From Kippur to Oslo:
Israel's Foreign Policy, 1973–1993

EMMANUEL NAVON

Niccolo Machiavelli's definition of political realism is blunt and unambiguous: 'Where the very safety of the country depends on the resolution to be taken, no consideration of justice or injustice, humanity or cruelty, nor of glory or of shame, should be allowed to prevail. But putting all other considerations aside, the only question should be: What course will save the life and liberty of the country?'[1] Statesmen oscillate between their duty to preserve the safety of their country and their aspiration to implement policies that meet their standards of justice, humanity and glory. Israeli statesmen are no exception in this regard, although conducting the foreign policy of a country that is under constant military threat and claims to be 'a light among nations' exacerbates the dilemma of choosing between idealism and realism.

The ideological divide between idealists and realists stems from two sets of assumptions regarding human nature and reality. Realists are wary of men's real intentions, while idealists rely on human goodwill: the state of nature is heaven to Rousseau and hell to Hobbes because the former believes that man is naturally good and socially perverted, while the latter assumes that man is 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.' Realists and idealists also see reality from two different viewpoints: to the realist, reality is a given to which man needs to submit and adapt his will; to the idealist, reality is man-made and can therefore be subjugated to man's will. Machiavelli teaches the Prince how to adapt to reality, while Kant implores him to change and adapt it to his ideals. These two different sets of assumptions – Is man good or bad? Is reality stronger than human will or the other way round? – are the core of the ideological debate between Right and Left in open societies, and this debate applies to foreign policy.

Israel's founding fathers had the loftiest of ideals: to establish a Jewish, democratic and socialist state in the heart of the Middle East. The *Yishuv*'s leaders originally had little interest in international affairs. They were disciples of Marx, not of Metternich. But the harsh reality of the Middle East and of world politics compelled them to learn the rules of *Realpolitik*. The last decade of Mandatory Palestine encompassed a long series of

Emmanuel Navon is an International Relations Lecturer at Tel Aviv University and Director of the Business Network for International Cooperation (BNIC).

dramatic historical events which critically affected the Zionist project: the Arab Revolt of 1936; the 1937 Partition Plan; the rise of European fascism and Nazism and the 1939 Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact; the 1939 White Paper; the Second World War and the Holocaust; the unexpected hostility of Britain's post-war Labour government towards Zionism; and the replacement of the European balance of power by a bipolar international system.[2] As Abba Eban wrote: 'The trouble with Utopia is that it does not exist. Writers who have described the ideal society have usually contrived to situate their Utopias on desert islands or on the peaks of inaccessible mountains, thus avoiding the two conditions that make Utopia impossible: boundaries and neighbours.'[3]

David Ben-Gurion eventually espoused realism in the light of Britain's betrayal of the Zionist movement, of the Arabs' fierce opposition to Zionism, and of the tragic outcome of Jewish powerlessness in Europe. His approach to the issue of implacable Arab opposition to Zionism was in many ways similar to the 'Iron Wall' theory developed by Ze'ev Jabotinsky, namely that the Arabs would never willingly accept the existence of a Jewish state on what they consider to be their land, but that only a strong deterrence force might eventually convince them to acquiesce to the presence of the abhorred enemy in their midst. Both Ben-Gurion and Jabotinsky (though not necessarily Jabotinsky's followers) were aware of the limits of power. They were realists in that they were both suspicious of human nature and willing to bow to reality. The basic consensus on this political realism was criticized, though never challenged, by ideologues from Right and Left. On the Right, Israel Eldad called for uncompromisingly imposing the National Will on reality. On the Left, Martin Buber pleaded for changing reality according to universal values. The appeal and influence of the radical Right and of the radical Left were marginal – until the trauma of the 1973 Yom Kippur War.

The Yom Kippur War shattered the confidence of Israel's youth in the *Mapai* leadership. The policy of deterrence and wariness was said to be outdated, and the territorial results of the Six-Day War were said to be the true cause of the Arab–Israeli conflict. The pragmatic realism of Ben-Gurion and his followers was under attack. For the new generation, deterrence led to a dead end, and territorial withdrawal was the key to peace. Idealists and ideologues from the Left and the Right emerged from the Yom Kippur War with new 'solutions' to the Arab–Israeli conflict and to Israel's diplomatic isolation: the establishment of a Palestinian state for the Left, the building of settlements in the West Bank for the Right. Universal justice was to the former what military force was to the latter: the solution to all problems. The idealism of the Left was Rousseauistic; the idealism of the Right was Nietzschean.

The international reality impeded the implementation of those two ideological visions: the PLO's 'phased strategy' of 1974 unequivocally

defined the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip as the first stage towards Israel's destruction; the building of Jewish settlements in the West Bank aggravated Israel's diplomatic isolation, alienated its allies, and jeopardized the demographic and social viability of the Jewish state. Yet both ideologies were put to a test with disastrous results. Yitzhak Shamir's policy would have turned Israel into a segregationist state and jeopardized its strategic relationship with the United States, had it not been halted. And Yossi Beilin's 'peace in our time' experiment generated the most merciless war and gravest existential danger ever experienced by the state of Israel.

After the Yom Kippur War Israel became militarily weakened in the Middle East and diplomatically isolated on the world scene. Its leaders chose to play down considerations of 'justice, humanity and glory' for the sake of safety, precisely when such a policy choice was more virulently criticized and challenged by political ideologies that grew in strength and influence in the aftermath of the war. The Oslo ideology was a by-product of the 1973 trauma. In the light of Oslo's ending, rethinking Israel's foreign policy is a moral and practical imperative.

THE IRON WALL AND ITS DETRACTORS

Ben-Gurion and Jabotinsky

During the Lebanon War a public debate arose between Yehoshafat Harkabi and Israel Eldad over the place of realism in Israel's foreign policy. Harkabi charged that the Israeli Right was alien to the principles of political realism because it dismissed the constraints of reality for the sake of nationalism. For Harkabi, this was a 'syndrome' that was not new to the Jewish people and had led in the past to the disastrous defeat of Bar-Kokhba (CE 132–35).[4] Harkabi's contender, Israel Eldad, did not even try to argue that the Israeli Right was more realistic than the Left, but prided himself on despising the very principle of political realism: 'Zionism is the process of turning a dream into reality which should not be suffocated because of the limitations of reality. Our existence and redemption rejects everything that is "real" and "rational".'[5] Furthermore, Zionism was 'an expression of the national will to change the face of reality' and 'romanticism which does not take facts into account' would win the battle of history.[6]

The fact that in this debate realism was advocated by a leftist figure (Harkabi) and denigrated by a rightist one (Eldad) is a typical Israeli political anomaly. Accepting reality as it is a conservative motto, while liberals and socialists generally view reality as a malleable system which man can change according to his ideals. In Western political culture, political realism is generally advocated by the Right and decried by the Left.

It is indeed a paradox that in Israel *Mapai* adopted the role and principles of European conservatism: on social issues it represented the interests of the ruling class, and on diplomatic issues it adopted policies that were certainly closer to the views of Bismarck or Kissinger than those of Jean Jaurès or Jimmy Carter. This anomaly can be explained by two main reasons. First, being the party in power, *Mapai* was naturally inclined to fully understand and apply Machiavelli's advice. Second, the Revisionist Right, especially its radical elements represented by the *Irgun* and *Lehi*, had an ambivalent attitude towards realism and a tendency to dismiss the constraints of reality and to believe that the will of the Nation would eventually prevail. The Civil Right was certainly closer to European conservatism and had a realistic approach to foreign policy, but its impact on Israeli politics was marginal. It was eventually co-opted by the Revisionists in the early 1960s. The political ideas prevailing in the *Yishuv* were based on eclectic sources such as Jewish tradition, Marxism and continental European nationalism, and had little connection with the liberal tradition of the mandatory power. Israel was founded by Russian, not Anglo-Saxon, Jews and British conservatism never took ground in British Palestine. Historically, the Israeli Right was more romantic than realistic, more revolutionary than conservative. Jabotinsky's mentors were Mazzani and Croce, not Burke or Tocqueville.

The *Yishuv*'s, and later Israel's, political Left was no less idealistic than the Revisionist Right. But Ben-Gurion gradually departed from the Marxist dogma and adopted the principles of political realism. He explicitly rejected socialism while determining his diplomatic stance in 1937. His attitude towards the Soviet Union and the Arab world became completely divorced from the question of class. When he claimed that the Soviets were supporting the Arabs because of the weakness of the *Yishuv* he was displaying pure *Realpolitik*. He ambivalently accepted the 1937 Partition Plan, based on a cold assessment of the *Yishuv*'s weakness. This switch to realism was characterized by a readiness to accept the constraints of reality, to make decisions based on non-emotional and non-ideological calculations and assessments, and to compromise. Realism was not adopted by all Zionist Socialists, however, but only by Ben-Gurion's *Mapai* – which, as it happened, was also closer to power than its Socialist allies and rivals. On the *Yishuv*'s political Left, only *Mapai* departed from the Marxist dogma and decided to play the game of *Realpolitik*. Ben-Gurion understood that if he wanted a Jewish state in the hostile context of the 1930s, he had to mitigate his ideology with strategy. He accepted the 1947 partition plan against his ideological inclinations because he understood that, in the real world, partition was the only way to attain Jewish statehood. When accused of departing from the 1941 Biltmore programme, which called for a Jewish state in all Mandatory Palestine, Ben-Gurion replied: 'Biltmore, shmiltmore, we must have a Jewish state.'

His ability and readiness to depart from dogma for the sake of political gains enabled him to successfully attain his goals, although at the expense of his socialist ideals. As explained by Sasson Sofer: 'When the Zionist Left proclaimed Israel's independence … its revolutionary ardour was almost completely spent. The spirit of 1948 was conservative, not radical.'[7]

Ben-Gurion accepted the fact that, in the light of the Arab revolts of 1929 and 1936 and of Britain's gradual distancing itself from its commitments to the Jewish 'National Home,' Zionism had to use force to impose itself in Palestine. 'Power, we must have power!' he exclaimed in February 1937. Ben-Gurion expressed a purely realistic standpoint when he declared: 'We are a poor people. Not only are we floundering in Poland, we are wallowing in our blood in Palestine. Why should I be concerned about the Arabs?'[8] Ben-Gurion believed that Zionism had to use deterrent force until it was accepted by the Arabs as a historical fact that could neither be ignored nor destroyed. The words 'facts' and 'reality' were a *leitmotiv* in Ben-Gurion's speeches and writings on foreign policy. He realized that the Arabs were firmly opposed to the Zionist enterprise, and based his strategy on a combination of military strength and external support from the great powers. The 1936 Arab Revolt convinced him that the Jewish state would have to be established by force: 'We and they want the same thing: We both want Palestine. And that is the fundamental conflict.'[9] Ben-Gurion believed that the Arabs would consider a settlement with the Jewish state only after they realized they had no other option: 'Only after total despair on the part of the Arabs, despair that will come not only from the failure of the disturbances and the attempt at rebellion, but also as a consequence of our growth in the country, may the Arabs possibly acquiesce in a Jewish Eretz Israel.'[10] Abba Eban also supported the idea that only deterrence might eventually convince the Arabs to abandon their dream of destroying Israel and settle for a policy of compromise:

> In the 1960s Israel's security doctrine was rooted in the idea of an independent deterrent power. I supported this definition. I believed that our strategy toward the Arab world would have to have an attritional stage. First they would have to be driven to despair of causing our downfall and liquidation. At that stage they would perhaps see the advantage and compulsion of 'doing a deal.' My experience and reading had told me that those who most ardently wanted peace were not always those who obtained it. At the same time, I wrote and said that even if we built a wall against attack or intimidation, we should have a door in the wall in case the attrition was successful and our neighbours came to seek accommodation. Our immediate task was to maintain a sufficient deterrent balance to bring the Arab states, or at least some elements in their leadership, to a realistic preference for compromise.[11]

Jabotinsky also advocated the adoption of an 'Iron Wall' strategy *vis-à-vis* the Arabs. He wrote that the Arabs would not accept Zionism's plan to turn Mandatory Palestine into a Jewish state, and rejected the view of those Zionists who hoped that the economic development of Palestine would convince the Arabs to accept Zionism: 'Every indigenous people will resist alien settlers as long as they see any hope of ridding themselves of the danger of foreign settlement. This is how the Arabs will behave and go on behaving so long as they possess a gleam of hope that they can prevent "Palestine" from becoming the Land of Israel.' Since the Arabs would never willingly accept the establishment of a Jewish state in their midst, Zionism had a choice between abandoning its enterprise or imposing it by force and surrounding itself with an 'Iron Wall' which the Arabs would be powerless to break down. Jabotinsky did not rule out an agreement with the Arabs, but argued that they would never *willingly* accept the Jewish state 'because they are not a rabble but a living people.'[12] Only when they realized that they could not get rid of the 'alien settlers' would they perhaps accept a compromise.

