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ABSTRACT

This thesis elaborates the influence of Israel lobby towards the U.S. foreign policy under President Barrack Obama’s first administration (2008-2012). It elaborates the strategies used by the Israel lobby to influence the U.S. foreign policy especially the policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict. One of the way used by the Israel lobby to influence the U.S. foreign policy is lobbying the Executive and legislative branch. Because the lobby is so powerful, it could even decide the President and Congress candidates who will sit on the important position in the U.S. government as well as decision-maker position, so the lobby process would be easier.

It analyzes whether under the President Obama’s administration the Israel lobby would be less effective in influencing the U.S. foreign policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict than the previous Presidents of the U.S.. After doing literature research, the author finds out that the lobby is still effective even in President Obama’s first administration. This leads to the disappointment of the world society especially the Muslim world for its hope for creation of peace in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Finally this research found that the lobby inflicted both the U.S. and Israel themselves. As the U.S. continued to give unconditional assistance to Israel, it actually has fueled anti-Americanism throughout the Arab and Islamic world and undermined the U.S. image in other countries as well. As of Israel, lobbying the U.S. government for military assistance has created an unsafe environment for Israel because the long campaign to kill, imprison, or marginalize the Palestinians has helped bring groups like Hamas to power and create stagnancy of peace process in Israeli-Palestinian conflict. So it is better for both America and Israel to start a fresh relationship based on both national interest.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The Middle East until today is known as the region where it is never away from conflicts. One of long lasting crises in this region is the conflict between Israel and Palestine that has been the major conflict to impact the other neighbor states in the Middle East. This conflict has been happening for more than 65 years since the establishment of Israel independent state on Palestinian land on 14 May 1948. There has been many resolutions and policies adopted to create peace between two conflicting sides but has not yet reached to a clear solution of peace until today.

U.S. under the administration of Barack Hussein Obama has attempted to create peace in the region. Since he was elected on November 2008, many people hoped for change for the American state and the U.S. relationship with the Muslim world (Ruslani, Suparto: 255). One of his contribution to make change towards the relationship between Muslim world and U.S. was his visits to several Islamic countries such as Egypt and Indonesia. In his speeches during his visits to Islamic countries, he mentioned some of his attempts to have a good relationship between the Muslim world and the U.S. In his speech during his visit to Cairo, 4 June 2009, he mentioned:
I have come here to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world; one based upon mutual interest and mutual respect; and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive, and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap, and share common principles – principles of justice and progress; tolerance and the dignity of all human beings. (www.nytimes.com, 28 September 2012)

Under the Barack Obama administration, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has become one of the priorities, especially for the U.S. Middle East policies. U.S. seem to be more firm towards Israel’s action of violating agreements and being uncooperative. U.S. refused to support the legitimation of Israel settlements in West Bank because it was not appropriate with several previous agreements. Obama also forced Israel to recognize Palestinian’s right to live as how Israeli’s were recognized and to support the agreement of the two-state solution and to stop the Israel settlements in the West Bank especially in East Yerussalem.

Just two days after Obama was inaugurated as the 44th President of the United States of America, he delivered some remarks that shows his full support towards Israel in his speech in the Ministry of foreign affairs of U.S.:

Let me be clear: America is committed to Israel's security. And we will always support Israel's right to defend itself against legitimate threats. For years, Hamas has launched thousands of rockets at innocent Israeli citizens. No democracy can tolerate such danger to its people, nor should the international community, and neither should the Palestinian people themselves, whose interests are only set back by acts of terror. To be a genuine party to peace, the quartet [U.S., Russia, European Union, United Nations] has made it clear that Hamas must meet clear conditions: recognize Israel's right to exist; renounce violence; and abide [between Israel-PLO/Palestine authority] by past agreements. (www.washingtonpost.com, 20 September 2012)
From his remarks above, Obama seem to be very contrary with his speech that he delivered at his visit to Cairo on June 2009. In this remarks, Obama shows his full support towards Israel that he considered has got legitimate threats from Palestinians. While on the other side, Palestinians also has faced threats launched by the Israelis.

John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt (2007:3) in their book “The Israel lobby and U.S. foreign policy” showed facts on how it is almost impossible for a U.S. President candidate to be chosen without Israel’s support. Before becoming U.S. President, each candidate should emphasize that he or she fully appreciates the threats that Israel will face and ensure that the United States will remain committed to defend Israel’s interests under any and all situation.

Before going further about the Israel lobby, it is important to know how the Jews lobbying culture first started in the U.S. and able to give influence to U.S. policies. The Jews are a classical story about United States’ success, from being immigrants until becoming rich people that could give influence to the U.S. policies. The Jews are well known as smart people with High IQ, priors education, a hard worker and loves peace (Sowell, 1989: 101 -142). Until now, many of Jews immigrants succeeded to become politicians or businessman and succeeded to sit on important positions in Congress or government, also plays big role among the U.S. intellectuals, academics, business, and mass media.
Martin Best and Irk Robb in their translated book “Yahudi Amerika dan Pandangan Baru Kepada Struktur Sosial Amerika” showed Jews filtration data in various structure in U.S. that 26% reporters, analysts, and political officials of U.S. are Jews, about 38% the official position of U.S. in the government are also held by Jews and mostly reside important positions in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, defense, finance and judiciary. From approximately three million Jews who lives in New York that spread out all over the state region, most of the important positions or key in politics and economics field are held by the American Jews (www.ерамуслим.com, 16 January 2013).

As minority, the number of Jews immigrant is just about 3% from 300 million people. However, it could be said as the most success immigrant in U.S. comparing to those who came from other countries. A Jews family income is around US$ 54,000 per year, 72% above the average national income and it is the highest income among any other ethnic in the U.S. (Sowell, 1989: 140).

Jews immigrants in the U.S. is well known for its lobbying power that has great influence in the U.S. government. Since the Six Days War of 1967, the U.S. primary focus in Middle East Policy is its relationship with Israel. At that time Israel lobby started to show its influence to provide the U.S. support and resulted in the U.S. veto to the resolution in the United Nations (UN) Security Council that cursed Israel and attempted to postpone the ceasefire in order to occupy a part of Suriah after
defeating Egypt troops in Sinai. The other interest groups in U.S. Congress attempted to direct the U.S. foreign policy to struggle their interests but no lobbies could succeed to convince that the submitted policy is for the U.S. national interest except the Israel Lobby. (Mearsheimer, Walt, 2007: 7).

The influence of Israel Lobby in the U.S. Congress and government began to appear after World War II under President Jimmy Carter and continued until the present Barrack Obama’s administration. This lobby power could be observed by how Israel lobby plays its roles in the important positions in the U.S. government, such as the Executive branch (President) and Legislative branch (Congress).

The Israel lobby does not choose a particular party to lobby, whether they are from the Republican or Democratic party. Just before the Barrack Obama administration, President George W. Bush was a candidate from the Republican Party who also has become the target of Israel lobby. One of the most successful Israel’s lobby under Bush’ administration was the invasion of the U.S. to Iraq in 2003. At that time, the invasion was triggered by the issue of the ownership of nuclear weapon by Iraq and that it could threaten the world’s security. Campaign of war was then made by the neoconservative and pro-Israel actors to influence the public opinion. President Bush has received much pressure as well to use its power to invade Iraq (Mearsheimer and Walt 2007, 229-262).
Under President Barrack Obama administration, a candidate from democratic party, the influence of Israel lobby in U.S. foreign policy is still effective. Some key officials in the U.S. government is held by the American Jews such as Rahm Emmanuel (Chief of Staff of White House), Joe Biden (Vice President), Daniel Inouye (Senator), Hillary Clinton (Secretary of State), Timothy Geithner (Secretary of Treasury), Robert Gates (Secretary of Defense) and Eric Holder (Attorney General).

Obama’s image as first Afro-American U.S. President makes it interesting to be discussed. Besides, his campaign speech that showed how he priors America’s relationship with the Muslim world makes him to be different than the previous Presidents of the U.S.. Many sides put hopes under his administration for the peace in Israel-Palestinian conflict. On the other side, some people doubts his firmness towards Israel due to his relationship with the Jewish Rabbi who is his wife’s cousin. Before elected as the U.S. president, Obama’s promises in front of the Jews society in U.S. was considered as guarantee of U.S. support towards Israel (Ruslani and Suparto, 2010: 11). Thus this has become a debate among many people whether or not under the Obama’s administration will be able to create peace in the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

This thesis will focus on the Israel lobby in the political aspect where the lobby plays role to gain support from the executive and legislative branch as well as the Congress. There will also be further discussion on the definition of Israel lobby and
brief explanations on the U.S. decision making to get an understanding on how does the U.S. consider lobbies in the U.S. decision making. Finally, elaborations on how the Israel lobby succeed to influence the U.S. foreign policy on Israel-Palestinian conflict under the Barrack Obama administration.

B. Research Question

From the background that is elaborated above, we can assume that Israel probably has special position in U.S. foreign policy. Thus, the writer raises a problem statement as follows: How does Israel lobby influence the U.S. Foreign Policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict under the Barrack Obama first administration?

C. Objective of Research

This research has the objective to answer the problem statement which then expected to explain the strategy of Israel lobbies in influencing the U.S. foreign policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict under Barrack Obama first administration (2008-2012). Therefore, this thesis will focus on how the Israel lobby shaped Obama administration’s Foreign Policy to conduct on Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In answering these issues, this thesis will also discuss about what is Israel lobby, how the Israel lobby formed and in what ways do they lobby the U.S. foreign policy towards the Israeli-Palestine conflict.
D. Literature Review

The topic of Israel lobby to the U.S. foreign policy is commonly discussed in articles and papers, especially after the book written by John Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt was published in 2007. This book entitled “The Israel Lobby and the US Foreign Policy” was one of the book that openly talks about facts and the power of lobby in the U.S. foreign policy. This book also elaborates the strategies used by the Israel lobby to influence the U.S. foreign policy by showing facts about the lobby’s success from the administration of President Harry S. Truman (1945 – 1953) to President George W. Bush (2001 – 2009).

