of relatively recent origin. It was apparently first used by Pope Gregory XV in his 1622 *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*.³ While the Catholic Church was unsuccessfully trying through war to arrest the spread of

³ Anthony Pratkanis and Elliot Aronson, *Age of Propaganda*. Freeman and Company (2001), p. 11.

Protestantism, the Pope established the papal propaganda office in order to convince Catholics of the superiority of the Catholic doctrine. The word *propaganda* thus acquired a negative connotation among Protestants and a positive one among Catholics. In the beginning of the twentieth century, the word propaganda was used to describe the persuasion tactics employed during World War one, and later by totalitarian regimes. Propaganda thus became synonymous with disseminating biased ideas and facts through the use of lies and deception.

Today's propaganda war is also known as the "Fourth Generation War" (4GW), a concept developed by American military experts in an article published in the *Marine Corps Gazette* in 1989.⁴ Copies of this seminal article were reportedly found by US troops in the caves of Tora Bora, the al-Qaida hideout in Afghanistan.⁵ In an article published by *Al Ansar* in February 2002, Abu Ubeid al-Qurashi, one of Osama bin Laden's deputies, revealed that al-Qaida had adopted the "Fourth Generation War" strategy, and that the purpose of 4GW is to undermine popular support for soldiers within the enemy's society. In this type of war, TV screens are considered as powerful if not more powerful than tanks, because the ultimate goal is to influence public opinion to make it perceive the enemy as the victim and the victim as the aggressor.⁶

The first generation of modern warfare was dominated by mass manpower, and it culminated in the Napoleonic wars. This type of warfare was generated by the State's monopoly on war as a result of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. It reflected tactics of the era of the smoothbore musket, of line and column. Progressively, however, rifled muskets, breechloaders and then machine guns made the old line-and-column tactics obsolete and even suicidal.

The second-generation of warfare was developed by the French army during World War I. Its tactics were based on fire and movement, and the main change from first generation tactics was heavy reliance on indirect fire. The central strategy of second

⁴ "The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation," *Marine Corps Gazette*, October 1989, pp. 22-26.

⁵ William S. Lind, "Understanding Fourth Generation War," *Military Review*, September-October 2004, p. 12.

⁶ <http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=subjects&Area=jihad&ID=SP34402>

generation war was summarized by the French maxim, “the artillery conquers, the infantry occupies.” Massed firepower replaced massed manpower.

During World War II, the Germans introduced third-generation warfare, which was characterized by maneuver. The attack relied on infiltration to bypass and collapse the enemy’s combat forces rather than seeking to close with and destroy them. Third generation war was based not on firepower and attrition but speed, surprise, and physical as well as mental dislocation. Its tactical purpose was to get into the enemy’s rear and collapse him from the rear forward.

First generation warfare focused tactically and operationally on the enemy’s front (his combat forces). Second generation warfare remained frontal tactically but, at least in Prussian practice, it focused operationally on the enemy’s rear through encirclement. The third generation warfare shifted the tactical as well as the operational focus to the enemy’s rear. The fourth generation warfare takes this strategy a step further by attempting to bypass the enemy’s military entirely and strike directly at his homeland and civilian targets, both physically *and* psychologically.

There was a 4GW component to the Vietnam War—the campaign by North Vietnam, of which the Viet Cong insurgency formed a key part, to turn US public opinion against the war. Once this was accomplished, and the US withdrew, the South could be finished off by conventional means. Similarly, the goal of the *mujaheddin* in Afghanistan was not to defeat the Red Army in some decisive battle, but to persuade the Soviet leadership to withdraw it. With the March 11, 2004, terrorist attack in Madrid, al-Qaida convinced Spanish public opinion and leadership to give up the fight in Iraq.

The 1989 *Marine Corps Gazette* article argued that: “The fact that some non-Western areas, such as the Islamic world, are not strong in technology may lead them to develop a fourth generation through *ideas* rather than technology.”⁷ As explained by military expert Thomas Hammes: “Fourth Generation Warfare (4GW) uses all available networks –political, economic, social, and military— to convince the

⁷ *Marine Corps Gazette*, October 1989, pp. 22-26 (Emphasis added).

enemy's political decision makers that their strategic goals are either unachievable or too costly for the perceived benefits. It is an evolved, media-based form of insurgency. Still rooted in the fundamental precept that superior political will, when properly employed, can defeat greater economic and military power, 4GW makes use of society's networks to carry on its fight. Unlike previous generations of warfare, it does not attempt to win by defeating the enemy's military forces. Instead, via the networks, it directly attacks the minds of enemy decision makers to destroy the enemy's political will. Fourth-generation wars are lengthy –measured in decades rather than months or years.’’⁸

4GW combatants attack the minds of the decision makers with a daily barrage of battlefield images and worldwide propaganda, exploiting differences of opinion in open societies, and raising the human and economic cost of the struggle. 4GW focuses on the moral level of warfare, where it works at convincing belligerents and neutrals that the cause for which the 4GW entity is fighting is morally superior. 4GW combatants also use freedom against free societies. They can move freely within open societies, and use democratic laws to defend themselves. They gain protection by being treated under Western laws. On the other hand, when Western governments use military force and depart from their own democratic standards to fight terrorism, television news makes the terrorists appear as the victims. Paradoxically, 4GW combatants wage their warfare while being protected by the societies they are attacking.

Hammes points out that the United States has already lost three 4GWs: in Vietnam, Lebanon, and Somalia. Moreover, 4GW continues to bleed Russia in Chechnya and the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since World War II, wars have been a mixture of conventional and non-conventional strategy. Conventional wars in the second part of the twentieth century erupted between the two Koreas, between Israel and the Arabs, between the U.K. and Argentina in the Falklands, between Iran and Iraq, and between Iraq and the U.S.-led coalition in 1991. These wars did not change the political and economic regimes of the states involved in them. By contrast, the unconventional wars of the Communist revolution in China, the first and second

⁸ Thomas X. Hammes, *The Sling and the Stone: On War in the 21st Century*. Zenith Press (2004), p. 2.

Indochina Wars, the Algerian War of Independence, the Sandinist struggle in Nicaragua, the Iranian revolution, the Afghan-Soviet war of the 1980s, the first *Intifda* and the Hezbollah campaign in South Lebanon, each ended with major political changes within the states involved. Fourth-generation wars generally last for decades. The Chinese Communists fought for more than 25 years, the Vietnamese for more than 30, the Sandinists for 18, the Afghans for 10 against the Soviet Union, the Chechens for more than 10, and the Palestinians for over 50.

4GW is partly rooted in Mao Zedong's theory that superior political will, when properly used, can defeat the greatest economic and military powers. The specificity of 4GW, however, is that it does not attempt to defeat the enemy's economic or military power, but to attack the minds of the enemy's decision makers in order to destroy their political will. The same way that mechanized war was made possible by tanks, planes and radios, 4GW was made possible by the late twentieth century's new and various communication channels.

There is a central and critical element in 4GW: propaganda and the manipulation of the international media in order to convince public opinion that the aggressor is a victim and the victim an aggressor. It is a psychological war, a war of ideas, where defeat and victory are not measured on the battlefield but in the minds of voters and decision-makers. As explained by 4GW experts, "Fourth generation adversaries will be adept at manipulating the media to alter domestic and world opinion to the point where skillful use of psychological operations will sometimes preclude the commitment of combat forces. A major target will be the enemy's population's support of its government and the war. *Television news may become a more powerful operational weapon than armored divisions.*"⁹

As explained by William S. Lind, "Fourth Generation [War] marks the most radical change since the Peace of Westphalia" because "the state loses its monopoly on war."¹⁰ With 4GW, state militaries fight non-state opponents such as al-Qaida, Hamas or Hizballah. Today, most 4GW fighters are Islamic organizations fighting

⁹ "The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation," *Marine Corps Gazette*, October 1989, pp. 22-26 [emphasis added].

¹⁰ "Understanding Fourth Generation War" (op. cit.), p. 13.

the West and Israel. Three centuries after its strategic military defeat and subsequent retreat in Vienna in 1683, Islam is back on the offensive. As we shall see in Part III (“The Problem with Europe”), Islam’s invasion of Europe today is not military but ideological as well as demographic.

The media play a central role in 4GW-based terrorism, because it is through the media that terrorists try to influence public opinion and elected leaders. As explained by Brigitte Narcos: “A nation enraged over terrorism may in fact either encourage or inhibit governmental responses in ways that play into the hands of terrorists.”¹¹

International propaganda did exist before the emergence of electronic and mass media, however. Throughout European History, leaders have appealed to other peoples to take sides in international disputes or civil wars. For example, in 1549, Venetian pamphleteer Pietro Aretino spread a false rumor that Venice was siding with the German Protestants. In 1870, Bismarck manipulated the Ems Telegram incident to put the Germans and the French in the mood for war. With the advent of radio and television, propaganda warfare acquired a new dimension. In 1939, Nazi Germany used Blitzkrieg films of Poland to terrify the Norwegians, and numerous radio stations were used for troop and non-combatant demoralization of the opposite side.¹² As explained by Harold Lasswell, a pioneer in propaganda studies, “The best success in war is achieved by the destruction of the enemy’s will to resist, and with a minimum annihilation of fighting capacity.”¹³ Propaganda has been used and continues to be used by governments not only to harm the enemy’s morale and international support, but also to divert the anger of frustrated subjects toward outside and imagined enemies. For example, the Russian government published the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in 1902 to divert the Russian middle class towards hating the Jews instead of the Russian leadership.

Today, Saudi Arabia is a central actor in the ideological war against the West.¹⁴ Its radical *Wahabism* is spread in America and Europe through Saudi-funded mosques and

¹¹ Brigitte L. Narcos, *Terrorism and the Media* (Columbia University Press, 1994), p. 10.

¹² Thomson, *Easily Led* (op. cit.), pp. 10-11.

¹³ Quoted from: Garth Jowett and Victoria O’Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion*. Sage Publications (1999), p. 204.

¹⁴ See: Dore Gold, *Hatred’s Kingdom*. Regnery (2003).

imams, and millions of Saudi dollars are spent on American campuses. According to a *Front Page Magazine* report quoted by the Luntz Research Companies, in 2004 Saudi Arabia donated \$20 million to set up a Middle East Studies Center at the University of Arkansas, \$5 million to UC Berkeley's Center for Middle East Studies, \$2.5 million to Harvard, \$8.1 million to Georgetown, \$11 million to Cornell, \$5 million to MIT, \$5 million to Columbia and \$1 million to Princeton.¹⁵ Saudi Arabia established many Chairs and research centers in American Universities, such as the King Fahd Center for Middle East and Islamic Studies at the University of Arkansas.

In his book *The Rise, Corruption and Coming Fall of the House of Saud* (1995), Arab journalist Said Aburish argues that Saudi Arabia took control of the pan-Arab press and gained influence over the Western press.¹⁶ Saudi ownership of the pan-Arab press started in 1979 with the newspaper *Sharq Al Awsat*, which was edited in London and transmitted via facsimile to printing presses throughout the Arab world. This was followed by the purchase of an old Lebanese newspaper, *Al Hayat*, which was also edited in London. Saudi Arabia owns international media outlets such as: the Middle East Broadcasting Corporation (MBC), an Arab language television station in London which serves the expatriate Arab community and transmits to the Middle East via satellite; ANA, the Arab radio station in Washington DC; Radio Orient, the Arabic language radio station in France. Saudi businessman Wafiq Al Said, a close friend of the late King Fahd, owns 35% of London's *Sunday Correspondent*, and Saudi businessman Sulayman Olayan owns 5% of *The Independent* and of *The Sunday Independent*. Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Bin Abdul Aziz Al Saud, the nephew of the late King Fahd, owns \$2.05 billion worth of AOL stock (parent company of Time-Warner and CNN). He also has large holdings in Disney (parent of ABC) and the News Corporation (parent of the New York Post, Fox News, and the London *Times*).

Ministers and senior officials from twelve Arab countries met in June 2002 in Cairo to discuss embarking upon a \$20 million public relations campaign against Israel. The campaign would "target the international community with the goal of refuting Israeli and American attempts to portray the Palestinians' national struggle as an unjust

¹⁵ "How the Next Generation Views Israel." *The Luntz Research Companies*, April 14, 2004.

¹⁶ Said Aburish, *The Rise, Corruption and Coming Fall of the House of Saud* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1995).

terror campaign.” Arab information ministers also discussed expediting the creation of an Arab satellite television station aimed at the international community. “Arab and international media outlets will be asked to make an effort in order to give evidence of war crimes committed by Israeli operations, in order to make it possible to put IDF soldiers and settlers on trial in the international court,” it was said at the conference.

2. The War of Ideas Against Israel

The Durban Conference of August-September 2001 marked the launching of the twenty first century’s new war of ideas. Supposedly organized by the UN to fight racism, this conference was hijacked by the Arab world to de-legitimize and demonize the Jewish state. But behind the traditional anti-Israel bashing through a UN Kafkaesque conference, Durban crystallized the new “victim ideology” and substituted “Jews” with “Israel” as the blame for the world’s evils. As French philosopher Alain Finkelkraut convincingly argued, the twenty first century’s new bon ton ideology idealizes the perceived “victim” and demonized the alleged “oppressor” –the ultimate “oppressor” being the Jewish state.¹⁷ Similarly, American lawyer Alan Dershowitz reached the conclusion that today’s criticism of Israel has become as unfair, irrational and hateful as anti-Semitic defamation of the Jews, and that the State of Israel has become the “Jew among Nations.”¹⁸

Since its independence, Israel has won all the military wars instigated by the Arab world, thus securing its physical existence. But it has lost the war of ideas –especially the current one— and this loss carries a threat to Israel’s security. The fact that Israel is singled out at the United Nations, in the media and on campuses as the world’s worst violator of human rights, and the fact that the very legitimacy of the Jewish state is now openly questioned by European and American opinion makers, only show how poorly Israel is doing in the war of ideas.

¹⁷ Alain Finkelkraut, *Au Nom de l'Autre. Essai sur l'antisémitisme qui vient*. Gallimard (2004).

¹⁸ Alan Dershowitz, *The Case for Israel*. Wiley (2003).

Combining terrorism with psychological warfare and propaganda has always been the PLO's core strategy to destroy the State of Israel. Shortly after it adopted its "Phased Plan" in June 1974 (calling for the establishment of a PLO foothold in the West Bank and Gaza in order to facilitate the destruction of Israel), the PLO launched an international PR campaign to de-legitimize the Jewish state. In November 1975, it obtained the passing of a UN General Assembly Resolution equating Zionism with racism, and in 1980 it rallied the European Economic Community (EEC) to its cause with the publication of the "Venice Declaration." The "psychological war" remained an integral part of Arafat's strategy during the Oslo process, well before he launched his terror war against Israel in September 2000. On January 30, 1996, Arafat declared to a group of Arab diplomats in Stockholm: "We plan to eliminate the State of Israel and establish a purely Palestinian state ... We will make life unbearable for Jews by *psychological warfare*."¹⁹

Since the late 1960s, the PLO has adopted the "people's war" strategy, which it borrowed from the Marxist-Leninist movements in China and Vietnam. This strategy consists of fighting the enemy both on the military *and* the psychological levels, the psychological side being the most critical in order to de-legitimize the enemy and divide its society.²⁰ Although France militarily vanquished the Algerian rebellion, the Algerians won the psychological war against France thanks to the skillful propaganda campaign carried out by the FLN, and by turning French and world public opinion against the French government. After the Six Day War, Muhammad Yazid, who had been minister of information in two Algerian wartime governments (1958-1962), taught the PLO how to manipulate facts and ideas to win psychological wars: "Wipe out the argument that Israel is a small state whose existence is threatened by the Arab states, or the reduction of the Palestinian problem to a question of refugees; instead, present the Palestinian struggle as a struggle for liberation like the others. Wipe out the impression ... that in the struggle between the Palestinians and the Zionists, the Zionist is the underdog. Now it is the Arab who is oppressed and victimized in his existence because he is not only facing the Zionists but also world imperialism."²¹

¹⁹ Quoted from: Efraim Karsh, *Arafat's War*. Grove Press (2003), pp. 57-58 (emphasis added).

²⁰ Joel S. Fishman, "Ten Years Since Oslo: The PLO's 'People's War' Strategy and Israel's Inadequate Response." *Jerusalem Viewpoints* No. 503 (1-15 September 2003), Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.

²¹ Quoted from Fishman (op. cit.), p. 4.

Fatah leader Abu Iyad visited North Vietnam in 1964 and again in 1970 (this time with Arafat). On both occasions, he learned from the Communists how to work in phases, how to conceal the PLO's true purpose, how to use strategic deception, how to give the appearance of moderation, and how to manipulate Western media. Interestingly, it is the Fatah movement that translated into Arabic the writings of Vietnamese Communist leader General Giap, as well as the writings of Mao and Che Guevara. It is Giap's psychological war strategy that enabled him to vanquish the militarily superior American and French armies.

One of Giap's most brilliant innovations was the manipulation of Western media. He understood that he could turn Western public opinion against its elected governments through the media. In 1954, for instance, only 4% of the French forces in Vietnam were defeated in Dien Bien Phu, but the way this relatively minor setback was reported in France shook French public opinion and shattered public support for the war. The same scenario was repeated with US forces in Vietnam. The 1968 Tet Offensive actually ended up in a Vietcong defeat and American casualties were relatively low, but the manipulation of that event by the anti-war American media had a strong psychological impact, similar to that of Dien Bien Phu twelve years earlier. Giap skillfully used the anti-war US media to undermine American support for the war. He exposed in candid terms his brilliant strategy: "In 1968 I realized that I could not defeat 500,000 American troops who were deployed in Vietnam. I could not defeat the Seventh Fleet, with its hundreds of aircraft, but I could bring pictures home to the Americans which would cause them to want to stop the war."²²

Arafat carefully learned from this strategy and skillfully put it into practice. Though the Vietnamese Communists were his main source of inspiration, Romanian dictator Nicolae Ceausescu also advised him to feign moderation: "How about pretending to break with terrorism? ... The West would love it ... The West may even become addicted to you and your PLO ... The only thing I want to change is the nameplate on your door ... from the PLO into a Palestinian government-in-exile."²³

²² Quoted from Fishman (op. cit.), p. 6.

²³ Ion Pacepa, *Red horizons. Inside the Romanian Secret Service –The Memoirs of Ceausescu's Spy Chief*. London (1989), pp. 23-29.

Media/psychological wars are based on four basic principles: 1) To deprive the enemy of its legitimacy and outside support; 2) To destroy the enemy's economy; 3) To promote anti-militarism and to encourage defections from the army; 4) To use mass terror in order to fatally affect the enemy's morale. Interestingly, the PLO has been implementing these principles with commitment and consistency, especially with the breakout of Arafat's War in September 2000. The PLO has been active in delegitimizing Israel in the world media and at the UN. The first stage in the implementation of this strategy was Yasser Arafat's speech at the UN in 1974, delegitimizing Israel as a "racist entity" and followed by the 1975 General Assembly's vote equating Zionism with racism. Within three months of the signing of the Oslo Agreements in September 1993, the PLO renewed its assault on Israel at the UN General Assembly, initiating dozens of anti-Israel resolutions. It was also in 1993 that the PLO established, through the UN Commission on Human Rights, a Special Rapporteur on the "Palestinian Territories" with the mandate to investigate "Israel's violations of international law."

The PLO's propaganda and psychological war has enabled this organization to win the hearts and minds of world public opinion despite its use of terrorism and rejection of Israel's right to exist. At the end of the 1960s, while PLO terrorism was increasing, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution in support of the "inalienable rights of the Palestinian people." In November 1974, Arafat became the first terrorist leader to address the General Assembly, while the PLO was active in murdering Israelis and Jews (including the murder of Israeli athletes in Munich in 1972 and of the *Maalot* schoolchildren in Israel in 1974). In September 1996, Arafat launched a wave of killings and violence, but it is Israel's Prime Minister that was blamed by the world media for that violence. Four years later, Arafat responded to Israel's peace offers with an all-out terrorist war, thus breaking his commitment not to resort to violence and without even making a counter-offer. Yet, Arafat was once again exonerated by world public opinion of any wrongdoing while Israel was accused of being the cause of Palestinian violence.

The Palestinians won the first *Intifada* because they were careful to present themselves as victims of a vastly more powerful Israel. Avoiding the use of weapons other than stones, and taking full advantage of TV cameras, the Palestinians

“transformed” Israel from the country of 6 million surrounded by 300,000 million Arabs, to the oppressive Goliath killing defenseless children. This is the “power of weakness” central to 4GW.