Jabotinsky's approach to the conflict between Zionism and the Arabs oscillated between his romantic nationalism and his cold realism. On the one hand, he was committed to the fulfilment of the Jews' national aspiration – a fulfilment that sometimes defied the constraints of reality. On the other hand, he was aware of the fact that there was a limit to which Zionism could impose its will on reality, and admitted that Zionism had to bow to the constraints of the international system. Jabotinsky realized the importance of Britain's support for Zionism, and emphasized in his address to the British parliament in July 1937 that the Jewish state would be a strategic asset for Britain. Though Jabotinsky opposed the 1937 partition plan, some documents suggest that 'there is a great deal of evidence to indicate that he was prepared to accept the plan, with certain territorial changes.' During the third world congress of *Betar* in September 1938 Jabotinsky vigorously attacked Begin for suggesting that the *Yishuv* should take Garibaldi as its model to fight for independence: 'No strategist in the world would say that in our situation we can do what Garibaldi and De Valera did. That is idle chatter. Our position is a far cry from that of the Italians or the Irish, and if you think there is no other way than that proposed by Mr. Begin and you have arms – go ahead and commit suicide.'[13] Jabotinsky recognized that Zionism could succeed only by taking into account the constraints of reality, and he was sometimes ready to put aside glory for the sake of Jewish statehood.

Ben-Gurion and Jabotinsky (who met in 1934) agreed on one point: that relations between Israel and the Arabs should be based on deterrence. Both men believed that the Arab world in general and the Palestinians in particular had not accepted Israel's existence and that this reality was unlikely to change.

Buber and Magnes

The 'Iron Wall' theory was firmly opposed by the Academic Left led by Martin Buber and Yehuda Magnes. In the years preceding the establishment of the state of Israel the Palestinian Jewish intelligentsia (which originated mainly in Germany and Lithuania) abhorred the idea that a nation returning to a homeland inhabited by others had to use force. It believed that a bi-national Jewish–Arab state would be a compromise acceptable to the Arab world, and that economic co-operation and integration would maintain a peaceful relationship between the two communities. Central to the worldview of Buber and Magnes was the idea that in the aftermath of the Second World War, the principle of federalism and supra-national framework would supersede nationalism and sovereignty. The *Ihud* movement (which inherited elements from pacifist associations such as *Brit Shalom*, *Kedma Mizraha* and the League for Jewish–Arab Rapprochement and Co-operation) advocated an uncompromising faithfulness to what it considered to be Jewish values, albeit at the expense of Jewish statehood. Despite the 1936 Arab Revolt and the fierce opposition of the Arabs to Zionism, *Ihud* believed that Zionism and Arab nationalism 'complement one another, and can live under one roof, in friendship and harmony' and that Jewish immigration to Palestine could be pursued 'with the agreement and cooperation of the Arab nation.'[14] *Ihud*'s leader, Judah Magnes, typically had an idealistic and moralistic approach to international relations. A convinced pacifist, he abhorred the use of force in foreign policy and had militated during his youth against US involvement in the First World War. Magnes consistently opposed the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state because he believed that a Jewish state would alter the purity of Judaism and would run counter to the 'new world order' based on federalism and communities of nations, which he thought would emerge in the aftermath of the Second World War. On the other hand, he supported the establishment of the Arab League, which did express, in his opinion, the federalist tendency of the new world order he envisioned. Magnes claimed that the Jewish state was born in sin because Palestine had been conquered by force and because the Balfour Declaration and the Versailles Treaties were iniquitous to the Arabs: 'When I think that Palestine was conquered by force of arms, and that it was made "Jewish" by the iniquitous [Versailles] Peace Conference, I am reminded of the well-known Jewish description: "Conceived and born in uncleanness."'[15] Magnes believed that the Jews had to abandon the idea of a Jewish state in Palestine because of the injustice the creation of such a state would cause to the Arabs: 'We must once and for all give up the idea of a "Jewish Palestine".' He went as far as to suggest that as long as the Jewish national home was not approved by the Arabs, it would be an immoral and therefore illegitimate enterprise: 'If we cannot find ways of

peace and understanding, if the only way to establish the Jewish national home is upon the bayonets of some empire, our whole enterprise is not worthwhile.'

Like Magnes, Martin Buber believed that nothing (not even the tragic fate of the Jews) justified any compromise with what he considered to be sacred moral standards. His approach to Zionism was ambiguous and contradictory: he was ready to accept some kind of Jewish presence in Palestine, but totally opposed any injustice that such presence would involve. This inner contradiction stemmed from his attachment to Jewish identity on the one hand, and from his idealized perception of reality on the other. Because he favoured morality over reality, Buber opposed the establishment of a Jewish state: since the Arabs opposed such a state and since imposing Jewish sovereignty against their will would cause injustice, the Jews had to abandon their design. Buber maintained that Jewish emigration to Palestine in the 1920s should arouse 'guilt' among Jews, because this immigration spurred Arab violence. After independence, he argued for the curtailment of further Jewish immigration into Israel and defended the right of Arab refugees to return to their homes. At the twelfth Zionist congress in Karlsbad in 1921, Buber explained that, since Zionism was producing Arab hatred and since the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine would cause injustice to the Arabs, the very idea of Jewish sovereignty had to be abandoned. He blamed the 1929 massacres of Jews by Arabs on the Jews themselves, claiming that such massacres would not have taken place had not Zionism claimed Jewish sovereignty in Palestine, and that 'When we [the Jews] started our infiltration into the country, we began an attack.' Buber abhorred the very concept of Jewish power and went as far as to argue, in 1958, that those Jews who supported the 'Iron Wall' strategy 'preferred to learn from Hitler,' for 'Hitler showed them that history does not go the way of the spirit but the way of power.'[16]

It is precisely because Ben-Gurion was ready to detach diplomacy and strategy from ideological considerations that he was criticized by the parties and movements that never converted to *Realpolitik*. *Ihud* accused Ben-Gurion of being a Jewish Bismarck at the expense of Jewish ethical values. The Marxist Left lamented his disregard for the socialist vision of peace. The Revisionist Right charged that he betrayed the integrity of the homeland for the sake of political gains.

ISRAEL AND THE ARAB WORLD

A Fissure in the Iron Wall

Without Israel's 'Iron Wall' of military strength, deterrence and determination, there would never have been a peace treaty between Israel and Egypt. It is only after realizing that he would not be able to recover the Sinai Peninsula by warfare (a fact that was blatantly proven by the 1973 war)

that Anwar Sadat agreed to sign a peace treaty with Israel. Asked why he
made peace with Israel, Sadat answered: 'Because you had my land. I tried
every way to recover it without the hazard of making peace: I tried UN
action, four-power, three-power, two-power pressure. I tried war, armistice,
international condemnation. I reached the answer that only by peace could I
recover my land.'[17] The secretary-general of Egypt's ruling Socialist Party,
Mustafa Khalil, confirmed this answer: 'We know that we have no chance of
winning a war, and we know that you [the Israelis] have the atomic bomb . . .
Egypt has no military solution, and we must seek another solution.'[18]
Nevertheless, many Israelis started questioning the validity of the 'Iron Wall'
strategy defended and implemented by the Labour old guard. As Shmuel
Eisenstadt explained: 'The Yom Kippur War brought to its peak the sense of
the existing institutional framework's inability to cope with existing
problems, further undermining the legitimacy of the ruling elites.'[19]
Moreover, the war 'brought a weakening of the image of military supremacy
and strength' as well as 'a growing criticism of various aspects of Israel's
policies.'[20] This description is confirmed by the personal testimony of Yossi
Beilin:

> The Yom Kippur War . . . became, in the end, the war that shaped my
> conception more than any other event in my life . . . I became a different
> man. I saw that the towns in the Golan Heights only complicated the
> defense of Israel . . . I saw how unimportant were the territories, and that
> in many respects we had become captive of our own occupation . . . I
> understood that Golda Meir, in her stupidity, missed the opportunity of
> making peace with Egypt in 1971 and to give up Sinai. This bitter
> disappointment convinced me to stop keeping *mitzvot* [religious
> commandments].[21]

Yossi Beilin does not explain how his faith in God was related to his faith
in Golda Meir, but he is explicit about the fact that he aspired to make
Israel's foreign policy 'more moral and more Jewish' and to turn Israel
into 'a moral symbol for human rights.' According to Beilin, the time
when Israel could not offer to worry about 'justice, humanity and glory'
(Machiavelli) was over, and one had to reject the idea that 'nothing has
changed in the Middle East.'[22] In Beilin's thought, the dilemma between
idealism and realism is not an issue: it is in Israel's interest to conduct a
moral foreign policy. Indeed, trying to preserve some of Israel's 1967
territorial conquests and attempting to counterweight Israel's diplomatic
isolation by co-operating with undemocratic regimes is both immoral and
counter-productive. If the territories conquered in 1967 have no strategic
value and if Israel has nothing to gain from its co-operation with
countries that violate human rights, the dilemma of choosing between
morality and *Realpolitik* is solved. The underlying assumption of Beilin's

philosophy is that the Arab world's hostility to Zionism is not inherent, but is the result of Israel's territorial conquests from the Six-Day War. This assumption follows the philosophy of Buber and Magnes: Israel caused the hostility of the Arabs and it alone can undo this hostility by fully applying universal principles of justice and morality. Occupation is unjust and immoral, and therefore, as soon as Israel puts an end to it, peace with the Arabs will follow.

The 'Iron Wall' strategy is based on the opposite assumption: the Arabs are fighting Israel because they are opposed to the very idea of a sovereign Jewish state in a region which they consider to be their exclusive property, and only military superiority and deterrence will convince them to come to terms with the abhorred reality of the Jewish state. The 'Iron Wall' strategy is Hobbesian, while the *Ihud* approach is Rousseauistic. The 'Iron Wall' is sceptical about man's true intentions and about his ability to shape reality according to his ideals. The *Ihud* approach is confident about man's goodness and power to change the world.

The Heirs of Ben-Gurion and Jabotinsky

When he presented his government to the Knesset on 3 June 1974, Yitzhak Rabin pledged that Israel would never withdraw to the 1949 ceasefire lines because these lines 'are not defensible borders, and they constitute a temptation of aggression against us, as has been proven in the past.'[23] Rabin was ready to negotiate with Jordan Israel's withdrawal from parts of the West Bank, along the lines of the Allon Plan, but only from a position of strength and after rebuilding Israel's deterrence. After becoming prime minister in June 1974, Rabin nominated his former *Hagana aide de camp* Yigal Allon to the post of foreign minister. As a *Palmah* officer, Allon wanted to conquer all Western Mandatory Palestine (that is, the territory which the 1947 UN Partition Plan had recommended for division between an Arab and a Jewish state), and thought that such a military enterprise was both desirable and feasible. He believed that in 1949 Israel had 'won the war but lost the peace' and that 'the map on the basis of which the armistice agreements were signed at the end of the war will be the direct cause of many future wars.'[24] After the Six-Day War Allon submitted to the government a plan (that was to bear his name) on the status of the West Bank. Based on the principle of 'maximum of security for Israel with minimum of Arab population,' the plan recommended the annexation to Israel of the Jordan Valley, of the eastern Judean Desert, of the Etzion Bloc, and of the northern surroundings of Jerusalem. The rest of the West Bank (in which the Arab population was concentrated) would become an autonomous region whose final status would be negotiated with the local population. Like Allon, Rabin considered the Jordan Valley a vital defence line and thought that the inclusion of a million Arabs in the Jewish state was unsustainable. Rabin made it clear that 'around a third, more or less,

of the territory of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip must be included in the context of peace, under Israeli sovereignty.'[25] Rabin ceded to Henry Kissinger's pressure to sign an interim withdrawal agreement with Egypt (known as 'Sinai II'), but his motivation was purely realistic: his true intention was 'to widen the rift between Sadat and Syria.'[26] When he once again became prime minister in July 1992, Rabin reiterated that security 'takes preference even over peace.'[27] Rabin also confirmed his commitment to the Allon Plan.[28]

Shimon Peres – another Ben-Gurion *protégé* – also believed, until his political metamorphosis in the late 1980s, that security took precedence over peace. In an article published in 1955, he wrote: 'The security of Israel does not depend on international conciliation, nor on conciliation with the Arabs. The degree of our security is as the degree to which we are able and ready to defend what we have achieved with so much blood.'[29] In his book *The Next Stage* (1965), Peres wrote that 'Jewish settlement diminishes the Arabs' desire for war,' that 'declarations by us of our desire for peace are not received by them [the Arabs] as being righteous … but rather as a sign of weakness,' and that 'dependence on our own strength was and remains our only realistic policy.'[30] Back in the 1970s Peres was firmly opposed to the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank, because 'Such a state, as we saw it, would split Western Palestine down the middle, leaving Israel with an untenable and indefensible narrow waist. True, we had agreed to partition in the past, but that very partition may well have brought on the Six Day War.'[31]

Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir had a more ideological approach to the Arab–Israeli conflict. In their view, Israel had to retain all the West Bank for ideological reasons. Begin insisted that 'we have a right and a claim of sovereignty to these areas of the land of Israel. This is our country, and it belongs by right to the Jewish people.'[32] He was altogether a realist who understood both the strategic value of a US-sponsored peace agreement with Egypt and the danger of a nuclear Iraq, and an ideologist who refused to accept the partition of the Land of Israel – regardless of the demographic consequences of such a refusal.