Furthermore, this topic was also used as academic purpose in campuses as student’s research. One of the research about this topic was written in form of Thesis by Sylvia Shirley Malinton entitled “Lobby Yahudi Terhadap Kebijakan Luar Negeri Pemerintahan George W. Bush, 2000 – 2006.” This study focuses on Jews lobby in influencing the George Bush’s administration on the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Malinton focuses her writings on the influence done by the neo-conservative and Christian Fundamentalist actors in America who plays role as the lobbyist. Her research found out that the invasion of Iraq in 2003 was resulted due to the influence of the Jews lobby.
A book entitled “Obama di Balik Aksi Yahudi” by Ruslani and Toto Suparto was another study that is similar to this topic. The book discussed on how actually Obama was related to the Jews and showing Obama’s weakness under the Israel lobby. Unlike Mearsheimer and Walt (2007), this book describes more to the case study under Barrack Obama’s administration and further emphasizes the relations with Indonesia.

All of the studies mentioned above has different ways of analyzing the topic. Some similarities would be found mostly on the strategy used by the lobbyist to influence the U.S. foreign policy, what makes it different is the case study used and the way of analyzing it. In this research, the focus is the Israel lobby to the Barrack Obama’s first administration on its policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The theory used is also different than the other researches that mostly use the concept of lobby to analyze the topic. As for this research, the theory used is the foreign policy and pressure group and it focuses on the state level of analysis.

E. Theoretical Framework

To analyze the problem statement, the writer uses the theory of foreign policy. Besides that, the concept of pressure group and the concept of lobby which is contained in U.S. constitution known as The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 (FRLA 1946). These concepts are used to analyze the influence of Israel lobby in Barack Obama’s first administration towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.
- **Foreign Policy Theory**

To understand foreign policy, Rossenau (1997: 27) defines foreign policy as “all the attitudes and activities through which organized nation societies seeks to cope with and benefit from international environment”. Rossenau also explains foreign policy decision making is influenced by five sources namely: Individual, Role, Government, Social and Systemic (Rossenau, 1997: 167). The source of individual is all aspects from a decision maker (values, talent and experience) that differentiates the choice of the foreign policy or behavior with the other decision maker. Role is all sources that is related to the external behavior of an official that origins from the role he is playing, apart from his individual characteristic. The government source explains on the input that is given by the congress to the President to do an action that could save the country and focus on the structure and the process of a government. Society is a non-governmental aspect from a society that influence the external behavior, such as orientation of the main value of a society, level of national unity and the development of the industrialization. Systemic source consists of all aspects related to people from the external environment of a society or every action that happens ouside the country that can influence the choice that is made by the state.

Furthermore, K. J. Holsti (1992: 82) explains foreign policy as a tool of ideas or actions that is made by a decision maker to solve a problem or make changes in policies, behavior or actions of other states, non-governmental actors, international economy or physical environment of the world.
According to Holsti (1992: 271-274) foreign policy making is influenced by two factors: external factor and internal factor. The external factor covers the structure of international system, structure of world economy, goals and actions of other actors, regional and global problems, as well as the international law and the world opinion. While the internal (domestic) factor covers the condition of the socio-economy, geographical and topography characteristic, national attribute, structure and government philosophy, public opinion, and bureaucracy (Holsti, 1992: 275-285).

According to Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf (1996) foreign policy consists of input and output. Input factors includes external sources, societal sources, governmental sources, role sources, dan individual sources. While output factors is the foreign policy that is produced. AIPAC (America-Israel Public Affairs Committee) is included in the societal sources category in the input factors as an interest group that influences U.S. foreign policy.

Related to the influence of Israel lobby towards Barrack Obama administration’s policy on Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the writer will use the theory of foreign policy that are explained above. These theory will be used to explain the factors that influence U.S. foreign policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

- **Pressure groups**

Pressure groups are interest groups that are active in politics (Skidmore and Tripp, 1989). Interest group that acquires direct political significance when they become political actors, actively try to influence the course of public policy, when they work to put favorable statues into law or attempt to persuade office holders to exercise
their authorities for the benefit of the group that are categorized as pressure groups (Latham, 1973: 161).

According to Maurice Duverger (1981: 119), the definition of pressure group is a group of think tanks who are used to make discussions to evaluate the state’s condition, critiques the governance, pouring ideas of improvement of a situation, and the result that becomes critiques usually delivered to the government or the other state’s institutes. These thoughts has broad impact on the change of the public opinion towards the government and causes the government to consider the influence of these think tanks, thus the think tanks could be said as having an informal collective political power.

In using its political influence, pressure groups uses three sources of power namely financial power, number of members and knowledge (Skidmore, Tripp: 1989: 77). While the efforts to reach the goal is by mobilizing the public opinion, campaign and promotion, supporting political candidates, publishing opinions, and sponsoring testimonial meetings by having dinner (Skidmore, Tripp: 1989: 78-79).

The presence of pressure group is supported by U.S. constitution on lobby in The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 (FRLA 1946) (The Washington Lobby, 1987: 36). FRLA 1946 is the constitution that controls domestic lobby activities.

One of the pressure group that is included as Israel lobby is the America-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). From the characteristics mentioned above, the writer categorizes AIPAC as a pressure group and its activities are controlled by FRLA
1946 in the U.S. constitution. AIPAC claims that it has a strong financial power, a huge amount of member, and has deep knowledge in lobbying (www.aipac.org, 17 January 2013). These capacities enables AIPAC to lobby in the process of U.S. foreign policy decision making.

- Lobby

In general, lobby is understood as the effort that is done by individual, a group or organization in order to influence other group, whether executive or legislative/congress to give a profitable result for the group.

The word lobby comes from a latin word “labium” which means entering room or “lounge”. Lobby could be seen from the political decision that is not produced from plenary sessions, but from pre-political phase that balances the request from various interests. Lobby could also defined as various intensive activity that is done by social groups, trade room, and companies in politics and bureaucracy (Beym, 1980). This theory is supported by the definition according to Richard Hall that defines lobby as a subsidy that helps decision makers in promoting the other group’s interests. His theory also considers the preference-centered lobbying where lobby and the campaign contribution hardly can change the position of decision maker (Hall, 1992).

The power of Israel lobby in U.S. uses their resources to support the success of its lobby, such as providing the campaign fund to support the President candidates, congress members and the governmental elites that are pro-Israel. Mostly, the chosen candidates owe the lobbyist group that sponsor and tend to rarely change their decision
to not support the lobbyist. This theory is supported by Edward Tivnan’s opinion in his book “The Lobby: Jewish Political Power and American Foreign Policy” that says:

Influence is thus inferred from resources, specifically the actor’s control over those relevant to rewards and deprivations: wealth, weapons, moral force and so on. The weight of influence depends upon objectives and resources and specific to situations. (Tivnan 1987).

The amount of the lobby influence could be measured from the capacity that is based on the political actor resources that influences. To be able to influence a policy, the elements of resources and the situations is very determining. In this case, besides having the financial power, Israel lobby also has the moral support by using anti-semitism issues, holocaust, and religious issues, also having special characteristics and uses public opinion power through Jews’ power in the U.S. mass media.

E. Research Method

This thesis uses qualitative analysis method. The problems that will be discussed in this thesis is about the strategies of Israel lobbies in influencing the U.S. foreign policy. This type of research is used to do a research towards the social phenomenon and in this case the writer develops concepts and facts but not examining the hypotesis.

In this research, the writer uses the secondary data (documents) in which the data sources are reference books, journals, researches, newspapers, homepage of the related institution and other written information that are relevant. The books are provided through a library research in the University of Indonesia library, Ali Al-atas
library of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, as well as main library of UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. Besides, this research also uses data from websites that are considered as relevant with the problem of this research.
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CHAPTER II

THE POWER OF ISRAEL LOBBY IN U.S.

The Israel lobby is one of the most powerful lobby that can influence the U.S. foreign policy. Israel lobby plays role in various sectors to put its influence. In government, in order to influence the foreign policy regarding Israel’s interests, the lobby allocates pro-Israel actors in the important seats such as Congress and another crucial positions in the U.S. government. In gaining the American people’s support, the lobby takes over the media to influence public opinion, and in gaining moral support Israel lobby uses the issues of the Jews past history who suffered from supression of the Holocaust and that they are a nation without land.

In defining the lobby, the Israel lobby here is defined as the individuals and organizations that actively work to shape U.S. foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction. It is different from the Jews lobby which lobbies for not always for Israel’s interests but for the Jews living in America. While the Jews are ethnic, Israel lobby takes position in a state level, where the lobby deals with two states.

A. The Emergence of Israel Lobby

The history of the beginning of Israel lobby was pioneered by Isaiah L. Kenen, a Canadian Jew who left Toronto to Cleveland in 1926 and worked as a journalist and activist who promoted Zionism. Kenen became the President of the Cleveland Zionist
District in 1941. In the 1940’s he served as the information director of the Jewish Agency and became the delegate of Israel in United Nations. In 1951, Kenen traveled to Washington to help lobby for Israel’s interest in order to provide U.S. economic and military assistance for Israel (Kenen, 1982: 68).

Between 1951-1953, Kenen served to represent American Zionist Council (AZC), a tax-exempt umbrella organization of American Jewish groups which focused on Israel. In the early 1950s there was rumor about President Dwight D. Eisenhower who investigated about AZC on the basis that it had used tax-exempt funds to lobby. As the consequence, Kenen managed American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs (AZPAC) in 1954, to act as pro-Israel lobby with control and financing independent of the AZC.

In 1959, AZPAC changed to AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee) and alienated the ZOA (Zionist Organization of America), one of the first official Zionist organizations in U.S. and an important representative to the World Zionist Organization (WZO), which felt that AIPAC risked surrendering control to Jews who were unwilling to help fund Jewish charities, schools and kibbutzim but were less dedicated to the traditional Zionist ideal of Israel as a sovereign Jewish state. (Urofsky 1995, 88, 158-61).