This absurd, upside-down situation is the result of over three decades of active PLO-led propaganda against Israel. For the past thirty years, the PLO has outmaneuvered Israel in framing the conflict for the world media. A turning point came during the 1982 Lebanon War, when the PLO initiated a propaganda campaign to cast itself as the defender of human rights and the Israelis as the violators of human rights. Yasser Arafat’s brother, Dr. Fatchi Arafat, exploited his position as director of the Palestinian Red Crescent Society to release grossly inflated casualty figures during the war. For instance, on June 10, 1982, Fatchi Arafat issued a statement claiming that 10,000 Palestinians had died and 600,000 had become homeless in the first few days of the war. This was a lie calculated to portray the Palestinians as the victims of a genocidal assault in Lebanon. In fact, the total population in the war zone numbered fewer than 300,000. Yet the International Red Cross and Middle East Action Committee of the American Friends Service Committee spread the 10,000/600,000 figure to every media outlet in the world, and the major American and European media published the “news.” Consequently, in the early days of the Lebanon War, words such as “holocaust” and “genocide” started circulating in Western media.

As a result of the PLO media war, the Arab-Israeli conflict was reframed in Western public opinion so as to portray Israel as an expansionist extension of US “hegemony,” to eclipse the role of the Arab world in this conflict, and to redefine the PLO from a terrorist organization to a national liberation movement. If the Six Day War provided the excuse to castigate and blame Israel for the Arab Israeli conflict, and if the Yom Kippur War turned Europe into the hostage of the Arab oil embargo, the Lebanon War unleashed unprecedented furry against Israel in Western media. As explained by Norman Podhoretz, “Israel’s ‘true friends’ ... were liberated by Lebanon to say much more straightforwardly and in more intemperate terms than before what they had all along felt: that Israeli intransigence and/or aggressiveness and/or expansionism are the main (and for some, the only) source of the Arab-Israeli conflict and therefore the

main (or only) obstacle to a peaceful resolution of that conflict.”²⁴ During the Lebanon War it became standard in Western media and among Western leaders to compare Israel to Nazi Germany and the Palestinians to the Jewish victims of the Holocaust. A *Wall Street Journal* cartoon, for example, portrayed besieged West Beirut as another Warsaw ghetto, with the PLO in the role of the Jews and the Israelis in the role of the Nazis.²⁵ The PLO also distributed a picture of an infant reported to have been crippled by Israeli bombs. President Reagan put a copy of this picture on his desk, and one of his aids reported that this “picture of the baby with the burnt arms had more impact on him than 50 position papers.” This picture, however, was later proved to be a fake.²⁶

Although the PLO committed the worst crimes against the civilian population in Lebanon, it was pictured as a victim instead of the ruthless aggressor it actually was. The PLO’s media manipulations during the Lebanon war turned Western public opinion against Israel, even though the Lebanese population had welcome the ousting of the PLO by Israel.

Encouraged by its media success during the Lebanon War, the PLO propaganda machine set up a PR system that proved very efficient. In March 1984, Ramonda Tawill, a media professional (who later became Yasser Arafat’s mother-in-law), helped the PLO establish the Palestinian Press Service (PPS) to provide assistance to visiting journalists and conduct training seminars in media relations. The PPS then joined forces with the Palestine Human Rights Information Center (PHRIC) to change the image of the PLO from that of a terrorist organization to an organization fighting to protect the victims of Israeli human rights abuses. PHRIC seminars instructed their “students” to steer every media interview to the same themes: Israeli occupation, illegal settlements, human rights abuses, and the right of the Palestinian refugees to go home. Regardless of the question, these themes were to be repeated over and over again.²⁷

²⁴ Norman Podhoretz, “J’Accuse.” Reprinted from *Commentary* in *The Media War Against Israel* (Steimatzky Publishing, 1986), p. 123.

²⁵ *The Media War Against Israel* (op. cit.), p. 126.

²⁶ *The Media War Against Israel* (op. cit.), p. 360.

²⁷ “Israel and the Palestinians: Why The Palestinians are Winning the Media War.” An Interview with David Bedein. *Reform Judaism Online*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (http://www.eyeonthepost.org/Bedein_Interview_Fall_2002.pdf).

One of Tawill's great "accomplishments" came in May 1985, after Israel released more than a thousand convicted PLO terrorists in exchange for seven Israeli soldiers. As a way of diverting media attention from their crimes, Tawill coached these freed terrorists to stress that they were tortured in Israeli jails for "political activism" and "support of Palestinian nationalism." Tawill trained her students and explained that by monopolizing the reporters' time with stories of torture, the journalists would invariably have to complete the interview before they had time to ask the terrorists about the actions that had led to their capture and imprisonment. At the time, Israeli intelligence did not allow reporters to look at the prison files of security detainees, so the crimes of these terrorists went virtually unreported.

Absurdly, the PHRIC is now widely perceived as a credible human rights organization by journalists. By mid-1989, international human rights organizations routinely reproduced "information" developed by the PHRIC, which by then had secured funding from the Ford Foundation and had established offices in Chicago and Washington.

Today, Palestinian PR professionals are routinely trained and generously funded. The Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA) provides courses and "users' manuals" on public relations, media relations, fundraising, communications, lobbying, and public speaking. PASSIA trains Palestinian academics who will be teaching abroad on how to promote their cause on university campuses. In addition, Palestinians in the U.S. are taught how to seek out the Arab constituencies in each congressional district and how to lobby members of Congress for political and financial support of the Palestinian cause. PASSIA also benefits from institutional funding in the United States and in Europe. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), a program of the U.S. State Department, grants PASSIA and many other Palestinian media relations firms in Jerusalem more than \$1 million annually. It was only in March 2002, after a U.S. House International Relations Committee member discovered that USAID was providing allocations for Palestinian media relations, that members of Congress became aware of this aid.²⁸

²⁸ *Ibid.*

The Jerusalem Media and Communications Center (JMCC) is a major Palestinian media organization subsidized by the European Union and the Ford Foundation. Headed by Dr. Ghassan Khatib, a former close associate of Yasser Arafat, JMCC provides the foreign media with professional services such as camera crews, translators, photographers, and transportation, as well as daily press bulletins, briefing papers, and people to interview.

In order to boost and coordinate the media war against Israel, the Palestinian Authority established The Palestine Media Center (PMC) in November 2001. Upon its establishment, the PMC was placed under the direct supervision of PLO “Information” Minister Yasser Abed Rabbo. According to PMC’s mission statement, “the decision to establish the PMC stemmed from the urgent need to provide a reliable and professional media source that will cater the media with accurate, timely and informative news relevant to the Palestinian reality” and to “formulate a media strategy to present and transmit the official position on various issues of concern to the Palestinian cause.” The mission statement adds that the PMC will act as “a networking agency that will be at the disposal of International and local journalists” and “a podium for official speech directed at international public opinion.”²⁹ Abed Rabbo turned PMC into a powerful propaganda machine aimed at foreign journalists, decision makers, and the wider public. His ruthless and disciplined management of Palestinian propaganda stems from his belief that “Palestinian national interest comes before the freedom of the press.”³⁰

That for Palestinian leaders “Palestinian national interest comes before the freedom of the press” is amply illustrated by the treatment of foreign journalists by the Palestinian Authority. On 6 January 2003, Seif al-Din Shahin, a senior Gaza correspondent for Qatar’s *Al Jazeera* News Agency, was arrested by Arafat’s Palestinian General Intelligence on charges of “inflicting damage to the interests and reputation of the Palestinian people and their struggle.” His “crime” was that he had reported that the Al Aqsa Brigades (which are part of the PLO’s military wing) had claimed responsibility for the double suicide bombing in Tel-Aviv the day before.³¹ Similarly,

²⁹ <http://www.palestine-pmc.com/about.asp>

³⁰ Quoted from: Dan Dicker, “The Influence of Palestinian Organizations on Foreign News Reporting.” *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, Vol. 2, No. 23 (27 March 2003), The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, p. 2.

³¹ http://www.honestreporting.com/articles/critiques/Tel_Aviv_Fallout.asp

foreign journalists are threatened when they film or report events that embarrass the Palestinian Authority. Following the lynching of two Israeli reservists inside a Palestinian police station in October 2000, Palestinian journalist Nasser Atta (who worked for ABC) reported that his cameraman had been beaten up and his crew prevented from filming the lynching. Palestinian security forces also surrounded a Polish TV crew who were beaten and relieved of their tapes.³² Following September 11, an AP photographer's life was threatened by PA officials for taking pictures of Palestinian street celebrations. Arafat's Cabinet Secretary, Ahmed Abdel Rahman, declared that "The Palestinian Authority cannot guarantee the life of the cameraman if the footage was broadcast."³³

The Palestinians are also active in promoting their agenda on the Internet. There are hundreds of websites that promote Palestinian myths and propaganda. These websites include www.palestineremembered.com, a propaganda website that provides arguments to pro-Palestinian advocates; www.sustaincampaign.org, an impressively designed website whose purpose is to gather widespread opposition to US aid to Israel and to Israel's security fence; www.stopthewall.org, a website that campaigns against Israel's security fence without ever mentioning Palestinian terrorism; and www.electronicintifada.net, a highly developed site that centralizes the Palestinian propaganda war on the Internet. "Electronic Intifada" was launched in February 2001. The Electronic Intifada's website receives around one quarter of a million visitors each month. During periods of increased conflict, the number of visitors dramatically increases. During Operation "Defensive Shield" in March/April 2002, the website of "Electronic Intifada" had over 600,000 visits in a month.³⁴

The PLO also has a strong PR presence in Washington DC. The PLO's PR person in Washington, Edward Abington, served as U.S. Consul in Jerusalem when USAID began to finance PASSIA in the 1990s, and is now the PLO's representative in Washington. Abington coordinates information from JMCC, PASSIA, and other Palestinian information agencies and puts a moderate face on the Palestinian "struggle." During Arafat's war (2000-2004), each time one of Arafat's militias took

³² Judy Balint, "Palestinian Harassment of Journalists," www.worldnetdaily.com, February 25, 2001.

³³ Quoted from: Dan Dicker, "The Influence of Palestinian Organizations on Foreign News Reporting." *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, Vol. 2, No. 23 (27 March 2003), The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, p. 5.

³⁴ www.electronicintifada.net

credit for a terror attack, Abington's office would issue a statement to the media denying Arafat's involvement. For instance, on November 20, 2000, the PLO's Fatah was quoted on official PBC radio and PBC TV as taking credit for an attack on a school bus near Kfar Darom, where two schoolteachers were murdered and three siblings were maimed for life. Yet CNN reported that the PLO had condemned the attack. This is because the international desk of CNN in Atlanta had received a call from Abington's office in Washington, followed by a fax, denying PLO involvement.

Abington also used to provide the press and the U.S. government with "translations" of Arafat's speeches. On May 15, 2002, Arafat delivered a speech to the Palestine Legislative Council in which he compared the Oslo accords to the *Huddabiya* Pact, a ten-year truce between Mohammed and the Jews, which Mohammed tore up two years later when his forces acquired the power to slaughter his enemies. President Bush declared that Arafat had been speaking the "right words." But, in fact, Bush had neither received nor read the speech: Abington's office had supplied the translated speech to the President, a "translation" that had removed Arafat's reference to the *Huddabiya* Pact.³⁵

The Palestinian use of lies and deception was reactivated in full gear with the launching of Arafat's war in September 2000. The PA unscrupulously manipulated the international coverage of the war it triggered, by disallowing the filming of anything it did not wish to be shown. Pictures of unarmed Palestinian civilians and of Israeli soldiers were shown around the world, thus portraying the Palestinians as the harmless and unarmed underdog. The PA made sure to prevent the filming of Palestinian gunmen shooting at Israeli soldiers from behind stone-throwers, as well as the daily firing on Jewish civilians and residential areas by Tanzim forces.

³⁵ Bedein (op. cit.)

New York Times



Associated Press
An Israeli policeman and a Palestinian on the Temple Mount.

New York Times, 30 September 2000

In September 2000, the PLO distributed to foreign news agency a photographic montage that portrayed an Israeli policeman and a young man with a blood-covered face, with the title: “An Israeli policeman and a Palestinian on the Temple Mount.” This picture was published on the front page of the *New York Times* as well as *Libération*. Yet it was a fake. In the picture’s background was a gas station, which is obviously nowhere to be found on the Temple Mount. Moreover, the alleged “Palestinian” was in fact a Jewish American Yeshiva student who had been beaten up by Arabs.

However, it is the al-Dura affair that caused the most harm to Israel’s international image. In September 2000, Palestinian journalist Talal Abu Rahma working for French TV channel *France 2* filmed the shooting of eleven-year-old Mohammed al-Dura as his father tried in vain to shield him during a battle at a road junction near Gaza. The video was edited by *France 2*’s veteran Israel correspondent Charles Enderlin, claiming that the child had been killed by Israeli bullets, although nothing in the pictures substantiated such a claim. Mohammed al-Dura became “poster boy” of Arafat’s War, and its international broadcast triggered an unprecedented wave of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic violence in Europe. And yet, this video was but another Palestinian manipulation and deception. A thorough IDF investigation, which was issued three weeks after the incident and confirmed by a German TV crew, showed that the bullets fired at the boy had come from the direction of Palestinian gunmen who had attacked an Israeli guard post. Moreover, nothing in Abu Rahma’s film shows that the boy was actually killed. Israeli expert Nahum Shahaf ultimately proved that the al-Dura film was a manipulation. *France 2* still refuses to disclose the

27 minutes “rushes” on the entire event –a highly suspicious behavior. But the world had “witnessed” the shooting of al-Dura, as the media scripted it –an atrocity committed by Israeli troops— and the damage could not be undone. *France 2*’s direct involvement in Palestinian propaganda confirms what Fayad Abu Shamala, the BBC correspondent in Gaza, declared at a Hamas rally in May 2001: “Journalists and media organizations [are] waging the campaign shoulder-to-shoulder together with the Palestinian people.”

Abu Shamala’s admission that “Journalists and media organizations [are] waging the campaign shoulder-to-shoulder together with the Palestinian people” is confirmed by his employer’s coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Trevor Asserson, a leading British litigation lawyer, has undertaken well-documented studies detailing the BBC’s systematic bias against Israel (www.bbcwatch.com). Asserson showed, for instance, that when BBC correspondent Kylie Morris reports from Gaza on Israeli retaliatory actions, she systematically omits to mention the IDF’s claim that destroyed buildings were used for attacking Israel. On 12 December 2001, Palestinian terrorists attacked an Israeli bus near the Jewish town of Emmanuel. Ten Israeli civilians were killed and dozens were seriously injured. In retaliation, Israel attacked a Palestinian police station, causing neither fatalities nor serious casualties. Yet the BBC only reported briefly on the Palestinian attack while focusing on Israel’s retaliation. During the 2003 Iraq War, the BBC went to considerable lengths to explain, excuse, and mitigate any civilian deaths at the hands of coalition troops, while systematically accusing the Israeli army of causing unnecessary casualties among Palestinian civilians. The same bias was shown by BBC Watch regarding suicide attacks. The BBC describes suicide attacks against US marines as acts of terrorism, while suicide attacks against Israeli civilians are described as acts perpetuated by *militants*. As Explained by Asserson: “By portraying Israel in an unfairly negative light, the BBC unwittingly legitimizes – and therefore encourages- aggression not only against Israelis, but also against UK Jewish citizens. That does not necessarily express itself only in violence; academic discrimination is another example.”³⁶

³⁶ Trevor Asserson, “What Went Wrong at the BBC: A Public Monopoly Abusing its Charter Through Bias Against Israel,” *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, No. 511, 15 January 2004, p. 13.

As a result of these skillful Palestinian manipulations, and as a result of Israel being unprepared for the PLO's new media assault in 2000, foreign media and international public opinion soon subscribed to the canard that Palestinian violence was the result of Ariel Sharon's "provocation" (i.e. his visit on the Temple Mount). Reacting publicly to the eruption of violence, EU Middle East peace envoy Miguel Moratinos offered his condolences to the bereaved Palestinian families, without mentioning Israeli casualties.³⁷ Similarly, French President Jacques Chirac reprimanded Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and accused him of being responsible for the violence: "Israel is to be blamed for the violence. It all started with a serious provocation by Sharon which seems to have been coordinated with you."³⁸

Palestinian propaganda and deception reached a new low with Operation Defensive Shield in April 2002. In their attempt to convince the world that the IDF massacred hundreds of civilians in the Jenin refugee camp, the Palestinians used animal carcasses to fill the air with the stench of rotting flesh in places where reporters and UN officials were likely to visit. The IDF caught that ploy on video, as well as a staged funeral in which "the body" jumped out of the coffin and ran for cover when an Israeli surveillance plane flew over the site.

As a result of the intensification of the media war against Israel since September 2000, Israel is progressively blamed for the world's ills, and the very legitimacy of the Jewish state is being questioned with increased vigor. International denial of Israel's legitimacy and right to exist may become fatal to Israel's security –which is precisely why Israel's enemies are waging an aggressive "war of ideas" against the Jewish state. This war of ideas against Israel has been quite successful since September 2000, to the point that a "new anti-Semitism" has emerged, targeting the Jewish state, as opposed to "traditional anti-Semitism," which used to target Jews as individuals. As explained by Prof. Irwin Cotler, "Traditional anti-Semitism denied Jews the right to live as equal members of society, but the new anti-Jewishness denies the right of the Jewish people to live as an equal member of the family of nations."³⁹ The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia disappeared for many reasons, but one of them is

³⁷ Karsh (op. cit.), p. 202.

³⁸ Karsh (op. cit.), p. 202.

³⁹ *National Post*, April 2, 2002.

the fact that the *idea* upon which these states were founded lost its credibility and legitimacy.

In the age of mass media, no government is immune from the influence of international public opinion. The success or failure of a policy is partly determined by the way such policy is *perceived* overseas. A distorted picture of events contributes to anti-Israel policies, especially in Europe. For instance, Israel's security fence is mostly dismissed as illegitimate and unnecessary in international public opinion. Palestinian propaganda has managed to present this fence as a *wall* calling it an *apartheid wall*, and successfully brought the issue to the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The ICJ decision condemned Israel for building the fence and called for its immediate dismantling, without even mentioning Palestinian terrorism.

U.S. support for Israel is critical and this support is being threatened by the Palestinian media war. As a 2004 report by the highly regarded Luntz Research and Strategic Services stated: "Never in the modern history of the Jewish state has there been more outspoken public opposition on the elite college campuses to the basic principles and tenets of Israel. To be brutally frank, if current trends are not averted, America's core commitment to and alliance with Israel may not survive."⁴⁰ The report added that "we are losing the communications war in the elite media, and it will cost us the support of a generation of elites. The enemies of Israel will always exist; the names may change but the threat will not. Unless we stand up, fight back and reverse this trend, the next generation of American leaders –those who will assume power around the year 2020— will not see Israel as an ally. They will see Israel as a burden –and one that may not be worth carrying."⁴¹ The report also found that to America's future leadership the notion of a "Jewish state" is an ethno-centric and outdated concept. It is deemed as religious, extremist and racist. The "Palestinian struggle" is viewed as a civil rights struggle against the "Jewish state," and a secular bi-national state is deemed a rational option worth exploring.

This is why Israel cannot fully win the terror war without successfully dealing with the psychological and media aspect of that war. Indeed, General Uzi Dayan suggested at the Second Herzliyah Conference (December 2001) that the government

⁴⁰ "How the Next Generation Views Israel," *The Luntz Research Companies*, April 14, 2004.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

include media strategy in its war against terror.⁴² Similarly, the State Comptroller recommended in his 2002 Report that the National Security Council (NSC) be responsible for integrating public relations and information into the national security strategy.⁴³

Winning the media war is as critical as winning the physical war. As Tom Gross puts it: “The systematic building up of a false picture of Israel as aggressor, and deliberate killer of babies and children, is helping to slowly chip away at Israel’s legitimacy. How can ordinary people elsewhere not end up hating such a country? And, contrary to the perceptions of some, Israel is not a big, tough major power that can withstand such international antagonism indefinitely. As the Jews have learnt only too well, acts of wholesale destruction and ultimately genocide did not just spring forth in a vacuum; they were the product of a climate.”⁴⁴

Victor Hugo wrote that “on résiste à l’invasion des armées, on ne résiste pas à l’invasion des idées,” (“more powerful than all the armies in the world is an idea whose time has come.”) He foresaw, well before the media wars of the twentieth century, that ideas could become more powerful than weapons. Israel has been winning the physical wars against its Arab enemies for the past fifty-years, but is has been mostly defeated on the battlefield of ideas. The United Nations Organization singles out Israel as the world’s worst violator of human rights, and the very legitimacy of the Jewish state is being questioned in Western media and campuses. Many polls point out that more and more people in Europe and the United States are turning against Israel.

It is not enough for Israel to win the physical war alone, because eventually *ideas* determine the outcome of the physical wars. What the Arab countries have been unable to achieve with guns and tanks, they are achieving through ideas, words and feelings. As anti-Zionists and anti-Semites are gaining more and more support in Europe and on college campuses in the United States, time is running out for the State of Israel and for the Jewish people.

⁴² Uzi Dayan, “The Media Environment and its Implications.” Herzliyah Conference, December 17, 2001.

⁴³ State of Israel, *Comptroller’s Report* # 53 A, October 7, 2002, p. 13.

⁴⁴ Quoted from: Tom Gross, “New Prejudice for Old. The Euro press and the Intifada.”