Shamir also had an ideological connection to the Land of Israel. His autobiography ends on a sort of political testament that summarizes his ideology: 'If history remembers me at all, in any way, I hope it will be as a man who loved the Land of Israel and watched over it in every way he could, all his life.'[33] Like Jabotinsky himself, both Begin and Shamir subscribed to only half of the tenets of political realism. Realism is based on pessimistic assumptions about human nature and about man's ability to change reality. Begin and Shamir shared these assumptions. But realism also prescribes that we look at reality as it is, and not as we wish it to be. Realist thinkers always implore statesmen not to let ideology blur their perception of reality, and to accept facts regardless of how painful

it might be. And here, Begin's and Shamir's passionate ideological commitment to the sanctity of the Land of Israel was stronger then their readiness to cope with the fact that, because of the demographic reality, retaining all the territories captured by Israel during the Six-Day War would eventually undermine the Jewishness of the Jewish state.

James Baker wrote of Shamir: 'I sensed an enormous ambivalence in the man. He seemed alternatively interested in doing something and scared to death at the very prospect.'[34] And indeed, Shamir was an ambivalent statesman. A former *Lehi* member, he believed that a strong will could subjugate reality. Faithful to Eldad's conviction that 'the elements of will' (the national will) could supersede 'the elements of necessity' (the objective constraints of reality), he believed that 'might is made up of several components, most important of which is our own self-confidence.'[35] He totally ignored reality when he asserted that 'it is absolutely possible and necessary to arrive at peace without conceding, Heaven forbid, one bit of the land of our forefathers, the Holy Land.'[36] On the other hand, Shamir made the realistic decision, during the 1991 Gulf War, not to retaliate to the Iraqi aggression, a decision which, he admitted, went 'against my grain as a Jew and as a Zionist' and which was 'opposed to the ideology on which my life has been based.'[37] Shamir, like Begin, was half a realist: he had a Hobbesian worldview and knew when to bow to reality, but his passionate ideological commitment to the integrity of the Land of Israel led him to a policy towards the Palestinians that totally ignored the demographic reality.

Rabin, Peres, Begin and Shamir all shared the Hobbesian worldview and Clausewitzian calculations of Ben-Gurion and Jabotinsky. But Ben-Gurion's nationalism was pragmatic, while Jabotinsky's was romantic. This is why the Israeli Left became more realistic, and therefore more conservative, than the Israeli Right. This political oddity was not confined to the realm of foreign policy: the Labour Party represented the socially privileged and introduced pro-market reforms in Israel's economy in the mid-1980s. But this oddity changed in the late 1980s.

When he became prime minister in 1984, Peres's main goal was to negotiate the final status of the West Bank with Jordan and to prevent any PLO involvement in the negotiations: 'We are prepared to negotiate separately with Jordan, or with a combined delegation: not PLO, not terrorist; a delegation which aspires to peace with Israel, not peace without Israel.'[38] Peres's strategy was complicated by Hussein's ambiguous and changing attitude towards the PLO. After excluding the PLO from his kingdom in 1970, Hussein secretly and regularly met Rabin and other Israeli leaders to negotiate the final status of the West Bank. These meetings were friendly but fruitless. Hussein could not resist the pressure of the Arab League to include the PLO in the negotiations, and he thought that the PLO might become more moderate after its expulsion from Lebanon

and subsequent weakening. He feared his reign would be endangered were he to negotiate directly with Israel, and hoped to bind Arafat into a subordinate negotiating role. In February 1984 Hussein signed an agreement with Arafat which called for Israel's withdrawal from all the territories captured in 1967, for the resolution of the refugees' issue, and for the convening of an international conference with the participation of the PLO and the permanent members of the Security Council. Peres was furious at Hussein and declared: 'Meeting with a Jordanian–Palestinian delegation without the PLO – yes! To go behind our backs in the US, and enter the back door and sell Arafat with his guns . . . no!'[39] Peres rejected the list of Palestinian delegates submitted by Jordan in July 1985 for negotiations with Israel because it contained top PLO leaders and did not represent the 'Palestinians from the inside.' Peres was eager to solve the Palestinian issue, but not at the expense of Israel's security and interests. He saw in the PLO 'the biggest obstacle to the solution of the Palestinian problem'[40] because the PLO never abandoned its 'strategy of phases' (that is, accepting the creation of a Palestinian state in the West Bank, not to live in peace with Israel but to facilitate the continued struggle against Israel).[41] By January 1986, however, Hussein's efforts to moderate Yasser Arafat's position and bring him to the negotiation table had failed, essentially because Arafat refused to recognize UN Security Council Resolution 242. In a speech to his nation on 22 February 1986 Hussein accused Arafat of reneging on his promise to accept Resolution 242. Hussein declared that he was ending his efforts to bring the PLO to the negotiating table and hinted to the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza that the time had come to think of negotiating a permanent status with Israel and without the PLO. He concluded that Jordan would be 'unable to continue to coordinate politically with the PLO leadership until such time as their words become their bond, characterized by commitment, credibility and constancy.'[42] Peres relates that, during his meeting with Hussein in London on 11 April 1987, Hussein complained that 'The PLO was engaged in terror and effectively rejected all openings for productive negotiations. This mixture, said Hussein, could only offer hopelessness and explosive danger.'[43] As soon as the Hussein–Arafat divorce was officially announced, Peres declared to the Palestinians: 'Arafat has finished the negotiations with Hussein, and you have to decide what you want.'[44] Peres's strategy consisted of returning the Arab-populated areas of the West Bank to Jordan. The territory to be transferred to Jordan would be demilitarized, and Israel would retain its sovereignty over areas of strategic value such as the Jordan Valley. Peres insisted on not creating a military vacuum in the West Bank because 'If we withdraw Israel's security protection, neither freedom not demilitarization will follow in our stead. In our stead will come PLO terrorism. That is the problem. If we were, for example, to leave Hebron, PLO terrorism would enter tomorrow.'[45] Peres opposed

the creation of a Palestinian state because he thought such a state would represent a mortal danger for Israel.[46]

Although the PLO and its allies did everything to hinder Israel's efforts to negotiate the final status of the West Bank with the local Palestinian population and with Jordan (the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine murdered the moderate mayor of Nablus on 2 March 1986 as a warning to other local Palestinian leaders), Peres and Hussein finally agreed, during their meeting in London on 11 April 1987, to negotiate the final status of the West Bank without the PLO. Shamir rejected the Peres–Hussein agreement (the 'London Agreement') because Peres had agreed on the principle of an international conference, although this conference was meant to be purely symbolical and to lead to direct negotiations between the parties. Shamir undoubtedly made a fatal mistake as he ruined the last realistic chance of removing the PLO from the negotiation table. As George Shultz explained: 'King Hussein had no choice but to ask for some sort of international conference to give legitimacy to his role as negotiator for the Palestinians.'[47] Hussein subsequently disclaimed the London Agreement in May 1987. Shultz tried to reach a new agreement, this time between Hussein and Shamir. Both leaders secretly met in London on 18 July 1987, and Shultz worked out a new plan that was similar to the one reached between Peres and Hussein three months earlier. This time, Shamir accepted the plan but Hussein rejected it. Hussein had no trust in Shamir and confessed to Shultz: 'I can't be alone with this man.'[48] Five months later the *intifada* broke out in the West Bank and Gaza. Fearing that it might spread to his kingdom, Hussein publicly announced, in July 1988, that he was cutting Jordan's ties with the West Bank, and that he accepted the claim of the PLO to secede from Jordan as an independent state. Arafat immediately launched an international diplomatic offensive to rebuild his legitimacy. Although Arafat delivered very ambiguous speeches at the European Parliament on 13 September 1988 and at the UN General Assembly on 13 December 1988 on his acceptance of Resolution 242, the Reagan administration decided to 'enter into a substantive dialogue with PLO representatives.' The 'Jordanian option' was over.

The Israeli government was left with three options: 1) negotiate with the PLO; 2) negotiate with an elected Palestinian delegation from the West Bank; 3) maintain the *status quo*. Yossi Beilin advocated the first option, Yitzhak Rabin and Moshe Arens the second, and Yitzhak Shamir the third. Arens explained that Israel was 'looking for new interlocutors on the ground, for people who want a constituency, for people who represent the Palestinian population in the area. Talks with the Palestinians yes, talks with the PLO no.'[49] Arens and Rabin eventually convinced Shamir to come up with a peace plan that would enable direct negotiations between Israel and the local, elected Palestinian leadership. The Israeli cabinet finally approved the 'Israeli Peace Initiative' on 14 May 1989. This peace plan was

very similar to the autonomy plan presented by Begin at the Camp David summit in 1978. While Arens and Rabin were working on establishing a direct relationship with the local Palestinian leadership, the PLO used brutal intimidatory methods to prevent these direct contacts from bearing fruit. Arafat threatened to 'put ten bullets in the chest of anybody who talks about cessation of violence,' and, indeed, the mayor of Nablus, Zafer al-Masri, was shot dead because of his support for direct negotiations between Israel and the local Palestinian leadership. Shamir was not enthusiastic about the Arens–Rabin plan, and sincerely believed that the *status quo* could be maintained forever: 'The idea of autonomy was Begin's, and, of course, it is a lesser evil than a Palestinian state, but personally I would have been better off without Palestinian autonomy. All you need is patience and determination.'[50] Arens, for his part, could not understand how Shamir 'envisioned a resolution of the Arab–Israeli conflict without meaningful contacts with the Palestinians' and regretted that Shamir 'didn't understand, or maybe didn't want to realize, that the obvious alternative to elections would be a non-elected Palestinian delegation, raising the issue of PLO representation and representation for East Jerusalem.' Arens was willing to negotiate with the Palestinians because he realized that the *status quo* was untenable for Israel both morally and strategically. He thought that the 'Iron Wall' strategy had succeeded since the Palestinians were apparently ready to negotiate with Israel. In his view, in the same way that the Revisionist movement had abandoned the claim of establishing a Jewish state over the two sides of the Jordan River after the Holocaust – realizing that with the destruction of European Jewry the *Yishuv* lacked the resources to implement the Revisionist programme – 'so now too we must maintain a reasonable correlation between our objectives and our resources. As a nation dedicated to Western values and ideals, we must live by them not only in Israel itself, but also in dealing with the Palestinian population.'

Although American Secretary of State James Baker 'was very pleased . . . with the Palestinian election,' the left wing of the Labour Party, led by Yossi Beilin, had already initiated a dialogue with the PLO and lobbied for quitting the National Unity Government. Arens complained to Rabin about 'the subversive behaviour of people in his party, notably Peres and his young disciples, who were assiduously operating behind the government's back, whether in talks with Egyptians, contacts with the PLO, or the continued leaking of classified documents to the media. "It has to stop" I said. Rabin didn't argue.'[51] The disagreement between Shamir and Secretary of State Baker over the election modalities in the territories (Baker insisted on including Palestinian residents from East Jerusalem) and over the 'land for peace' principle (Shamir claimed that Israel was under no obligation to give up its sovereignty over the West Bank and Gaza) led to a stalemate. After Labour left the National Unity

Government in March 1990, and with the formation of a right-wing Israeli government in June 1990, the tension between Israel and the Bush administration reached its peak, and Baker publicly castigated Israel, suggesting to Shamir to 'give me a call' when he was serious about negotiating with the Palestinians. This tension was temporarily diverted by the Gulf War, but the outcome of the war affected Israel's strategic stance. The disintegration of Soviet influence in the Middle East and the partial destruction of Iraq's military arsenal lowered Israel's strategic value *vis-à-vis* the United States, and Shamir could barely resist Baker's pressures to organize an international conference. On the other hand, Israel's claim that the PLO should not be included in peace negotiations once again received a favourable echo in Washington. Arafat's support of Saddam Hussein cost the PLO both its political credit in the United States and its financial backing from the Gulf States. Martin Indyk argued in the aftermath of the war that 'PLO setback may combine with the impact of the *Intifada* to shift decisively the balance of power in the Palestinian national movement from the headquarters in Tunis to a local leadership in the territories that would be more responsive to the local populations', and that the 'process of empowering a Palestinian leadership in the territories can develop quickly if it enjoys the backing of the United States and the disengagement of Israel. The ground is fertile in the West Bank and Gaza because of the PLO's failure to advance Palestinian interests.'[52] Shamir obtained from Baker the exclusion of the PLO from the Madrid Conference, and the inclusion of a 'Jordanian–Palestinian' delegation composed of local leaders. However, Shamir himself admitted that the PLO 'pervaded in the ranks of the Palestinian delegation's advisers and spokesmen and was, in fact, active.'[53]