The existence of Israel lobby is one form of democratic values that is followed by U.S. as attached in the first amandement of the U.S. constitution that organizes lobbies
(FARA-1938 and FRLA-1946), that is to guarantee every individual and group rights to submit petition which indirectly also illustrates the form of pluralism of culture and democracy among U.S. citizens. That first amendment has become the base of the emergence of lobby groups that plays its roles in the U.S. governmental institution such as Congress, Executive and in the U.S. social life. (The washington Lobby, 1987: 36)

The lobby groups in the U.S. Congress could represent the interest of its organization or the origin country in its relationship with the policy of the central government, state or the other executive branches. The Jews lobby group and its members sometimes also are involved in designing the constitution and also allowed to submit petitions.

Israel lobby is the lobby done by the Jewish groups and pro-Israelis in order to provide support and influence the U.S. government and congress to make policies that supports Israel’s interests. The lobby’s way to influence the U.S. Middle East foreign policies are by ensuring the government and Congress that the policy which is being struggled is for the U.S. national interest.

The importance of Israel lobby in U.S. to Diaspora Jews to formulate Israel’s foreign policy was described by Michael Brecher (1972: 38) as follows:

The importance of world jewry in Israel’s foreign policy system can hardly be exaggerated. There is indeed a unique relationship, deriving from the unique experience of the Jewish people. There is only one Jewish state – and this is conciously perceived as a restoration of a political entinity with flourished in antiquity. The links between
Diaspora Jews and Eretz Yisrael (the land of Israel) are powerful and deeprooted in history, culture, religion, and emotional attachment.

As minority ethnic, the Jews in America continuously struggles to show its existence by spreading its influence in the government, Congress and American society through their lobby power, mainly to influence the U.S. foreign policy towards the Middle East region that is based on Israel’s interests. Since the six day war, U.S. has consistently gave support in politics, economics, and military section. These supports are the result of the experience of the Jews lobby in the U.S. government and Congress.

The AWACS case is one of the proof of the effectiveness of Israel lobby. The cancellation of U.S. weapon purchased by Saudi Arabia on July 1988 in Ronald Reagan administration. The plan of purchasing weapon that costs apparently $30 trillion failed due to the interference that was taken by the Israel Lobby in U.S. congress (Findley:1985).

In its function, the Jews lobby could be separated as formal and informal lobby. Formal lobby acts in the Congress while informal lobby consist of individual Jews or Jews organizations in the U.S. The Jews lobby that is included as formal lobby are the ones who lobbies to the Congress such as AIPAC.

In serving the function of the lobby, both formal and informal group cooperates, although at the end the most influential is the formal group. Since AIPAC was formed in 1959, they actively lobby in Congress especially issues regarding to the existence of
Israel state and the U.S. foreign policy towards it. Their sensitivity in reacting towards that case could not be replaced by ‘moral bond’ or the dream of the creation of Israel state before 1948 until ‘the ideal Israel’ as associated by the term Zion or the Kingdom of God was formed.

The dream of the creation of the ideal state is not apart from the main part of the Jew religion which is a formed Kingdom of God and the arrival of Messiah. The word Messiah origins from the Hebrew language, Mashiah, The Anoited one; which could be translated as a figure that will save the Israelis and their birth land towards the end of time (Neusner, et al, 1990: 126-127)

Besides Messianism, there are other concept of the history of Jew named Exodus that pushes the Jews to return to ancestral land and create the Israeli state as aimed. Huston Smith called this as an idealism reason in creating Israeli state. This reason motivates the Jews to create a state that is devoted to the realization of the ideals and prophetic moral norms completely (Smith: 1991: 352).

B. Israel Lobby in Executive and Legislative Branch

In analyzing on what and how Israel lobby plays role in the U.S. political system, the focus will be on its role in the Congress. In doing the lobby, lobbyist has various techniques to gain the Congress support such as: organizing coalition, direct lobbying, grass-roots techniques and the campaign support. (Mac Kenzie 1986, 102).
Among these techniques, campaign support is one of the techniques that could directly explain the special relationship between the lobby and the U.S. Congress. Therefore, The Washington Lobby (1987, 9-10) explains it as follows:

Campaign contributions to members of Congress serve two important functions for lobbying organizations. Political support not only can induce a congressman to back the group’s legislative interests but also can help to ensure that members friendly to the group goals remain in office.

To gain support from candidates of the Congress members, an organization called as Political Action Committees (PAC) was formed. The emergence of the term PACs for the first time was mentioned in The Federal Election Campaign Acts (FECA) in 1971, that is; regulations of the constitution that controls funds for elections of federal organization members such as Congress (Burns et al 1989; Friendly and Elliot 1987).

Most PACs that are formed are linked to business interests but there are also interests that are specific to support the U.S. foreign policy towards a specific interest, for instance: pro-Israel PAC, that emerges the issue of the function of Israel to support the success of international politics of the U.S. in the Middle East. (Smith 1988; Tivnan: 1987)

As an example, through PAC, the American Jews will collect fund from the American Jews or non-Jews that are pro-Israel to support the candidates of Congress members who were predicted to support the U.S. policies that tend to be pro-Israel. The Washington Lobby emphasizes on the emergence of PAC organization after the
Federal Election Commission (FEC) was formed in PAC decision in 1975. Contribution of election fund from the companies which at the beginning were just stake holders grew larger, including from the workers. (The Washington Lobby 1987: 10)

The Israel lobby is included in FRLA 1946 called as Domestic lobby. This lobby influences the U.S. foreign policy regarding the Middle East to profit Israel. For that aim, Israel lobby creates issue on “role or function” of Israel for the U.S. national interest. In effort to build that reason, Israel lobby uses cultural values of America as the base.

Out of all cultural values of America, the Israel lobby found the strategy to raise the human rights, democracy and cultural compound issues are the most effective issues to be raised to show the important means of the existence of Israel for America’s people and culture.

By using these strategy, Israel lobby not just present the role values for the American people, but also uses the issue of the role or the function of Israel as the only state in the Middle East that applies these values. With that strategy, thus Israel should be considered as one of the national interest asset in the Middle East, and that makes it logic when the U.S. must tend to take Israel side.
In the governmental level, Israel lobby supported by the neo-conservative intellectual groups and the fundamental Christian succeeded to influence the executive branch (President). The U.S. State Department, the Department of Defense as well as the other governmental officials are mostly will pro-Israel in decision making process. In the Israel lobby environment, the think tank group that consists of Jews academics and intellectuals writes their thoughts through publishing papers and articles in the mass media to influence the public opinion that can benefit to the Jews or Israel interests.

In Legislative level, the Israel Lobby by its most influential lobby group in congress called American Israel Public affairs Committee (AIPAC) succeeded to build a strong “power relationship” with the Congress members and staff that deals with the international relations. The Israel lobby also put its people to become the staff of the congress members, and able to gain their support towards policies concerning Jews/Israel’s interests.

C. Israel Lobby Organizations and Pro-Israel Actors

The Israel lobby organizations and pro-Israel actors are the main role of the act of Israel lobby. Since the precidency of Truman, the lobby has been effective to influence the U.S. policies that tend to support Israel interests. These actors has changed from time-to time continued by their generations. This sub chapter will focus on the pro-Israel actors under Barrack Obama administration.
1. **Israel Lobby Organizations In U.S.**

There are hundreds of Israel lobby organizations in the United States that has various kinds of interests from various sectors such as politics, social, economy, culture, religion, education, art, youth, etc. This thesis will only focus on the Jews organizations that dominates in the Israel lobby.

All Jewish lobbies and organizations are interconnected. The leaders of the numerous Jewish Lobby Groups go to the same synagogues, country clubs, and share the same Jewish investment bankers. And this inter-connectedness extends to the Jews who run the Federal Reserve Bank, U.S. Homeland Security, and the U.S. State Department.

**American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC):** AIPAC has a staff of over 150 employees and an annual budget of over $60 million derived from private contributions from wealthy Jews and Jewish-owned businesses. AIPAC has many PACs attached to their Lobby. PACs are “Public Action Committees,” sanctioned by Federal Law, that give huge donations to political candidates. PACs are the means by which AIPAC and all Jewish lobbies utilize the immense wealth of Jewry to bribe U.S. politicians.

**American Jewish Congress (AJC):** “The American Jewish Congress is an association of Jewish Americans organized to defend Jewish interests at home and abroad through public policy advocacy - using diplomacy, legislation, and the courts” (www.ajcongress.org accessed 8 September 2013).
In the 1930’s, the AJC led a major boycott of German goods in America, which, among other provocations of the Jews, prompted a backlash against the Jews in Germany. Currently, the AJC works with pandering Congressman and “bought” Senators like Senator Jeff Bingaman to push through Bills with Zionist agendas. The AJC also has many PACs.

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations: 51 of the largest Jewish organizations come together regularly under the umbrella group of the Conference. Their Mission Statement reads, “Forging diverse groups into a unified force for Israel’s well being. Strengthen and foster the special U.S.-Israel relationship”. The conference also has many PACs. (www.conferenceofpresidents.org accessed 8 September 2013).


Middle East Forum (MEF): The Middle East Forum seeks to promote American interests in the Middle East. The MEF reallizes its goals through three
main mechanism: Intellectual, Operational and Philanthrophic (www.meforum.org accessed 8 September 2013). This organization is included as one of the Israel lobby organization that moves in creating public opinion.

**Zionist Organization of America (ZOA):** “Founded in 1897, the Zionist Organization of America is the oldest pro-Israel organization in the United States. With offices around the country and in Israel, the ZOA is dedicated to educating the public, elected officials, media, and college/high school students about the truth of the ongoing and relentless Arab war against Israel. ZOA is also committed to promoting strong U.S.-Israel relations. ZOA works to protect Jewish college and high school students from intimidation, harassment and discrimination, and in fighting anti-Semitism in general” (www.zoa.org accessed 8 September 2013).

The ZOA has played a key role in Congress regarding victims of; keeping Jerusalem unified under Israeli; fighting Hamas and Fatah; and working on the imposition of sanctions on Syria and Saudi Arabia.