3. Israel's Achilles' Heel

On October 7, 2002, Israel's State Comptroller ("Mevaker Hamedina") published his annual report, which was very critical of Israel's PR strategy –or lack thereof. The Comptroller wrote that "since its establishment in 1948, Israel's intelligence organs have not succeeded in responding to the broad-based propaganda and incitement by the Arab world."⁴⁵ Moreover, the Report emphasized that "the lack of a central authority to direct and coordinate all government information bodies to execute a public relations policy is the main factor accounting for Israel's longstanding failures in this field."⁴⁶ The Report lamented a long series of structural problems with Israel's PR strategy, among them: 1) A lack of overall strategic public relations conception and objective; 2) Redundancies, wasted resources, and lack of coordination between government PR offices; 3) No comprehensive budgetary analysis to serve government public relations requirements; 4) Ill-defined areas of responsibility and authority between the Prime Minister's Office, the Foreign Ministry, the Defense Ministry, and the IDF Spokesperson.

The first serious cabinet discussion on diplomatic advocacy took place in December 2003, more than three years after the outbreak of Arafat's war, and more than a year after the criticism leveled by the 2002 State Comptroller's Report.⁴⁷ Strategy meetings between the government's information bodies were not held until after the Pesach Seder massacre in April 2002.⁴⁸ In July 2002, the Jaffe Center for Strategic Studies lamented that the IDF had still not integrated public relations in its strategic assessments.⁴⁹

Public relations expert Benny Cohen noted that "The budget of a diaper manufacturer who advertises in Israel totaled, over the past two years, more than \$22 million. The advertising and public relations budgeted for the State of Israel for the entire world over the past two years was \$6 million."⁵⁰ Israeli embassies in Europe do not have the

⁴⁵ *Comptroller's Report* (op. cit.), p. 42.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁴⁷ Source: *The Jerusalem Post*, Weekly Supplement ("Up Front"), December 5, 2003, p. 12.

⁴⁸ Dan Diker, "Why Are Israel's Public Relations so Poor?" *Jerusalem Letter/Viewpoints*, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, No. 487 (15 October – 1 November 2002), p. 3.

⁴⁹ Zeev Schiff, "Back to Jenin," *Ha'aretz*, July 17, 2002.

⁵⁰ Benny Cohen, "Israel Needs PR Expertise." www.israel21c.com, November 23, 2003.

budgets to hire public relations experts in order to influence European public opinion. They cannot effectively influence the public opinion of the countries in which they operate with one or two employees.⁵¹ As opposed to the PA, Israeli information resources do not benefit from petrodollars or from the EU's generous donations. Recently, Arab governments and Palestinian supporters contributed an average \$22 million to the Palestinians for their international PR.⁵² By contrast, the Foreign Ministry's annual PR budget is only of \$4 million.⁵³

Another obstacle to efficient advocacy is the political appointments phenomenon. Israel's ambassadors in many European capitals are political appointees, which means that they sometimes lack the skills (including the language skills) to do their job and that they are replaced before they have a chance to learn what this job is about. Although some political appointees have made excellent ambassadors (such as Benjamin Netanyahu or Danny Gilerman at the UN), unprofessional ambassadors often make poor speakers.

Finally, as noted by the State Comptroller's report, Israel suffers from a lack of message discipline and coordination between the different government bodies. Responsibility for Israel's information and public relations is divided between the Prime Minister's Office, the Foreign Ministry, the Defense Ministry, the IDF Spokesperson, and the Israel Police. Each of these offices operates independently, and there is no central information authority empowered by the government to determine information strategy and communications management. In 1999, the Barak government appointed the Foreign Ministry to be responsible for coordinating Israel's information and public relations efforts. However, since this decision had no Knesset legislative backing, it became legally meaningless, which partly explains the competition for information authority between the Foreign Ministry and the Prime Minister's Office. The government tried to tackle this lack of central command doubled with overlap. Aware of the lack of coordination in the information policy, the government appointed in 2001 Yossi Gal as information policy coordinator at the Prime Minister's Office, a role similar to that of the White House Communications

⁵¹ The Foreign Ministry actually spends 9 million per year on what it broadly defines as "hasbara" - but half of that is for the staff at the consulates around the world.

⁵² Source: *The Israel's Project Guide to Proven Pro-Israel Communications* (October 2003), p. 3.

⁵³ Dan Diker (op. cit.), p. 7.

Director. However, Gal's responsibilities were not clearly defined and he soon resigned amid growing frustration. A similar pointless reform occurred in August 2001 when the Prime Minister appointed Zipi Livni Minister in charge of information policy at the Prime Minister's Office. However, no legal measures were taken to institutionalize the new minister's authority, and indeed the different PR-related institutions at the Prime Minister's Office (the domestic and foreign media advisors, the National Security Council, and the Government Press Office) refused to take instructions from the newly appointed minister, who subsequently resigned.

Official Israeli statements originate from at least four different offices: the IDF, the Foreign Ministry, the Prime Minister's Office, and the Defense Ministry. Sometimes, each office conveys a different message. On October 28, 2001, for example, Israel's Foreign Minister Shimon Peres gave numerous interviews to Israeli and foreign journalists stating that Arafat was not responsible for the wave of terror that was hitting Israel at the time, and produced as proof the fact that the PA had recently arrested several Hamas terrorists. Yet on that same day, IDF intelligence met with more than a hundred journalists to present evidence linking Arafat and his Fatah organization to Hamas terror activity. Explaining how Hamas terror groups train and operate in the full view of the Palestinian Authority security services, an Israeli military spokesman provided the media with documentation that the Hamas wing operates as an official, integral part of Arafat's "security" forces in Gaza. He also pointed out that two wanted Hamas terrorists working for the Palestinian security services had murdered four women and wounded fifty civilians at the Hadera bus station that very morning.

In contrast to the often uncoordinated messages coming from Israel, spokespeople of the autocratic Palestinian Authority adhere to a party line with discipline, simply reciting the standard litany of complaints about their "oppression," the "occupation," "human rights abuses," "racism," etc.

But there is an additional explanation to Israel's Achilles' heel, an explanation not mentioned by the State Comptroller: the Jewish taste for self-hatred and debasement. Israel's most violent international bashers happen to be Jews, which provides Israel's enemies with the convenient excuse: "If *they* say it, what do you want from me?" In

September 2003 Avraham Burg wrote on the front page of *Le Monde* and other prestigious international publications such as the *International Herald Tribune* that “the Israeli nation is a pile of corruption, oppression and injustice,” that this nation established “a ghetto in Kalkilya and a gulag in Jenin,” and that it practices “ethnic segregation.” Indeed, Israel is “a nationalistic and cruel state where discrimination reigns, a state whose rich businessmen live overseas and whose beggars are everywhere on the streets, a state where power is corrupted and where politics corrupts, a state of poor people and generals, a state of thieves and settlers.”⁵⁴ If the former Speaker of the Knesset says that, why shouldn’t European citizens believe him? He is obviously not anti-Israel or anti-Semitic.

Most Israeli spokespeople constantly find themselves on the defensive. By framing the conflict as a human rights issue, the Palestinians have succeeded in convincing world public opinion that every act of terrorism against Israeli civilians is not a crime, but a legitimate response to human rights abuses. Moreover, many Israeli policymaker and spokespeople seem to believe, as Shimon Peres once famously put it, that “good policies are good P.R.; they speak for themselves.” Unfortunately, however, this statement is completely mistaken. In PR, as Joseph Goebels once said and as all totalitarian regimes (including the PA) know very well, a lie can be more convincing than the truth, if its is big enough and if it is repeated often enough.

Moreover, no Israeli TV crew can compete with the heavily subsidized Jerusalem Media and Communications Center (JMCC), a Palestinian organization which has cornered the market on media services for the foreign press. The foreign press is totally dependent on Palestinian technical support personnel, who have a strong influence on the narrative and images that appear in the Western media. Most foreign journalists are not fluent in either Arabic or Hebrew, and are dependent on a network of local Palestinian “fixers.” These “fixers” arrange interviews for foreign journalists with Palestinian officials and encourage journalists to report on topics that suit the PR agenda of the Palestinian Authority. Working with a good “fixer” enables foreign journalists to get interviews with top Palestinian leaders and move safely around the West Bank and Gaza. Moreover, Palestinian camera operators film the vast majority

⁵⁴ Avraham Burg, “La révolution sioniste est morte,” *Le Monde*, 11 September 2003 (front page).

of foreign TV news coverage in the West Bank and Gaza. This is because Israeli camera operators are prohibited by the IDF from working in the West Bank and Gaza, and also because they are more expensive than their Palestinian counterparts. For instance, it is the Palestinian journalist Talal Abu Rahma who filmed the al Dura scene for *France 2* in September 2000. It is no surprise, then, if international TV news pictures focus daily on Palestinian dead and wounded, on funerals, on mourning Palestinian families, and on demolished Palestinian homes. Finally, Palestinian employees of several international news agencies, including the Associated Press and Reuters, regularly coordinate their news coverage with Palestinian officials. For instance, Marwan Barghouti used to issue early warnings to the foreign TV networks about impending Palestinian shooting attacks on Gilo so that film crews could capture Israeli return fire on the neighboring village of Beit Jalla.⁵⁵

While the PLO designed and implemented a professional and propaganda machine directed against Israel in the 1980s, the Israeli Foreign Ministry started doing the very opposite by ceasing to show the PLO's true face to the world. In 1986, Israel's Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and his deputy Dr. Yossi Beilin revised the way in which the government would relate to the PLO. They asked the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to cease distribution of the PLO Covenant, which has never officially changed the provision calling for the destruction of the State of Israel. They also asked that the Ministry stop defining the PLO as an enemy.

During the Oslo process, successive Israeli governments stopped fighting the media war, claiming that this war was over and incompatible with the peace process. In 1993, the Israeli government closed down the Public Information Department at the Foreign Ministry and from that point until the outbreak of Arafat's war in September 2000, it downplayed terrorist attacks and the two-faced message of the Palestinian leadership, which presented a message of peace in English and a message of war in Arabic. The very same year Israel shut down the Foreign Ministry's Public Information Department (in 1993), the PLO created at the UN a Special Rapporteur on the "Palestinian Territories" with the mandate to investigate "Israel's violations of international law."

⁵⁵ Dan Dicker, "The Influence of Palestinian Organizations on Foreign News Reporting." *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, Vol. 2, No. 23 (27 March 2003), The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, pp. 55-6.

To keep the Oslo process from collapsing, both Israeli and U.S. leaders decided in the 1990s to ignore the PA's daily radio and TV calls for a renewed war against Israel. Although the Foreign Ministry was aware of Palestinian incitement as soon as the PA was established, directives were issued by the Ministry to ignore this incitement for the sake of not infringing with the progress of negotiations between Israel and the PA.⁵⁶ In 1995, when the Institute for Peace Education produced videos of Arafat's speeches promoting *jihad* (holy war), Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres asked Israel TV not to air any of Arafat's speeches in Arabic. In September 1995, Peres went so far as to ask Representative Ben Gilman, the chairman of the U.S. House International Relations Committee, not to hold a special hearing in which these videos of Arafat's speeches were to be screened. The "don't tell" policy somehow continued during the Netanyahu administration from 1996 to 1999. The Barak government, which assumed power in May 1999, ignored the clauses in the Oslo accords that required the PA to cease incitement against Israel. As a result, Israel lost the sympathy and understanding it had enjoyed before Oslo over the PLO's calls to destroy the Jewish state.

Consequently, when Arafat launched his terrorist war against Israel in September 2000, Israel was caught off guard and ten years behind in the realm of PR and propaganda. Moreover, in the struggle over foreign sympathy, the Palestinians have a clear advantage over Israel for a reason candidly explained by the representative of an international news organization: "Television loves emotions and cares less about facts. The Palestinians don't care about losing people, and the Israelis can't fight that."⁵⁷ The Palestinians excel in conveying in the foreign media messages that clearly differ from their true intentions. For instance, Faysal Hussein was eulogized by Western media as a man of peace, compromise and coexistence. Shortly after his death in May 2001, the *New York Times* called him a "champion of living in peace" and the Associated Press declared him a "champion of coexistence."⁵⁸ This was indeed the image Hussein had managed to convey to foreign media over the years, both about himself and about the PLO. Yet, as Hussein admitted himself shortly

⁵⁶ Dan Diker (op. cit.), p. 10.

⁵⁷ Quoted from: Dan Diker, (op. cit.), p. 1.

⁵⁸ Deborah Sontag, "A Palestinian Champion of Living in Peace is Dead," *New York Times* (June 1, 2001). Karin Laub, "Faisal Hussein, Palestinian Champion of Coexistence, Dead at 60," *Associated Press* (May 31, 2001).

before his death, his goal and the PLO's continued to be the destruction of Israel through deceit and gradual strengthening of the PLO's foothold inside Israel. In an interview published by *Al Arabi* (Egypt) on June 24, 2001, Hussein declared that for the PLO the Oslo Agreements were a "Trojan Horse" meant to serve the PLO's "long-term goal" which is "the liberation of Palestine from the river to the sea."⁵⁹ This declaration did not constitute some sudden "radicalization" of Hussein's worldview and strategy. Indeed, it was consistent with previous statements made in Arabic such as the interview with *Al Rai* (Jordan) from 1992 in which Hussein candidly admitted that the purpose of the PLO's negotiations with Israel was "the gradual dissolution of the Zionist entity."⁶⁰ Yet most Europeans and Americans are convinced, by their own media, that Hussein and the PLO want peace with Israel based on a territorial compromise, and that the only obstacle to such a compromise is Israel's alleged intransigence, stubbornness, and territorial greed.

One rarely hears a dissenting voice among the Palestinians because anyone who publicly criticizes the PA can be imprisoned or even executed. The foreign media is told, and dutifully reports, that the person in question was a "collaborator." For instance, in early March 2002, the BBC reported the execution of two Palestinians who had been accused by the PA of collaboration. When the BBC crew met with the families of the two victims, they discovered that both had a history of opposition to the PA and that both had openly criticized Arafat. The BBC correspondent knew that these were dissidents, not collaborators, but BBC World Service chose not to report the story.

A rare exception occurred in October 2001 when two IDF soldiers were lynched in the Ramallah police station. The horrible scene was captured by an Italian TV crew and sent abroad without going through PA censors. The PA demanded, and obtained, an apology and a promise never to do it again.

⁵⁹ *Al Arabi* (Egypt), 24 June 2001. Translated by the Middle East Media and Research Institute (MEMRI), Dispatch No. 236 (July 2, 2001).

⁶⁰ *Al Rai* (Jordan), November 12, 1992. As cited in Benjamin Netanyahu, *A Place Among the Nations* (Bantam Books, 1993), p. 102.

Part II: The War of Ideas in the International Arena

1. The United States as a Target

Israel is not the only democracy that suffers from an enormous gap between reality and the way it is perceived overseas as a result of hostile and efficient propaganda. Anthony J. Blinken, a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and member of the U.S. National Security Council from 1994 to 2001, explains that the United States is dependent on the active cooperation of others to defeat its enemies and to advance its interests, yet such active cooperation is increasingly threatened by the United States' poor and unfairly tarnished international image. According to Blinken: "U.S. success in Afghanistan will count for little if the United States loses the global war of ideas. That war has produced a growing gap between much of the world's perception of the United States and the U.S. perception of itself. If this gap persists, U.S. influence abroad will erode, and the partners the United States needs to advance its interests will stand down. The few real enemies the United States faces will find it easier both to avoid sanction and to recruit others to their cause."⁶¹ This is why "pursuing the right policies is not enough. The U.S. government must convince its critics that the United States is right."⁶²

The Cold War was also a war of ideas, and the United States developed an arsenal to fight and win. In 1953, President Dwight Eisenhower created the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) in order to diffuse worldwide information about the United States and its policies. The "public diplomacy" of the U.S. government during the Cold War emphasized the advantages of political and economic freedoms and helped bring about the collapse of communism by discrediting this ideology among Soviet and East European citizens. The U.S. government also created powerful radio stations such as Voice of America (VOA), Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, which, at their peak during the Cold War, reached 50% of the Soviet population and 70% of Eastern Europe's population.

⁶¹ Anthony J. Blinken, "Winning the War of Ideas," *The Washington Quarterly* 25:2, p. 101.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 104.

With the end of the Cold War and the victory over Communism, it was widely believed in the United States that the war of ideas had been won and was over. Between 1989 and 1999, the budget of USIA decreased by 10%, and the agency was integrated into the State Department. Public diplomacy now accounts for 8% of the State Department's budget.⁶³ Only 2% of the Arab world listens to VOA.

The U.S. government realized after September 11 that the war of ideas had become a critical element of the global war declared by fundamentalist Islam. In September 2002, President Bush presented to Congress a new international information strategy to win the war against terrorism. The newly created Homeland Security Administration includes a central body for information and public relations. Since the establishment of this body, the US government provides daily information briefings to the press, and a web-based information HQ offers hourly updated information on US diplomatic and military activities. The flow of information is tightly controlled and messages emanating from the White House are consistent and disciplined.

Because terrorism is media-oriented, it is critical to fight it on the media level. Since one of the central tenets of 4GW is to convince public opinion that the terrorists are actually the victims and that the victims of terrorism are actually the ones responsible for terrorism, no counter-4GW strategy can be productive without defeating the manipulation of Western media by Islamic terrorists. Typically, the terrorists responsible for the World Trade Center Bombing in 1993 claimed that they had acted in response to American support to Israel, and warned that "The American people are responsible for the actions of their government and they must question all of the crimes that their government is committing against other people. Or they – Americans— will be the targets of our operations that could diminish them."⁶⁴ In other words, the 4GW-inspired terrorist strategy consists of weakening the enemy through the manipulation of its public opinion via the media.

An article published in *Politics and Diplomacy* in 2004 argued that "the battle for hearts and minds is not a short-term campaign but a key dimension of a protracted

⁶³ *Ibid*, p. 105.

⁶⁴ Quoted from: Brigitte L. Nacos, *Terrorism and the Media* (Columbia University Press, 1994), pp. 9-10.

conflict. To win this battle, the United States should formulate an integrated strategy of public diplomacy and political action ... The United States should focus on the information and media battlefields, which are as important as the conventional aspects of the conflict.”⁶⁵ The article recommended that American businessmen take part in this strategy: the US government should target business leaders for exchange programs with US businessmen in order to advance liberal ideas in the Muslim world. Similarly, Anthony J. Blinken argued that “prominent individuals involved in business, the arts and sciences, and sports can validate U.S. policy initiatives and the U.S. way of life. These individuals may be more credible than those serving in official capacities.”⁶⁶

The United States’ negative image in certain parts of the world is affecting American business overseas. In 2002, French Muslim lawyer Tawfik Mathlouti began marketing Mecca-Cola, a distinctly non-American imitation of Coca-Cola, in France, Britain, and elsewhere in Europe. Mathlouti vigorously opposes US foreign policy in the Middle East, and believes that the world should protest by boycotting American products. Ahead of the 2003 Iraq war, polls in Europe showed that many Europeans so strongly opposed the war that they were less inclined to buy US products. In 2004, Pepsi gained market shares in Bahrain by portraying Coca-Cola as the American soft drink and Pepsi as its local rival.⁶⁷ A poll of 8,000 consumers in eight nations taken in December 2004 by GMI Inc. showed that 61% of French consumers and 58% of German consumers felt negatively toward American firms.⁶⁸

American business leaders have consequently initiated a public relations project to improve their country’s international image and business activity. In January 2004, Keith Reinhard, an American advertising guru, launched an initiative to improve his country's poor international image for the sake of American business. His central argument is that something is amiss in the perception of America abroad, that this perception is economically damaging, and that it can and must be changed. He incorporated, together with other senior executives in America's advertising industry

⁶⁵ Ariel Cohen, “Combating Militant Islamic Ideology,” *Politics and Diplomacy* (Winter/Spring 2004), p. 113.

⁶⁶ Blinken (op. cit.), p. 109.

⁶⁷ *The Economist*, February 28th, 2004, p. 72.

⁶⁸ Source: Perter Gumber, “Branding America,” *Time Magazine*, Feb. 28, 2005.

and a few academics, Business for Diplomatic Action, a group aimed at finding a business-oriented solution to America's image problems. Reinhard commissioned research in 17 countries that showed that America and American business are viewed as arrogant, exploitative, corrupt, and willing to sacrifice anything in an effort to generate profits. Another survey showed a sharp drop in international support for American brands. Consequently, Business for Diplomatic Action aims at improving America's international image through America's business community in order to preserve American business achievements throughout the world.