Oslo

Rabin had not deviated from his realist worldview when he yet again became prime minister in July 1992. His primary concern was the security of Israel, which, he believed, could be guaranteed only by negotiating the Allon Plan with an elected Palestinian body disconnected from the PLO. He had formulated together with Moshe Arens the 1989 Israeli peace initiative, and intended to implement this initiative when he became prime minister again. When he presented his government to the Knesset on 13 July 1992, Rabin made it clear that he was not ready to pay any price for peace, indeed not a price that would imperil Israel's security. He confirmed Israel's commitment to the strengthening of 'strategic' settlements in the West Bank ('The Government will continue to enhance and strengthen Jewish settlement along the lines of confrontation, due to their importance for security, and in Greater Jerusalem'),[54] ruled out any negotiation over Jerusalem ('The Government is firm in its resolve that Jerusalem will not be open to negotiation'),[55] warned that Israel would favour its security over

the search for peace ('Security takes preference even over peace'),[56] and vowed that Israel 'will not retreat from the Golan Heights.'[57] Rabin clearly stated that Israel's interests and security needs prevailed over the aspirations and feelings of the Palestinians: 'Instead of learning from their mistakes over generations, instead of accepting what has been offered to them – or at least discuss [it] seriously – the Palestinians are still adhering to "all-or-nothing." If it will be this way, if they are not willing to change their positions, they will ultimately remain with nothing.'[58]

How is it, then, that Rabin came to recognize the PLO and sign with this organization a 'Declaration of Principles' (DOP) that included Jerusalem and the refugees in the negotiations over the final status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? The truth is that Rabin was presented with a *fait accompli* by Yossi Beilin, who had secretly negotiated a deal with the PLO in Norway while the Israeli government was negotiating with the Jordanian–Palestinian delegation in Washington. Beilin began establishing contacts with the PLO in the early 1980s, with the support of Haifa University Professor Yair Hirschfeld (himself a friend of Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, who had received Arafat as a head of state in Vienna in July 1979). Beilin strongly opposed the passing of the 1986 law forbidding contacts between Israeli citizens and PLO representatives, a law which he called 'one of the most reactionary and shameful' in Israel's history. He was one of the only Israeli politicians who praised the decision of the Reagan administration to initiate a dialogue with the PLO in November 1988, and did everything he could to torpedo the efforts of Yitzhak Rabin and Moshe Arens to organize elections in Judea–Samaria and Gaza in 1989. Although in March 1989 Peres himself rejected the proposal of Dutch Foreign Minister Max van der Stuhl to establish a secret negotiation channel with the PLO in Holland, Beilin flew to the Hague three months later to negotiate a declaration of principles with the PLO representative in Holland Hafif Safieh. In August 1990 Beilin met with PLO leaders in Jerusalem and agreed on 'general principles' for future negotiations between Israel and the PLO. Despite the fact that the PLO claimed and praised the failed terrorist attack on an Israeli beach on 30 May 1990, and despite the fact that Arafat fervently supported Saddam during the Gulf War, Beilin maintained that Israel should negotiate with the PLO, a position that was abandoned at the time even by Yossi Sarid. Four days before the general elections in Israel in June 1992 Beilin agreed with Faisal Husseini to set up a secret negotiation track between Israel and the PLO. After the elections, Rabin reluctantly agreed to authorize the nomination of Beilin (whom he derided as 'Peres's poodle') as deputy foreign minister. One of Beilin's first acts after his appointment was to lobby for the repealing of the 1986 law forbidding contacts between Israelis and the PLO. In January 1993 the Knesset repealed the 1986 law – but Rabin did not take part in the vote. Beilin himself relates that Rabin was

opposed to the repealing of the law: 'Rabin was very attached to the differentiation between the PLO and the residents of Judea–Samaria and the Gaza District.' The fact is that when he became prime minister, he was opposed to any dialogue with the PLO, as illustrated by his unwillingness to repeal the 1986 law.' Beilin did not report to Peres and Rabin that secret negotiations had begun in Oslo in December 1992 between Hirschfeld, his colleague Ron Pundak, and PLO official Abu Ala, because he knew that 'Rabin would have stopped the process before it started.' When, in February 1993, Hirschfeld, Pundak and Abu Ala agreed on basic principles for future negotiations between Israel and the PLO, Beilin informed Peres of the secret channel, and Peres informed Rabin.[59] Originally, Peres himself was in shock and called Hirschfeld and Pundack 'crazy.'[60] When he was informed of the secret Oslo channel, Rabin first thought it might help jumpstart the Washington negotiations (between Israel and the Jordanian–Palestinian delegation). Rabin did not take Oslo seriously: he 'was sceptical about the Olso talks; sometimes he wholly disbelieved in them. When asked later why he did not share the secret with any of his close aides, he replied frankly that he doubted anything would come out of Oslo.'[61] But Oslo confronted Rabin with a dilemma: on the one hand, he was opposed to negotiating with the PLO; on the other, he realized that his electoral commitment to reach an agreement with the Palestinians by March 1993 was not realistic. At the same time, Hirschfeld and Pundak were only waiting for his approval to reach an agreement with Abu Ala. In May 1993 (two months after the March 1993 'deadline') Rabin finally agreed to send the director-general of the Foreign Ministry, Uri Savir, to Oslo. However, a few days after his decision, Rabin sent an angry letter to Peres, condemning the Oslo track and complaining that the secret negotiations had been initiated without his knowledge and without consulting the IDF; he also accused the PLO of manipulating Israel in Oslo in order to torpedo the Washington talks. Beilin was struck by 'Rabin's turnaround', for which he had no explanation. In early June 1993 Rabin decided to allow the negotiations in Oslo to start again, and this time decided to involve himself directly in the talks. Once again, Beilin was struck by Rabin's behaviour: 'What happened? We will never understand this turnaround either.' As Beilin relates: 'Until the historical signature, Rabin was torn between his reluctance to recognize the PLO and his willingness to reach a committing agreement with the Palestinians.'[62] Between the recognition of the PLO and his tragic death, Rabin made many contradictory and confusing statements on his perception of the Arab–Israeli conflict. Peres, by contrast, made the bold move of explaining his turnaround in *The New Middle East*, a book he published after the signature of the Oslo accords. According to Peres, he had never actually changed but rather 'realized' that he was living in a 'new world,' which is why he himself became a new man: 'It was not I who shifted course . . . Rather, the world has changed.' In Peres's view, the world

was 'in the throes of a cataclysmic change' whereby 'the division is between those who still live in the old world and those who have set their sails to be directed by new and more powerful winds.' Peres claims that human history has entered, at an unspecified date, a 'new world' which is radically different from the 'old world.' What was true in the 'old world' is no longer true in the 'new world' and vice versa. The 'new world,' Peres maintains, 'has moved beyond having ideological confrontation,' and economic rivalries 'have begun to take the place of military confrontation.' Zionism, the Jewish national movement, was born in the 'old world,' which 'no longer exists.' Unfortunately, most people are still 'unable to grasp the magnitude of the changes' that gave birth to the 'new world.'[63] Israel's security no longer depends on its military strength but on its ability to adapt to the trends of the 'new world.' These trends are: the gradual fading of nationalism ('particularist nationalism is fading and the idea of 'citizen of the world' is taking hold'), the declining importance of borders ('We need soft borders'), the irrelevance of military power ('True power – even military power – is no longer anchored in the boot camp, but on the university campuses'), and the dwindling of national sovereignty ('We do not need to reinforce sovereignty, but rather to strengthen the position of mankind'). According to Peres, peace in the 'New Middle East' will result from a virtuous circle: prosperity will lead to democracy, and democracy will lead to peace: 'Democratization will put an end to the danger to regional and world peace … The higher the standard of living rises, the lower the level of violence will fall.'[64] Peres also subscribes to the Kantian democratic peace theory: 'There is no stable peace unless it is based on relations between democratic states.'[65] In the 'new world,' moreover, 'the physical considerations of the traditional strategy – natural obstacles, man-made structures, troop mobilizations, location of the battlefields – are irrelevant.'[66]

   In other words, the dilemma between realism and idealism has evaporated: Israeli statesmen need not be torn between their concern for Israel's security and their aspiration to achieve peace in a hostile environment. Indeed, natural borders and military power are 'irrelevant' and Israel's security depends on economic development. Moreover, the PLO is no longer opposed to Zionism because the world 'has moved beyond having ideological confrontation' and because 'particularist nationalism is fading.' From Ben-Gurion's fervent disciple, Peres has become a Buberian apostle: Arab and Jewish nationalism are complementary (indeed, they are fading away); military power is an anathema (fortunately, it is no longer relevant); and economic development will foster democratization, which in turn will bring peace.

   Rabin did not share Peres's 'New Middle East' ideology. He was a son of the nationalistic *Ha-kibbutz Ha-meuhad* movement, and a pragmatic general. Despite his many hesitations, he accepted the Oslo track, but from

a realistic point of view. He did not share the ideological assumption of Peres and Beilin that the Arabs and the Middle East had changed. Despite his ideological attachment to the Land of Israel (the *Ha-kibbutz Ha-meuhad* movement had opposed the partition of Palestine), he realized that Israel's presence in the West Bank was untenable in the long run, demographically, economically and ethically. His assessment was that with the implosion of the Soviet Union, the military defeat of Iraq, the improvement of Israel's diplomatic stance, the massive immigration of Soviet Jews, and the diplomatic and financial bankruptcy of the PLO, Arafat would realize that time was playing against him. His was a pragmatic calculation and a calculated risk – not an ideological conversion to Buber's political gospel.

To some extent, Harkabi had a point: that the Greater Israel ideology would eventually undermine the Jewish and democratic foundations of the state of Israel was a fact recognized by the Left and mostly ignored by the Right. But Peres and Beilin departed from Ben-Gurion's realism when they assumed that liberating Israel from the Palestinian quagmire would generate a regional nirvana. It is one thing to admit the demographic reality; it is another to believe that Arab hostility to Zionism has ceased, that Israel can rely on the good intentions of its neighbours, and that Israel can reshape the Middle East into an open society where political and economic freedoms prevail.

ISRAEL ON THE WORLD SCENE

Israel's international status dramatically deteriorated after the Yom Kippur War. The Arab oil embargo damaged Israel's relations with Western Europe, Asia, Latin America and Asia. The Arab states also exploited the oil weapon to create an 'automatic majority' at the UN General Assembly and to use this body to isolate and delegitimize Israel. This policy culminated in the 1975 UN resolution equating Zionism with racism.[67] In addition, the 'triangle' of Israel's 'periphery policy' (Iran–Turkey–Ethiopia) fell apart in the 1970s: Ethiopia became Marxist in 1974, Iran became fundamentalist in 1979, and Turkey was affected by the oil embargo.

Israel could not put an end to this isolation by meeting Arab demands: the PLO and its backers were not calling for a territorial compromise but for the destruction of the Jewish state. Consequently, Israel tried to bypass the Arab strategy by developing military ties with anti-Soviet regimes. Israel enjoyed a comparative advantage in the field of military exports, and many Third World countries needed military support to fight Marxist guerrillas. Under the Carter administration, the United States linked its military assistance to basic respect of human rights, and most anti-Soviet regimes in Latin America and Africa did not meet the US criteria.

Israel thus became a major weapons supplier for military and repressive regimes in the Third World. This position did not suit its moral standards, let alone its ideological aspiration to be 'a light among nations.' Critics of Israeli *Realpolitik* added the post-1973 'arms sales diplomacy' to their list of grievances. But the only other option in the international context of the 1970s and 1980s was for Israel to be a pariah state. As Abba Eban admitted: 'For many years Israel was so starved for friendship that it had to look for it wherever it could be found. We could not have maintained even a restricted foothold in world diplomacy if we had made the acceptance of Israel's social ideals a condition of our friendship.'[68]

Israel and the United States

The 'special relationship' between the US and Israel was never a perfectly harmonious one.[69] In the aftermath of the Yom Kippur War, however, Nixon and Kissinger were interested in 'using Israel to counter the Soviet Union' in the Middle East.[70] Kissinger's strategy was to obtain interim agreements between Israel and its neighbours (first and foremost with Egypt) to weaken the Soviet presence in the Middle East. Rabin was also in favour of pulling Egypt and other Arab states out of the Soviet camp, and he knew that Israel had to pay a territorial price for the success of this strategy. But, as opposed to Kissinger, he was in no hurry: after the trauma of the Yom Kippur War; his first priority was to rebuild Israel's military strength and deterrence. Only then would Israel negotiate with its neighbours – this time from a position of strength. These two agendas eventually clashed and Kissinger blamed Rabin for the failure of his efforts to reach a second disengagement agreement between Israel and Egypt. President Ford even announced that the United States would 'reassess' its relations with Israel. The threat was efficient, and Israel signed the Sinai II Agreement in 1975. Rabin wanted more time than Kissinger was willing to grant him, but he shared his strategy. Kissinger wanted to sever the relationship between the Soviet Union and the Arab states because he believed that this relationship was the main obstacle to a settlement of the Arab–Israeli conflict. His was a *Realpolitik* strategy in which the Soviet Union had to be defeated.