2. Pro-Israel Actors

Under Barrack Obama administrations there are various pro-Israel actors that plays important role in the U.S. government. By having the pro-Israel actors that plays critical role in the U.S. government, the lobby could run smoother and
easier. This sub-chapter will elaborate the pro-Israel actors who takes critical positions in the U.S. government under Barrack Obama’s first Administration.

Joseph Robinette Biden or well known as Joe Biden is the Vice president of the U.S. under Barrack Obama administration. His career in the U.S. government has started since he was 29 years old when he was chosen as a senator as a delegate for Delaware and became one of the youngest senator in the U.S. Since then, Biden has always became senator until 2009 where he officially was inaugurated as the Vice President of the U.S.

As a senator, Biden was active in handling international issues and played important role in the U.S. foreign policy decision making regarding terrorism, weapon of mass destruction and Middle East. Obama put big trust in him by giving full access to Biden to attend all of his Presidential schedule. Many cabinet members thinks that Biden has a very big influence to Obama.

Among numerous U.S. senators, Biden is included as loyal to Israel. In a dinner event of Jewish National Fund (JNF), David Ivry, the Ambassador of Israel for U.S. mentioned in his speech that Senator Biden has shown his commitment towards Israel’s security needs by understanding Israel’s effort to fight against terror and threats that shadows Middle East. Moreover, Senator Biden has clearly admitted himself as a Zionist in an interview from Schalom TV, saying “I’m a Zionist. You don’t have to be a Jew to be a Zionist”
**Rahm Israel Emanuel** is one of the most influential person in Obama’s team. New York Times mentioned “Mr. Emanuel is arguably the second most powerful person in the country” (nytimes, 4 Jan 2009). Emanuel was the first person to be appointed by Obama to be one of his team, his appointment to be the White House Chief of Staff was done just two days after Obama won the election without the agreement of the Senate, unlike the secretary.

Emanuel is plays huge role in the appointment of the cabinet personnel of Obama. He was the one who pursued Obama to put Hillary Clinton as secretary of State and Leon Panetta as the Chief of CIA. He also had influence in the appointment of Peter R. Orszag as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, a Jew who served as the Assistant to the President for the economic policy in the Bill Clinton’s administration. His close friend, Ray LaHood the Senator from Chicago was appointed as the U.S. Secretary of Transportation after 30 minutes meeting with Obama in Chicago. It was said that this decision demonstrates Emanuel’s sway with Obama (nytimes, 4 Jan 2009).

Haaretz, a leading newspaper in Israel elaborated Emanuel’s background. Emanuel is a son from a Doctor who was a member of Irgun, a terrorist militant who did massacre in Deir Yassin district. Emanuel’s father then moved to Chicago and in 1959 Emanuel was born.

Emanuel’s loyalty towards Israel is clearly seen in the Gulf war 1991, when he returned to Israel and joined in Israel Defense Force. Ira N. Forman, the
Executive Director of the National Jewish Democratic Council said “Obama made an outstanding selection. Emanuel has been a forceful and effective leader within the Democratic Party. His voting record and leadership in support of the U.S.-Israel relationship are outstanding. Emanuel has deep Jewish roots and strong ties to the Jewish community. Emanuel, the son of an Israeli immigrant, has a proven commitment to Israel's security and served as civilian volunteer on an Israeli military base during the Persian Gulf War of 1991.” (Haaretz.com nov 7, 2008)

Hillary Diane Rodham Clinton is the 67th United States Secretary of State from 2009 to 2013, serving under President Barack Obama. She was previously a United States Senator for New York from 2001 to 2009. As the wife of President Bill Clinton, she was First Lady of the United States from 1993 to 2001. In the 2008 election, Clinton was a leading candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Hillary Clinton is another loyal supporter of Israel. In front of AIPAC, she gave speech on how U.S. and Israel relationship is very close. She said:

The United States and Israel have an incredible bond, as allies, friends, as partners. We have shared interests. We have shared ideals. These are not just common values. They are our core values: freedom, democracy, and human rights, women's rights, a robust civil society. And we stand with Israel, because Israel demonstrates that democracy can flourish in the most difficult conditions, because its very existence is a stinging rebuke to hatred and the holocaust, because in defeating terror Israel’s cause is our cause, and because Israel’s struggle is a struggle not just for the Jewish people but for all people who want to live in peace and security under a democratically elected government.
Robert Michael Gates is a retired civil servant who served as the 22nd United States Secretary of Defense from 2006 to 2011. In an international security conference in Bahrain, Gates defended Israel's reputed nuclear program, he said that “Israel did not seek to destroy its neighbors or support terrorism, unlike Iran.” When he was asked whether he thought Israel's nuclear program caused a threat to the region, Gates replied: "No, I do not. Israel is not training terrorists to subvert its neighbours. It has not shipped weapons into a place like Iraq to kill thousands of innocent civilians covertly," (www.Haaretz.com). The fact is that on July 2006, Israel attacked South Lebanon and killed 1000 people. For more than 60 years Israel has also done military operation in Palestine.

Timothy Franz Geithner is an American economic policy maker and central banker who served as the 75th United States Secretary of the Treasury, under President Barack Obama. He was previously the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York from 2003 to 2009.

Geithner's position included a large role in directing the Federal Government's spending on the Financial crisis of 2007–2008, including allocation of $350 billion of funds from the Troubled Asset Relief Program enacted during the previous administration. At the end of his first year in office, he continued to deal with multiple high visibility issues, including administration efforts to restructure the regulation of the nation's financial system, attempts to spur recovery of both the mortgage market and the automobile industry, demands for protectionism, President Obama's tax changes, and negotiations with foreign
governments on approaches to worldwide financial issues. Apart from his major mistakes, Obama still keep his position as the Secretary of Treasury until now.

D. The Source of Israel Lobby Power

The Israel lobby power are gained through the fund source that Israel owns to support its lobby success, such as financial power, moral support and influencing the public opinion. This sub-chapter will elaborate these sources that could help the lobby to be effective.

1. Financial Power

The Jews financial power is a power source that the Jews own in influencing the U.S. foreign policy, whether in the executive, legislative, mass media or the intellectuals and academists. The Jews financial power has a strong link with the economic power of the Jews organization in the U.S. and the role of the Jews businessman who succeeded to dominate several important sectors in the U.S. economy sector.

The Jews businessmen has played several important role in the financial sector in several large capitalist countries including the U.S., one of them plays role in the banking sector. Huge banks such as Lehman Brothers, Kuhn, Loeb and Citycorp are owned by the Jews. Non-bank companies namely American Express, Mersill Lynch and Corporation, Prudential Insurance Corporation, and Sears are also owned by the Jews.
The Jews businessmen monopolise the stocks in various large industries in the U.S. such as beverage company Coca-Cola, fast food company Mc Donalds, Pizza Hut, Kentucky Fried Chicken, etc. These companies has franchise that spreads all over the world. Jews businessmen also dominates in various clothing company, jewelery trade, sugar company, tobacco, as well as movie industry, Hollywood. The Jews in Wall Street and Manhattan, New York city has played important role in deciding the financial movement in the whole world.

The financial power owned by the Jews are used to donate the campaigns of the U.S. president candidates, governor and the Congress members who are pro-Israel. These fund are channeled through PAC (Political Action Committee) that is recognized by the U.S. government as official institution of campaign funds supplier. Candidates who does not support the interests of the Jews would be labelled anti-semitism and dropped in elections by numerous tactics and strategy done by the Jews lobby.

The other supporting factor that is also important is its financial power funds in order to support its lobbying power. Those funds are collected from the donation of the American Jews enterpreneurs that are very rich. The Israel lobby plays important role in the U.S. Presidential elections, governmental elections, and Congressional elections by donating funds to the candidates campaigns that supports Israel’s interests (pro-Israel), from the Republic or Democrat Parties. The Washington Post newspaper once estimated the President candidates from
Democrat Party depends 60 percent of their election campaign money on the Jews donation (Mearsheimer, Walt, 2006: 17).

2. Moral Support Power

To spread its influence in the government, Congress, mass media, academists and the american society, the Jews lobby also uses special issues as the lobby moral support power which is anti-semitism, holocaust, and religious issues in influencing the Christian group. These issues are proven to be effective in gaining support towards the Jews and Israel.

The Holocaust is an issue about mass murder of Jews in Germany at Hitler’s administration triggered by hatred towards the Jews that roots from anti-semitism. The tragedy of this genocide is commemorated by the Jews and is used as a tool to gain sympathy, empathy and moral support of the Americans towards Jews.

Other issues used by the Jews to gain moral support is by raising religious issues to influence the Fundamental Christians to support and justify Israel’s acts by using the myths about the Jews as God’s chosen people and the belief of “the return of Christ” as well as the existence of Israeli state. This issue succeeded in gaining the Fundamental Christian towards Israel’s interests and most of them tend to be pro-Israel.

Israel lobbyists also uses some tactics to achive their lobby, by using the the issue of “anti-semitism” as a discriminating treatment and prejudice that humiliates Arabs and Jews. This anti-semitism issue is very effective in gaining
moral support from the Americans. In general, Americans realize the power of Israel lobby, however they are unwilling to talk openly about it, they are worried to be accused as “anti-semitism” thus many of them are afraid to oppose the policies that are pro-Israel.

In the U.S., the label of anti-semitism is very shameful because it is very contradicting with the culture and values in U.S. about appreciation to the multiculturalism and anti-discrimination.

Anti-semitism issue is a negative stereotype term of anti-Jews which is considered as discrimination act towards the Jews. Usually Americans are worried about the blame on anti-semitism because it is contradicting with the cultural values of America on appreciating human rights, anti racial issues, and anti discriminations. Accusation of anti-semitism is always used as a weapon to attack individuals or groups that are not in line with the Jews and Israel lobby interests. The Jews lobby groups and the pro-Israel sympathizers use the accusation of anti-semitism in order to stop the critiques towards Israel.