The Taiwanese government has also been recruiting its business leaders for diplomatic purposes. In March 2004, it encouraged Taiwanese businessmen to pursue a "Go South" policy (towards ASEAN countries) in economics, trade and investments. The intention and strategy of this "Go South" policy was meant to lessen Taiwan's economic dependence with and links to the Mainland, for fear of troublesome strategic implications, especially if held to ransom or "taken hostage" by Beijing, in the event of tensions or conflicts across the Taiwan Straits.⁶⁹

2. The Role of the United Nations

The United Nations (UN) itself is involved in advancing Palestinian propaganda. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) maintains a professional media relations department and a news service called the UNRWA television network, both based in the *Ain el-Helweh* UNRWA refugee camp in Lebanon. UNRWA cooperates with the media services of the PLO and the Palestine Broadcasting Corporation (PBC) to provide the visiting press with information and services. Its literature focuses largely on the plight of the refugees who are being housed in camps until they can return to their "homeland" —which, in Palestinian parlance, includes not only the territories captured by Israel in 1967, but Israel itself.

Originally envisaged as a temporary organization, UNRWA began operation in 1950. Today, UNRWA operates 27 refugee camps in the West Bank and Gaza. In a November 1951 report, UNRWA director John Blandford Jr. said he expected Arab

⁶⁹ <http://www.tp.org.tw/eletter/story.htm?id=20000054>

governments to assume responsibility for relief operations by July 1952. But as Ralph Galloway, a former UNRWA director, explained in August 1958: “The Arab states do not want to solve the refugee problem. They want to keep it as an open sore, as an affront to the United Nations and as a weapon against Israel. Arab leaders don’t give a damn whether the refugees live or die.” UNRWA camps have become the main operating centers for PLO, Hamas, Islamic Jihad and PFLP terrorist groups responsible for the killing of hundreds of Israelis and the injuring of thousands. Twenty-three suicide bombers, responsible for killing 57 Israelis and injuring 1,000, came from the UNRWA camp in Jenin alone. While UNRWA is responsible for all aspects of the administration of the camps, the UN has ceded control to the terrorist elements operating within them. As former US Ambassador to Morocco Marc Ginsburg explains, “The refugee camps indeed are not policed by anyone but the Palestinian Authority, with the United Nations Relief and Works Administration personnel administering the lion’s share of the programs. But other organizations, including extremist Islamic organizations, operate freely in the camps.”⁷⁰ During searches of UNRWA camps after Operation Defensive Shield, Israel uncovered illegal arms caches, bomb factories and a plant manufacturing the new Qassam-2 rocket, designed to reach Israeli population centers.

UNRWA also operates one of the largest school systems in the Middle East, with 266 schools and 242,000 students. UNRWA uses and funds textbooks that incorporate maps of the Middle East that omit Israel and that de-legitimize Israel, Judaism and Jews.⁷¹ In a speech given July 6, 2001, UNRWA representative Saheil Alhinadi praised Hamas suicide attacks, saying: “The road to Palestine passes through the blood of the fallen, and these fallen have written history with parts of their flesh and their bodies.”⁷² Despite these well-known facts, the European Commission supplemented 80 million Euros for 2001 and 15 million Euros to reduce UNRWA’s deficit. The EU has budgeted €237 million for UNWRA for the period 2002-2005.⁷³

The United Nations became active in promoting the PLO’s agenda in the 1970s (more specifically, after the 1973 Yom Kippur War). In 1974, the International Labor

⁷⁰ Fox News, May 1st, 2002.

⁷¹ *Weekly Standard*, 13 May 2002.

⁷² <http://www.pmo.gov.il/english/nave/violence-5.html>

⁷³ Source: NGO Monitor.

Organization (ILO) admitted the PLO to participate in its General Conference, which condemned Israel for “racist” practices in the West Bank. In 1975, the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) excluded Israel from its activities. In 1976, the World Health Organization condemned Israel for the state of health administration in the West Bank and Gaza and appointed a committee of inquiry to check into the matter. The committee concluded that medical care in the West Bank and Gaza had actually improved since 1967. The WHO simply refused to consider the committee’s “unexpected” report. In 1981, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) suspended Israel from membership. UN Conferences also took part in this anti-Israel campaign. In 1976, the UN Conference on Water Resources spent most of its time condemning Israel. In 1980, the UN Conference on Women (Copenhagen) focused its work on an anti-Israel resolution and adopted a Program of Action calling for the eradication of Zionism, referring to the Arab citizens of the State of Israel as a “conquered people,” and calling the Israeli government “colonialist” and “racist.”⁷⁴ The 2001 UN Conference on Racism in Durban turned into a diplomatic and ideological assault and defamation campaign against the Jewish state.

The hijacking of the UN by the Arab states to wage their war against Israel on the diplomatic front is evidenced by the UN’s double standards and obsession with Israel. Almost 30% of the resolutions of the UN’s Commission on Human Rights over the past thirty-five years have been on Israel. Israel is the only member state that has been the subject of an entire agenda item of the Commission on Human Rights for the past three decades. There has never been a UN Commission on Human Rights resolution on countries like China, Syria, Saudi Arabia, or Zimbabwe. Altogether, the UN General Assembly has had only ten emergency sessions in its history, six of them being focused on Israel. In 2002 alone, the General Assembly produced twenty-two reports and formal notes on “conditions of Palestinian and other Arab citizens living under Israeli occupation.” The UN’s Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (established in 1968) is the only country-specific UN human

⁷⁴ Quoted from: Michael Curtis, “The United Nations Against Israel.” *Middle East Review* 13 (1981), p. 51.

rights investigative mechanism that is not comprised of independent experts, but by state representatives. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People is still around and produces every year propaganda material for the PLO with UN money. In 1993, the UN Commission on Human Rights established a Special Rapporteur on the “Palestinian Territories” with the mandate to investigate “Israel’s violations of international law.” At the 1993 Vienna World Conference on Human Rights (the second world conference on human rights in the history of the UN), efforts to include “Anti-Semitism” into the Vienna Declaration failed. In October 1995, when the UN General Assembly adopted a Declaration in Connection with the Fiftieth Anniversary of the End of the Second World War, efforts to include the Holocaust were rejected. At the UN Durban World Conference in September 2001, only Israel was criticized as a racist country. In 2002, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on Palestinian children, the same week that a gunman from Arafat’s Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade broke into a home in a kibbutz in northern Israel and shot to death a four-and-five year-old at close range. Although hundreds of Israeli children have been murdered by Arafat’s war and thousands wounded or maimed, the UN resolution made no mention of Israeli children. In 2002, there were twenty General Assembly resolutions directed at Israel.⁷⁵ The 2003 report of the Special Rapporteur on Israel, submitted to the Commission on Human Rights says: “Both Palestinian and Israeli children have been exposed to threats of personal safety, while Palestinian children have, in addition, felt the breakdown of family life.” There is nothing in that report on the breakdown of the family life of Israeli children whose parents were murdered or maimed in suicide bombing or shooting attacks. In March 2003, the Palestinian representative to the UN declared to the Commission on Human Rights: “The world condemned the old Nazism in the past ... during the Second World War ... The world also condemned Zionist Israel for the same criminal crimes it has been perpetuating against the Palestinian people ... for over fifty years now, starting in 1948 ... The world has not yet eliminated the New Zionist Nazism.”⁷⁶

The UN’s response to Israel’s military incursion into Jenin in April 2002 typifies the organization’s treatment of the Jewish state. At the time, even a report by Arafat’s Fatah movement recognized Jenin as “the suicider’s capital,” a place where

⁷⁵ Anne Bayefsky, “The UN and the Assault on Israel’s Legitimacy: Implications for the Roadmap.” *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, No. 510 (1 August 2003), p. 6.

⁷⁶ Quoted from: Bayefsky, “The UN and the Assault on Israel’s Legitimacy” (op. cit.), p. 4.

organizations like Hamas and Islamic Jihad had sought shelter, among civilians, for their ongoing terrorist operations. However, the UN saved its venom for the IDF's response to the violence directed against Israeli citizens. Terje Roed-Larsen, the UN special coordinator for the Middle East peace process, described the scene after Israel's strike (a strike expressly designed to limit civilian casualties) as "horrific beyond belief." Peter Hansen, commissioner general of the UN Relief and Works Agency, called it "a human catastrophe that had few parallels in recent history." A UN press release was headlined, "End the horror in the camps." All this despite the fact that the Palestinian death toll from this "massacre" was 52, approximately 35 of whom were armed combatants, as the Secretary General himself admitted in the report he released on Jenin in the Summer of 2002.

In 2003, the General Assembly passed no less than eighteen resolutions that singled out Israel for criticism. By contrast, human-rights violations in the rest of the world drew only four country-specific resolutions, and no resolution of the UN Commission on Human Rights has ever been directed at China, Syria, Bahrain, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Pakistan, Malaysia, Mali, or Zimbabwe. The genocide in Sudan has gone nearly unnoticed at the UN.

Israel is now routinely condemned at the UN with Nazi terminology (current resolutions speak of the "Judaization" of Jerusalem) or is likened to Nazis. As the Algerian representative to the UN recently claimed: "Kristallnacht repeats itself daily. . . . Israeli soldiers are the true disciples of Goebbels and of Himmler, who strip Palestinian prisoners and inscribe numbers on their bodies. . . . Must we wait in silence until new death camps are built. . . . The Israeli war machine has been trying for five decades to arrive at a final solution."⁷⁷

At the UN 2001 Conference on racism in Durban, the Arab Lawyer's Union freely distributed books containing cartoons of swastika-festooned Israelis and fanged, hooked-nosed Jews, blood dripping from their hands. Another best-selling title was *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Hundreds of flyers were distributed with a picture of Hitler and the words, "What if I had won? The good thing—there would be no Israel." Appeals to the conference's secretary-general, UN High Commissioner

⁷⁷ Quoted from: Anne Bayefsky, "The UN and the Jews" (<http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/un/andthejews.html>)

for Human Rights Mary Robinson, to demand the removal of this anti-Semitic literature were ignored. Since the Durban Conference, anti-Semitism voiced under the auspices of the UN has taken a new and indeed more dangerous turn. In every UN body, Arab and Muslim states have opposed any effort to give meaningful definition to the notion of terrorism, largely because of its obvious implications for the Palestinian terror war against Israel.

In 2002, John Dugard, a special UN *rappporteur* for the Commission on Human Rights, could barely contain his admiration for the murderous enemies of Israel: “The Palestinian response is equally tough: while suicide bombers have created terror in the Israeli heartland, militarized groups armed with rifles, mortars, and Qassam-2 rockets confront the IDF [Israeli army] with new determination, daring, and success.”⁷⁸

In 2003, as Israel suffered successive waves of terrorist attacks against its civilians, the UN Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution affirming the legitimacy of suicide bombing, declaring that movements against “foreign occupation and for self-determination” were entitled to “all available means, including armed struggle.” The only members to vote against the resolution were Australia, Germany, Peru, Canada, and the United States (France and the United Kingdom abstained). As explained by Anne Bayefsky, “the UN serves as a breeding ground for anti-Semitism, where Jewish victimhood is routinely denied and displaced by the Palestinian victim said to be living under racist, Nazi-like oppression. The UN goal is to minimize the role of negotiations, intervene on behalf of the Palestinian victim on the grounds that the root cause of the dispute is the Israeli occupation, and to impose pre-determined right answers on the Israeli culprit.”⁷⁹

During its annual session in Geneva, the UNCHR regularly adopts 5 to 8 anti-Israel resolutions, and more than 30 percent of its meeting time is devoted to condemnations of Israel. Largely as a result of campaigning by NGOs that enjoy consultative privileges at the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), such as the Palestinian Center for Human Rights (PCHR), the commission ignores the world’s

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Anne Bayefsky, “The UN and the Assault on Israel’s Legitimacy” (op. cit.), p. 6.

most significant human rights abuses, especially in the Arab world (in 2004, the UNCHR had a Libyan chair while Israel is barred from membership). While its mission statement promises criticism of all factors affecting Palestinians human rights, its long reports make scant mention of the high levels of corruption in the Palestinian Authority including the misuse of hundreds of millions of dollars of donor money. Yet, the PCHR is funded by the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) and the Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network (EMHRN), which itself receives 80 percent of its funding directly from the European Union. Indeed, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) actively contribute to the UN's role in the propaganda war against Israel.

3. The Role of NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations)

Palestinian NGOs, such as medical and relief organizations, are very much involved in the media war. The Union of Palestine Medical Relief Committees (UPMRC), run by Dr. Mustafa Al-Bargouti (brother of jailed Fatah Tanzim leader Marwan Al-Bargouti), coordinates its strategies with Dr. Fatchi Arafat's Palestinian Red Crescent Society in disseminating false reports of Israeli medical neglect and torture of Palestinians. There have also been numerous incidents in which false information issued by UPMRC sources has been picked up by U.S. media. On July 11, 2001, for example, the Associated Press reported that a pregnant Palestinian woman was shot to death at an Israeli roadblock. In fact, she didn't die, and the doctor who had told the AP reporter she had been shot and killed had not even seen her. He was in a different town at the time.

The BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency & Refugee Rights, established in Bethlehem in 1998, is very active on the "right of return" issue. Its declared goal is to "provide a resource pool of alternative, critical and progressive information and analysis on the question of Palestinian refugees and displaced persons." With a budget of over \$400,000, BADIL receives funding from sources including Oxfam, the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC), the Canadian International Development Agency, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, and the Swiss Foreign Ministry. BADIL has pending applications for "special consultative status" with the

UN and for membership with the Palestinian NGO Network (PNGO).⁸⁰ BADIL refuses to recognize Israel as a Jewish state, openly declaring that the ultimate purpose of the “right of return” is to “alter the demographic balance in Israel so much that it would destroy Israel’s Zionist, exclusionist character.” BADIL was a signatory to an August 2002 call to boycott Israel, including an endorsement of the NGO Program of Action conceived at the 2001 Durban conference. BADIL’s statement emphasizes the Durban declaration’s call for the “launch of an international anti-Israeli Apartheid movement as implemented against the South African Apartheid...”

Other influential Palestinian NGOs include MIFTAH and Al-Haq. MIFTAH claims that the refugee issue was the result of “a systematic policy of ethnic cleansing” and “attacks aimed to annihilate the entire Palestinian territory and population.” It accuses Israel of carrying out a “continued pursuit of transfer.” Al-Haq, an active participant at the 2001 Durban conference, aggressively promotes the “right of return.”

Less known, however, is the role of *international* NGOs in the war of ideas against Israel. NGOs have multiplied since the end of the Second World War: only sixty-nine NGOs had a consultative status at the UN in 1948; today, more than two thousand do. Most of today’s NGOs define themselves as “universal human rights organizations,” but in fact promote agendas that are far remote from human rights. Among today’s most powerful NGOs are Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch (HRW), and the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ). These organizations exert tremendous influence at the United Nations, as well as the European Union (EU) and Western capitals.

Until the launching of the PLO media war in the 1970s, NGOs had not yet been recruited by the Arab world and therefore were hardly involved in Middle East affairs. Rather, they were instrumental in promoting human rights in the Communist world. For example, they played a central role in advocating the human rights agenda of the

⁸⁰ Established in September 1993, the PNGO umbrella organization comprises 92 Palestinian NGO member organizations and receives hundreds of thousands of dollars in Ford Foundation money. PNGO was instrumental in producing many of the preparatory documents for the Durban 2001 conference including the document calling for embargoes on Israel.

Helsinki process and of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Helsinki Watch (which later became Human Rights Watch) and Amnesty International were vocal and efficient advocates of the Jews' human rights in the Soviet Union and Communist Europe.

This is no longer the case. Today's NGOs take sides in international disputes, and when it comes to the Arab-Israeli conflict, they systematically blame Israel for the very existence of that conflict while absolving the Arab states from any wrongdoing.⁸¹ Part of the PLO's media war strategy launched in the 1970s was to recruit international governmental and non-governmental organizations in that war. This strategy has proved successful. Major NGOs such as HRW, Amnesty International and Christian Aid have been instrumental in promoting the PLO's agenda and interests. These NGOs work closely with the media and UN agencies (such as the UN's Human Rights Commission). For example, it is the NGO community that set the agenda and shaped the discussions of the infamous Durban Conference of August-September 2001. NGOs were also instrumental in obtaining a UN General Assembly resolution referring the Israeli security fence to the International Court of Justice.

Amnesty International's 2005 report on "Israel and the Occupied Territories: Conflict, occupation and patriarchy - Women carry the burden" (31 March 2005) typically exemplified this organization's bias and political involvement in the Arab-Israeli conflict, implicitly denying Palestinian society the maturity to act responsibly.⁸² The report ignored the context behind checkpoints and other physical barriers. While pointing out isolated and tragic incidents that have occurred at checkpoints involving pregnant Palestinian women, the report ignored the impact of several suicide bombings and other terrorist acts, including those carried out by or involving female Palestinians. Likewise, the report ignored the abuse of ambulances and other medical materials for terror purposes while criticizing access to medical facilities. Many of the report's quotes were provided by the Palestinian Center for Human Rights and Palestine Monitor. Noting the lack of legal protection for Palestinian women and the inability of Palestinian law enforcement agencies to uphold the rule of law, the report

⁸¹ See: Gerald Steinberg, "NGOs Make War on Israel," *Middle East Quarterly*, Summer 2004 (www.meforum.org/article/633).

⁸² <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engmde150162005>

put the blame on Israel, who supposedly “has prevented PA security forces from operating in much of the Occupied Territories.”

In Europe, government ministers and legislators routinely meet and consult with NGO leaders, whose reports on international conflicts influence government policies and decisions. For example, a report by the British Parliament on the Arab-Israeli conflict in January 2004 was very much influenced, if not shaped, by NGOs such as Christian Aid, Oxfam, and the Save the Children Fund.⁸³

The ability of international NGOs to raise money partially depends on their connections with local NGOs and governments. In the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict, most of the international NGOs’ local partners are Palestinian and Israeli Arab groups, such as the Palestinian Committee for the Protection of Human Rights and the Environment, *Miftah*, *Al-Haq*, *Al-Mezan*, and *Adalah*. Incidentally, all these Palestinian organizations are affiliated with the PLO and do not inquire about the human rights dimensions of Palestinian terror or the corruption of the Palestinian Authority.

NGOs have become extremely powerful and influential on international media, decision makers, and the UN. Their reports, protests and lobbying activities have a dominant impact on the UN as well as on the policies adopted by many governments. However, unlike democratically elected governments or public companies, no systematic framework exists for holding NGOs to rigorous standards of accountability for the statements and reports they produce. Because they claim to pursue “universal humanitarian goals,” NGOs enjoy immunity from detailed scrutiny or criticism. The vast resources at the disposal of these self-proclaimed humanitarian NGOs allows them to produce reports, press releases and media interviews, turning them into primary sources for journalists, researchers, and government policy makers. The amplifying effect of these public pronouncements has often framed the terms of public discourse and strongly influences policy. This influence has been skillfully exploited by the PLO.

⁸³ “International Development’s Second Report,” House of Commons, International Committee on Development Assistance to the Occupied Palestinian Territories, London, January 15, 2004 (www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmintdev/230/23005.htm#evidence).

The 2001 Durban Conference illustrated the efficiency of PLO manipulation of international NGOs in the war of ideas against Israel. The agenda and preliminary texts of the Durban Conference were set during the fourth (and final) preparatory conference held in Teheran, from which Israel and Jewish NGOs were excluded. At the Durban Conference, no less than ninety Palestinian NGOs were active in promoting their agenda along with hundreds of sympathetic international NGOs.⁸⁴ For example, the Palestinian Committee for the Protection of Human Rights and the Environment (also known as LAW) played a central role in steering committees and workshops at Durban to promote the theory that Israel is an “Apartheid state.” Incidentally, this NGO has received over \$1 million from the Ford Foundation and additional funding from the EU.⁸⁵

Instead of dealing with the assigned issue of racism, the Durban Conference was effectively hijacked by the PLO and the Arab world to de-legitimize, defame, and demonize Israel –a classic technique used for three decades by the PLO in its war of ideas against the Jewish state. Indeed, the final declaration of the Durban Conference included statements asserting that “targeted victims of Israel’s brand of apartheid and ethnic cleansing methods have been in particular children, women, and refugees,” condemning Israel for its alleged “perpetration of racist crimes against humanity including ethnic cleansing, acts of genocide,” and calling for “a policy of complete and total isolation of Israel as an apartheid state ... the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions and embargoes, the full cessation of all links ... between all states and Israel.”⁸⁶

International NGOs did take part in this Middle Age-like blood libel. HRW’s Executive Director Kenneth Roth confirmed his organization’s role in the Durban final declaration, declaring: “Clearly, Israeli racist practices are an appropriate topic.”⁸⁷ Moreover, international NGOs such as HRW prevented the participation of Jewish NGOs in the Durban Conference.

⁸⁴ Steinberg, p. 5.

⁸⁵ <http://ngo-monitor.org/editions/v1n06/v1n06-1.htm>.

⁸⁶ www.racism.org.za/index.html

⁸⁷ Steinberg, p. 5.