Jimmy Carter's worldview was totally different. For him the East–West confrontation involved but one element of what he defined as a 'multidimensional environment.' While Kissinger had a realist *Weltanschauung*, Carter had a liberal approach to foreign policy. Regional conflicts, among them the Arab–Israeli conflict, should therefore be dealt with regardless of the Soviet–American rivalry, namely 'by taking into account local and regional realities and no longer, as in Kissinger's days, by applying [to them] the yardstick of the Soviet–American contest.'[71] Thus, while for Kissinger the Geneva conference was a mere facade for a bilateral diplomacy aimed at turning the moderate Arab regimes away from Soviet

influence, Carter believed in reviving the Geneva formula so as to associate the Soviet Union with the Middle East peace process. This position worried Rabin, who 'viewed the Soviet Union encroachment in the Middle East as a dangerous development that played a destructive role in the Arab–Israeli conflict.'[72] Carter was also the first American president to advocate Israeli recognition of the PLO. Thus, the disagreement between Carter and Rabin over the question of the territories captured by Israel in 1967 became a persistent source of friction between the United States and Israel.

Begin's ideological commitment to the integrity of the Land of Israel did not coincide with American interests in the Middle East. Although, as Begin himself recalled in January 1978, Carter had declared that Israel's peace plan revealed 'a great deal of flexibility,'[73] the president never espoused Begin's autonomy plan, and had a totally different approach to the resolution of the Palestinian issue. While Begin was confident on his way to Camp David that he would not have to uproot Jewish settlements in Sinai in order to reach an agreement with Egypt, Carter pressured him to change his position on the matter, and made it clear that Israel had to choose between Israeli settlements in Sinai and the United States' friendship.[74] The 'differences of opinion' deplored by Begin almost turned into a confrontation in December 1978 when the US openly supported the Egyptian demands regarding the draft of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. The disagreement between the United States and Israel was further illustrated by the fierce opposition of the Carter administration to the building of Jewish settlements in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Reagan shared Begin's Hobbesian worldview and anti-Soviet feelings. For Reagan, Israel constituted the forefront of the war against the Soviet Union and its allies in the Middle East. The community of interests and ideology between the Begin government and the Reagan administration created a new partnership between Israel and the United States. Indeed, the two countries signed in 1981 a Memorandum of Understanding on Strategic Co-operation, essentially aimed at the Soviet Union. This co-operation went beyond the Middle East and sometimes beyond common sense, as illustrated by the 'Iran–Contra' affair. Not that the US–Israel relationship under Reagan was devoid of friction: US arms sales to Saudi Arabia in 1981, Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights the same year, and the Pollard affair in 1985 confirmed that, even among friends, interests do not always match. But by launching the 1982 Lebanon War and by breaching the US–Israeli agreement on limited Israeli intervention in Lebanon, Israel alienated the US. The United States consequently reassessed its Middle East policy, and in September 1982 called on Israel to fully implement the Camp David agreements and begin negotiating the final status of the West Bank with an elected Palestinian leadership. By that time, Begin had foregone his Camp David commitment to negotiate the final status of the West Bank. Begin was eager to remind America that

the Jewish state was the only counter-force to Soviet expansionism in the Middle East, but he could not admit that the United States had other interests in the region besides supporting Israel, and that being Israel's friend did not imply approving the 'Greater Israel' ideology, let alone approving the siege of Beirut or the annexation of the Golan.

The contending visions between the US and Israel over the legality of Jewish settlements in the West Bank led to unprecedented tension under the Bush administration. James Baker surprised the Israeli government when he declared: 'lay aside, once and for all, the unrealistic vision of a Greater Israel … Stop settlement activity.'[75] After the Gulf War, President Bush refused to sign a $10 billion loan guarantee without an Israeli commitment to freeze all settlement activity in the West Bank, thus making it clear that Israel had to chose between ideology and American assistance. Clearly, Shamir's Greater Israel ideology had become a source of tension in the US–Israel relationship. Shamir favoured ideology ('Should I sell my country for money?'),[76] but the Bush ultimatum proved that the dilemma between ideology and realism was not only theoretical. The end of the Cold War diminished Israel's strategic value *vis-à-vis* the United States: recognizing that fact required a realistic assessment of the new international reality.

Israel and Europe

Israel's relations with Western Europe reached a low point in the aftermath of the Yom Kippur War, as explained by Avner Yaniv: 'Although there were individual variations, European reactions to the fourth Arab–Israeli war manifested, in the aggregate, an undeniable switch from a previously neutral to pro-Israeli stance to one ranging between neutrality and pro-Arabism.'[77] The degeneration of the Israeli–European relationship during and after the Yom Kippur War was mainly due to the oil embargo and was first illustrated by the total ban on military exports to the belligerents declared by France and Britain. Since the Arab states were totally dependent on Soviet arms anyway, this decision primarily affected Israel. Moreover, while France did not oppose the transfer of the French-made Mirage aircrafts from Libya to Egypt, its foreign minister, Michel Jobert, defined the Egyptian–Syrian surprise attack as 'an attempt by someone to return to his own home from which he was forcibly ejected.'[78] France's hostile policy was further illustrated by President Giscard d'Estaing's support for the admission of the PLO into various international organizations as well as for the invitation to Yasser Arafat to address the UN General Assembly in 1974, and the opening in Paris of a PLO office in 1975. West Germany, for its part, forbade Israeli vessels docking on its coasts to receive arms supplies from American depots in Germany during the Yom Kippur War. The nine governments of the European Economic Community rejected an official US request to allow an American airlift to Israel to land on European territory. Furthermore, the Council of Ministers

of the European Economic Community issued a declaration endorsing the French version of Resolution 242 of the Security Council.[79] As far as Western Europe was concerned, the Arab oil embargo worked beyond the hopes of its initiators.

France was the main driving force behind the European post-1973 pro-Arab policy. Since the first days of the Fifth Republic France's foreign policy grew increasingly divorced from that of the United States. This was particularly true in the Middle East, where France openly challenged US strategy. In the aftermath of the Yom Kippur War, Kissinger worked on convincing Arab states to abandon their support for the Soviet Union and to sign peace agreements with Israel. His primary focus was Egypt. France adopted the opposite strategy: it supported the PLO, built a nuclear plant in Iraq (an oil-exporting country barely in need of an alternative source of energy), and did not oppose Syria's invasion of Lebanon. France was the only Western country that supported, in October 1974, the Arab-sponsored decision of the UN General Assembly to invite Arafat. That same month, France's foreign minister, Jean Sauvagnargues, was the first high-ranking Western official to meet Arafat in Beirut. This meeting took place four months after the adoption of the 'phased plan' by the PLO in Cairo in June 1974 which called for the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip only to facilitate the destruction of Israel. Israel was shocked by the fact that France had decided to become the PLO's international advocate after this organization had declared that its aim was to eliminate Israel in stages, the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip being one stage in the implementation of that strategy. In January 1977 France released Abu-Daoud (thus violating its extradition agreement with Israel), the Palestinian terrorist responsible for the murder of 11 Israeli athletes in Munich in 1972. Abu-Daoud's lawyer, Roland Dumas, became France's foreign minister in 1984.

Within the European Economic Community (EEC) France pushed for the adoption of its Middle East diplomatic stance. The combination of the Arab oil embargo and of France's diplomatic pressure generated a pro-Arab shift among those European countries that were traditionally neutral or pro-Israel (West Germany and Holland). On 6 November 1973 the EEC published a 'common declaration' calling for a total and unconditional Israeli withdrawal to the 1949 ceasefire lines – a call that was consistent neither with UN Security Council Resolution 242 nor with Israel's security. Abba Eban commented at the time that this 'declaration' might bring oil to Europe but not peace to the Middle East.

The Camp David agreements were a victory for the United States' Middle East strategy and a failure for France's attempts to promote the PLO. Indeed, France did not approve of these agreements, arguing that they failed to address 'the real issue.' Realizing that Camp David had succeeded in marginalizing France and the PLO from the Middle East,

the French government decided to lobby within the EEC for a European policy that would grant legitimacy to the PLO. France's diplomatic efforts eventually bore fruit: on 13 June 1980 the EEC published its Venice Declaration, calling for a recognition of the PLO and for PLO participation in the Middle East peace process. This was the first time that Western governments had officially called for recognizing the PLO, and the first time that the EEC had officially tried to torpedo the Camp David process. Former British Prime Minister Edward Heath claimed that it was absurd to call for Israeli recognition of the PLO as long as the PLO refused to recognize Israel and UN Security Council Resolution 242. Abba Eban commented that: 'Having placed a parochial and mercantile approach above Israel's survival and Western solidarity, Europe could not expect to be taken seriously as a disinterested conciliator … It is legitimate for Europe to hope for a change in the Palestinian attitude towards Israel's sovereignty and safety. But you do not produce a change by pretending that it has happened when it has not even begun to occur.'[80]

Begin was even blunter about his feelings towards Europe's Middle East policy. When he publicly announced in the summer of 1977 that Israel was providing military aid to the Christians in Southern Lebanon, he openly criticized the Europeans (especially the French) for abandoning their martyred co-religionists in order not to upset their oil suppliers: 'Christian France, having been a patron of the Maronites for ages, now sold them down the river. The only materialistic calculation is how to find favour with those who have the oil.'[81] Begin publicly wondered why President Giscard d'Estaing was so worried about the 'legitimate rights' of the Palestinians, but did not recognize such rights with regard to Corsica or Brittany: 'Was the promise of self-determination for the peoples of Corsica and Brittany ever given perhaps by Mr. Giscard d'Estaing? I, for one, have never heard about such French proposals. Is, perhaps, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing intransigent?'[82] Begin personally attacked Giscard d'Estaing on a number of occasions, declaring that the French president had 'no principles whatsoever. Only to sell weapons to the Arabs and to buy oil from them.'[83] Begin was pleased by Mitterrand's election in 1981, but irritated by the statements of the new French foreign minister Claude Cheysson on the need to create a PLO-led state in the West Bank. When Begin reiterated his suggestion that France grant an autonomy regime to Corsica, similar to the one Israel had offered the Palestinians, Mitterrand stated during a government meeting: 'Begin's statement didn't shock me. Corsica after all, is French only since 1768; it is more recent than the days of Abraham! Although annoying, Begin's remark was a good one.'[84]

In the 1980s relations between Israel and Europe were further complicated by the admission of Greece, Spain and Portugal to the EEC. When Greece joined the EEC in 1981 it did not have diplomatic relations with Israel but was a firm supporter of the PLO. The PLO had a diplomatic

representation in Athens, and the then Greek prime minister, Papandreou, both condemned the Camp David agreements and compared Israel's military intervention in Lebanon to that of the Nazis in Eastern Europe. When Spain and Portugal joined the EEC in 1986 they did not have diplomatic relations with Israel either. Being major citrus producers, these two countries challenged Israeli exports to the EEC.

Paradoxically, despite Europe's pro-Arab stance and rhetoric, economic co-operation between Europe and Israel grew after the Yom Kippur War: in May 1975 Israel and the EEC signed a free-trade agreement that considerably fostered the level of trade between the two partners. Behind the political antagonism, Israel and the EEC maintained strong economic relations, although the EEC tried to use its economic leverage on Israel for political motives. Until Israel's recognition of the PLO in August 1993 the EEC refused to upgrade its economic ties with Israel. Rabin lamented the fact that the EEC 'hinders improving our trade balance for political considerations that have led them not to update the 1975 trade agreement.'[85]

Israel, the Soviet Bloc and the Former Soviet Empire

Though the Soviet Union armed Egypt and Syria during the Yom Kippur War, Sadat's post-war policy weakened Soviet influence in the Middle East. Sadat realized that he would not recover Sinai through Soviet armament but through American pressure on Israel and, eventually, an American-brokered peace agreement between Egypt and Israel. The Soviet Union reacted to Sadat's move by reinforcing its support for the PLO – which did not augur well for a possible Soviet–Israeli rapprochement.

Officially, Israeli leaders were not willing to withhold their vociferous advocacy of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, although this policy constituted but another obstacle to Soviet–Israeli *détente*. For instance, when the Soviet Union offered, in September 1977, to conditionally renew its diplomatic ties with Israel, Begin replied that Israel's condition to the renewal of such ties was the liberation of the 'Prisoners of Zion.'[86] Similarly, Peres did not hesitate to upset the Soviet regime when he declared to the UN General Assembly in 1985: 'Let our people go! Empty the prisons of people whose sole crime is loyalty to Jewish tradition and pursuit of the Zionist dream … This call exceeds ordinary political considerations.'[87] On the other hand, while Israeli governments knew that *détente* was a necessary precondition for the increase of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, they were also aware that Israel's strategic value *vis-à-vis* the United States was proportionate to the level of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union.