From the historical background, anti-semitism is an act of racism that appeared in the 19th century and developed among the Christians who are anti Jews. The accusation of Jews as people of their own God’s murderer has become the main key to explain the natural behavior of torture suffered by the Jews.
3. Public Opinion Power Through Mass Media, Academist, and Intellectuals

The other source owned by the Jews lobby is its power to hold the mass media and the intellectuals in the academic sector. Israel lobby efforts to influence the U.S. citizens to sympathize the Jews and supports the government’s policy that are pro-Israel by shaping the public opinion through mass media and ensure that the pro-Israel’s views are more superior in every debate in the mass media, academist and public.

News reports that the pro-Israel bias mostly are packed in an editorial form in the top newspapers in the US such as The Journal, Chicago Sun Times, Washington Times where the reports tend to be pro-israel. Magazines such as The Commentary, The New Republic, and Weekly Standard also always support the Israel interst in its every report. Reports that are pro-Israel could also be found in newspaper such as The New York Times that sometimes critics Israel’s policies but supports Israel’s interests at the same time (Mearsheimer, Walt, 2007: 171-172).

Any reports linked to Israel were informed more transparently by the media than the editorial because reporters tries to show news that are more objective, besides that, it is also difficult to cover news in the dispute areas without knowing the real behavior and actions of Israel. In posting news on Israel, the lobby assembles “letter writing campaign” in order to show and boycot the news that are anti-Israel. One of the CNN executive said that he receives about 6000 mail everyday that complains the news that are anti-Israel. CAMERA (the pro-Israel
Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America) assembled campaigns to all public radio stations in 33 cities on May 2003 to convince radio contributors in showing their sympathy towards Israel on reports about the Middle East. One of the radio stations in Boston said that more than 1 million contributions gained due to that effort.

The lobby then formed an organization “the caravan for Democracy” that drives the pro-Israel academists to campuses. These organizations are supported by the Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA) and the Israel on Campus Coalition (ICC). They are shaped to gain pro-Israel supports from campuses. AIPAC spends more than three times to watch campus activities and train the early students who are pro-Israel.

The lobby effort to gain support in campuses and isolate critics towards Israel may not be as big as the success of the lobby influence towards the Congress and government, but that lobby does exist and are effective, especially when it uses anti-semitism issue.

Besides that, Israel lobby has root its influence towards a famous think tank groups namely Center for Security Policy (CSP), the Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI), the Heritage Foundation, the Hudson Institute, the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis (IFPA), the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA). These groups are mostly pro-Israel and least of them critics on the U.S. support to Israel.
CHAPTER III

THE INFLUENCE OF ISRAEL LOBBY TO THE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY UNDER BARRACK OBAMA’S FIRST ADMINISTRATION TOWARDS ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

There are various types of government used by different countries in the world. In the United States, the government is divided into Executive, Legislative and Judicative or known as trias politica. Because the U.S. is a democratic country, its tradition of free speech is well-established. But running elections in the U.S. is expensive and campaign contributions are weakly regulated. This condition becomes a slot to different groups to influence policy by donating directly to candidates and try to defeat candidates whose views are considered suspicious. They can also lobby elected representatives and members of the executive branch, and they can try to get their own supporters to sit in key policy-making positions. (Mearsheimer and Walt 2007: 140).

A. U.S. Foreign Policy Decision Making Process

The U.S. divides its power into three sections known as trias politica namely Executive, Legislative and Judicative. In foreign policy decision making, executive and legislative branch are the ones who has the authority to create a policy. This is mentioned in the U.S. constitution on the making of U.S. foreign policy that gives the authority to the President, Congress and Bureaucracy to run foreign policy (McDougal, 2010: 12).
President and Congress that consists of House of Representatives and Senate plays important role in the U.S. foreign policy decision making process. Both executive and legislative cooperates, shares tasks, power sharing as well as checking and balances. In the decision making process, President takes position in planning a policy, while Congress analyses and critics, as well as giving input to the President for the policy addressed by Congress. Every governmental programs that will be run by the executive must be submitted to Congress, and the result will still be decided by the Congress whether the policy could be agreed or not (McDougal, 2010: 12).

In the making of U.S. foreign policy, when a decision will be taken, it will involve several process. At first level, lobbyist from various fields with various requests, lobbies the policy influencers and the domestic political actors according to their interests. Then, decision makers will consider the policy according to the domestic political system whether the lobby requests could fulfill the U.S. national interest or not. Then the foreign policy will be shaped as an output of this process (Coplin, 1971: 86).

B. Israel Lobby in Barrack Obama Administration

Israel lobby has been effective to put its influence in the U.S. since the World war II and since the Six Day War of 1967, the lobby size, wealth and influence grew substantially. The U.S. commitment towards Israel has been proven far before Obama was elected as President.
In the President Harry S. Truman’s administration, the U.S. 33rd President, in his memoir he wrote that the main leaders of the Jews in the U.S. gave him full pressure to use the U.S. authority and power for the Jews aspirations in Palestine (Truman, 1955: 153). Regarding the U.S. Middle East foreign policy, one of the biggest influence of the lobby was to goal the Iraq war under George W. Bush Jr. and far before that, the lobby has influenced many U.S. foreign policy under most of the U.S. Presidents (Sulaeman, 2009: 54 - 64).

Under Barrack Obama’s administration, the lobby continues to influence the U.S. foreign policy to goal the Israel’s national interests. Barrack Obama seem to continue the tradition of the previous Presidents of the U.S.. Barrack Obama’s administration in its foreign policies seem to fully supports the Israel’s interests politically, diplomatically as well as militarily.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Military Grant</th>
<th>Immig. Grant</th>
<th>ASHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,423.9</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,583.9</td>
<td>2,550.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,803.8</td>
<td>2,775.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,029.22</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,098.0</td>
<td>3,075.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These support under Barrack Obama administration are also derived by the special relationship between Israel and the U.S. as a result of the power of Israel lobby. The Israel lobby in the U.S. efforts to do lobby activities in order to influence the U.S. foreign policy that would benefit for the Israel’s interests. Their lobbying activities includes preparing campaign fund contribution, and supporting the pro-Israel organizations.

The Israel lobby power in the Obama’s administration could be seen from Obama’s working team in the government that involves many pro-Israelis as well as Jews in the important positions. As elaborated in the previous chapter, important position such as the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Treasury, Vice President and White House Chief of staff are all held by pro-Israeli actors. Even the think tank groups that writes papers to influence the public opinion through the media such as newspapers, magazines, or articles.

The lobbyist position in the political process of the U.S. are tied with the democratic values that they adopted. Legislative branch consider that the lobbyist system in a phenomenon that must be received in the compound of democracy life, that roots from the America’s culture tradition (Welch: 1990: 19).

In his campaign, Barrack Obama has actually once mentioned that if he were to be a President, he will not give chance for lobbyist to work in the White House (www.washingtonpost.com, 17 September 2013). He also said that he doesn’t receive money from oil company or the Washington lobbyist and will not let the lobbyist to block change (www.newsweek.com, 17 September 2013). Soon after Obama was
chosen he released rules that forbid lobbyist to donate or seek for money in the administration transition time. But how effective is this regulation? The Washington Post evaluates “it seems silly to prohibit lobbyists from giving advice in the very fields of their expertise; well-qualified advisers will no doubt be excluded as a result. And it seems similarly odd to single out lobbyists for special prohibitions, when, say, union leaders are free under the rules to give advice on the Labor Department transition or pharmaceutical company executives are permitted to participate in the health-care review” (www.washingtonpost.com, 17 September 2013).

The Israel lobby defeated Obama when he appointed Chas W. Freeman as Director of International Intelligence. Freeman was known as anti-Israel. He once said that the violence towards the Palestinians by the Israelis is the main hamper for the Middle east Peace. Soon after that, Freeman received pressure and attacks from senators that are pro-Israel. As a result of the pressures, Freedman withdrew his nomination by making letter that clearly mentioned pro-Israel lobby as the threats behind all attacks (www.enduringamerica.com) (see attachment 1).

**The lobbying process**

In the Obama’s administration, the lobby uses several techniques to goal its lobby namely Coalition organizing, direct lobbying, grass roots and campaign support.

- **Coalition Organizing:** In this case, AIPAC, the Jews lobby organization, who has direct access to the Congress, lobbies the Congressional staff that deals with international relations problem. The Congressional staffers including the internship fellows are potential people, and in between them some Jews are also
penetrated by the Israel lobby. Generally, the Congress members are too busy with their work in handling the arrangements of constitution and entrust their job to the congressional staff to help, which sometimes “they do not read what they signed”. Besides that, the Jews group are expert in building power relationship with the Congress members so they succeeded to gain the Congress support towards the policies regarding the Jews interests.

Bruce C. Wolpe and Betram J. Levine in their book “Lobbying the Congress: How the System Works” mentioned that the credibility and the trust built between the lobbyist and the Congress members are also needed to be built with the Congress Staffs. Every lobby groups appreciates personal relationships with the people’s representatives and Senators remembering the importance of direct dialogues on several problems, but, the decision makers usually depends on their staff in giving its evaluation, guide and help. It is impossible for Congress to sit in various committee and sub-committee and able to have control all issues and its expansion everytime, so they depend on their staff in finding out a problem, the reason and the suggestions (Wolpe, Levine, 1996). Therefore building close relationship with the Congressional staff is also important since they keep on developing their ability to take control over various problems and has great influence to the Congress members.

This opinion is supported by Mearsheimer and Walt who says as follows:

Pro-israel congressional staffers are another source of the lobby power. As Morris Amitay, a former head of AIPAC once admitted “there are a lot of guys at the working level up here (on capitol hill) who happen to be Jewish, who are willing.... to
look at certain issues in terms of their jewishness... these are all guys who are in position to make the decision in these areas for those senators you can get an awful lot done just at the staff level (Mearsheimer and Walt 2006: 17)

- **Direct Lobbying:** The Israel lobby places some of its missionary to sit on critical positions in the U.S. government. In Obama’s administration, the Israel lobby has put Rahm Emanuel in the position of the Chief Staff of White House, pro-Israel actor Hillary Clinton as the Secretary of state and other critical positions taken over by the Israel Lobby’s missionary.