During and after Operation Defensive Shield in April 2002, the Palestinian propaganda machine went out of its way to convince the world that Israel was committing “war crimes” and “massacres” against the Palestinians. Many international NGOs took an active part in this propaganda campaign. For example, Christian Aid, one of Europe’s wealthiest and most influential NGOs, produced a movie on Operation Defensive Shield called *Peace under Siege*. While Christian Aid’s declared purpose is to fight malnutrition and diseases around the world, this organization actively takes part in PLO propaganda. The movie *Peace under Siege* framed Israel as a ruthless aggressor only interested in grabbing land and killing Palestinian children, and totally ignored the issue of Palestinian terrorism. Christian Aid was founded in the 1950s and is based in London. Its official purpose is “to further charitable purposes, which relieve or combat malnutrition, hunger, disease, sickness or distress throughout the world” and “to further charitable purposes which advance or assist such other charitable work as may be carried on by or with the support or approval of the British Council of Churches.” However, Christian Aid is extensively involved in anti-Israel propaganda. Christian Aid not only contributes funds, but also legitimacy and logistic support to Palestinian NGOs. Christian Aid is a partner of many Palestinian NGOs such as Adalah, Physicians for Human Rights - Israel and the Union of Palestinian Medical Relief Committees, Palestine Monitor, LAW and PCHR. LAW and PCHR played prominent roles in the anti-Israel defamation campaign that took place at Durban in September 2001. According to NGO Monitor, the EU investigated suspicions that LAW passed money received from the EU to terrorist organizations such as Fatah and Hamas.⁸⁸

Christian Aid’s 2004 publication, “Facts on the ground: The end of the two-state solution?” (October 21, 2004) isolates the single issue of land, examining it exclusively from the perspective of the Palestinian leadership, thus producing a highly biased and imbalanced political publication. Drawing upon Christian imagery and symbolism, Christian Aid headlined its Christmas 2004 appeal “Child of Bethlehem,” focusing on the story of a seven-year old Palestinian girl living in Bethlehem who was “hit in the eye by shrapnel from a bullet fired by Israeli soldiers.” Using the emotions that the town of Bethlehem arouses among Christians during the Christmas holiday,

⁸⁸ www.ngo-monitor.org

Christian Aid linked the suffering of Palestinian Christian children with that of Jesus (who was born in Bethlehem).

Christian Aid recently launched its “PressureWorks” website. The website, which urges its readers to “Take action now!” by contacting their MPs and Foreign Office ministers, condemns Israeli security policies, settlements, the security barrier, but nowhere does it call for Palestinians to put an end to terrorism. The website also claims that “Osama bin Laden refers to US support of the Israelis as one of the main reasons for his 9/11 attack on the World Trade Centre,” thus attributing the rise of international terrorism to the US and Israel.

Christian Aid also takes British politicians on “fact-finding missions” to the West Bank and Gaza, presenting a one-sided view of the situation, and not giving a chance for an official Israeli response. After one of these “fact-finding missions,” MP Jenny Tonge said of suicide bombers: “If I had to live in that situation - and I say that advisedly - I might just consider becoming one myself.”⁸⁹ Christian Aid’s emphasis on political activity rather than humanitarian assistance was recently illustrated by a press release of 16 April 2004 expressing opposition to Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s Gaza disengagement initiative and describing US President Bush’s endorsement of the plan as “another blow...dealt to the peoples of the Middle East.”⁹⁰

War on Want (WoW), an NGO founded in the early 1950s in the UK, is also active in promoting Palestinian propaganda. This NGO claims that its mission is “fighting for a world without poverty” and ensuring “that workers in conflict zones are able to work in secure conditions.” WoW is a partner of the Union of Palestine Medical Relief Committees, and was previously run by British MP George Galloway. Galloway was expelled from the Labour Party for public incitement against British forces serving in Iraq, and is under investigation for alleged links to the Saddam Hussein regime and personal involvement in the “oil for food” scandal. WoW routinely uses hate rhetoric against Israel, such as “apartheid,” “slavery,” and “a heavyweight beating a child.” WoW’s latest campaign focuses on Israel’s security barrier, which it calls “the world’s biggest prison.” WoW’s statements make no mention of the terrorism that has killed over 1,000 Israelis (mostly civilians), and

⁸⁹ http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/3421669.stm

⁹⁰ <http://www.christianaid.org.uk/news/stories/040416s1.htm>

which highlights the moral rationale of Israel's defensive response. WoW alleges that Israel's security barrier "is destroying the possibility of a Palestinian state, because Palestinian land is being divided into ghettos." WoW falsely and libelously claims that Israel electrified the barrier, "with watchtowers and sniper positions every few hundred meters" and that "the Wall is part of an on-going attempt to make life unendurable for Palestinians." There is no room in WoW for the human rights of Israelis. Instead, WoW justifies Palestinian terrorism claiming that it "is a result of Palestinian anger and desperation at the situation they have suffered." WoW's documents show figures on Palestinian casualties, while failing to mention Israeli victims of Palestinian terror. WoW also adopts traditional anti-Semitic libels such as "poisoning the wells."

The UK-based Save the Children (SCF) Fund promotes itself as an educational resource center for teachers and educators. SCF runs a number of educational projects in Gaza with a very heavy political dimension, including a biased version of the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict. SCF has never condemned the Palestinian exploitation of children for use in suicide terror attacks, but it did conduct a major campaign to distort and demonize Israel's anti-terror measures at the 2004 Geneva session of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

The US-based Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) describes itself as "a relief, service, and peace agency of the North American Mennonite and Brethren in Christ churches." However, MCC's activities and publications reveal a deeply flawed anti-Israel agenda, including campaigning against the Israeli security barrier while ignoring Palestinian terror and providing links to other politicized NGOs, such as PENGON and the "Stop the Wall Campaign." MCC's "Peace Office Newsletter" produced by the organization's Middle East leadership contains violent attacks on Israel. The Newsletter contains contributions from radical anti-Israel NGOs, including the Palestinian Authority-affiliated Applied Research Institute and Jeff Halper from the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions, with other links to Palestinian NGOs such as Al-Haq, the Palestinian Center for Human Rights, the Electronic Intifada, the Stop the Wall Campaign, LAW, ad-Dameer, and al-Awda.

Mercy Corps is an NGO that provides humanitarian assistance around the world, including in the Darfur war zone, and in the tsunami disaster areas. However, this

NGO is politically involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The descriptions of the Mercy Corps' humanitarian projects to aid Palestinians include biased claims blaming Israel exclusively for poverty and suffering, ignoring the rampant corruption of the Palestinian Authority, and the campaign of terrorism directed against Israeli civilians.

The Center on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), headed by former PLO staff member Scott Leckie, announced in its 2000-2002 biennial report that "COHRE and BADIL are planning to jointly hire a lobbyist to co-ordinate a campaign to change policies within various UN agencies and States with regard to the right of Palestinian refugees to repossess the properties confiscated by Israel since 1947."⁹¹

Many European NGOs, which actively participate in the war of ideas against Israel, are funded by the European Union. The Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network (EMHRN), itself linked to the Euro-Mediterranean Project, is one of the leading promoters of anti-Israel rhetoric and action. In October 2002, EMHRN called for the "total or partial suspension of the EU Association Agreement with Israel" because of Israel's alleged "indiscriminate, excessive and disproportionate use of force ... willful killings, arbitrary executions and targeted assassinations."⁹² The European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) provides funding for *Ilam* and *Adalah*, two organizations whose reports consistently use terms such as "war crimes" and "crimes against humanity" in reference to Israel's response to Palestinian terrorism. *Adalah* was instrumental in drafting many of the accusations of "apartheid" and "institutional racism" directed against Israel during the Durban Conference.

In May 2005, the British Association of University Teachers (AUT) decided to boycott Israeli universities. Boycotts are a major part of the anti-Israel propaganda war, and many NGOs are driving the process. For example, the AUT boycott resolution specifically repeats the accusations of the PNGO – the Palestinian Non-Governmental Organization. The PNGO has indeed played a central role in the assault on Israel's legitimacy and the right of the Jewish people to self-determination. This goal is reflected in many activities that PNGO supports, such as the December 2004 conference at the School of Oriental & African Studies, London on "Resisting

⁹¹ http://www.cohre.org/library/COHRE_Activity_report.pdf, p. 61.

⁹² <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/archives/infofile.htm#euro>

Israeli Apartheid Strategies & Principles.” This theme advanced the boycott process, accompanied by the justification of Palestinian terror. As documented in NGO Monitor’s detailed reports on PNGO, this umbrella organization and its constituent members (real and virtual) receive funding from the British Department for International Development, parallel groups in Europe and Canada, and from private sources such as the Ford Foundation.

PNGO constantly promotes boycotts of Israel, such as the Grassroots International Protection for the Palestinian People (GIPP), which calls for an economic and civilian boycott of all official Israeli organizations and institutions, the expulsion of Israel from intergovernmental organizations, and demands that foreign states refuse entry to Israeli officials. PNGO’s extremist political agenda is reflected in its rejection of USAID guidelines designed to prevent funding to recognized terrorist groups. In its policy statement, PNGO argues that the USAID guidelines could prevent “Palestinians who want to take part in international events” from making presentations “from a Palestinian perspective,” thus implying that opposition to terror is irreconcilable with the “Palestinian perspective.”⁹³

The European Union (EU) and many European government support NGOs that cover their anti-Israel activism under the banner of humanitarian and human rights. The Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network (EMHRN), linked to the Euro-Mediterranean Project, is one of the leading promoters of anti-Israel activism. In October 2002 the EMHRN called for the “total or partial suspension of the EU Association Agreement with Israel” because of “Israel’s indiscriminate, excessive and disproportionate use of force ... willful killings, arbitrary executions and targeted assassinations.” The EMHRN did not mention the campaign of mass terror to which Israel was responding.

The EU is a major source of funding for *B’tselem*, whose reports alleging Israeli human rights abuses fail to consider the context of terrorism and the need for effective responses. In addition, while claiming to be a human rights organization, *B’tselem* devotes most of its activities and resources to its well-known political agenda, and is closely connected with openly anti-Israel organizations such as PCHR and *Miftah*. In

⁹³ http://www.pngo.net/activities/cond_funding/05-01-2004.htm

this way, the EU is assisting in the exploitation of human rights claims for highly partisan and political objectives.

The EU Commission Office in Israel and the Finnish Embassy have funded Physicians for Human Rights - Israel, whose highly politicized and demonization activities and reports have led the Israeli Medical Association to end all cooperation. The EU Commission Office in Israel has also funded the Israeli Committee Against House Demolition, a highly politicized anti-Israeli NGO, whose reports also ignore critical legal and political contexts, and make claims that are unsupported or false.

Between 1994 and 2004, over 50% of international assistance (i.e., over \$3 billion) to the Palestinians came from the EU.⁹⁴ A permanent EU representative office administers direct assistance of up to \$80 million dollars annually, a sum that does not include EU financial assistance to non-Palestinian organizations that advance Palestinian causes and agenda, as well as the official representations from individual EU member states that also contribute significant funds. A large proportion of these funds has been used to promote anti-Israel propaganda. 20% of EU project funding is channeled to NGOs from the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). One of the Israeli organizations funded by EIDHR is *I'lam*, the Media Center for Arab Palestinians in Israel. This organization claims to “contribute to the development of a plural and unbiased media landscape, which is fundamental for every democracy.” In reality, *I'lam* is a political organization that disseminates defamatory and libelous accusations against Israel in the international community. For instance, *I'lam* claims that “[Israeli] media is primarily controlled by the national government and constitutes an important mechanism of control and manipulation. The antidemocratic features and role of the media system in Israel have their origin in governmental policies, legislative regulations, and in the self-censorship by Israeli media workers.”

⁹⁴ NGO Monitor, www.ngo-monitor.org

EIDHR also funds *Adalah*, whose widely publicized reports consistently use terms such as “war crimes” and “crimes against humanity” in reference to Israeli responses to terrorism, and is a leading proponent of the pro-Palestinian political agenda. *Adalah* was also prominent in drafting many of the accusations of “apartheid” and “institutional racism” in Israel for the NGO Declaration that was issued in parallel to the World Conference against Racism in Durban in September 2001.

Part III: The Problem With Europe

1. Europe's Ideological and Cultural Surrender

Following the Yom Kippur War and the Arab oil blackmail in 1973, the then European Economic Community (EEC) agreed to the creation of a forum called the Euro-Arab Dialogue (EAD). The project was initiated by both the Arab countries and France, and was composed of representatives from the EEC and Arab countries. France's support for EAD was in line with what had become a central tenet of French foreign policy since de Gaulle, namely to make France's attempt to regain its stance in the Arab world after the Algerian war (1962) converge with France's effort to challenge American supremacy within the Atlantic Alliance. Since de Gaulle's return to power in 1958, France aspired to lead the EEC and to turn this French-led geopolitical bloc into a rival of the United States. In line with its ambitions, France's strategy in the Middle East was to broker an Arab-Israeli peace agreement that would satisfy Arab demands and eliminate American influence. During the Yom Kippur War, France denied landing rights to American aircraft with military material en route to Israel. After the Yom Kippur War, France benefited from favorable oil contracts, sold Mirage fighter planes to Libya, built a nuclear reactor in Iraq, allowed the opening of a PLO mission in Paris, rivaled only with the Soviet Union in its promotion of a PLO state in the West Bank and in Gaza, released Abu Daoud (who masterminded and executed the murder of the Israeli Olympic athletes in Munich), and condemned the Camp David peace agreements between Israel and Egypt.

The EAD was a diplomatic fig leaf for a tacit agreement between the EEC and the Arab world, whereby the EEC would support the Arab world diplomatically in the Arab-Israeli conflict, and benefit, in return for economic agreements and continuous oil supply. But the Arab world had another and wider plan with the establishment of EAD: to break the traditional trans-Atlantic solidarity and bring Western Europe into the Arab-Islamic sphere of influence.

From the outset, EAD operated at the highest political level, with foreign ministers on both sides, as well as the president of the EEC (later called EU) and the Secretary

General of the Arab League. EAD's central body, the General Commission, was in charge of implementing a "dialogue," which in practice lobbied for Arab immigration to Europe as well as anti-Americanism and anti-Israel policies. EAD encouraged Arab immigration to Europe, as well as the maintaining of immigrants' ties with their countries of origin, thus impeding their integration in European society. Immigration flows from North Africa to Europe reached unprecedented peaks, with millions of Arab immigrants admitted into Europe. The Great Mosque of Paris was opened back in 1926 as a gesture aimed at rewarding North African Arabs for their service in World War I, but large-scale immigration did not begin until the end of the Algerian war, when about 250,000 Algerians who had supported the French sought refuge in France. In the 1960s and 1970s Arab immigrants arrived from Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, but they were only allowed as guest workers. In 1974, the French Parliament passed a law granting them residence, civil rights, and even citizenship.⁹⁵ The timing of this law was not fortuitous, and the impact of EAD was obvious.

EAD also encouraged, and indeed implemented, the diffusion of Arab and Islamic culture in Europe through European universities. The EAD summits in Venice (1977) and Hamburg (1983) called for the teaching and promotion of Arab language and culture in Europe and for the creation of Arab cultural centers in European capitals. In October 1980, France created the *Institut du monde arabe*, a Paris-based institution whose purpose is to promote Arab language and culture in France. This new tendency was in line with the 1975 propositions of the EEC's parliamentary association for Euro-Arab cooperation, which had called for "a mid and long-term policy aimed at exchanging European technology for Arab oil and workforce," for the immigration of Arab workers to Europe, and for the need to recognize the Arab immigrants' right to "export their culture to Europe."⁹⁶

EAD became the vehicle for legitimizing PLO propaganda in Europe. As explained by Middle East scholar Bat Ye'or, "The EAD, which had tied Arab strategic policies for the destruction of Israel to the European economy was the Trojan horse for Europe's inclusion into the orbit of Arab-Muslim influence."⁹⁷ The EEC endorsed the

⁹⁵ David Pryce-Jones, "Jews, Arabs, and French Diplomacy." *Commentary*, May 2005, p. 28.

⁹⁶ Oriana Fallaci, *La Force de la Raison* (Paris: Éditions du Rocher, 2004), pp. 125-126.

⁹⁷ <http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-yeor100902.asp>

Arab diplomatic stance by blaming Israel's military presence beyond the 1949 armistice lines as the cause rather than the consequence of the Arab-Israeli conflict, by demanding Israel's unconditional and total withdrawal to those lines, and by supporting the PLO infiltration at the UN. The EEC also dismissed the Camp David Agreements as missing the point of the "real issue" (the alleged need to recognize the PLO in order to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict) and officially called in 1980 to recognize the PLO ("Venice Declaration").

It is through EAD that the EEC eventually subscribed to the Arab version of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The EEC's Declaration on the Middle East (29 June 1977) and the speech delivered by Belgian Foreign Minister and rotating EEC President Simonet at the UN General Assembly on 26 September 1977 were similar in their tone and content to Arab diatribes against Israel. The EEC also bought into the PLO's new concept of "Palestinian people" with its "inalienable rights."

In 1975, a new European journal came out under the revealing name of *Eurabia*. This journal was published jointly by different European pro-Arab organizations such as the *Comité européen de coordination des associations d'amitié avec le monde arabe* (Paris), *Middle East International* (London), *France-Pays arabes* (Paris), and the *Groupe d'Études sur le Moyen Orient* (Geneva). The second issue of *Eurabia* argued for the "need for a political understanding between Europe and the Arab world, based on economic agreements" and called upon Europe to "understand the political and economic interests of the Arab world."

In 1975, France and its European partners let Syria get away with its invasion and occupation of Lebanon. In 1977, France started building a nuclear plant in Iraq. The 1980 "Venice Declaration" constituted the first tangible diplomatic achievement of the EAD. In this document, the EEC endorsed every single Arab position on the Arab-Israeli conflict: Israeli unconditional and total withdrawal to the 1949 armistice lines, Israeli recognition of the PLO, and blaming of the Arab-Israeli conflict on Israel's military presence beyond the 1949 armistice lines.

According to Bat Yeor, one of EAD's effects is that today's Europe is both consciously and unconsciously surrendering its Judeo-Christian roots and embracing

new cultural and political identities in which Arab and Islamic traditions are its central unifying themes. Europe's hysterical reaction to the violence triggered by Arafat in September 2000 was partly the result of thirty years of Arab propaganda and blackmail. Tellingly, French President Jacques Chirac declared during his visit to Cairo in 1996 that Europe and Muslims "should write History together." Six years later, his Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin declared at the French Parliament on October 8, 2002, that Saladin had "liberated" Jerusalem from the Crusaders. After September 2000, Europe sided with Arafat in its war against Israel. After September 2001, it blamed Israel for al-Qaida's fury.

In October 2003, the European Commission published a report on the "Dialogue Among the Peoples and Cultures in the Euro-Mediterranean Area."⁹⁸ Among the Report's authors was Tariq Ramadan, the most vocal advocate of Wahabism in France, who also happens to be the grandson of Hassan Al Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood. Ramadan has been very active in France during the past ten years, spreading his extremist views and becoming the unofficial voice of French Islam. He has now become a star, appearing constantly on French prime-time television. Ramadan symbolizes the view, as Jacques Jormier, a leading French expert on Islam, puts it, "that does not modernize Islam but Islamizes modernity."⁹⁹ Interestingly, the Commission's Report called for new "Mediterranean" satellite TV channels such as ARABSAT as well as a "reform" of European schoolbooks.

The "reform" of European schoolbooks eventually took place. In May 2005, Israel's ambassadors to Spain and Norway complained about the inclusion of anti-Israel propaganda into Spanish and Norwegian school material. In Spain, a teachers' manual put out by the Barcelona municipality drew parallels between the Holocaust and Israel's security fence. A Norwegian matriculation exam included a poem about a Palestinian girl killed in Bethlehem in 2002. The poem was presented as an example of a text dealing with a conflict, and the students were asked to analyze it. This poem was the only political text in the test, with other poems dealing with personal or family issues.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/commissioners/prodi/pdf/spirit_report_fr.pdf

⁹⁹ <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=11445>

¹⁰⁰ *The Jerusalem Post*, 24 May, 2005.

In November 2004, Hizballah's TV channel *al-Manar* started broadcasting in Europe, following an agreement signed between France's Broadcasting Authority (CSA, Conseil Supérieur de l'Audiovisuel) and *al-Manar*'s director Muhamad Haidar. *Al-Manar* was broadcast in Europe through European satellite *Eutelstat*.¹⁰¹ For a few months, this TV channel offered to European viewers violent anti-Semitic and anti-Zionistic propaganda, promising that "Zion will be exterminated," that "Jerusalem belongs to us, Arabs, and those who occupy it will be exterminated," that "no one is allowed to give up even an inch of Palestine" and shouting slogans such as "death to Israel!" and "Israel is absolute evil."¹⁰² The French Government eventually decided to suspend *al-Manar*'s broadcasts, whose defenders protested that this decision was an offense to "freedom of speech."

A four-hour film called "La Porte du Soleil" ("The Gate of the Sun"), produced with French government subsidies and Syrian contribution, was broadcast in 2004 on the French-German cultural channel ARTE and was later shown in movie theaters and scheduled for prestigious film festivals in Europe. This movie is a fiction that portrays Israeli soldiers (in 1948) as Nazis, dresses Palestinians in the rags and postures of persecuted European Jews engulfed by the Shoah, condemns Israel in its very origins and pleads for the demise of the Jewish state.

