



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS  
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING



---

C1. Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA), Comments on the Influence of the Pro-Israel Lobby, *Tikkun*, May 2007.

Source: *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Autumn 2007), pp. 205-207

Published by: [University of California Press](#) on behalf of the [Institute for Palestine Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jps.2007.37.1.205>

Accessed: 27/08/2015 12:23

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and Institute for Palestine Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Palestine Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

*Quarterly Update for additional details). The government comprises independent technocrats except for Interior Minister Abd al-Raziq al-Yahiya, a Fatah stalwart, who controls the PA security forces. Four members reside in Gaza.*

1. Prime Minister, Finance Minister, and Foreign Minister: Salam al-Fayyad
2. Minister of the Interior: 'Abd-al-Raziq al-Yahiya
3. Minister of Local Governance: Ziyad al-Bandak
4. Minister of Tourism and Women's Affairs: Khulud Du'aybs
5. Minister of National Economy, Housing, Public Works, and Communications: Muhammad Kamal Hasuna
6. Minister of Education and Higher Education: Lamis al-'Alami
7. Minister of Labor and Planning: Samir 'Ali
8. Minister of Health: Fathi Abu Mughli
9. Minister of Information: Riyadh al-Maliki
10. Minister of Awqaf and Religious Affairs: Jamal Buwatina
11. Minister of Prisoners' Affairs: Ashraf al-'Ajrami
12. Minister of Transportation and Communications: Mashhur Abu Daqqa
13. Minister of Agriculture and Social Affairs: Mahmud al-Habash
14. Minister of Culture: Ibrahim Ibrash
15. Minister of Justice: Ali Khashan
16. Minister of Youth and Sports: Tahani Abu Daqqa

## UNITED STATES

### **C1. REP. JIM MORAN (D-VA), COMMENTS ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRO-ISRAEL LOBBY, *TIKKUN*, MAY 2007.**

*The September-October 2007 issue of Tikkun magazine ran the following excerpt of an interview with Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA) conducted earlier in May 2007 by editor Rabbi Michael Lerner. The excerpt prompted a 19 September letter to Moran by the National Jewish Democratic Council (representing sixteen of the thirty Jewish members of the House of Representatives), calling Moran's statements "irresponsible," with "absolutely no basis in fact," and typical of "the anti-Semitic stereotypes some have used historically against Jews." The letter concluded by stating that "As Jewish*

*colleagues, we don't understand your hostility to AIPAC or your determination to embarrass yourself with this series of inaccurate, illogical, and inflammatory comments. But we find them deeply offensive and call on you to retract your statements. They have no place in the House Democratic Caucus." The letter was signed by Henry Waxman (D-CA), Rahm Emanuel (D-IL), Shelley Berkley (D-NV), Gary Ackerman (D-NY), Barney Frank (D-MA), Nita Lowey (D-NY), Janice Schakowsky (D-IL), Sander Levin (D-MI), Howard Berman (D-CA), Eliot Engel (D-NY), Allyson Schwartz (D-PA), Ron Klein (D-FL), Jerrold Nadler (D-NY), Tom Lantos (D-CA), Jane Harman (D-CA), and Adam Schiff (D-CA). Separately, Rep. Eric Cantor (R-VA) said on 19 September that Moran's words echoed the work of Hitler and Mein Kampf. Moran did not respond to the criticisms. The text of the interview was taken from the TikkunWeb site at [tikkun.org](http://tikkun.org).*

*Tikkun: To take an example from these past few months of the Israel lobby exercising its power, liberals in the House of Representatives in the spring of 2007 sought to include in the defense funding budget an amendment that would require specific authorization from Congress before the administration could use the defense budget monies for a military strike at Iran. The amendment failed. Most liberals in the U.S. today oppose preventive wars in general and a military strike against Iran in particular. So who supports such a move? ... What do you think the reasoning is for the Democrats who voted against the amendment requiring that the president get authorization from Congress before attacking Iran?*