- **Grass Roots:** This part involves the approach to the individuals or mass media through telegrams, phone calls, electronic letters and gathering public opinion. The lobby involves the thinktanks such as Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), the Middle East Forum (MEF) and the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP) to write articles that does not criticise Israel’s act to lobby and to gain sympathy of the readers through the writings. The thinktank groups also are placed in universities and research organizations to influence the public opinion. This involves the issues of Holocaust and anti-semitism which is very effective to provide the public’s sympathy towards the past tragedy suffered by the Jews.

- **Campaign Support:** The Israel lobby, in order to shape a team that could guarantee the Israel’s national interest, it has to choose the candidates who sits in the important position who supports the Israel’s lobby. Therefore in the election time, the President candidates or Congress candidates were being selected. The
candidate who offers the most interesting policy towards Israel will be considered
at most, and will be elected by the pro-Israelis in the U.S., as well as donated in
the campaigns.

C. U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Generally, the U.S. foreign policy is made based on the sacred values and
cultural values owned by the U.S. which are based on the the concept of: (1) Principal
on international relations that could be reached through peace ways and refuse
violence as policy method, (2) Principal on national sovereignty under international
law, (3) Principal on maintaining peace among neighbour states that are more
supportive in handling aid from the weaker, (4) Principal of shared security in nation-
state scope. These principals became reference as guidance to the direction of the U.S.
foreign policy, so if violations happen, thus these principals could be used as guidance
to return to the real purpose (Gabriel 1974: 198).

There are various perspectives in examining the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It
could be examined according to pre-1948 history (before the declaration of Israel).
DR. Ilan Pappe in his book “The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine”, he mentioned that
Israel was stood by expelling and killing the people in Palestine. By looking from this
point of view, the existance of Israel as a state is illegal.

Gideon Levy, a journalist in Hareetz, assumed that Israel is a state that its
existence is recognized by the United Nations (UN), with the boundary as determined
by the UN 1947. The UN result the 181 resolution on the partitions of Israel and Palestine land into 56,5% for the Jews, 43% for the Arabs, and Jerusaleam as International region (www.Hareetz.com, 9 September 2013).

“The root of all occupation is the settlement”, Levy wrote. What he meant by this is that the long lasting conflict of Israel and Palestine roots from Israel acts of occupying Palestine’s land. In 1967, through the Six Day War, Israel settled in areas which was at first place belongs to Palestine and East Jerusaleam. Some areas in de jure was returned to Palestine in the Oslo Summit 1994, but in de facto Israel’s troops were actually still settle there.

In contradiction with the Jenewa Convention, Israel built Jews houses in the area, their people are brought in, they live and give birth there, and that place then was claimed as Israel’s part until today, Israel kept on building houses in several settlement places, even in East Jerusaleam which is actually the international zone. This is what was meant by Levy by the root of occupation evil is the settlement (www.Haaretz.com, 9 September 2013).

In general, the U.S. foreign policy towards Israeli-Palestinian conflict could be seen from his speech in the Department of State (22/1), Obama said,

Let me be clear: America is committed to Israel's security. And we will always support Israel’s right to defend itself against legitimate threats. For years, Hamas has launched thousands of rockets at innocent Israeli citizens. No democracy can tolerate such danger to its people, nor should the international community, and neither should the Palestinian people themselves, whose interests are only set back by acts of terror. To be a genuine party to peace, the quartet [U.S., Russia, European Union, United Nations] has made it clear that Hamas must meet clear conditions: recognize Israel's right to exist; renounce violence; and abide [between Israel-PLO/Palestine authority] by past agreements.
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In his speech in Cairo on June 4, 2009, he said:

Hamas does have support among some Palestinians, but they also have responsibilities. To play a role in fulfilling Palestinian aspirations, and to unify the Palestinian people, Hamas must put an end to violence, recognize past agreements, and recognize Israel's right to exist... America’s strong bonds with Israel are well-known. This bond is unbreakable... At the same time, Israelis must acknowledge that just as Israel's right to exist cannot be denied, neither can Palestine's. The United States does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements. This construction violates previous agreements and undermines efforts to achieve peace. It is time for these settlements to stop.

But as written by Gideon Levy, after all Israel leaders were aware to wait for the following act from Obama’s speech, now they remained relaxed and make sure that there is nothing to fear from Obama. “The settlers continue to move into more homes in East Jerusalem, Netanyahu is silent and Israelis sense that the "danger" has passed. Israel is once again permitted to do as it pleases. The landlord has once again gone insane. Except that the landlord has gone insane because the real landlord is showing signs of weakness, signs of folding, signs of losing interest in events in the region that most endangers world peace.” (Levy, 2009). In front of Israel’s violations Obama still submit a budget of $2,77 billion for military grant to Israel in 2010. (see attachment 2)

Since the World War II, the United States economic and military assistance to Israel has reached to nearly $154 billion. Every year, Israel receives direct foreign assistance of $3 billion average which is roughly equal to one-sixth from total of U.S. foreign assistance budget and equal to 2 percent of Israel’s GDP. (see attachment 3)

The amount of $154 billion refers on the direct foreign assistance to Israel. The actual total is significantly higher, because direct U.S. aid is given under unusually
favorable terms and the United States provides Israel with other forms of material assistance that are not included in the foreign assistance budget (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007: 24-26).

For instance, the result of Arab-Israel war in 1973, in order to save Israel, the U.S. made diplomatic relations with Israel’s opponents, Egypt and Jordan; they were given foreign assistance as reward from their willingness to make peace with Israel. As well as the funds that the U.S. must spend to build Israel’s military base in the Middle East. It was all done to protect Israel.

In 2007, former Under Secretary of States for Political Affairs in the Bush administration, Nicholas Burns signed MoU entitled “Memorandum of Understanding on U.S. Military Assistance,” that assisted $30 billion to Israel to be an investment in peace, in 10 years time. He said:

We consider this 30 billion dollars in assistance to Israel to be an investment in peace - in long-term peace. Peace will not be made without strength. Peace will not be made without Israel being strong in the future. Of course, our objective as a country and our specific objective as a government is to contribute to that peace, a peace between Israel and the Palestinian people, the creation of an independent Palestinian state willing to live side by side in peace with Israel, and a general peace in the region that has eluded the Israeli people for 59 years but which is, we hope, the destiny of the Israeli people as well as the Arab peoples of the region. Our policy in this entire region is dedicated to that final objective.

The Barrack Obama’s administration is no much difference than the other previous U.S. Presidents. In 2009, Obama became the first U.S. President to authorize the sale of bunker buster bombs to Israel (see attachment 4). The transfer was kept secret to avoid the impression that the United States was arming Israel for an attack on Iran. Until the end of his first administration he still had signed into law a bill that
would extend by another three years the program of United States guarantees for Israeli government debt.

Regarding his dreams of creating a peace world that he mentioned several times in his campaign speeches, has not yet realized in his first administration. His position still remained as the previous U.S. presidents in giving unconditional foreign assistance to Israel. This leads to the impossibility of the creation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Not only Obama, but any upcoming U.S. President candidates will never succeed in creating peace in that region, as mediator of the conflict, if they take the same position in supporting only one side of the conflicting side. In solving this problem, U.S. as a mediator must be fair to both sides.

It does not mean that Obama has not done anything to create peace in Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He has committed to create a permanent peace of the Arab and Israel through two-state solutions and peace talks that has been done several times, it is just the peace has not been realized yet. Some factors are violations of the agreement that has been made, and supported by the U.S. aid unconditionally which impacts to the stagnation of the peace process (Kementerian Luar Negeri, 2010).

However, by giving an unconditional foreign assistant to Israel in most of the time is also not good for the United States itself. Besides it is costly, embracing Israel too closely would jeopardize U.S. relations with the Arab and Islamic world and undermined the U.S. image in many other countries as well. The U.S. will also be thought as hypocrite when the U.S. try to promote democracy in another states, since
the U.S. also do not give a good example in some cases. The lobby has made it difficult for U.S. leaders to pressure Israel, thereby prolonging the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The lobby’s influence has not always helped Israel either. By enabling Israel’s refusal to recognize the Palestinian’s legitimate aspirations, the long campaign to kill, imprison, or marginalize a generation of Palestinian leaders has helped bring groups like Hamas to power and reduced the number of Palestinian leaders who would welcome a negotiated settlement and be able to make it work.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSION

The Israel Lobby towards U.S. foreign policy has been active doing its lobbying activities since the administration of Harry S. Truman until Obama’s administration. Some people may think that the Obama’s administration would be different than the other previous U.S. Presidents, but the fact is that under Barrack Obama’s administration the lobby is still playing its big influence and President Obama could not deny it.

The Israel lobby used several issues in order to goal its lobby, such as the “shared-interest” between the U.S. and Israel to goal especially the Middle East policy. Religious issues such as the return of Christ, and the return of the Jews in Palestine (the promised land) has influenced the Christians to support the existence of Israel’s state. The Christians believe that the return of the Jews to Palestine is the Key event in the preordained process that will lead to the Second coming which is written in the Bible.

In order to gather the public opinion, the Israel lobby takes over the control of the media such as Television, newspapers, magazines etc. to influence the public opinion to take Israel’s side and humiliate people that are not supporting the Jews. These people who are anti-Israel will be accused as anti-semite, the people who discriminates the Jews. This label is shameful for Americans because the United States
is a liberal democracy where people of any race, religion, or ethnicity are supposed to enjoy equal rights. The other way to influence the public opinion is by sending think tanks to universities and international institutions to influence the people’s thoughts about Israel.

The lobby has actually inflicted the United States and Israel themselves. By giving unconditional aid to Israel, it could affect to the image of the United States as the state who promotes democracy. To gradually give foreign assistance to Israel has also become very costly as well. The U.S. has at least given $3 billion of military aid every year excluding other foreign aids to Israel (Sharp, 2013). The biggest impact is that there would be more rebellion groups emerging to threaten them and the muslim world would lack trust to America in the creation of friendship relation with the Muslim world.