The EAD strategy worked, and it is now boosted by a new demographic and cultural reality. The number of believing and observant Christians has sharply decreased in Europe in the past two generations, and some analysts estimate that Britain's mosques host more worshipers each week than does the Church of England.¹⁰³ While sustaining a population requires each woman on average to bear 2.1 children, the birth rate of Christian women in Europe is of 1.5 children. As Christian Europeans under-reproduce at advanced ages, Muslim Europeans reproduce in large numbers while young. Some 5% of the EU's citizens identify themselves as Muslims. Should current demographic trends continue, that number would reach 10% in 2020.¹⁰⁴ If Turkey joins the EU by then, the figure will be much higher. There are over 6 million Muslims in France (10% of the total population), and over 5,000 mosques. In light of

¹⁰¹ www.proche-orient.info, 20 November 2004.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Daniel Pipes, "Civilizational Senility," *The Jerusalem Post*, 11 May 2004.

¹⁰⁴ Pipes (op. cit.).

these data, Middle East expert Prof. Bernard Lewis declared in an interview with German newspaper *Die Welt* in September 2004 that “Europe will be Muslim by the end of the century.”¹⁰⁵

In 2003, the French Government created the *Conseil Français du Culte Musulman*, in an attempt to prevent the radicalization of France’s Muslim community. However, this decision backfired, as some of France’s most radical Muslim leaders were elected to the Board of this new organization. In 2004, the French Government decided to ban the wearing of “ostentatious” religious items in public schools, as a means to put an end to the phenomenon of Muslim pupils coming to school with a *hijab*. Sweden’s third-largest city, Malmö, according to Swedish newspaper *Aftonbladet*, is ruled by violent gangs of Muslim immigrants, and the police no longer controls the situation there. Some of the Muslims have lived in the area of Rosengård, Malmö, for twenty years, and still don’t know how to read or write Swedish. The Nordgårdsskolen school in Aarhus, Denmark, has become the first Dane-free Danish school. The students now come entirely from Denmark’s fastest-growing constituency: Muslim immigrants. In 2004, Pakistani Muslim leader Qazi Hussain Ahmed gave an address at the Islamic Cultural Center in Oslo. He was readily allowed into the country despite the fact that, according to Norwegian newspaper *Aftenposten*, he had earlier made flattering comments about Osama bin Laden, and his party, Jamaat-e-Islami, also had hailed al-Qaida members as heroes.¹⁰⁶

In 1974, former Algerian President Houari Boumediene said in a speech at the U.N.: “One day millions of men will leave the southern hemisphere to go to the northern hemisphere. And they will not go there as friends. Because they will go there to conquer it. And they will conquer it with their sons. The wombs of our women will give *us* victory.”¹⁰⁷ But why “conquer” the “northern hemisphere”? The answer was provided by George Habash, head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, to Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci in 1972: “Our revolution is a step toward world revolution. It is not limited to the conquest of Palestine. Let’s be honest and admit that we want to trigger a war similar to the Vietnam War. We want another Vietnam.

¹⁰⁵ Frits Bolkestein, “Der lange Weg Nach Europa,” *Die Welt*, 10 September 2004 (<http://www.welt.de/data/2004/09/10/330339.html?search=bernard+lewis&searchHILI=1>)

¹⁰⁶ <http://www.humaneventsonline.com/article.php?id=5096>

¹⁰⁷ *La Force de la Raison* (op. cit.), p. 46.

And not only because of Palestine but also because of all the Arab states. The Palestinians are part of the Arab nation. It is therefore necessary that the entire Arab nation wage war against America and Europe. The Arab nation needs to trigger a war against the West. And it will. America and Europe should know that this is only the beginning ... Progressing step by step, inch by inch. Year after year. Decade after decade. Determined, committed, patient. Such is our strategy.”¹⁰⁸

2. European Hostility Toward Israel since September 2000

Opinion polls conducted in Europe since the beginning of the millennium unequivocally reveal a rising hostility toward Israel. According to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 62% of Europeans had a negative opinion of Israel in December 2002.¹⁰⁹ A survey published by the EU in November 2003 revealed that 59% of Europeans believe that Israel constitutes a bigger threat to world peace than North Korea, Iran or Afghanistan.¹¹⁰ This figure of 59% is an average, but it reaches 74% in the Netherlands, 69% in Austria, 66% in Luxemburg, 65% in Germany, 64% in Denmark, and 63% in Belgium. Most Europeans blame Israel for the Arab-Israeli conflict, believe that the Palestinians want peace (while Israel does not), and that Palestinian terrorism is the consequence of “Israeli occupation” and “Ariel Sharon’s aggressive policies.” About two-thirds of European public opinion sides with the Palestinians, 15% of Europeans justify Palestinian terrorism and make Israel’s right to exist conditional on the establishment of a Palestinian state. Fewer and fewer Europeans see Israel’s existence as legitimate and necessary.¹¹¹ 62% of the French public believes that Israel does not want peace.¹¹²

In December 2004, a German poll revealed that more than 50% of Germans believe that Israel’s present-day treatment of the Palestinians is similar to what the Nazis did to the Jews during World War II. The survey also found that 68% of Germans believe that Israel is waging a “war of extermination” against the Palestinians.¹¹³ In January

¹⁰⁸ *La Force de la Raison* (op. cit.), p. 113.

¹⁰⁹ Source: *The Economist*, January 4th 2003, p. 19.

¹¹⁰ Source: *The Jerusalem Post*, Nov. 1, 2003.

¹¹¹ Emanuele Ottolenghi, “Europe Wants Israel to Loose,” *The Jerusalem Post*, 27 July 2004.

¹¹² www.proche-orient.info, 16 May 2004.

¹¹³ *The Jerusalem Post*, 7 December 2004.

2005, a poll carried for the British *Telegraph* revealed that Britons rate Israel as the country least deserving of international respect, as well as one of the world's "least democratic countries." Israel was also ranked number one country where British people would least like to live or visit on holiday, and it gained the titled of the world's least beautiful country, as well as the world's most unfriendly country.¹¹⁴

Banners, articles and caricatures equating Ariel Sharon with Hitler and the Star of David with the swastika have become commonplace in Western media and demonstrations. The British daily *The Independent* accused Israel of adopting "Nazi tactics"¹¹⁵ and in December 2003, French comedian Dieudonné appeared on French television proclaiming, with a Hitler salute, "Heil Israel!" On 7 April 2002, the Greek daily *Ethnos* caricatured two Israeli soldiers slaughtering innocent Palestinians, with one of the soldiers telling his fellow: "Don't feel guilty my brother; we were in Auschwitz and Dachau not to suffer but to learn." On 27 January 2003, *The Independent* published a cartoon featuring Ariel Sharon as an ogre eating a Palestinian child (based on Goya's painting *Saturn Devouring His Children*).



**The Independent,
27 January 2003**

On 8 November 2001, the French weekly *Le Nouvel Observateur* falsely accused Israeli soldiers of raping Palestinian women at checkpoints in order for these women to be killed by their relatives for disgracing the family. In April 2002, British poet Tom Paulin told the Egyptian press that Jewish settlers in the West Bank are "Nazis and racists ... [who] should be shot dead."¹¹⁶ Portuguese Nobel Prize winner Jose

¹¹⁴ *The Jerusalem Post*, 4 January 2005.

¹¹⁵ <http://www.ajc.org/InTheMedia/RelatedArticles.asp?did=889>

¹¹⁶ *The Guardian*, 27 April, 2002.

Saramago compared the blockade of Ramallah by the IDF to the situation in Auschwitz during the Holocaust.

In June 2002, *Le Monde* published an op-ed by two French academics (Edgar Morin and Danièle Sallenave) and a European MP (Samir Nair) under the title: “Israel-Palestine: The Cancer.” This article was replete with lies, slanders and myths about “the chosen people,” “the Jenin massacre,” describing the Jews as “a contemptuous people taking satisfaction in “humiliating others,” and “imposing their unmerciful rule.”

The British media have gone particularly far in their irrational treatment of Israel. *The Guardian* has equated Israel with al Qaida, and *The Evening Standard* has compared Israel to the Taliban. The BBC’s Middle East correspondent, Orla Guerin, claimed that “the Israelis stole Christmas,” and *The Independent*’s Middle East correspondent Robert Fisk wrote that, “If ever a sword was thrust into a military alliance of East and West, the Israelis wielded that dagger.” Fisk also implied that the White House has fallen into the hands of the Jews: “The Perles and the Wolfowitzes and the Cohens...[the] very sinister people hovering around Bush.”¹¹⁷ In June 2002, Alan Rusbridger wrote in *The Guardian* that: “We are forced to confront some uncomfortable truths about how the dream of a sanctuary for the Jewish people in the very land in which their spiritual, religious and political identity was shaped has come to be poisoned. The establishment of this sanctuary has been bought at a very high cost in human rights and human lives. It must be apparent that the international community cannot support this cost indefinitely.”¹¹⁸ Alexei Sayle wrote in *The Independent* in October 2000: “If the Zionists wanted a homeland, why didn’t they take a piece of Germany? The answer is of course, that Arabs then and now were not considered fully human by the Zionists ... and therefore could be murdered without qualm.”¹¹⁹

The Spanish media have also crossed all the lines of legitimate and rational criticism. On June 4, 2001 (three days after a Palestinian suicide bomber killed 21 young

¹¹⁷ Tom Gross, “J’Accuse,” *The Wall Street Journal*, 2 June 2005.

¹¹⁸ Quoted from: Tom Gross, “New Prejudice for Old. The Euro press and the Intifada.”

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Israelis at a disco, and wounded over 100 others, all in the midst of a unilateral Israeli ceasefire), the liberal daily *Cambio 16* published a cartoon of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon with a hook nose and a *yarmulke*, sporting a swastika inside a star of David on his chest, and proclaiming: “At least Hitler taught me how to invade a country and destroy every living insect.” The week before, on May 23, *El Pais* (“*The New York Times* of Spain”) published a cartoon of an allegorical figure carrying a small rectangular-shaped black moustache, flying through the air toward Ariel Sharon’s upper lip; the caption read: “Clio, the muse of History, puts Hitler’s moustache on Ariel Sharon.” Two days later, on May 25, the Catalan daily *La Vanguardia* published a cartoon showing an imposing building, with a sign outside reading “Museo del Holocausto Judio” (Museum of the Jewish Holocaust), and next to it another building under construction, with a large sign reading “Futuro Museo del Holocausto Palestino” (Future Museum of the Palestinian Holocaust).

Greece’s largest newspaper, the leftist daily *Eleftherotypia*, has run many cartoons comparing Israel to Nazi Germany. In April 2002, on its front cover, under the title “Holocaust II,” an Israeli soldier was depicted as a Nazi officer and a Palestinian civilian as a Jewish death camp inmate. In September 2002, another cartoon in *Eleftherotypia* represented an Israeli soldier with a Jewish star telling a Nazi officer next to him “Arafat is not a person the Reich can talk to anymore.” The Nazi officer responds: “Why? Is he a Jew?”

While the Spanish and Greek media have been routinely equating Israel’s military actions against Palestinian terrorism with the genocide of European Jews by Nazi Germany, the Italian media have been using Christian-inspired anti-Semitic themes. In October 2001, the website of one of Italy’s most respected newspapers, *La Repubblica*, published the notorious anti-Semitic *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in its entirety without providing any historical explanation. The newspaper did suggest, however, that the work would help readers understand why the U.S. had taken military action in Afghanistan.¹²⁰ In April 2002, the Italian liberal daily *La Stampa* ran a front-page cartoon showing an Israeli tank with a Jewish star pointing a large gun at the baby Jesus saying: “Surely they don’t want to kill me again, do they?” The

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

Jesus icon was also used by *Corriere Della Sera*: a cartoon showed Jesus trapped in his tomb, unable to rise, because Ariel Sharon, rifle in hand, is sitting on the sepulcher.

Comparing Israel to Nazism and al-Qaida, and using anti-Semitic themes, is a pattern that exists in Scandinavian newspapers as well. Sweden's largest morning paper, *Dagens Nyheter*, ran a caricature of a Hassidic Jew accusing anyone who criticized Israel of anti-Semitism. Another leading Swedish paper, *Aftonbladet*, used the headline "The Crucifixion of Arafat."¹²¹ Norway's leading regional paper, *Stavanger Aftenblad*, equated Israel's actions against terrorists in Ramallah with the attacks on the World Trade Center.

The attitude of European media toward Israel is also palpable in academia. In December 2004, an international conference entitled "Resisting Israeli Apartheid" was held at the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London. Speakers at the conference claimed that "the Hebrew University in Jerusalem is sitting on ethnically cleansed Arab land" and that "IDF actions are similar to, though certainly not on the same scale as, the Nazis." One of the participants argued that "[Israeli] occupation started in 1948," admitted that the aim "is to make Israel a pariah state," and added that "there is no valid comparison between South Africa and Israel; Israel is much worse. South Africa exploited its native population while Israel expelled and committed genocide against its native population."¹²² In April 2005, the British Association of University Teachers (AUT) announced a boycott of Israeli universities, specifying that the boycott would exclude "conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their state's colonial and racist policies." As explained by Rabbi Jeremy Newmark, the political consultant to the Jewish Board of Deputies in the UK, "the AUT boycott is a symptom of the growth of new anti-Semitism in the UK. This is discursive anti-Semitism on the part of an Islamist-allied new left wing, and it rears its head in political polemic rather than in street violence."¹²³

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *The Jerusalem Post*, 7 December 2004.

¹²³ *The Jerusalem Post*, 2 June 2005.

In 2004, the Israeli Science Foundation (ISF), Israel's biggest science research funding body, received a dozen refusals from British academics to review grant applications. One refusal said: "I support the academic boycott of Israeli academic institutions, as a means of registering my protest against Israel's lack of respect for human rights and continuing illegal occupation of Palestinian land."¹²⁴

Most worryingly, some mainstream European leaders now deny Israel's right to defend itself and even to exist as a Jewish state. On 16 May 2001, European Member of Parliament Paul Couteaux declared in Parliament: "I have no hesitation in saying that we must consider giving the Arab side a large enough force, including a large enough nuclear force, to persuade Israel that it cannot simply do whatever it wants." In June 2004, European Member of Parliament and former French Prime Minister Michel Rocard declared during a speech at the Alexandria Library that the origin of the Palestinian problem was the "decision" of Great Britain to create a nation state for the Jews in Palestine, and that this decision was a "mistake." Moreover, according to Rocard, the State of Israel is based on a "racist tendency" and it has been "threatening" its neighbors and the stability of the Middle East for the past decades.¹²⁵

In May 2005, a central London rally organized by the British Palestine Solidarity Campaign heard MP George Galloway advocate a general boycott of Israel, as well as other speeches calling for Israel's destruction. Galloway declared at the rally that "It's about time that the British government made some reparations for the Balfour Declaration." Andrew Birgin, of the Stop the War Coalition said at that rally: "Israel is a racist state! It is an apartheid state! With its Apache helicopters and its F-16 fighter jets! The South African apartheid state never inflicted the sort of repression that Israel is inflicting on the Palestinians! When there is real democracy, there will be no more Israel!" PLO representative to the United Kingdom, Husam Zomlot, stated that "The Israelis are continuing the ethnic cleansing campaign they started in 1948" and that "the right of return is non-negotiable!" MK Jeremy Corbyn urged the British government "to cease all trade with Israel."¹²⁶

¹²⁴ *The Jerusalem Post*, April 2005.

¹²⁵ www.proche-orient.info, 21 June 2004.

¹²⁶ *The Jerusalem Post*, 22 May 2005.

As Paris-based American author Nidra Poller wrote: “The sea change began on September 28, 2000, when the domestic repercussions of Arafat’s prefabricated “al-Aqsa” *intifada* in Jerusalem struck me in a dizzying instant of recognition. I was hardly alone. Stunned and dazed, the formerly integrated, assimilated, liberated, progressive, and (in some cases) indifferent Jews of France found themselves – ourselves – thrust out of the body politic and herded into a virtual ghetto. In the years since then, things have only gotten worse, much worse.”¹²⁷ Poller is an acute observer of French society, and her conclusions are authoritative: a war of public opinion against Zionism and the Jews, that has been keeping pace with the Palestinian terrorist war against Israel, has reached a point of no return. According to Poller, Europe, pretending to defend higher values, peaceful resolution of conflicts, mature behavior, human rights, social justice and international law, is in fact choking on its worst impulses.

French scholar Pierre-André Taguieff explains that Arab propaganda has managed “to transform the reality of a democratic society of a nation-state threatened with annihilation by its enemies into the repulsive image of a criminal, racist, and expansionist state.”¹²⁸ The war of ideas against the United States and globalization is not disconnected from the war of ideas against Zionism. Indeed, French anti-globalization and anti-Zionist icon José Bové declared in October 2001 that “Israel is an outpost of liberal colonialism. Our fight is part of the struggle against the world’s domination by liberal ideology ... The struggle for the rights of the Palestinian people is part of the struggle against financial globalization.”¹²⁹

In France, the state-owned media consistently communicate biased information about Israel. In October 2004, the news director of state-owned Radio France Internationale (RFI) declared that Israel is a “racist state.” France Culture, another government media, has subsidized a violently anti-Zionist movie on the separation “Wall.” The French Ministry of Culture, the French Foreign Ministry, French TV channels France 2 and TV5, as well as the National Cinema Center (a state-owned fund for the production of French-speaking movies) financed a movie by Egyptian director Yousry

¹²⁷ Nidra Poller, “Betrayed By Europe: an Expatriate’s Lament.” *Commentary*, March 2003.

¹²⁸ Pierre-André Taguieff, “Anti-israélisme et judéophobie: l’exception française.” *Outre-Terre. Revue française de géopolitique* N. 9 (October 2004), p. 386.

¹²⁹ www.mdh.limoges.fr

Nasrallah, called “The Gates of the Sun,” which portrayed the Israelis in 1948 as Nazis, and was widely acclaimed in France. The Franco-German cultural television channel ARTE has specialized in producing defamation and de-legitimization movies about Israel. Most Jewish opinion leaders are not invited to media discussions in France, unless they are anti-Zionist.

As explained by Professor Shmuel Trigano from Paris-Nanterre University: “The media discourse [in France] is hateful to the Jews. What is shown and said hurts their most precious values. Their protests are not listened to but rather lead to accusations that they are pro-Sharon, which means in the prevailing atmosphere, pro-apartheid.”¹³⁰ According to Trigano, the great majority of the French media presents biased information about Israel, and efforts of the French Jewish community to correct this bias have mostly failed. The fact that the French media are mostly owned and very much influenced by the government makes it nearly impossible for Israel to influence public opinion via the media. For example, the French government decided in July 2004 to create a scandal about Ariel Sharon’s public call to French Jews to leave France for Israel. There was a coordinated attack and perfect harmony between the position of the French Foreign Ministry, the French (state-owned) Press Agency (AFP), and the major newspapers. This phenomenon recalls the way the French Foreign Ministry basically dictated anti-American and pro-Iraqi messages to its state-owned media during the war in Iraq in 2003. When it comes to Israel and to the United States, there is in France a total, striking, and indeed worrying uniformity of thought between the government and the media, and a total absence of debate and questioning of the “common wisdom.” As Trigano explains about the French media, it is “frightening to turn on a television or to read a newspaper and see the same ideological discourse of disinformation about Israel.”¹³¹

Michel Gurfinkel, editor-in-chief of the French weekly *Valeurs Actuelles*, explains that: “Almost all French TV channels are either State run or indirectly controlled by the State. The same is true about the radios. There is only one national press agency in France, *Agence France Presse*, whose director is nominated by the president of the

¹³⁰ “French Anti-Semitism: A Barometer for Gauging Society’s Perverseness.” An Interview with Shmuel Trigano, *The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*, Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism, No. 26, 1 November 2004.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

Republic. As for national newspapers or newsmagazines, they are ridiculous by any objective standard: their circulation is low (less than half a million copies as an average, against one to two million in Germany or in the UK) and their professional level is low. *Le Monde*, France's quality paper par excellence, looks much like the *Pravda* of old. When Mr. Berlusconi of Italy was reelected as prime minister, some years ago, it printed on its front page: "Italy denies absolute majority to Berlusconi."¹³²

Alain Finkelkraut, a renowned French academic and philosopher, argues that anti-Israel hatred in Europe stems from a new trend of European self-hatred.¹³³ This new European self-hatred divides the world between Good (the "victims") and Evil (the "white supremacists"). The first category (the "victims") includes colored people whose ancestors were exploited by European colonialism and who are now supposedly exploited by "globalization" and "capitalism" including on the European Continent itself. The second category (the "white supremacists") includes all non-colored people, the United States, Europe, and Israel. In this Manichean worldview, Jews and Israel belong to Evil, and are identified with colonialism, exploitation, racism, as well as the supposed evils of capitalism and globalization. Thus, the Arab-Israeli conflict is not perceived as a conflict between two national movements but between Good and Evil, where the Palestinians incarnate the Good and Israel incarnates Evil.