With the signature of the Soviet–Syrian friendship and co-operation treaty in October 1980, the Arab–Israeli conflict polarized around the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This polarization was confirmed by the strategic agreement signed between Israel and the United States in November 1981. The Soviet Union warned Israel that this agreement would jeopardize further Jewish emigration from the USSR to Israel.[88]

Paradoxically, the Lebanon War contributed to a certain rapprochement between the Soviet Union and Israel. Initially, the Soviets provided weapons to Syria and the PLO (including SAM-5 missiles to Syria), and the United States gave its consent to a limited Israeli operation in Southern Lebanon. Eventually, however, the Soviet disappointment with its Arab clients and Israel's annoyance at the United States (with the publication of the 'Reagan plan') created the conditions for a Soviet–Israeli rapprochement. Brezhnev was struck by the enormity of the Arab defeat and failed to appreciate that, because of it, the Soviet Union had no leverage on the situation and had to stand by while the United States was arranging the departure of the PLO from Beirut. Begin, for his part, was furious with Reagan for issuing a peace plan that stole from Israel the fruits of victory and had been elaborated without any consultation with Israel. Following the publication of the 'Reagan plan', Begin 'threatened' to renew Israel's diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Ironically Israel was interested in maintaining a limited Soviet influence in the Middle East, despite Moscow's support for Syria and rebuff of Israeli overtures. As explained by an expert on Israel–Soviet relations, 'While anti-Soviet, Israel prefers a Soviet role in the area as it enhances Israel's own values as an American strategic asset and thereby contributes to Congressional willingness to extend economic and military assistance.'[89]

Soviet–Israeli relations improved only with the *perestroika* policy of Mikhail Gorbachev. Moscow began to show more flexibility on the issue of Jewish emigration to Israel (Natan Sharansky was released in 1986), and in 1989 it lifted its ban on the emigration of Soviet Jews. In 1987 the Soviet Union and Israel exchanged consular representatives, and in 1991 the countries resumed diplomatic relations (these relations did not last long: the Soviet Union was dissolved a few months later).

The Camp David accords were a blow to Soviet influence in the Middle East. In addition, the Soviet economy began to collapse, precisely when the Reagan administration compelled the Soviet regime to compete with the 'Star Wars' programme and to raise its defence expenses. Gorbachev had no choice but to call for a pause, and to cut Soviet financial support for its Middle East clients. Israel benefited from this change. In April 1988 Gorbachev pressured Arafat to recognize Israel and to accept UN Security Council Resolution 242. In 1989 the Soviet Union voted against the upgrading of the PLO's status at the UN and against the admission of the PLO to the World Health Organization (WHO), and in 1991 it voted in favour of repealing the 1975 UN General Assembly resolution equating Zionism with racism. During the 1991 Gulf War the Soviet Union and

the PLO joined opposite camps. Meanwhile, Soviet Jews were emigrating en masse to Israel. In 1992 Russian President Boris Yeltsin supported Israel's position not to admit the PLO to the peace process. For Arafat, the good old days of the Cold War were over.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 Israel developed economic and strategic relations with the former Soviet republics of Central Asia. Four main concerns motivated this policy: 1) prevention of the export of nuclear material and weapons from these republics to the Middle East; 2) containment of the expansion of Iranian Islamism to that region; 3) facilitation of the immigration of the 200,000 Jews living in these republics; 4) the Central Asian Republics needed technical support and advice in agriculture and irrigation, and Israel had a comparative advantage in these fields. Israel established diplomatic relations with the newly independent republics in 1992–93, and Kirghizstan became the first Muslim country to open an embassy in Jerusalem.

Israel and Asia

Since its exclusion from the Bandung Conference in 1955, Israel had failed to establish diplomatic relations with Asia's two largest powers, China and India. China not only sided with the Arab world and the PLO, but did not recognize Israel's right to exist even within the 1949 cease-fire lines. The *Peking Review* wrote on 7 November 1969 that 'Palestinian fighters are active in all the occupied Israeli territories, including Tel Aviv, Haifa, Eilat and Jerusalem.' In 1970 the leader of the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, George Habash, admitted that China 'wants Israel erased from the map.'[90] In the early 1970s, however, China's policy towards Israel began to change. Chinese–Soviet rivalry deteriorated, the United States exploiting this rivalry and initiating a rapprochement policy with China (Communist China replaced Taiwan as a Security Council permanent member in 1971). The Soviet Union became China's foremost enemy, and Israel was the major anti-Soviet country in the Middle East. In December 1973 the CIA estimated that 'Beijing's vital interest is to block the Soviet penetration from Southeast Asia to Europe, and to the extent that Israel stands in the way of Soviet dominance in the Middle East, China supports Israeli efforts.' In June 1974 Senator Henry Jackson confirmed to Rabin that Beijing was very impressed by Israel's efforts to upset Soviet expansionism in the Middle East.

In 1975 Chinese Prime Minister Chou En-Lai called for 'four modernizations' (in agriculture, industry, science and technology, and national defence). As far as national defence was concerned, China could rely neither on the West nor on the Soviet Union, which had ceased to provide weapons to China in the early 1960s. In contrast, Israel was already known for being a major weapon exporter, and an expert at upgrading the Soviet weaponry it had captured in 1956, 1967, 1973

and 1982 from the Arab armies. Incidentally, China had a stock of outdated Soviet military equipment badly in need of improvement.[91]

Mao died in 1976, and his successor, Deng Xiaoping, initiated a policy of economic reform, military modernization, and co-operation with the West. China started to enquire about Israeli military technology in the mid-1970s. China's request fitted Israel's post-1973 policy of avoiding diplomatic isolation and the Arab boycott by developing military ties with anti-Soviet regimes. For Israel, the establishment of an informal relationship with China through military and commercial co-operation was a decisive step in weakening the friendship between China and the radical Arab regimes.

In addition to the new military relationship with Israel, the fact that the United States and China established formal diplomatic relations in 1979 probably influenced China's Middle East policy. Incidentally, during an official visit to Cairo in 1982, the Chinese prime minister declared that 'all the Middle East countries including Israel' should enjoy 'the rights of independence and existence . . . on the basis of the Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 and the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people.' China's official recognition of Israel's right to exist constituted a change. Israel became a major arms provider for China.[92] According to one estimate, Israeli military sales to China totalled some $4 billion between 1976 and 1988.[93] The military and commercial links between Israel and China were facilitated by the initiatives of Israeli business tycoon Saul Eisenberg, who organized the visit of an Israeli delegation to China in April 1979.[94] According to US sources, Israel had become 'the most important supplier of advanced military technology to China' by 1990.[95]

By the mid- and late 1980s open contacts were established between Chinese and Israeli officials. In September 1987 Foreign Minister Peres met with his Chinese counterpart at the UN. Peres insisted that China could not reasonably call for an international conference for the Middle East and hope to play a role in the region without recognizing Israel. The collapse of the Soviet Union also convinced the Chinese leadership that China could not fill the void of Soviet influence in the Middle East without recognizing the main actors in that region. In January 1992 China and Israel established full diplomatic relations.

The post-1973 Israeli strategy of developing military ties with anti-Soviet regimes could not be applied to India, which was a pro-Soviet country. And indeed, relations between Israel and India began to improve only with the end of the Cold War. Like China, India established full diplomatic relations with Israel in January 1992. Israel and India started to develop an intelligence and military relationship in the early 1990s. Embroiled in a protracted conflict in Kashmir, India was interested in Israel's expertise in fighting terrorism.

For Israel, Japan was the major Asian casualty of the post-1973 Arab oil embargo. Japan had maintained good relations with Israel since 1952, but it was also totally dependent on Arab oil, and its Middle East policy changed accordingly. Japan did not go as far as to sever diplomatic relations with Israel (probably because of American warnings), but it did give in to Arab pressures by calling on 22 November 1973 for a total and unconditional Israeli withdrawal to the 1949 ceasefire lines. Japan also permitted the opening of a PLO office in Tokyo in 1977, and the Japanese themselves joked about the fact that in Japanese the word *Arabu* (pro-Arab) is strikingly similar to the word *Abura* (pro-oil).

Other Asian countries followed a similar diplomatic line, and Israel replied with her policy of arms supply. Beginning in the late 1970s, Israel sold weapons to Japan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan and Hong Kong.[96]

Israel and Latin America

Latin America was less affected by the oil embargo than Europe and Japan, but affected nevertheless. In 1973 Venezuela and Ecuador were OPEC members and were influenced by this organization's political motivations. Brazil imported a significant part of its oil supplies from the Middle East. Latin America's voting pattern at the UN General Assembly became overtly pro-Arab.

However, as opposed to African states, Latin American states did not sever diplomatic relations en masse with Israel following the Yom Kippur War (with the exception of Cuba and Guyana). In the aftermath of that war, Latin America remained the only part of the Third World where Israel maintained a diplomatic presence. This presence was strategically important for two main reasons: three Latin American states were oil exporters (Mexico, Venezuela, Ecuador) and, Cuba aside, Latin America was an anti-Soviet stronghold in the Third World and therefore a natural candidate for the post-1973 Israeli 'arms sale diplomacy.'

With the Khomeini revolution in Iran in 1979 and the total withdrawal from Sinai in 1982, Israel lost its only oilfield and its main oil supplier, leaving it with access to merely 10 per cent of the international oil market. Moreover, Israel had not obtained from Egypt long-term binding oil shipment guarantees following the final implementation of the peace treaty between the two countries. Consequently, in the early 1980s Latin America became Israel's main oil supplier (in 1982 Mexico alone supplied 82 per cent of Israel's oil imports). The maintenance of good relations with Latin America was therefore of primary importance. Most Latin American countries were also interested in maintaining close military relations with Israel. The anti-communist regimes of Latin America saw in Israel the forefront of Western resistance to communism. As one commentator observed: 'The Latin American military is fervently anticommunist

and tends to perceive Israel as the guardian of Western civilization in the face of leftist terrorists and Soviet-backed Arab regimes.'[97]

Israel started to massively sell weapons to Latin America in 1975. In the 1980s Latin America was Israel's largest market for arms sales. According to some estimates, in 1980 one-third of Israel's total arms sales ($1.2 billion) went to Argentina and El Salvador alone. With the exception of Nicaragua since the Sandinist revolution in 1979, every country in Central America purchased weapons from Israel. The *New York Times* reported in 1982 that Israel was the world's largest supplier of infantry equipment to El Salvador and Guatemala.

Israel's arms industry benefited from Carter's human rights policy in Central America. The Carter administration issued a ban on military credits to El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua because of the human rights violations in these countries. Following Carter's ban, Israel became the major arms supplier of Central American States. Israel depended on Latin American oil and Latin America depended on Israeli weapons. In 1980 Israel was supplying 80 per cent of El Salvador's weapons. The army and regime of President Somoza of Nicaragua also relied on Israeli weapons after the ban of the Carter administration. Until the collapse of Somoza's regime in July 1979, Israel became Somoza's main weapons supplier. After the Sandinist victory over Somoza's regime, Israel continued to support militarily Somoza's followers (the Contras) operating from Honduras, Costa Rica and El Salvador. The Sandinist–PLO relationship began in 1969, and one of the first decisions of the Sandinist government in 1982 was to sever Nicaragua's diplomatic relations with Israel. The Iran–Contra affair in 1986 revealed the depth of the co-operation between Israel and the Reagan administration in fighting pro-Soviet forces in Latin America. These arms sales significantly helped Israel to finance her oil imports from Latin America.[98]

Israel's military ties with the anti-Soviet yet very unenlightened regimes of Latin America generated a heated public debate in Israel. Should *Realpolitik* be devoid of moral considerations? Did Israel have a choice in the hostile international environment of the 1970s and 1980s? Even Abba Eban expressed concern about Israeli arms sales to Guatemala and El Salvador, though it was Rabin's Labour government that initiated this policy in 1974.[99]

Israel and Africa

Israel began its 'diplomatic offensive' in Africa in 1956. The development of relations with Africa was made possible by the opening of the Tiran Straits (following the 1956 war) and was aimed at strengthening Israel's diplomatic presence around the hostile Middle East. In the 1960s Israel was deeply involved in Africa's economic and technological development. The 1967 Six-Day War somewhat affected this relationship

(Egypt is an African country) without severing it. In the early 1970s the geopolitical balance of the African continent changed: many African countries began developing ties with the Soviet Union and China, and some became Marxist regimes. Israel did not benefit from this change. In parallel, the Arab states began to invest diplomatic efforts in the African continent as a counterweight to Israel's presence. Libya and Saudi Arabia used their financial leverage on the African states to damage their relations with Israel. This strategy succeeded. Official statements of the OUA (Organization of African Unity) became increasingly hostile to Israel, and African states began to sever diplomatic relations with Israel: Chad, Congo and Uganda in 1972; Burundi, Mali, Togo and Niger in 1973 (before the Yom Kippur War). As Muammar Qaddhafi gloated: 'Libya has succeeded within two years in isolating Israel from Africa … Seventeen African countries severed their relations with the Jewish state due to our efforts.'[100]