As to Israel, by lobbying the U.S. government actually will not solve the problem of Israeli-Palestinian conflict itself. Israel will further face threats especially from the Arab countries that surrounds it. By violating the treaties made in the agreement of Israel and Palestine peace talks, it actually would affect badly to the Israel’s national security. The long campaign to kill, imprison, or marginalize a generation of Palestinian leaders has helped bring groups like Hamas to power and reduced the number of Palestinian leaders who would welcome a negotiated settlement and be able to make it work.
In solving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the United States as the mediator first has to be neutral towards both sides. U.S. leaders have actually been engaged in every aspect of the peace process, but they have never used their full influence to push within its pre-1967 border, the United States should make it clear that it is dead set against Israel’s expansionist settlements policy – including the “land grabbing” security fence – and that it believes that this policy is not in America’s or Israel’s long-term interests.

In particular, the United States should make it clear that Israel must withdraw from almost all the territories that it has occupied in June 1967 in exchange for full peace. Israel and the Palestinians will also have to reach agreement on the rights of displaced Palestinians to return to the lands they took over in 1948. Israel will have to acknowledge a “right” of return - in effect acknowledging that Israel’s creation involved the Palestinian rights – and the Palestinians will have to agree to renounce this right in exchange for an appropriate level of compensation. The United States and the European Union could organize and finance a generous program of reconstruction aid to compensate the Palestinians, which would terminate all claims for their actual return into what is now and will forever remain Israeli territory.

For the U.S. to reduce its dependency on the Israel lobby, one of the way could be to re-identify what is the U.S. interests in the Middle East again. Although some Americans believe that America should support Israel’s existence, Israel’s security is ultimately not of critical strategic importance to the United States.
does not support Israel’s existence because it makes Americans more secure, but rather because Americans recognize the long history of Jewish suffering and believe that it is desirable for the Jewish people to have their own state.

As a general conclusion of this thesis, the writer concludes that whoever sits in the position of U.S. President, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could hardly be solved as long as they are tied with the Israel lobby. Candidates who are elected based on its support to Israel’s national interest will tend to support Israel in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. As also happened during the previous Presidencies such as George W. Bush and other previous U.S. Presidents who ended remaining the Israeli-Palestinian conflict unsolved until the next administrations.

A mediator should take a neutral position to solve a conflict and be firm towards its solutions of the two states. In this position, the U.S. is the one who is responsible to take a firm act towards the sides that violate the agreement in order to create peace in the region.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Hires lobbyists?</th>
<th>Lobbying firm?*</th>
<th>Lobbyist(s) give to member?</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Indivs</th>
<th>PACs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$1,392,675</td>
<td>$1,392,675</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goldman Sachs</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$1,035,095</td>
<td>$1,035,095</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$831,110</td>
<td>$831,110</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Microsoft Corp</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$809,799</td>
<td>$809,799</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Google Inc</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$796,564</td>
<td>$796,564</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JPMorgan Chase &amp; Co</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$700,808</td>
<td>$696,808</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Citigroup Inc</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$681,318</td>
<td>$679,318</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sidley Austin LLP</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$604,938</td>
<td>$604,438</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>➡️</td>
<td>$599,089</td>
<td>$599,089</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>$584,904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Skadden, Arps et al</td>
<td>$564,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Time Warner</td>
<td>$540,051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>UBS AG</td>
<td>$529,869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IBM Corp</td>
<td>$525,857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>WilmerHale</td>
<td>$525,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Morgan Stanley</td>
<td>$513,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>$507,316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>National Amusements Inc</td>
<td>$506,751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kirkland &amp; Ellis</td>
<td>$501,335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>US Government</td>
<td>$483,656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Registrants, or active lobbying firm.

This table lists the top donors to this candidate in the 2003-2008 election cycle. The organizations themselves did not donate, rather the money came from the organizations’ PACs, their individual members or employees or owners, and those individuals’ immediate families. Organization totals include subsidiaries and affiliates.
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Appendix B. Bilateral Aid to Israel

Table B-1 shows cumulative U.S. aid to Israel for FY1949 through FY1996, and U.S. aid to Israel for each fiscal year since. Detail for the years 1949-1996 is shown in Table B-2 and Table B-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Military Grant</th>
<th>Economic Grant</th>
<th>Immig. Grant</th>
<th>ASHA</th>
<th>All other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949-96</td>
<td>68,030.9</td>
<td>29,014.9</td>
<td>23,122.4</td>
<td>868.9</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>14,903.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3,132.1</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
<td>1,200.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3,080.0</td>
<td>1,800.0</td>
<td>1,200.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,010.0</td>
<td>1,860.0</td>
<td>1,080.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,131.85</td>
<td>3,120.0</td>
<td>949.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,876.05</td>
<td>1,975.6</td>
<td>838.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,850.65</td>
<td>2,040.0</td>
<td>720.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,745.15</td>
<td>3,086.4</td>
<td>596.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,687.25</td>
<td>2,147.3</td>
<td>477.2</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,612.15</td>
<td>2,202.2</td>
<td>357.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,534.5</td>
<td>2,257.0</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,503.15</td>
<td>2,340.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,423.9</td>
<td>2,380.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,583.9</td>
<td>2,550.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,803.8</td>
<td>2,775.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,029.22</td>
<td>3,000.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,098.0</td>
<td>3,075.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,115.0 (Before Sequestration)</td>
<td>3,100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,115.0</td>
<td>3,100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 118,247.57 | 70,523.4 | 30,897.0 | 1,673.2 | 162,075 | 14,991.9 |

Notes: ESF was earmarked for $960 million for FY2000 but was reduced to meet a 0.38% rescission. FY2000 military grants include $1.2 billion for the Wye agreement and $1.92 billion in annual military aid. Final amounts for FY2003 are reduced by 0.65% mandated rescission, and final amounts for FY2004 are reduced by 0.59%.

The $600 million in housing loan guarantees, $5.5 billion in military debt reduction loan guarantees, $9.2 billion in Soviet Jew resettlement loan guarantees, and $9 billion in economic recovery loan guarantees are not included in the tables because the United States government did not transfer funds to Israel. The United States underwrote loans to Israel from commercial institutions.
American media also questioned whether Israel violated an agreement not to use cluster bombs on civilian targets. Although many of the cluster bombs used were advanced M-85 munitions developed by Israel Military Industries, Israel also used older munitions purchased from the U.S. Evidence during the conflict had shown that cluster bombs had hit civilian areas, although the civilian population had mostly fled, as well as Israel claiming that Hezbollah frequently used civilian areas to stockpile weaponry and fire rockets, in violation of international law. Many bomblets remained undetonated after the war, causing hazard for Lebanese civilians. Israel said that it had not violated any international law because cluster bombs are not illegal and were used only on military targets.[34]

**Opposing immediate unconditional ceasefire**

On 15 July, the United Nations Security Council again rejected pleas from Lebanon that it call for an immediate ceasefire between Israel and Lebanon. The Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* reported the U.S. was the only member of out the 15-nation UN body to oppose any council action at all.[35]

On 19 July, the Bush administration rejected calls for an immediate ceasefire.[36] Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said certain conditions had to be met, not specifying what they were. John Bolton, then U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, rejected the call for a ceasefire, on the grounds that such an action addressed the conflict only superficially: "The notion that you just declare a ceasefire and act as if that is going to solve the problem, I think is simplistic."[37]

On 26 July, foreign ministers from the United States, Europe and the Middle East that met in Rome vowed "to work immediately to reach with the utmost urgency a ceasefire that puts an end to the current violence and hostilities", though the U.S. maintained strong support for the Israeli campaign and the conference's results were reported to have fallen short of Arab and European leaders' expectations.[38]

**Obama administration (2009–present)**

Israeli–U.S. relations came under increased strain during Prime Minister Netanyahu's second administration and the new Obama administration. After he took office, Obama made achieving a peace deal between Israel and the Palestinians a major goal, and pressured Netanyahu into accepting a Palestinian state and entering negotiations. Netanyahu eventually conceded on 14 July 2009. In accordance with U.S. wishes, Israel imposed a ten-month freeze on settlement construction in the West Bank. As the freeze did not include East Jerusalem, which Israel regards as its sovereign territory, or 3,000 pre-approved housing units already under construction, as well as the failure to dismantle already-built Israeli outposts, the Palestinians rejected the freeze as inadequate, and refused to enter negotiations for nine months.

In 2009, Obama became the first U.S. President to authorize the sale of bunker buster bombs to Israel. The transfer was kept secret to avoid the impression that the United States was arming Israel for an attack on Iran.[39]

In March 2010, Israel announced it would continue to build 1,600 new homes that were already under construction in the eastern Jerusalem neighborhood of Ramat Shlomo, during Vice President Joe Biden's visit to Israel. The incident was described as "one of the most serious rows between the two allies in recent decades".[40] Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Israel's move was "deeply negative" for U.S.-Israeli relations.[41] East Jerusalem is, on the international diplomatic stage, widely considered to be occupied territory, while Israel disputes this, as it annexed the area.[40] Obama was reported to be "livid" over the announcement.[42]
Shortly afterward, Obama instructed Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to present Netanyahu with a four-part ultimatum: that Israel cancel the approval of the housing units, freeze all Jewish construction in East Jerusalem, that Israel make a gesture to the Palestinians that it wants peace with a recommendation on releasing hundreds of Palestinian prisoners, and that Israel agree to discuss a partition of Jerusalem and a solution to the Palestinian refugee problem during the negotiations. Obama threatened that neither he nor any senior administration official would meet Netanyahu and his senior ministers during their upcoming visit to Washington.\cite{43}