3. The Economic Boycott of Israel in Europe

In the 1990s, Israel became a major international player in the hi-tech industry. The economic reforms and recovery of the late 1980s, the influx of educated immigrants in the early 1990s, a high level of education and of R&D investment, and a unique entrepreneurship spirit, all contributed to Israel's technological edge in the global economy. In the mid-1990s, Israel's international stance improved both economically and politically: as a result of what seemed then as an imminent resolution of the Arab-

¹³² Michel Gurfinkel, "France, the Jews and Israel," Speech at Hillel House, Harvard University, 1 November 2004.

¹³³ Alain Finkelkraut, "Israel in a Post-National World." International Conference at Bar-Ilan University on "Israel's Image in the World: How to Win Over Public Opinion?" Bar-Ilan University, 8 May 2005.

Israeli conflict, Israel's international image improved dramatically. The Israeli economy benefited from two main assets: the excellence of its technology and the prospect of a peaceful Middle East.

The second asset no longer exists. Israel's economy and international image have been dramatically affected by the war that erupted in September 2000. The loss caused by the war to the Israeli economy between September 2000 and December 2001 is estimated at about NIS 12.3 billion (4% of the annual business product).¹³⁴ The sharp decline in the revenue of the tourism and construction industries is a direct consequence of the war. The high-tech industry was less directly affected by the war because its growth is export-driven, and therefore the difficulties it experienced at the turn of the new millennium were due to global slowdown rather than to local turmoil. However, the decrease in demand for Israeli products and technology is not only the result of a business cycle. It is also caused by a growing unwillingness to do business with Israel for political reasons, and this growing unwillingness is itself the consequence of Israel's negative international *image*.

The outbreak of war between the PA and Israel in September 2000 affected Israel's international image for two main reasons: 1) International television reporting of that war created the impression among foreign viewers that a powerful and ruthless army was attempting to crush a legitimate and powerless national liberation movement; 2) The PA worked on reinforcing this impression by methodically disseminating incorrect information and sophistic arguments in the foreign media.

The hostility of European public opinion toward Israel has a negative impact on Israel's business activity in Europe. A boycott policy that was originally initiated by citizens and NGOs is gaining support from European political and business leaders.

In July 2001, Members of British Parliament Lynn Jones, George Galloway, John Austin, Bill Etherington and Neil Gerrard pledged their support for the boycott of Israeli products in Britain.¹³⁵ In April 2002, in the aftermath of Operation Defensive

¹³⁴ Prime Minister's Office, *Report on the Economic Damages caused by the Palestinian Authority*, March 2002, p. 3.

¹³⁵ Source: http://www.palestinemonitor.org/comments/a_boycott_of_israeli_products_lo.htm

Shield, European boycott of Israeli products became a nearly official policy. The European Parliament called for EU governments to suspend relations in the EU-Israel Association Council (the formal forum for talks on trade and political ties) and Swedish Foreign Minister Anna Lindh announced publicly that she would boycott Israeli products available in the Swedish market, especially citrus fruits and avocados.¹³⁶ Norway's second-largest supermarket chain, Coop Norge, opted to boycott Israeli products.¹³⁷ In October 2002, the mayor of Seclin (a French city) declared publicly that he had instructed all public institutions in his constituency to boycott Israeli products.¹³⁸

In March 2003, the Israeli company *Ahava* claimed that its sales in Europe had dropped dramatically as a consequence of the anti-Israel boycott.¹³⁹ In July 2003, Oxfam Belgium called for a European boycott of Israeli agricultural products.¹⁴⁰ An Oxfam poster pictured blood extracted from a juicy Israeli grapefruit, and read: "Israeli fruits have a bitter taste...reject the occupation of Palestine, don't buy Israeli fruits and vegetables." In September 2003, the Archbishop of Sweden, K. G. Hammar, and the Swedish ambassador to Germany, Carl Tham, officially called to boycott Israeli products.¹⁴¹

In February 2004, the British House of Common's Select Committee on International Development called on the European Union to impose a trade boycott on Israel.¹⁴² The committee also called on the British government to propose to the European Union's Council of Trade Ministers that Israel's preferential terms of trade with the EU be suspended.

In March 2004, Israeli embassies in Europe reported to Trade and Industry Minister Ehud Olmert that in Scandinavia, Belgium, Luxemburg and Germany, business

¹³⁶ Source: http://www.palestinemonitor.org/comments/swedish_foreign_minister_boycott.htm

¹³⁷ Source: <http://www.snopes.com/inboxer/boycotts/norway.asp>

¹³⁸ Source: <http://www.solidarite-palestine.org/breves.php3?brv=0635>

¹³⁹ Source: <http://www.aljazeeraah.info> (11 March 2003).

¹⁴⁰ Source: http://www.wiesenthal.com/mailings_sw/swc_july09.html

¹⁴¹ Source: http://gc2003.episcopalchurch.org/ens/print/3577_19937_ENG_Print.html

¹⁴² Source: *The Jerusalem Post*, Feb. 6 2004, p. 6.

relations were affected by a “boycott atmosphere” and that many European businesspeople are avoiding contact with Israeli counterparts.¹⁴³

In April 2004, the European Parliament passed a resolution calling for the suspension of the association agreement between Israel and the EU if Israel continues its policy of targeted killings of terrorist leaders.

This tendency is potentially devastating for the Israeli economy because the EU is Israel’s first trade partner: it occupies rank number 1 in Israel’s imports and rank number 2 in its exports. EU imports from Israel have approximately tripled between 1990 (€3,626 billion) and 2001 (€9,568 billion). So have EU exports to Israel from 1990 (€5,456 billion in 1990, €14,449 billion in 2001). Total trade has reached €24 billion in 2001.¹⁴⁴ EU-Israel trade relations are regulated by an Association Agreement that was signed in 1995, came into force in 2000, and replaced the EC-Israel Cooperation Agreement signed in 1975.

Israel also benefits from EU funding for its R&D activities: the EU concluded an agreement on scientific and technical cooperation with Israel (in force since August 1996, extended most recently in 2003 for another four years), which provides for the full association of Israel with the EU framework research programs. Israel has also been a member of the EUREKA research initiative since June 2000 and in March 2000 obtained the status of a COST cooperation state (Cooération européenne dans le domaine de la recherche scientifique et technique).¹⁴⁵ In 2004, ten European countries¹⁴⁶ joined the EU, which further increased the economic importance of the European market vis-à-vis Israel. Europeans are aware of the fact that their special economic relationship with Israel is beneficial to them because of Israel’s technological excellence and innovation. However, they also increasingly tend to believe that the alleged immorality of doing business with Israel should outweigh the economic benefits of having Israeli partners, suppliers and customers.

¹⁴³ Source: www.upjf.org, 10 March 2004.

¹⁴⁴ Source: http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/israel/intro/

¹⁴⁵ The COST program is supported by the EU and promotes joint research projects between EU member states, EFTA states and central and Eastern Europe.

¹⁴⁶ Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, The Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, Malta and Cyprus.

The Business Network for International Cooperation (BNIC) used to receive reports of Israeli companies unable to advance their business interests in Europe because of security and political reasons. One member explained that major customers demand from their Israeli suppliers to relocate their production chain to Europe in fear of delivery delays due to the volatile security situation in Israel. Another member received an email from a potential European client announcing that he “strictly requested a solution not based on products of America or Israel.”¹⁴⁷

The above facts and data indicate two parallel and contradictory tendencies. On the one hand, economic relations between Israel and the EU are growing both quantitatively and qualitatively, and the EU greatly contributes to the growth of Israel’s economy. On the other hand, these relations are progressively threatened by the hostility of European public opinion toward Israel. In other words, the growth of Israel’s business sector is increasingly dependent upon a special trade relationship whose sustainability is more and more vulnerable.

One could argue that there always was a contrast between European political hostility towards Israel and the sustained growth of trade relations between the Old Continent and the Jewish state. Indeed, the then European Economic Community (EEC) signed a trade agreement with Israel in 1975, at the height of anti-Israel European diplomatic declarations. However, even this separation between business and politics seems to be no longer valid. On 21 April 2004, European Commission Permanent Representative to Israel Giancarlo Chevallard declared that the European Union would no longer differentiate between business and politics when dealing with Israel, and would even consider imposing “economic sanctions” on Israel in case Israel continues to impede EU involvement in Middle Eastern diplomacy.¹⁴⁸

European hostility toward Israel, and this hostility’s negative impact on EU-Israel economic relations, was confirmed by an internal report published by the Israeli Foreign Ministry in October 2004. The report predicted that relations between Israel and Europe would soon become “inimical” and that Israel’s economic interest would suffer as a result. The report also mentioned the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and

¹⁴⁷ BNIC’s email archive.

¹⁴⁸ *Ha’aretz*, 22 April 2004.

European questioning of Israel's very legitimacy. The report concluded that Israel's stance in Europe was becoming more and more similar to that of South Africa during the Apartheid regime.¹⁴⁹

Faced with this growing economic threat, a group of Israeli business leaders created the Business Network for International Cooperation (BNIC) in January 2004.¹⁵⁰ BNIC was similar to Keith Reinhard's Business for Diplomatic Action, the organization started in America around the same time with the purpose of involving US business leaders in pro-American advocacy overseas.¹⁵¹ The underlying idea of BNIC was that Israel's business leaders could turn their routine business trips into advocacy encounters by: 1) Getting the appropriate training in order to become effective Israel advocates during their social interactions with foreign business people overseas; 2) Adding meetings/speaking engagements to their meeting schedules in order to reach out to key audiences and decision/opinion makers.

BNIC tried to leverage the fact that political and economic leaders constitute "hubs of influence" that reach most people with the greatest level of influence, especially in Europe. For instance, in France, most political and business leaders are alumni from the same public administration graduate school (ENA – École Nationale d'Administration). The idea was that influencing the minds and opinions of foreign CEOs was likely to have a multiplying effect because of those CEOs' acquaintances in Government.

In practice, the model did not work. Not enough business leaders were willing to give some of their time and money for the model to be successfully implemented (as a non-profit organization, BNIC depended on its members' donations). Adding meetings to the schedule of traveling Israeli businesspeople proved logistically impossible, for two reasons. First, business leaders are simply too busy to be able or willing (or both) to find extra time to talk on campuses or meet with opinion makers. Second, organizing meetings with influential people overseas takes a long time, while business leaders generally know about their business trips on very short notice. BNIC did organize

¹⁴⁹ *Ha'aretz*, 13 October 2004.

¹⁵⁰ www.bnic.org

¹⁵¹ www.businessfordiplomaticaction.org

many PowerPoint-based training sessions at Israeli companies, but even this was laborious and problematic. Companies do not see advocacy training as a priority and they had to be “begged” to give some of their time for such training. Moreover, even though BNIC’s training material was politically neutral and focused on consensual issues, many CEOs felt that any advocacy training had some political flavor which they did not want in their company. Indeed, a standard justification for refusing to host BNIC training sessions was that “our company does not mix business with politics” or “this is too political.”

One aspect of the BNIC model that did work was the website and the weekly newsletter. Those business leaders who joined BNIC reported that the one-page, weekly “advocacy update” (sent by email) was very helpful to them, because they would come prepared to their business meetings with the background and arguments they needed to refute misperceptions of Israel. Moreover, BNIC’s website provided them with up-to-date information and arguments about the main issues that generally come up when Israel is discussed overseas.

Recruiting Israel’s business leaders for pro-Israel advocacy has proven problematic, and the gap between the model and reality (as well as between declared intentions and actual devotion) was very wide indeed.

Conclusion

The war launched by the PLO against Israel in September 2000 had two objectives:

- 1) To exhaust and demoralize Israeli society by making life impossible to Israelis;
- 2) To invite international pressure and intervention by presenting Israel in the foreign media as the powerful and ruthless aggressor of a powerless and desperate people.

The first objective has failed; the second has succeeded –especially in Europe. Israel’s citizens have stood firm and resolute in the terror war, and the Israeli government has mostly turned the tables on the Palestinian Authority. But, so far, Israel has been defeated in the media war.

For Clausewitz, war was the continuation of politics by other means. For terrorist organizations, the war of ideas is the continuation of terrorism by other means. The ultimate aim of this kind of war is to convince the enemy that it cannot prevail and to convince world public opinion that the aggressor is the victim and the victim the aggressor. The PLO has been implementing this strategy, which it learned from Communist revolutionaries in China and Vietnam, since the 1970s. With the outbreak of Arafat’s war in September 2000, this method was revived with destructive efficiency.

Israel woke up to a new world in September 2000. So did America a year later. As a result of September 11, the United States realized what 4GW is really about and that it is also a target in that war. The United States has responded to this new challenge by creating a Homeland Security Administration that includes a central body for information and public relations. Unfortunately, the West is not waging this war with a united front, as Europe started drifting away from the United States and towards the Arab world in the 1970s as a result of the Arab oil boycott and of the Euro-Arab Dialogue (EAD), which managed to progressively change the demographic and ethnic composition of Europe, as well as European ideological mindsets.

As cleverly and passionately explained by Oriana Fallaci, “The war that Islam has declared on the West is not a military war. It is a cultural war. It is a war, as

Tocqueville would have said, that first wants to conquer our soul, not our bodies ... The terrorists and kamikazes kill us not only for the pleasure of killing. They kill us because they want us to give in. They want to scare us, to tire us out, to make us give up and they use blackmail. Their aim is not to fill cemeteries. Nor is it to destroy our sky-scrapers, our Pisa towers, our Eiffel towers, our cathedrals, our Michelangelo's Davids. It is to destroy our soul, our ideas, our feelings, our dreams ... And how can one possibly trust Europe, which sold itself and continues to sell itself to the enemy like a wimp?"¹⁵²

The Cold War scenario of the 1980s is repeating itself with a different enemy: instead of the Soviet Union threatening the West, manipulating its public opinion and exploiting the divisions between Europe and the United States, Islamism is playing the very same role with identical tactics. What Norman Podhoretz wrote in 1982 about Western self-inculcating guilt and lack of resolution vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, and about Europe's (and sometimes America's) tendency to blame Israel for the enemy's wrath instead of fighting the enemy, is chillingly replicable to the current context: "We in the West confront in the Soviet Union a deadly enemy sworn to our destruction, just as Israel does in the Arab world. But whereas the Israelis have faced the reality of their peril and have willingly borne the sacrifices essential to coping with it, we in the West have increasingly fallen into the habit of denial, and we have shown ourselves reluctant to do what the survival of our civilization requires. We tell ourselves that the danger comes from our own misunderstanding and misperception; we castigate ourselves for being the main cause of the conflict; we urge unilateral actions upon ourselves in the hope of appeasing the enemy."¹⁵³

Winning 4GW, or the war of ideas, is of critical importance to maintain U.S. political and economic power. But for Israel, winning that war is more than a question of economic interests: it is question of national survival. Fighting the propaganda war is not just a matter of improving Israel's image, public relations, or business activity. The war of ideas is not a mere PR contest. One third of the Jewish people was murdered by Nazi Germany as a result of propaganda. As explained by Oliver Thomson, "Man ... has been manipulated by his fellows from the beginning of time

¹⁵² *La Force de la Raison* (op. cit.), p. 230.

¹⁵³ *The Media War Against Israel* (op. cit.), p. 157.

and has in turn often been manipulative. We do not mind being manipulated. We often benefit from it, but equally there have been numerous occasions when we have been quite easily led into the most preposterously dangerous behaviour. We have been motivated to genocide, human sacrifice, war, witch-hunting, racist hysteria, religious intolerance and many other forms of irrational behaviour.”¹⁵⁴ The Nazis started out with trying to “kill Jews with words” during the Weimar Republic. Their propaganda managed to instill a virulent anti-Semitism in Germany and in Europe. This propaganda enabled Hitler to rise to power and to implement his planned destruction of the Jewish people.

Winning the war of ideas requires more than countering false information and having the right information reaching the right audiences at the right time. Winning the war of ideas also requires a constant analysis of the enemy’s media/psychological strategy and the design of counter-strategies that would enable Israel to be on the offensive and to take the initiative. Israel has been able to win the physical wars when it kept the initiative and went on the offensive (like in 1967) and suffered much damage when it adopted a passive and reactive approach (like in 1973). Similarly, Israel will win the war of ideas only when it takes the initiative, goes on the offensive and exposes the hypocrisy, immorality and corruption of its enemies. Developing an operative strategy for the waging of 4GW should become part of the National Security Council’s activity. This strategy should then be implemented in coordination with all the government’s information-related organizations, under the centralized command of the Prime Minister’s Office.

The current war between Israel and the PA is being waged on the ground and in the media. It is the responsibility of governments to lead the fight on both fronts. However, while governments have (or should have) a legitimate monopoly over the use of military force and of diplomacy, they do not have (and should not have) such a monopoly over the use of channels and arguments aimed at influencing world public opinion. Private organizations and initiatives play a crucial part in the war of ideas. The business community is probably one of the most important elements of civil society to be recruited in the war of ideas because of its financial resources, of its

¹⁵⁴ Thomson, *Easily Led* (op. cit.), p. 331.

exposure to hubs of influence overseas, and because its economic interests are directly affected by the negative side effects of the media war.

Israel's business community should be recruited to financially contribute to Israel's "media defense." A "media VC fund" would raise money from Israeli companies (first and foremost from the high-tech sector) and selectively finance private initiatives and projects aimed at improving Israel's stance in the propaganda war. Priority would be given to the Internet and to television, in order to increase the number of pro-Israel websites as well as short pro-Israel movies broadcast on foreign televisions. Today, a Google search on the Arab-Israeli conflict produces a long list of websites that are apparently neutral and professional but which in fact diffuse Arab propaganda. Similar websites with a pro-Israel content are urgently needed, since the Web has become a major source of information, especially among students. Similarly, European TV channels broadcast many pro-Arab documentaries not only because of bias and pressures, but also because more pro-Arab than pro-Israel movies are produced and submitted for broadcasting. Since the Israeli Foreign Ministry does not have the budget to finance Israel's TV and Internet presence, Israel's business community should fill the gap and give money to Israel's "media defense." In the arena of the propaganda war, Israel's hi-tech money should at least counter-balance Saudi petrodollars.

The Government should also develop a consistent message line and enroll civil society (first and foremost the business community) to express this message line overseas. Arab spokespeople have convinced large (and indeed growing) segments of world public opinion that Israel is an apartheid state, that Israel banished the Palestinians by force, that the Arab countries seek peace with Israel and Israel rejects such peace, that Israel indiscriminately massacres Palestinian women and children, and that Jews have colonized Palestine, stealing the land from the allegedly ancient and indigenous Palestinian people. The most repeated lie, which in turn has become the most accepted "truth," is that Israeli "occupation" and settlements are the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Nazi propagandist Joseph Goebbels used to say that if a lie is big enough and repeated often enough, it will be believed. The Palestinian propaganda machine has been

implementing this principle with unparalleled success. Yet, if repeating the same lie over and over works, surely repeating the same truth over and over again should also work. This is precisely what Israel's advocates should do. Israel's advocates should go on the offensive and tirelessly repeat the same basic truths about the Arab-Israeli conflict. Research on the effectiveness of television advertising shows that a repetition of at least four times per person is the required average to convince the audience.¹⁵⁵ Repetition and message consistency are critical elements of efficient propaganda.

When people who are not versed in the history of the Middle East hear lies repeatedly, they start believing them. As Goebbels said, and as the Palestinians understand, “propaganda must ... always be essentially simple and repetitious ... it must confine itself to a few points and repeat them over and over.” Propaganda can be effective only if it is based on spreading and repeating the same disciplined message. Israel should obviously not spread lies and myths, but the very opposite: it should repeat the same truths over and over again. Arab propagandists are not embarrassed to lie; Israel advocates should not be embarrassed to tell the truth. It is precisely because Arab spokespeople sound like broken records that they are getting their message across. Pro-Israel advocates should do the same with the truth.

Basic and redundant messages on the Arab-Israeli conflict could take as a model the “Seven Truths” developed by Dr. Tal Ben-Shahar from Harvard University and from the David Project:

Truth 1: Arab rejectionism. *The Conflict is about Arab rejection of Jewish sovereignty and freedom in the Middle East.*

Truth 2: The Suffering. *The Arab regimes are responsible for the suffering of Israelis and Palestinians alike.*

Truth 3: Immoral equivalency. *While Israel is committed to democracy and individual freedoms for all its citizens, Arab countries are oppressive dictatorships,*

¹⁵⁵ Thomson, *Easily Led* (op. cit.), p. 9.

disrespectful of basic human rights, and guilty of apartheid on the basis of ethnicity, religion, and gender.