It is the Yom Kippur War, however, that sealed the diplomatic divorce between Israel and Africa: 20 African states severed relations with Israel during and after the war. Only Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland and Mauritius did not follow suit. The threat of an oil embargo and the financial blackmail of the Arab states did wonders. Even those African states which had no interests or reasons to cut ties with Israel and felt confident enough to resist the pressures from the Arab states became isolated. For instance, President Senghor of Senegal initially criticized the cowardliness of the African countries; so did President Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast. Liberia was also uncomfortable with the sudden alacrity to join the anti-Israel camp, and as a Liberian diplomat admitted: 'If others had stood with us then we could have withstood the pressures, but we couldn't do it alone.' Ethiopia and Nigeria, the last two African countries that stood firm in the face of the Arab pressures, eventually chose to join the stream. Senegal did not resist the general trend either, and as President Léopold Sedar Senghor admitted: 'The Arabs have the numbers, space and oil. In the Third World they outweigh Israel.'[101]

For Israel, the massive severance of diplomatic relations with Black Africa was a bitter blow. Abba Eban called the African move a 'gross betrayal of international friendship and goodwill,' and the *Jerusalem Post* wrote that 'the taste of betrayal at a time of crisis will remain.'[102] Israel responded to this betrayal and diplomatic isolation with the developing of military and economic ties with South Africa. Even the liberal Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* called for a normalization of Israel's relations with South Africa after 1973, arguing that South Africa had shown unreserved support for Israel during the war, as opposed to the rest of the continent. Israel's ambassador to the UN, Chaim Herzog, also recommended that Israel improve her relations with South Africa.[103] An Israeli official was quoted as saying that 'For years we spent millions in Black Africa on

various projects, including building up their armies … What was the result? In the course of less than two years, 1972 and 1973, one after the other broke relations with us. Bought off by Arab money. So today we make friends where we can and however we can.'[104] In 1974 Israel upgraded its diplomatic relations with South Africa and appointed an ambassador to Pretoria. Israel ceased to support anti-South Africa resolutions at the United Nations General Assembly. In April 1976 the South African prime minister paid an official state visit to Israel. According to one source, South Africa was the largest buyer of Israeli arms in 1980, accounting for 35 per cent of Israel's total arms exports.[105] Israel and South Africa were also suspected of co-operating in the nuclear field. Israeli Defence Minister Ezer Weizmann visited South Africa in March 1980, and the CIA asserted in June 1980 that Israel and South Africa had jointly tested a nuclear bomb in the South Atlantic.

Israel's policy towards South Africa was controversial, and indeed led to sharp disagreements among the Israeli public and within the cabinet itself. On the one hand, former Foreign Ministry Director-General David Kimche criticized this policy on moral grounds: 'Do you really seek to see Israel, or more correctly, Israel's image as one which leans solely on the US, on Western Europe and with good relations with South Africa's racist, despotic regime, and perhaps several other similar regimes?'[106] On the other hand, the former head of Israel's military intelligence, Shlomo Gazit, justified that very policy in terms of lack of choice and national interest: 'Israel is in a state of war and has been for the last thirty-six years. We are under tremendous pressure. We can't allow ourselves the luxury of refusing cooperation, of receiving political, economic and scientific help or support from any party that could be of assistance to us. If cooperation with South Africa helps Israel, I'm for it.'[107]

Yitzhak Rabin (who was minister of defence between 1984 and 1990 and had initiated the policy of rapprochement with South Africa in 1974 while prime minister) was in favour of maintaining this policy, while Foreign Ministry Director-General Yossi Beilin opposed it. Rabin was sensitive to the fact that, because of South Africa's high priority on military preparedness against external threat, it purchased fighter crafts, missiles and patrol boats, which were Israeli specialties.[108] Rabin was also concerned about South Africa's large Jewish community, and feared that going too far in applying sanctions to South Africa might endanger the status and safety of the Jews living there. Eventually, the 'anti-South Africa' tendency within the government prevailed because of US pressures. In October 1986 the US Congress passed the Anti-Apartheid Act, which forbade US military assistance to countries engaged in military transactions with South Africa. Fearing penalties under this law, the Israeli government announced a set of measures against South Africa in March 1987 (consisting essentially of banning military sales to Pretoria, and limiting

tourist and cultural ties between the two countries). In September 1987 the Israeli government imposed additional sanctions on South Africa: Israeli officials were forbidden to travel to the country, Israel ceased to serve as a transit station for South African goods and imposed an embargo on oil and steel imports from South Africa, and a special fund was set up to allow black South Africans to attend training courses in Israel. In November 1987 Israel voted for the first time in two decades against South Africa in the United Nations General Assembly.[109] Not that Israel's military exports to South Africa were proportionally higher than those of other enlightened weapons exporters such as the United States and France, Britain or Germany. In 1980 France provided half of South Africa's military equipment. Israel's policy towards South Africa was neither more nor less hypocritical than that of the West – outrage in public, business in private.

Despite Israel's new co-operation with South Africa, the unofficial military and economic ties with Black Africa continued. Israel applied its post-1973 'arms sales diplomacy' to Africa, including South Africa. Officially, the Africans protested, but they were interested in maintaining and even increasing their military ties with Israel. The African states soon came to realize that the Arabs were more willing to share their enemies than their oil. Moreover, they were threatened by Libya's expansionist and destabilizing policy in Africa in the 1980s, and the best help they could get to counter Qaddhafi's ambitions was from the Reagan administration and the Begin government. Finally, the Camp David agreements took away from the African states their official reason for boycotting Israel (the 'occupation of African land' in Sinai): if Egypt had recognized Israel, why could not the rest of the African continent follow suit?

The Israeli 're-conquest' of Africa was led by Defence Minister Ariel Sharon and by the Director-General of the Foreign Ministry, David Kimche. Sharon's objective was to create an Israeli sphere of interest around the Middle East, a 'security belt' from Africa to Iran. Israel intensified its military sales to the Central African Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaire, Zambia, Gabon, Chad, Liberia, and even Morocco.[110] None of these regimes was enlightened, and, as the Israeli daily *Ma'ariv* asked in an editorial on the relations between Israel and Zaire: 'Do we have to give military know-how and defence plans to a country … which is hardly an example of democracy and moral values?'[111] But Israel's policy worked: by the late 1980s Israel had renewed diplomatic ties with all the African states that had severed them in 1973. Israel's diplomatic isolation in Africa was over. In addition, with the end of the apartheid regime in South Africa in the early 1990s, the relations with that country ceased to constitute a moral issue.

CONCLUSION

David Ben-Gurion died in 1973, a year of trauma, anger and disenchantment. His legacy and his successors were accused of being the cause of the war, which, said the critics, could have been avoided. What came under attack was not only a policy, but a strategy, a worldview based on deterrence and caution.

Ben-Gurion was a Jewish nationalist and a political realist. He recognized the limits of human power and knew when to bow to reality. He was wary of human nature. His realism led him to make decisions and adopt policies that ran counter to his beliefs without betraying them. Notwithstanding his yearning for peace, he understood that the state of Israel had to be established and defended by force. In September 1948 he resisted the ideological temptation of conquering Judea and Samaria out of concern for the demographic viability of the Jewish state. He accepted the two bitter truths that were unacceptable to dogmatic ideologists of both Right and Left – that the partition of the Land of Israel was inevitable, and that peace with the Palestinians was impossible.

The Yom Kippur War understandably caused pain and disillusionment to the generation that fought it and suffered from it. But it did not invalidate the accuracy of Ben-Gurion's assumptions. On the contrary, Anwar Sadat would not have made peace with Israel had he not lost this war. Nevertheless, the Rousseauistic Left and the Nietzschean Right emerged with vigour from Ben-Gurion's crumbling legacy. Political realism came under attack precisely when Israel's foreign policy was compelled to set aside moral considerations for the sake of national survival. In the hostile and cynical international context that followed the Yom Kippur War, Israel had to play the rules of the game to defend its vital interests. Israel could not be innocent in a world that was not innocent. Yet this very policy choice added to the list of grievances and accusations of the generation that rebelled against Ben-Gurion's strategy.

The ideological heirs of both Israel Eldad and Martin Buber benefited from the confusion and the search for quick solutions that emerged from the 1973 trauma, and they were both given a chance to experiment with their ideologies. Palestinian extremism made compromise impossible, which enabled Yitzhak Shamir to try and jeopardize the partition of the Land of Israel. But his cult of 'Eretz Israel' was powerless to change the demographic reality. With the end of the Cold War, the Arabs lost their military and financial backing, and the United States lost its patience for Shamir's caprices. A new, more favourable international reality had emerged.

Israelis were aware of this new reality, and were ready to seize its opportunities. But in 1992 they did not vote for the 'New Middle East': they elected a pragmatic former general who was willing to compromise

and was not naïve. The Oslo process was conceived by Rabin's political opponents and was based on an ideology that constituted the opposite of the 'Iron Wall' strategy, which had always been his. Rabin eventually endorsed Oslo not because he had failed to reach an agreement with the Palestinians through the Washington talks but also because he believed that Arafat had no better option and had finally fractured his head against Israel's 'Iron Wall.' This assessment was reasonable. Arafat's traditional backers had lost their power: the Soviet Union had imploded, and Iraq had been militarily defeated. His most faithful diplomatic supporters had established official relations with Israel (the Soviet Union in 1991, China and India in 1992), and were pressuring him to become more realistic. After the Gulf War, Saudi Arabia cut its financial support and the PLO was on the verge of bankruptcy. The United States wrote Arafat off because of his support for Saddam Hussein. And the massive immigration of Soviet Jews seemed to turn the demographic tables on the Palestinians. In such a context, Arafat understood that time was against him.

But his perception of time eventually changed again. Azzam Pasha, first secretary-general of the Arab League, once said: 'We have a secret weapon which we can use better than guns, and this is time.'[112] Tragically, Rabin's assessment proved correct in the short run but wrong over the long run, because Arafat's perception of time changed again as the troubled international system of the mid- and late 1990s raised new hopes for him. His decision to sign the Oslo accords was tactical, not strategic, as he himself said. On 23 May 1994 he declared in a Johannesburg mosque that the Oslo agreements were a modern version of the Hudaibiya Treaty signed in 628 between Prophet Muhammad and the Quraish tribe of Mecca – a temporary agreement signed for lack of better options, and with the sole purpose of defeating the enemy once conditions changed. Arafat also confirmed time and again that the purpose of the Palestinian Authority was to implement the PLO's 'phased plan' adopted in 1974. This strategy is not Arafat's alone. Israeli Arab Member of Knesset Abdel Malek Dahamshe declared on *PATV* on 1 September 2000: 'We exaggerate when we say peace. What we are really speaking about is Hudna [a ceasefire].' Former PA Representative for Jerusalem Affairs Faisal Husseini admitted that Oslo was a 'Trojan horse,' and, had the United States and Israel realized this, 'they would never have opened their fortified gates to let it inside their wall,' for 'the Oslo agreement, or any other agreement, is just a temporary procedure, or just a step towards something bigger ... We distinguish the strategic, long-term goals from the political phased goals, which we are compelled to temporarily accept due to international pressure ... [Palestine] according to the higher strategy [is] from the river to the sea.'[113] Othman Abu Gharrbia, a senior Fatah ideologue, was no less explicit: 'Every Palestinian must know clearly and unequivocally that the independent Palestinian state, with Jerusalem as its capital is not the end of

the road. The Palestinian state is a stage after which there will be another stage and that is the democratic state of all of Palestine' (*Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, 25 November 1999).[114] The list is much longer, but the message is clear. And it was never hidden from Israel. In fact, Member of Knesset Azmi Bishara explained at length to an Israeli newspaper, during the Oslo process, what was the strategy of the Arabs:

> You have to distinguish between a historical compromise and a temporary arrangement … A temporary arrangement is valid for a limited period of time … It is based on a balance of powers … This is what Rabin wanted, and he made a mistake … You can't have a temporary arrangement and expect peace with the Arab world and a new historical period. This is part of my argument with the Zionist Left. It does not understand this. It only discusses the 1967 issue as if the 1948 issue didn't exist … And this is a bitter mistake of course. A bitter one. So if you ask me if there can be a Zionist peace, my answer is that there can only be a temporary arrangement … But not a comprehensive and final peace. Not the end of the conflict. What will happen is that the struggle against Zionism will continue with other means.[115]

The partition of the Land of Israel is a necessity. But it will never bring peace with the Palestinians – at least not until they forfeit their dream of eliminating Israel, which has not yet occurred. Partition's only, and vital, purpose is to liberate Israel from a demographic ticking bomb, an ethical burden, and an economic liability. Abba Eban was right to say that 'the Arab states can no longer be permitted to recognize Israel's existence only for the purpose of plotting its elimination,'[116] but this is precisely what the Palestinians did at Oslo and Israel can no longer afford to be naïve. The conflict between Israel and Egypt was territorial and therefore had a territorial solution. The conflict with the Palestinians is existential. Breaking down the 'Iron Wall' was a mistake, but this wall needs to be rebuilt around a Jewish state, not a bi-national inferno.