On 26 March 2010, Netanyahu and Obama met in the White House. The meeting was conducted without photographers or any press statements. During the meeting, Obama demanded that Israel extend the settlement freeze after its expiration, impose a freeze on Jewish construction in East Jerusalem, and withdraw troops to positions held before the start of the Second Intifada. Netanyahu did not give written concessions on these issues, and presented Obama with a flowchart on how permission for building is granted in the Jerusalem Municipality to reiterate that he had no prior knowledge of the plans. Obama then suggested that Netanyahu and his staff stay at the White House to consider his proposals so that if he changed his mind, he could inform Obama right away, and was quoted as saying "I'm still around, let me know if there is anything new". Netanyahu and his aides went to the Roosevelt Room, spent a further half-hour with Obama, and extended his stay for a day of emergency talks to restart peace negotiations, but left without any official statement from either side.\cite{42,44}

On 19 May 2011, Obama made a foreign policy speech in which he called for a return to the pre-1967 Israeli borders with mutually agreed land swaps, to which Netanyahu objected.\cite{45} Obama was criticized by Republicans for the speech, and some of these criticisms were found to be misleading.\cite{46,47} The speech came a day before Obama and Netanyahu were scheduled to meet.\cite{48} In an address to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee on 22 May, Obama elaborated on his 19 May speech: "It was my reference to the 1967 lines — with mutually agreed swaps — that received the lion’s share of the attention, including just now. And since my position has been misrepresented several times, let me reaffirm what '1967 lines with mutually agreed swaps' means. By definition, it means that the parties themselves — Israelis and Palestinians — will negotiate a border that is different than the one that existed on June 4, 1967. That's what mutually agreed-upon swaps means. It is a well-known formula to all who have worked on this issue for a generation. It allows the parties themselves to account for the changes that have taken place over the last 44 years. It allows the parties themselves to take account of those changes, including the new demographic realities on the ground, and the needs of both sides. The ultimate goal is two states for two people: Israel as a Jewish state and the homeland for the Jewish people and the state of Palestine as the homeland for the Palestinian people — each state in joined self-determination, mutual recognition and peace.\cite{49} In his speech to a joint session of congress on May 24, Netanyahu adopted some of Obama's earlier language: "Now the precise delineation of those borders must be negotiated. We'll be generous about the size of the future Palestinian state. But as President Obama said, the border will be different than the one that existed on 4 June 1967. Israel will not return to the indefensible boundaries of 1967."\cite{49}

In October 2011 the new American Defense Secretary, Leon Panetta, suggested that Israeli policies were partly responsible for its increasing diplomatic isolation in the Middle East, but the Israeli government responded that the problem was the growing radicalism in the region rather than their own policies.\cite{50}
In 2012, President Obama signed into law a bill that would extend by another three years the program of United States guarantees for Israeli government debt.\[51\]

Tony Blinken, National Security Advisor to U.S. Vice President Joe Biden, lamented in 2012 a tendency by U.S. politicians to use the debate over policy toward Israel for political purposes. Until then, Israel had been a bastion of bipartisan consensus in the U.S.\[52\]

In 2010 and again in July–August 2012, Israeli exports to the United States surpassed those to the European Union, usually the top destination for Israeli exports.\[53\]

**Current issues**

**United States aid**

*See also: United States military aid to Israel*

Since the 1970s, Israel has been one of the top recipients of U.S. foreign aid. In the past, a portion was dedicated to economic assistance, but all economic aid to Israel ended in 2007 due to Israel's growing economy.\[55\]/\[56\]

Currently, Israel receives $3 billion in U.S. assistance through U.S. Foreign Military Financing (FMF).\[57\] Seventy-four percent of these funds must be spent on the acquisition of U.S. defense equipment, services, and training.\[58\] Thus, United States military aid to Israel is seen as a subsidy for U.S. industries.

FMF is intended to promote U.S. national security by contributing to global stability, strengthening military support for democratically-elected governments and containing transnational threats, including terrorism and trafficking of weapons.\[57\] According to the Department of State these grants enable U.S. allies to improve their defense capabilities and foster closer military relationships between the U.S. and recipient nations.

In 1998, Israeli, congressional, and Administration officials agreed to reduce U.S. $1.2 billion in Economic Support Funds (ESF) to zero over ten years, while increasing FMF from $1.8 billion to $2.4 billion. Separate from the scheduled cuts, there was an extra $200 million in anti-terror assistance, $1.2 billion to implement the Wye agreement, and the supplemental appropriations bill assisted for another $1 billion in FMF for the 2003 fiscal year. For the 2005 fiscal year, Israel received $2.202 billion in FMF, $357 million in ESF, and migration settlement assistance of $50 million. For 2006, the Administration has requested $240 million in ESF and $2.28 billion in FMF. H.R. 3057, passed in the House on 28 June 2005, and in the Senate on 20 July, approved these amounts. House and Senate measures also supported $40 million for the settlement of immigrants from the former Soviet Union and plan to bring the remaining Ethiopian Jews to Israel.\[citation needed\]

President Obama's Fiscal Year 2010 budget proposes $53.8 billion for appropriated international affairs' programs. From that budget, $5.7 billion is appropriated for foreign military financing, military education, and peacekeeping operations. From that $5.7 billion, $2.8 billion, almost 50% is appropriated for Israel.\[59\] Israel also has available roughly $3 billion of conditional loan guarantees, with additional funds coming available if Israel meets conditions negotiated at the U.S.-Israel Joint Economic Development Group (JEDG).

In 2010, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees approved President Obama's request for $3 billion in military aid to Israel in the 2011 budget.\[60\] The appropriation has not yet been approved by Congress.
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Reprinted from Mondoweiss:

There is a special irony in having been accused of improper regard for the opinions of foreign governments and societies by a group so clearly intent on enforcing adherence to the policies of a foreign government – in this case, the government of Israel. I believe that the inability of the American public to discuss, or the government to consider, any option for US policies in the Middle East opposed by the ruling faction in Israeli politics has allowed that faction to adopt and sustain policies that ultimately threaten the existence of the state of Israel. It is not permitted for anyone in the United States to say so. This is not just a tragedy for Israelis and their neighbors in the Middle East; it is doing widening damage to the national security of the United States.

To all who supported me or gave me words of encouragement during the controversy of the past two weeks, you have my gratitude and respect.

You will by now have seen the statement by Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair reporting that I have withdrawn my previous acceptance of his invitation to chair the National Intelligence Council.

I have concluded that the barrage of libelous distortions of my record would not cease upon my entry into office. The effort to smear me and to destroy my credibility would instead continue. I do not believe the National Intelligence Council could function effectively while its chair was under constant attack by unscrupulous people with a passionate attachment to the views of a political faction in a foreign country. I agreed to chair the NIC to strengthen it and protect it against politicization, not to introduce it to efforts by a special interest group to assert control over it through a protracted political campaign.
As those who know me are well aware, I have greatly enjoyed life since retiring from government. Nothing was further from my mind than a return to public service. When Admiral Blair asked me to chair the NIC I responded that I understood he was “asking me to give my freedom of speech, my leisure, the greater part of my income, subject myself to the mental colonoscopy of a polygraph, and resume a daily commute to a job with long working hours and a daily ration of political abuse.” I added that I wondered “whether there wasn’t some sort of downside to this offer.” I was mindful that no one is indispensable; I am not an exception. It took weeks of reflection for me to conclude that, given the unprecedentedly challenging circumstances in which our country now finds itself abroad and at home, I had no choice but accept the call to return to public service. I thereupon resigned from all positions that I had held and all activities in which I was engaged. I now look forward to returning to private life, freed of all previous obligations.

I am not so immodest as to believe that this controversy was about me rather than issues of public policy. These issues had little to do with the NIC and were not at the heart of what I hoped to contribute to the quality of analysis available to President Obama and his administration. Still, I am saddened by what the controversy and the manner in which the public vitriol of those who devoted themselves to sustaining it have revealed about the state of our civil society. It is apparent that we Americans cannot any longer conduct a serious public discussion or exercise independent judgment about matters of great importance to our country as well as to our allies and friends.

The libels on me and their easily traceable email trails show conclusively that there is a powerful lobby determined to prevent any view other than its own from being aired, still less to factor in American understanding of trends and events in the Middle East. The tactics of the Israel Lobby plumb the depths of dishonor and indecency and include character assassination, selective misquotation, the willful distortion of the record, the fabrication of falsehoods, and an utter disregard for the truth. The aim of this Lobby is control of the policy process through the exercise of a veto over the appointment of people who dispute the wisdom of its views, the substitution of political correctness for analysis, and the exclusion of any and all options for decision by Americans and our government other than those that it favors.

There is a special irony in having been accused of improper regard for the opinions of foreign governments and societies by a group so clearly intent on enforcing adherence to the policies of a foreign government—in this case, the government of Israel. I believe that the inability of the American public to discuss, or the government to consider, any option for US policies in the Middle East opposed by the ruling faction in Israeli politics has allowed that faction to adopt and sustain policies that ultimately threaten the existence of the state of Israel. It is not permitted for anyone in the United States to say so. This is not just a tragedy for Israelis and their neighbors in the Middle East; it is doing widening damage to the national security of the United States.

The outrageous agitation that followed the leak of my pending appointment will be seen by many to raise serious questions about whether the Obama administration will be able to make its own decisions about the Middle East and related issues. I regret that my willingness to serve the new administration has ended by casting doubt on its ability to consider, let alone decide what policies might best serve the interests of the United States rather than those of a Lobby intent on
enforcing the will and interests of a foreign government.

In the court of public opinion, unlike a court of law, one is guilty until proven innocent. The speeches from which quotations have been lifted from their context are available for anyone interested in the truth to read. The injustice of the accusations made against me has been obvious to those with open minds. Those who have sought to impugn my character are uninterested in any rebuttal that I or anyone else might make.

Still, for the record: I have never sought to be paid or accepted payment from any foreign government, including Saudi Arabia or China, for any service, nor have I ever spoken on behalf of a foreign government, its interests, or its policies. I have never lobbied any branch of our government for any cause, foreign or domestic. I am my own man, no one else’s, and with my return to private life, I will once again – to my pleasure – serve no master other than myself. I will continue to speak out as I choose on issues of concern to me and other Americans.

I retain my respect and confidence in President Obama and DNI Blair. Our country now faces terrible challenges abroad as well as at home. Like all patriotic Americans, I continue to pray that our president can successfully lead us in surmounting them.