*Moran: Well, AIPAC strongly opposed it. In fact, Rep. [John] Murtha [D-PA], Rep. [David] Obey [D-WI], and myself wanted it in the supplemental. We had it in and then the leadership had to take it out because AIPAC was having a conference in Washington and insisted with the leadership and many of the members with whom they have close alliances. Yesterday, AIPAC had an amendment to recommit the whole Armed Services Bill in order to add language requiring America to develop missile defenses jointly with Israel, to share all its missile defense technology with Israel. That passed overwhelmingly. There were only thirty members—that's less than 10 percent—who voted against sharing all our missile technology with Israel.*

It received about 400 votes in favor of it. I was one of the thirty. My feeling was that it wasn't just the incendiary language that Israel is under immediate attack and we need to protect it from another Holocaust, it was also the idea that the solution to Israel's security is a militaristic one. I would urge you to read the Congressional record for the debate on the recommital. It put our loyalty to Israel in terms of complete military support. My feeling is that both America and Israel have acted in counterproductive fashion and have undermined their security by focusing exclusively on military capability.

That was a key vote yesterday. It was phrased by many as an "AIPAC vote." As a result, it prevailed approximately 400 to thirty.

*Tikkun: In your estimation, how does AIPAC get that power?*

*Moran:* AIPAC is very well organized. The members are willing to be very generous with their personal wealth. But it's a two-edged sword. If you cross AIPAC, AIPAC is unforgiving and will destroy you politically. Their means of communications, their ties to certain newspapers and magazines and individuals in the media are substantial and intimidating. Every member knows it's the best-organized national lobbying force. The National Rifle Association comes a close second, but AIPAC can rightfully brag that they're the most powerful lobbying force in the world today. Certainly they are in the United States. Not in Europe, obviously. Most people that are involved in foreign policy especially look at a broad range of issues and consider a person's entire voting record. AIPAC considers the voting record only as it applies to Israel.

*Tikkun: Where is the national interest, then? What happens to those who think that the best interest of the United States is to live in peace with the world? Certainly the American people feel a very strong revulsion toward this war in Iraq. Why doesn't that translate into policy?*

*Moran:* You've touched on a quandary, and it particularly applies to the Jewish American community. Jewish Americans, as a voting bloc and as an influence on American foreign policy, are overwhelmingly opposed to the war. There is no ethnic group as opposed to the war as much as Jewish Americans. But AIPAC is the most powerful lobby and has pushed this war from the beginning. I don't think they represent the mainstream

of American Jewish thinking at all, but because they are so well organized and their members are extraordinarily powerful—most of them are quite wealthy—they have been able to exert power.

The reason I don't hesitate to speak out about AIPAC's influence—notwithstanding the fact that I'll be accused of being anti-Semitic every time I suggest it—is that I don't think AIPAC represents the mainstream of American Jewish thinking. I think that, in fact, if you were to sit down with Jewish families in the United States, far more would agree with your philosophy of reconciliation, in acting in a manner consistent with Torah, and they believe in *tikkun* [to heal, repair, and transform the world]. AIPAC doesn't believe in *tikkun*, judging from their policy proposals, but nevertheless, they have the Congress pretty . . . well [pause] "controlled" may be too strong a word, but their influence is dominant in the Congress—and their attitude is the opposite of *Tikkun's* and the NSP's [the interfaith Network of Spiritual Progressives]. They support domination, not healing. They feel that you acquire security through military force, through intimidation, even through occupation, when necessary, and that if you have people who are hostile toward you, it's OK to kill them rather than talk with them, negotiate with them, try to understand them, and ultimately try to love them. That's what *Tikkun* and the NSP is all about: healing, mending, reconciling, understanding, and love, which is why I think you are on the right path. . . .

*Tikkun: Have you heard anybody in the Democratic Caucus present a scenario trying to convince other members of the caucus about why a strike at Iran would be a rational policy for either country?*

*Moran:* A strike at Iran is argued as necessary because of Iran's potential threat to Israel. No one's suggested that Iran is a potential threat to the United States, any more than Iraq could ever have been a threat to the United States. It's a threat to our ally, and those in the Likud Party, and AIPAC—who agree pretty consistently with Likud—feel that the best way to eliminate a threat is to destroy it, and they want America to use its military might to eliminate that threat.