Realism need not be Machiavellian and cynical, and idealism need not be Rousseauistic or Nietzschean. To be a great statesman is to have a strong belief, a strong ideal, but also the courage and honesty to realize what cannot be achieved in the real world. And a wise statesman, especially in the Middle East, cannot afford to be naïve about human nature. Thirty years after the Yom Kippur War and ten years after the Oslo illusion, the time has come to learn from the wisdom of Israel's founding fathers.

NOTES

1. Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince and Discourses* (trans. Max Lerner), New York, 1940, p.528, cited from Abba Eban, *Diplomacy for the Next Century*, New Haven, 1998, p.31.
2. Sasson Sofer, *Zionism and the Foundations of Israeli Diplomacy*, Cambridge, 1998, pp.28–55.

3. Abba Eban, *Personal Witness: Israel Through My Eyes*, New York, 1992, p.52.
4. Yehoshafat Harkabi, *The Bar-Kokhbah Syndrome*, New York, 1983.
5. Israel Eldad, *A Controversy: Our Perceptions of the Destruction of the Second Temple and of the Bar-Kokhbah Revolt*, Jerusalem, 1982, pp.84–85 (Hebrew).
6. Sofer, *Zionism*, pp.256, 258.
7. Ibid., p.372.
8. Ibid. p.101.
9. Shabtai Teveth, *Ben-Gurion and the Palestinian Arabs: From Peace to War*, Oxford, 1985, p.166.
10. David Ben-Gurion, *My Talks with Arab Leaders*, Jerusalem, 1972, p.80.
11. Eban, *Personal Witness*, p.327.
12. Ze'ev Jabotinsky, 'The Iron Wall', cited from Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*, New York, 2000, pp.13–14.
13. Sofer, *Zionism*, pp.216, 227.
14. Ibid., p.341.
15. Yoram Hazony, *The Jewish State: The Struggle for Israel's Soul*, New York, 2000, p.203.
16. Ibid., pp.213–14, 275, 277–78, 281.
17. Eban, *Personal Witness*, p.655.
18. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist–Arab Conflict, 1881–1999*, New York, 1999, p.454.
19. Shmuel Eisenstadt, 'Israeli Society Transformed', *Jerusalem Quarterly*, No.34 (1985), p.52.
20. Shmuel Eisenstadt, *The Transformation of Israeli Society*, Boulder, 1985, p.396.
21. Yossi Beilin, *Laga'at Beshalom* (Touching Peace), Tel Aviv, 1997, pp.23–24.
22. Ibid., pp.246–49.
23. Address to Knesset by Prime Minister Rabin on presentation of his government, 3 June 1974, in Meron Medzini (ed.), *Israel's Foreign Relations: Selected Documents*, Jerusalem, 1996, Vol.3, p.5.
24. Sofer, *Zionism*, p.159.
25. Efraim Inbar, *Rabin and Israel's National Security*, Baltimore, 1999, pp.30–31.
26. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, p.340.
27. Address to Knesset by Prime Minister Rabin on presentation of his government, 13 July 1992, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.13, p.3.
28. Interview with Prime Minister Rabin in *Die Welt*, 19 February 1993, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.13, p.177.
29. Shimon Peres, 'Conciliation Is Not Security', *Nir Hakvutza*, 29 September 1955, reprinted in Shimon Peres, *Ha-Shalav Ha-bah* (The Next Stage), Tel Aviv, 1964, p.24.
30. Ibid., pp.11, 15, 19.
31. Shimon Peres, *Battling for Peace*, London, 1995, p.301.
32. Statement to Knesset by Prime Minister Begin presenting Israel's peace plan, 28 December 1977, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.4, p.273.
33. Yitzhak Shamir, *Summing Up: An Autobiography*, London, 1994, p.257.
34. James A. Baker III, *The Politics of Diplomacy*, New York, 1995, p.120.
35. Statement in Knesset by Prime Minister-designate Shamir, 20 October 1986, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.519.
36. Address by Prime Minister Shamir to rabbinical conference, 27 July 1989, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.11, p.227.
37. Shamir, *Summing-Up*, p.217.
38. Address to Knesset by Prime Minister Peres, 3 December 1984, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.64.
39. Remarks in Knesset by Prime Minister Peres, 5 March 1985, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.168.
40. Reply in Knesset by Prime Minister Peres, 16 January 1986, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.391.
41. On 9 June 1974 the 12th session of the Palestinian National Council adopted in Cairo the PLO's 'phased plan': 1) Through 'armed struggle,' to establish an 'independent combatant national authority' over any territory that is 'liberated' from Israeli rule (Article 2); 2) To continue the struggle against Israel, using the territory of the national authority as a base of

operations (Article 4); 3) To provoke an all-out war in which Israel's Arab neighbours 'liberate all Palestinian territory' (Article 8).

42. Speech by King Hussein, 22 February 1986, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.427.
43. Peres, *Battling for Peace*, p.306.
44. Reply in Knesset by Prime Minister Peres on the peace process, 12 February 1986, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.413.
45. Ibid., p.417.
46. Peres, *Battling for Peace*, p.302.
47. George P. Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph*, New York, 1993, p.941.
48. Ibid., p.948.
49. Address by Foreign Minister Arens to conference on Jewish solidarity with Israel, 21 March 1989, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.11, p.80.
50. Author's interview with Yitzhak Shamir, 29 December 1998.
51. Moshe Arens, *Broken Covenant: American Foreign Policy and the Crisis between the US and Israel*, New York, 1995, pp.68, 103, 129, 223–24, 279.
52. Martin Indyk, 'Peace Without the PLO', *Foreign Policy*, No.83 (1991), pp.33–37.
53. Shamir, *Summing-Up*, pp.228–29.
54. Address to Knesset by Prime Minister Rabin presenting his government, 13 July 1992, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.13, p.4.
55. Address to Knesset by Prime Minister Rabin, 13 July 1992, pp.4–5.
56. Ibid., p.5.
57. Interview with Prime Minister Rabin on Israeli Television, 15 July 1992, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.13, pp.22–23.
58. Statement in Knesset by Prime Minister Rabin, 26 October 1992, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.13, p.79.
59. Beilin, *La-gaat Ba-shalom*, pp.29, 45–48, 74, 77.
60. Morris, *Righteous Victims*, p.617.
61. Shimon Peres, *Battling for Peace*, p.330.
62. Beilin, *La-gaat Ba-shalom*, pp.109, 111, 137.
63. Shimon Peres, *The New Middle East*, New York, 1993, pp.33–34, 318–20.
64. Ibid., pp.34–35, 45–46, 98, 171, 172.
65. Address to Knesset by Foreign Minister Peres, welcoming European Parliamentary Assembly Council President Martinez, 24 January 1993, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.13, p.168.
66. Peres, *The New Middle East*, pp.33–34.
67. Emmanuel Mréjen, 'Israel and the Reform of the UN', *Israel Affairs*, Vol.5, No.1 (1998), pp.76–80.
68. Eban, *Personal Witness*, p.544.
69. Yaacov Bar Siman-Tov, 'The United States and Israel Since 1948: A "Special Relationship?"', *Diplomatic History*, Vol.22, No.2 (Spring 1998).
70. Steven L. Spiegel, *The Other Arab–Israeli Conflict: Making America's Middle East Policy from Truman to Reagan*, Chicago, 1985, p.189.
71. Avraham Ben-Zvi, *The United States and Israel: The Limits of the Special Relationship*, New York, 1993, pp.77–105.
72. Inbar, *Rabin and Israel's National Security*, p.51.
73. Israel government statement following breakdown of Political Committee talks, 19 January 1978, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.4, p.301.
74. Ezer Weizman, *The Battle for Peace*, Jerusalem, 1981, p.246; Moshe Dayan, *Breakthrough: A Personal Account of the Egypt–Israel Negotiations*, New York, 1981, p.173.
75. Statement to AIPAC by Secretary of State Baker, 22 May 1989, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.11, p.169.
76. Author's interview with Yitzhak Shamir, 29 December 1998.
77. Avner Yaniv, 'The European Economic Community and Israel Since October 1973', in Avigador Levy (ed.), *The Arab–Israeli Conflict: Risks and Opportunities*, Statis, 1975, p. 37.
78. 'Est-ce que tenter de remettre les pieds chez soi constitue forcément une agression imprévue?', cited from Alfred Grosser, *Affaires extérieures*, Paris, 1989, p.250.
79. David A. Korn, *The Making of United Nations Security Council 242*, Pew Case Studies in International Affairs, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University, 1992.

 80. Ilan Greilsammer, *Europe's Middle-East Dilemma: The Quest for a Unified Stance*, Boulder, 1987.
 81. Remarks by Prime Minister Begin on the situation in Lebanon, 8 August 1977, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.4, p.77.
 82. Interview with Prime Minister Begin in *Le Figaro*, 14 June 1980, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.6, p.279.
 83. Interview with Prime Minister Begin on Israel Radio, 7 May 1981, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.7, p.33.
 84. Jacques Attali, *Verbatim I (1981–1986)*, Paris, 1993, p.173.
 85. Rosemary Hollis, 'Israel–European Economic Relations', *Israel Affairs*, Vol.1, No.1 (1994), p.130.
 86. Moshe Zak, *Forty Years of Dialogue with Moscow*, Tel Aviv, 1998, p.428 (Hebrew).
 87. Address to UN General Assembly by Prime Minister Peres, 21 October 1985, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.23.
 88. Zak, *Forty Years of Dialogue with Moscow*, p.461.
 89. Arthur Klinghoffer and Judith Apter, *Israel and the Soviet Union: Alienation or Reconciliation?*, Boulder, 1985, pp.215, 234.
 90. Jacob Abadi, 'Piercing the Bamboo Curtain: The Triumph of Israel's China Policy', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol.5, No.3 (1994), p.64.
 91. Yossi Melman and Ruth Sinai, 'Israeli–Chinese Relations and Their Future Prospects: From Shadow to Sunlight', *Asia Survey*, Vol.27, No.4 (1987), pp.396, 401.
 92. Han Xiaoxing, 'Sino-Israeli Relations', *Journal of Palestine* Studies, Vol.22, No.2 (winter 1993), p.68.
 93. P.R. Kumaraswamy, 'The Star and the Dragon: An Overview of Israeli–PRC Military Relations', *Issues and Studies* (April 1994), p.43.
 94. Melman and Sinai, 'Israeli–Chinese Relations', p.395.
 95. Xiaoxing, 'Sino-Israeli Relations', p.69.
 96. Aaron Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach: Arms Sales as Diplomacy*, Washington, 1985, p.141. See also 'Israël: La connection asiatique', *Afrique–Asie*, 13 January 1986, p.42.
 97. Bishara Bahbah, *Israel and Latin America: The Military Connection*, New York, 1986, p.90.
 98. Allan Metz, 'Israeli Military Assistance to Latin America', *Latin American Research* Review, 1993, p.259. See also Cheryl A. Rubenberg, 'Israeli Foreign Policy in Central America', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol.8, No.3 (July 1986), pp.896–915; Bahbah, *Israel and Latin America*, pp.61, 143–49.
 99. Edy Kaufman, 'The View from Jerusalem', *The Washington Quarterly* (Fall 1994), pp.43, 50.
100. Joel Peters, *Israel and Africa: The Problematic Friendship*, London, 1991, p.47.
101. Ibid., pp.55, 58.
102. Olusola Ojo, *Africa and Israel: Relations in Perspective*, Boulder, 1988, p.107.
103. Peters, *Israel and Africa*, p.150.
104. Kunirum Osia, *Israel, South Africa and Black Africa: A Study of the Primacy of the Politics of Expediency*, Washington, 1981, p.31.
105. Ojo, *Africa and Israel*, p.129. See also Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, 1985, p.139.
106. Interview with Foreign Ministry Director-General Kimche on ties with Cameroon, 24 August 1986, in *Israel's Foreign Relations*, Vol.9, p.493.
107. Peters, *Israel and Africa*, p.169.
108. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, p.145.
109. Peters, *Israel and Africa*, p.168.
110. Klieman, *Israel's Global Reach*, pp.138–41.
111. *Ma'ariv*, 18 January 1983.
112. Eban, *Personal Witness*, p.197.
113. *Al-Arabi*, Egypt, 24 June 2001.
114. *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*, 25 November 1999.
115. Interview with Azmi Bishara, *Ha'aretz supplement*, 29 May 1998, p.22.
116. Eban, *Personal Witness*, p.436.