Truth 4: Population patterns. *With the rise of modern Zionism, Jews returning to Israel purchased and cultivated land, attracted mass Arab immigration, and improved the living conditions of Jews and Arabs.*

Truth 5: Arab Anti-Semitism. *There can be no peace in the Middle East as long as the regimes, the media, the mosques, and the schools incite to violence, and teach to hate.*

Truth 6: The Need for a Jewish State. *To secure the basic rights of the Jews in the Middle East, Israel must remain a Jewish State.*

Truth 7: Making the world a better place. *Israel, though constantly forced to fight against those bent on its destruction, focuses on creation –working toward progress and betterment of lives around the world.*

These “seven truths” belong to the “Israeli consensus” and therefore can be endorsed by most Israelis willing to advocate for Israel regardless of their personal political leanings. As explained by Dr. Ben-Shahar, there are obviously more than seven truths about the Arab-Israeli conflict, however as shown by research in psychology, our short term memory is able to retain between five and nine pieces of information. It is therefore important to limit the number of messages we wish to hammer.

Thus, for Israel to win the War of Ideas or Fourth Generation War (4GW), three actions need to be taken: 1) The National Security Council should be put in charge of analyzing the enemy’s 4GW strategy and of designing Israel’s own counter-offensive and strategy, a strategy that should be placed under the direct and centralized control and supervision of the Prime Minister, with other Government bodies such as the Foreign Ministry implementing the strategy and directives emanating from the Prime Minister’s Office; 2) Israel’s business community, first and foremost the high-tech community, should donate a yearly fund to finance pro-Israel advocacy projects and actions, with an emphasis on the Internet and television; 3) The message strategy

designed by the Prime Minister's Office should be consistently communicated to pro-Israel organizations in order to guarantee message discipline and consistency. Emphasis should be given to the didactic and systematic repetition of basic truths about the Arab-Israeli conflict, as a counter-strategy to the Arab method of obsessively hammering the same lies.

Those three steps will add money and efficiency to Israel's 4GW strategy. They will not turn Israel into the darling of European media, but they will provide Israel with the minimal tools needed in order to design and implement a counter-strategy to the psychological war that Israel has been losing since September 2000. Radicals on both sides of the political spectrum argue that PR and advocacy are irrelevant. For some, Israel's image problems will be solved the very moment Israel withdraws to the 1949 cease-fire lines. For others, anti-Semitism is the root-cause of anti-Israel bias and therefore Israel will continue to be condemned and vilified regardless of its policies or PR campaigns. Both arguments contain some element of truth, but both completely ignore or misunderstand (or both) the existence and nature of 4GW. The ultimate aim of Israel's enemies is not to obtain its withdrawal to the 1949 armistice lines, but to call into question Israel's very right to exist, regardless of Israel's borders. Thus, an Israeli withdrawal to the 1949 armistice lines will not put an end to the delegitimization campaign against the Jewish state. And the existence of anti-Semitism does not absolve Israel from taking action in order to defend its national security and right to exist. 4GW terrorists are definitely helped by European anti-Semitism, but they would still implement their strategy even if such anti-Semitism did not exist, and therefore Israel cannot reasonably claim that there is no point taking action simply because media terrorism can always rely on the sympathy of anti-Semites.

Being aware of what the War of Ideas is about and of what Israel's enemies are up to is a first step. The second step is to fight back and win. The alternative is doing nothing. And, as Edmund Burke said, all it takes for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

Appendix: Selected List of Pro-Israel Organizations

Since the outbreak of the media war in September 2000, many organizations and projects have been established, in the United States, in Europe and in Israel, to defend and promote Israel in the media, on campuses and elsewhere. Some of the organizations and projects described below existed before the eruption of the present media war, and are linked to the pro-Israel advocacy network.

The main pro-Israel initiatives, organizations and projects include:

United States

The Israel Project, an organization that was started in March 2002 to improve Israel's image in the United States. It was initiated Stan Greenberg, Frank Luntz, Neil Newhouse and Jennifer Laszlo Mizrahi. The Israel Project has conducted the largest ever public opinion research to find out how Israel is viewed in the United States and in Europe, and what strategy and arguments should be used to improve Israel's image. It runs pro-Israel Television ads on CNN, MSNBC, FOX and NBC, trains pro-Israel spokespeople, and regularly sends mail pieces to top reporters, editors, politicians, key government staff members, and other opinion leaders. Since June 2004, it organizes a yearly international pro-Israel advocacy seminar in Washington DC, gathering the world's most important pro-Israel advocacy organizations and initiatives (www.theisraelproject.org).

Israel21c, a non-profit organization based in California that creates, aggregates and broadly disseminates high-quality information to the American public about the Israel that exists beyond the pervasive imagery of conflict that characterizes so much of Western media reporting. The goal of Israel 21c is to strengthen the vibrant and enduring partnership between the United States and Israel, and between Americans and Israelis (www.israel21c.com).

Justice for Jews from Arab Countries (JJAC), an organization created in September 2002 to ensure that the plight of former Jewish refugees from Arab countries assumes

its rightful place on the international agenda and that their rights be secured as a matter of law and equity (www.jewishrefugees.org/JusticeForJews.htm).

Camera (Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America), a media-monitoring, research organization devoted to promoting accurate and balanced coverage of Israel and the Middle East (www.camera.org).

Honest Reporting, an online network that alerts, informs and mobilizes members via e-mail to respond to imbalanced reporting by contacting the media directly (www.honestreporting.com).

MEMRI (The Middle East Media Research Institute), an organization that explores the Middle East through the region's media. MEMRI bridges the language gap which exists between the West and the Middle East, providing timely translations of Arabic, Farsi, and Hebrew media, as well as original analysis of political, ideological, intellectual, social, cultural, and religious trends in the Middle East. MEMRI's headquarters are located in Washington, DC with branch offices in Berlin, London, and Jerusalem, where MEMRI also maintains its Media Center. MEMRI research is translated into English, German, Hebrew, Italian, French, Spanish, Turkish, and Russian (www.memri.org).

Hasbara Fellowships, a program that educates and trains university students to be effective pro-Israel activists on their campuses. The Hasbara Fellowships, started in 2001 in conjunction with Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, brings hundreds of students to Israel every summer and winter, giving them the information and tools to return to their campuses as leaders in the fight for Israel's image (www.israelactivism.com).

The David Project, a grassroots initiative that promotes a fair and honest understanding of the Middle East conflict. The David Project was launched in August, 2002 in Boston, MA, in response to the growing ideological assault on Israel. The organization trains people to be pro-active in their Israel advocacy - to counter the unfair and dishonest discourse in American universities, media, and communities (www.davidproject.org).

Israel on Campus, another organization that helps students to make the case for Israel on Western university campuses (www.israeloncampus.org).

The Israel on Campus Coalition (ICC), a national coalition of nearly 30 Jewish agencies committed to promoting pro-Israel advocacy on campuses (www.israeloncampuscoalition.org).

Fuel for Truth, an organization that recruits assimilated, unaffiliated Jews on US campuses for pro-Israel advocacy (www.fuelfortruth.org).

Europe

The Europe Near East Forum (ENF), a Brussels-based non-profit organization whose aim is to draw the attention of EU policy and decision makers to the concerns of European Jewry. The organization's strategy consists of building support for Israel among key European decision makers and policy shapers, of strengthening the bond between the EU and Israel, and of standing up against anti-Israel bias in the EU. ENF was established in 2002. It works continuously in the EU and member states to monitor all legislation that impacts on Israel and lends its support to new laws and initiatives that will help Israel to exist within safe and secure borders. ENF lobbies political decision makers and those who influence public opinion. ENF also organizes exploratory trips to Israel to build bridges with Israeli politicians.

European Coalition for Israel (ECI), a Christian initiative promoting European-Israeli cooperation. The founding coalition members are: Bridges for Peace (Israel), Christians voor Israel International (Holland), Christian Friends of Israel, and the International Christian Embassy Jerusalem (pan-European). ECI established the Middle East Information Service, a monthly publication that presents news, information and commentary concerning Israel, Europe and the Middle East. It is sent each month to all members of the European Parliament and key officials in the European Union.

UN Watch, a non-governmental organization based in Geneva whose mandate is to monitor the performance of the United Nations by the yardstick of its own Charter. UN Watch was established in 1993 under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Morris B. Abram, the former U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations in Geneva. UN Watch participates actively as an accredited NGO in Special Consultative Status with the UN Economic and Social Council (www.unwatch.org).

BICOM, a British organization that tries to have an impact on British public opinion by providing real-time briefings and high quality in-depth research, publishing daily and weekly briefings on media coverage of Israel with analysis, and organizing and delivering visitor programs for key politicians, academics and journalists (www.bicom.org.uk).

Action Against Bias, a non-governmental organization dedicated to combating the misrepresentation of Israel and its neighboring states. Located in central London, Action Against Bias organizes proactive campaigns to counteract institutional and media bias, and seeks to rectify the underlying causes of the serious misinformation that permeates UK & European Governments, the media and society at large (www.actionagainstbias.com).

Union des Patrons juifs de France (UPJF), a pro-Israel lobby of Jewish French businessmen (www.upjf.org).

Israel

The Business Network for International Cooperation (BNIC), a non-profit organization committed to strengthening Israel's economy by improving its international image, particularly within the countries of the European Union. BNIC leverages routine Israeli business travel by: 1) providing information and professional training that assists them to effectively advocate for Israel while overseas, and 2) arranging meetings with leading European business personalities through whom public opinion/policy can be influenced. Additionally, BNIC members have access to an on-line database of information relevant to their role as ad-hoc ambassadors. While contributing to Israel's economic future, BNIC members also enjoy the benefit of an ever-expanding network of European business contacts. With each meeting,

media appearance and interview, BNIC members enlarge the Israeli-European business community by establishing a dialogue with new potential partners, customers and suppliers (www.bnic.org).

NGO Monitor, an organization whose aim is to promote accountability for NGOs, and advance a vigorous discussion on the reports and activities of humanitarian NGOs in the framework of the Arab-Israeli conflict. NGO Monitor has revealed that, in many cases, the established humanitarian NGOs produce reports and launch campaigns that stand in sharp contradiction to their own noble mission statements claiming to uphold universal human rights values. Selective morality, as evidenced in the obscuring or simply the removal of context alongside highly misleading reporting, often through incomplete images, have made widespread gross distortions of the humanitarian dimension of the Arab-Israeli conflict. NGO Monitor provides information and analysis, in order to challenge such interpretations and the perceptions that have been built up by fostering a comprehensive debate on these critical issues (www.ngo-monitor.org).

Palestinian Media Watch (PMW), an organization that was established in 1996 to gain an understanding of Palestinian society through the monitoring of the Palestinian Arabic language media and schoolbooks. PMW analyzes Palestinian Authority [PA] culture and society from numerous perspectives, including studies on summer camps, poetry, schoolbooks, religious ideology, crossword puzzles, and many more. PMW has been playing the critical role of documenting the contradictions between the image the Palestinians present to the world in English and the messages to their own people in Arabic. The world's view of the Palestinian Authority, to a significant degree, is the result of PMW research (www.pmw.org.il).

The Center for Monitoring the Impact of Peace (CMIP), an organization that reviews and translates the curricula, schoolbooks for students and handbooks for the teachers, in order to understand and reveal the views and values that Middle East societies want to instill in their youth (www.edume.org).

The Israel Citizens' Information Council (ICIC), an organization that assists efforts to explain Israeli life from the vantage point of the average Israeli citizen. ICIC

promotes a “citizen diplomacy” that allows the presentation of mainstream Israeli thinking as represented by the grass roots (www.hasbara.com).

The Israel Hasbara Committee, an organization that challenges misinformation and bias about Israel and Judaism, and that seeks to inform and train those who wish to combat bias (www.infoisrael.net).

The Israel Action Center (IAC), an Israeli association of volunteers who develop and maintain personal contact with key representatives of international organizations, businesses, governments, media and diplomats to ensure they are informed and receive hospitality while visiting Israel. (www.iacnet.org/gateway.html).

The Prism Group, a volunteers association that disseminates information on the Arab-Israeli conflict, and tries to increase public awareness of indoctrination, incitement and human rights violations in the Middle East (www.theprismgroup.org and also www.eufunding.org).

Independent Media Review and Analysis (IMRA), an organization that publishes Israeli public opinion polls performed by Gallup, Palestinian public opinion surveys conducted by the Palestinian research centers, summaries of news reports from the Israeli and Arab press and Arab broadcast media, official Israeli and PNA statements, English translations of government reports and memoranda, and translations of important unofficial documents (www.imra.org.il).

The Council of Hasbara Volunteers (CoHav), is an international umbrella organization for volunteer Israel advocacy groups around the world. CoHaV promotes cooperation and networking between its group members, as well as coordination of local and international hasbara campaigns and projects (www.cohav.org).

BIG (the British Israel Group), an organization of 500 members, all ex-Brits living in Israel and working to promote and improve Israel's image in the UK. BIG meets with groups and individuals visiting Israel, Jewish and Christian, often entertaining them in their homes, to tell them about the realities of life in Israel. These include youth groups, solidarity missions, visiting MPs and Christian clergy. BIG also meets with and befriends UK journalists, resident in Israel in an effort to combat biased and

selective reporting. BIG writes pro-active and re-active letters and articles about Israel for UK newspapers, synagogue and community magazines & e-mail newsletters.

In addition, there are many websites that diffuse pro-Israel information on the Internet, act as media watchdogs, or simply websites of pro-Israel lobbies or think-tanks such as:

Ediblog.com	www.ediblog.com
Eye on the Washington Post	www.eyeonthepost.org
Boycott the New York Times	www.mytimesprotest.org
Facts and Logic About the Middle East	www.factsandlogic.org
Middle East Reporting in Truth	www.ocmerit.org
Minnesotans Against Terrorism	www.minnesotansagainstterrorism.org
BBC Watch	www.bbcwatch.com
Information Regarding Israel's Security	www.iris.org.il
Middle East Info	www.middle-east-info.com
Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs	www.jcpa.org/index.htm
Helping Israel	www.helpingisrael.com
Access Middle East	www.accessmiddleeast.org
AIPAC	www.aipac.org
The American Jewish Committee	www.ajc.org
Anti-Defamation League	www.adl.org/israel
Debka	www.debka.com
Freeman Center for Strategic Studies	www.freeman.org
Hadassah	www.hadassaj.org
Hasbara	www.hasbara.us
Israel Bonds	www.israelbonds.com
Israel Links	www.israellinks.org
Israel 101: A Survival Kit for Dummies	www.masada2000.org
Jerusalem Archives	www.jerusalem-archives.org
Jewish Council for Public Affairs	www.jewishpublicaffairs.org
Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs	www.jinsa.org/home/home.html

Jewish National Fund	www.jnf.org
The Jewish Internet Portal	www.hareshima.com/Israel/government.asp
The Jewish Task Force	www.jtf.org
Jewish Virtual Library	www.us-israel.org
MidEast Truth	www.mideasttruth.com
Myths and Facts	www.us-israel.org/jsource/myths/mftoc.html
Simon Wisenthal Center	www.wisenthal.com
Stand With Us	www.standwithus.com
Virtual Israel Political Action Committee	www.vipac.org
Zionist Organization of America	www.zoa.org
Canadian Institute for Jewish Research	www.isranet.org
Australian/Israel and Jewish Affairs Council	www.ajjac.org.au
Bridges for Peace	www.bridgesforpeace.com
Christian Action for Israel	www.cdn-friends-icej.ca
Christian Friends of Israel-USA	www.cfi-usa.org
International Christian Embassy Jerusalem	www.icej.org
International Fellowship of Christians and Jews	www.ifcj.org
Unity Coalition for Israel	www.israelunitycoalition.org
Stand for Israel	www.standforisrael.org
USA 4 Israel	www.usa4israel.com
Battalions of Deborah	www.battalionofdeborah.org
AGS Consulting	www.agsconsulting.com
The Arab-Israeli Conflict in Maps	www.jafi.org.il/education/100/mpas/index.html
The Real Story of the Palestinians in Israel	www.rotter.net/israel
Daily Alert	www.dailyalert.org

Bibliography

Books:

Said Aburish, *The Rise, Corruption and Coming Fall of the House of Saud* (St. Martin's Griffin, 1995).

Avi Becker, *The United Nations and Israel. From Recognition to Reprehension* (Lexington Books, 1988).

Yehuda Blum, *For Zion's Sake* (Cornell Books, 1987).

Alan Dershowitz, *The Case for Israel* (Wiley, 2003).

Dore Gold, *Hatred's Kingdom* (Regnery, 2003).

Dore Gold, *Tower of Babble* (Crown Forum, 2004).

Oriana Fallaci, *La Force de la Raison* (Éditions du Rocher, 2004).

Alain Finkelkraut, *Au Nom de l'Autre. Essai sur l'antisémitisme qui vient* (Gallimard, 2004).

Thomas X. Hammes, *The Sling and the Stone: On War in the 21st Century* (Zenith Press, 2004).

Haim Herzog, *Who Stands Accused?* (Random House, 1978).

Garth Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell, *Propaganda and Persuasion* (Sage Publications, 1999).

Efraim Karsh, *Arafat's War* (Grove Press, 2003).

Brigitte L. Nacos, *Terrorism and the Media* (Columbia University Press, 1994).

Benjamin Netanyahu, *A Place Among the Nations* (Bantam Books, 1993).

Anthony Pratkanis and Elliot Aronson, *Age of Propaganda* (Freeman and Company, 2001).

Harris O. Schonberg, *A Mandate For Terror. The United Nations and the PLO* (Shapolski Publishers, 1989).

Oliver Thomson, *Easily Led. A History of Propaganda* (Sutton Publishing, 1999).

Bat Yeor. *Eurabia. The Euro-Arab Axis* (Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005).

Articles:

Anne Bayesfsky, "Inequity in the United Nations Human Rights System." *Justice* 6 (August 1995).

Anthony J. Blinken, "Winning the War of Ideas," *The Washington Quarterly* 25:2.

Ariel Cohen, "Combating Militant Islamic Ideology," *Politics and Diplomacy* (Winter/Spring 2004).

Michael Curtis, "The United Nations Against Israel." *Middle East Review* 13 (1981).

William S. Lind, "Understanding Fourth Generation War," *Military Review*, September-October 2004.

Norman Podhoretz, "World War IV: How It Started, What It Means, and Why We Have to Win." *Commentary*, September 2004 (Vo. 118, No. 2).

Norman Podhoretz, "J'Accuse." Reprinted from *Commentary* in *The Media War Against Israel* (Steimatzky Publishing, 1986).

Nidra Poller, "Betrayed By Europe: an Expatriate's Lament." *Commentary*, March 2003.

Gerald Steinberg, "NGOs Make War on Israel," *Middle East Quarterly*, Summer 2004.

David Pryce-Jones, "Jews, Arabs, and French Diplomacy." *Commentary*, May 2005.

Pierre-André Taguieff, "Anti-israélisme et judéophobie: l'exception française." *Outre-Terre. Revue française de géopolitique* N. 9 (October 2004).

"The Changing Face of War: Into the Fourth Generation," *Marine Corps Gazette*, October 1989.

Monographs and Reports:

Trevor Asserson, "What Went Wrong at the BBC: A Public Monopoly Abusing its Charter Through Bias Against Israel," *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, No. 511, 15 January 2004.

Anne Bayesfsky, "The UN and the Assault on Israel's Legitimacy: Implications for the Roadmap." *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, No. 510 (1 August 2003).

Dan Diker, "Why Are Israel's Public Relations so Poor?" *Jerusalem Viewpoints*, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, No. 487 (15 October – 1 November 2002).

Dan Dicker, "The Influence of Palestinian Organizations on Foreign News Reporting." *Jerusalem Issue Brief*, Vol. 2, No. 23 (27 March 2003), The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.

Joel S. Fishman, "Ten Years Since Oslo: The PLO's 'People's War' Strategy and Israel's Inadequate Response." *Jerusalem Viewpoints* No. 503 (1-15 September 2003), Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.

State of Israel, *Comptroller's Report # 53 A*, October 7, 2002.

State of Israel, Prime Minister's Office, *Report on the Economic Damages caused by the Palestinian Authority*, March 2002.

Shmuel Trigano, "French Anti-Semitism: A Barometer for Gauging Society's Perverseness." An Interview with Shmuel Trigano, *The Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs*, Post-Holocaust and Anti-Semitism, No. 26, 1 November 2004.

The Luntz Research Companies, "How the Next Generation Views Israel." April 2004.

Newspapers:

Ha'aretz

Le Monde

The Economist

The Guardian

The Jerusalem Post

The New York Times

The Wall Street Journal

Time Magazine

Weekly Standard

Websites:

www.electronicintifada.net

www.honestreporting.com

www.israel21c.com

www.memri.org

www.ngo-monitor.org

www.palestine-pmc.com

www.palestinemonitor.org

www.proche-orient.info

www.worldnetdaily.com

Conferences:

Uzi Dayan, "The Media Environment and its Implications." Herzliyah Conference, December 17, 2001.

Alain Finkelkraut, "Israel in a Post-National World." International Conference at Bar-Ilan University on "Israel's Image in the World: How to Win Over Public Opinion?" Bar-Ilan University, 8 May 2005.

Michel Gurfinkel, "France, the Jews and Israel," Speech at Hillel House, Harvard University, 1 November 2004.