*Tikkun: Are there people who say that in the Democratic Caucus? In a meeting where you're sitting together and saying,*

*"How do we vote on a bill to prevent the president from making war with Iran without having authorization from us?"*

*Moran:* Normally it's said in somewhat veiled language. If you look at the debate that took place even yesterday, you can see language that pretty much says the same thing in the words of Ileana Ros-Lehtinen [R-FL] or Duncan Hunter [R-CA] or Tom Lantos. Tom Lantos has moderated his views somewhat. Mark Kirk [R-IL] introduced the resolution on Iran.

They make it clear that we should be prepared to enter into military conflict with Iran. There are several debates that took place on the issue yesterday. I'm sure you could get in online at the Congressional Record. May 16th and May 17th. You'll find the debate, and you'll find what's being said is quite striking with regard to America's need to be prepared for a military confrontation with Iran, notwithstanding that it's 70 million people, that it used to be an ally, that it was a strong democracy until they elected Mohammed Mossadegh. Mossadegh wanted to nationalize the oil revenue, because most of the profit was being given to the American and British interests instead of the Iranian interests. So the British and the Americans had him executed and then imposed the Shah of Iran, who imposed a philosophy that we liked—but did so with oppressive tactics. This caused the counter-reaction of the Ayatollah Khomeini coming in 1979 with the Iranian revolution, and that's put the religious extremists in power.

America's had a direct role in Iran's fortunes, and we continue to believe that we can tell Iran what to say and do. I personally take great umbrage at the way Iran treats dissenters today. But that's a relatively small number of people in sensitive positions in the religious and military factions. The majority of Iranians are very young—I think almost two thirds are under the age of twenty-five years, so it's a very young population—and most of them want to be liberated from this repressive religious regime and be able to be part of a modern world. It's a very well-educated population, and for the vast majority of America's existence, Iran has been our ally. The present enmity could be turned around if we could take an approach of negotiation, sound reconciliation, and trying to find areas of agreement, instead of trying to emphasize those areas of disagreement. Obviously, we need to protect Israel, but the more we brandish swords

and threaten Iran, ironically, the more of a threat Iran becomes to Israel, because Israel is seen as a surrogate power of the United States. We are inextricably tied, since our policies are seen as identical. I think that the attitude we're taking is entirely wrong; nevertheless, it's the reality, and we've got a long way to go before the Congress would turn around and embrace the kind of approach that you and a few other enlightened people are suggesting.

**C2. "MARINES TO TRAIN AT NEW ISRAELI COMBAT CENTER," *MARINE CORPS TIMES*, 25 JUNE 2007.**

*This article by Marine Corps Times staff writer Barbara Opall-Rome provides insights into Israel's past and future military tactics against the Palestinians in the occupied territories, its overall military strategy, and its influence on the U.S. military's handling of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the general (mis)perceptions underpinning the U.S. military's understanding of conflicts in the region. The text is available online at [marinecorpstimes.com](http://marinecorpstimes.com).*

In a new, elaborate training center in the Negev desert, Israeli troops—and someday, U.S. Marines and soldiers—are preparing for the wide range of urban scenarios they may confront. Here, at Israel's new National Urban Training Center [NUTC], the Israeli Defense Force's Ground Forces Command is preparing forces to fight in four theaters: Gaza, Lebanon, the West Bank, and Syria.

Built by the Army Corps of Engineers and funded largely from U.S. military aid, the 7.4-square-mile generic city—*balad*, in Arabic, means village—consists of 1,100 basic modules that can be reconfigured by mission planners to represent specific towns.

It's a much smaller, IDF-tailored version of the Army's Joint Readiness Training Center [JRTC], the sprawling 100,000-acre simulated microcosm of the Middle East used to train infantry brigade task forces deployed in the region. And while Baladia City won't feature all the pyrotechnic bells and whistles of the Fort Polk, La., facility, it will offer the same high-fidelity simulated battlefield technologies, force identification and location systems, and debriefing capabilities, officers here said.

"Combat units from platoon up to brigade level will train in an environment that simulates the real urban battle," said Brig. Gen. Uzi Moskovich, commander of the NUTC.